

PUBLIC HEARING REPORT

TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

November 12, 2004

Accepted December 15, 2004

LIST OF PEOPLE SPEAKING AT PUBLIC HEARING (written comment number)

- A Lester Bagley, St. Paul Chmbr. of Commerce & Central Corr Prtnshp. (19)
- B Rick Beeson, CEO St. Anthony Park Bank
- C Phil Krinkie, Representative (88)
- D Dean Zimmerman, Mpls City Council
- E Wendy Wolf, City of Lakeville
- F Kris Wilson, Assoc. of Metro. Municipalities (105)
- G Nancy Shouweiler, Dakota Co. Commissioner & Chair (73)
- H Aaron Gebhauer, St. Paul Resident, Member Citizens for PRT (21)
- I Ted Kolderie, downtown St. Paul resident (22)
- J Barb Thoman, Transit for Livable Communities (40)
- K Russ Stark, Midway TMO (24)
- L Michael Wietecki, Univ. of St. Thomas Sch. Of Law Env. Law Society (89)
- M David Green, Isaiah, interfaith coalition (86)
- N Devora Molitor, St. Paul Citizen
- O Russ Adams, Alliance for Metropolitan Stability (20)
- P Cordelia Pearson, Trust for Public Land (26)
- Q Peter McLaughlin, Henn. Co. Commissioner, Chair MTDB & HCRRA
- R Mat Hollinshead, Sierra Club (80)

2030 Transportation Policy Plan Comments

(V=voice mail, F-fax, L-letter, I-email, cc=comment card)

Number	Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Method
1	8/19/04	Dick	Allendorf, Chair	TMO Commuter Connections	L
2	8/19/04	Rafael	Ortega, Chair	Ramsey Co. Regl. Railroad Authority	L
3	9/8/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (2)
4	9/10/04	Leslie	Berry, Sales Manager	Roseville Visitors Association	E
5	9/13/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (1)
6	9/13/04	Kent	Bolson, Citizen	Minneapolis	E
7	9/14/04	Celia	Connoy, Citizen	Minneapolis	E
8	9/22/04	Linda	Koblick, Commissioner	Hennepin County	L/F
9	9/22/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (3)
10	9/23/04	Mrs. Shirley	Anderson, Citizen	Staples	CC (1)
11	9/23/04	Robert L.	Anderson, Citizen	Staples	CC (1)
12	9/24/04	Kurt	Kimber, Citizen	Minneapolis	E
13	9/24/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (2)
14	9/27/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (2)
15	9/27/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (2)
16	9/27/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (2)
17	9/27/04	Ken	Avidor, Citizen	Minneapolis	E
18	9/27/04	James	Linder, Citizen	Gem Lake	E
19	9/27/04	Lester	Bagley	St. Paul Chamber of Commerce	L
20	9/27/04	Russ	Adams, Exec. Director	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	L
21	9/27/04	Aaron	Gebauer	Citizens for Personal Rapid Transit	L
22	9/27/04	Ted	Kolderie, Citizen	-	L
23	9/27/04	Commissioner Peter	McLaughlin, Chair	Metro Transitways Development Bd	L
24	9/27/04	Russ	Stark	Midway TMO	L
25	9/27/04	Roy	Zimmerman, Citizen	-	E
26	9/29/04	Cordelia	Pierson, Program Manager	Trust for Public Land	E/L
27	9/29/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (3)
28	9/29/04	John	Wilson, Citizen	-	CC (2)
29	9/29/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (2)
30	9/30/04	R.M.	Zeilbel, Citizen	-	CC (2)
31	9/30/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (2)
32	9/30/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (1)

33	9/30/04	Elmer	Otto, Citizen	Shakopee	CC (1)
34	10/1/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (1)
35	10/1/04	Raymond	Hagen, Citizen	Apple Valley	E
36	10/8/04	Martha	Henderson, Citizen	St. Paul	E
37	10/8/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (1)
38	10/13/04	Russ	Stark, Exec. Director	Midway TMO	L/E
39	10/13/04	Michael A.	Holtz, Mayor	City of Robbinsdale	L
40	10/12/04	Barb	Thoman, Prog. Director	Transit for Livable Communities	L
41	10/12/04	Gerald	Splinter, City Manager	City of Coon Rapids	L
42	10/19/04	Eric	Johnson, City Admin	City of Oak Park Heights	L
43	10/19/04	Chip	Welling, Citizen	-	E/L
44	10/19/04	Dave	Fellon, President	Progressive Rail Incorporate	L
45	10/19/04	Terry	Holmes, Chair	Empire Township, Dakota County	L
46	10/19/04	Barbara	Marschall, Chair	Scott Co. Bd. Of Commissioners	L
47	10/21/04	Patricia	Curtin	Larkin Hoffman Law Firm	E
48	10/21/04	Myra	Peterson, Chair	Red Rock Corridor Commission	L
49	10/21/04	Eric P.	Herrera, Citizen	-	E
50	10/21/04	Richard B.	Kelley	City of Apple Valley	L/E
51	10/21/04	-	Citizen	-	CC (2)
52	10/21/04	Michael	Darger, Citizen	Minneapolis	E
53	10/21/04	Glenn	Olson, Chair	TPAC	E/L
54	10/21/04	Linda	Elfstrand, President	MN Public Transit Association	L
55	10/21/04	Rafael	Ortega, Chair	Ramsey Co. Regional Railroad Auth.	E/L
56	10/21/04	Alice	Tibbetts, Chair	St. Paul Bicycle Advisory Board	L
57	10/21/04	Jack Penny	Russek, Commissioner Steele, Commissioner	Wright County Hennepin County Highway 55 Corridor Coalition	E/L
58	10/22/04	Sandy	Colvin Roy, Chair	City of Minneapolis, Transportation & Public Works Committee	L
59	10/22/04	Thomas	Brennan, Mayor	City of Savage	L
60	10/22/04	Wayne D.	Houle, Dir of Public Wks	City of Edina	L
61	10/22/04	James B.	Hovland, Chair	I-494 Corridor Commission	L
62	10/22/04	Peter	McLaughlin, Chair	Metro Transitways Development Bd	L
63	10/22/04	-	Citizen	-	V
64	10/22/04	Andy	Inserra, Citizen	-	E

65	10/22/04	Jeannie	Schubert	Atlas Specialized Transport Inc	F/L
66	10/22/04	Gerald G.	Ristow, Mayor	City of Farmington	F/L
67	10/22/04	Martin J.	Kirsch, Mayor	City of Richfield	F/L
68	10/22/04	Judy A.	Johnson, Mayor	City of Plymouth	F/L
69	10/22/04	William H.	Droste, Mayor	City of Rosemount	F/L
70	10/22/04	Karen J.	Anderson, Mayor	City of Minnetonka	L
71	10/22/04	Michael	Turner, Chair	35W Solutions Alliance	L
72	10/22/04	Marvin D.	Johnson, Mayor	City of Independence	L
73	10/22/04	Nancy	Schouweiler, Chair	Dakota Co. Bd of Commissioners	L
74	10/22/04	Steven C.	Mielke, City Administrator	City of Lakeville	L
75	10/22/04	Stanley R.	Crooks, Tribal Chairman	Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community	L
76	10/22/04	Patrick C.	Hughes, Metro District Engineer	Minnesota Department of Transportation	L
77	10/22/04	-	Citizen	-	V
78	10/22/04	Marcus	Culver, Traffic Engineer	City of Maple Grove	L
79	10/22/04	-	-	Transportation Advisory Board	L
80	10/22/04	Mat	Hollinshead	Sierra Club North Star Chapter	E
81	10/22/04	Jean M.	White, Citizen	Edina	E
82	10/22/04	Rick	Krueger, Exec. Director	The Transportation Alliance	L/F
83	10/22/04	Daniel F.	Kaplan	Cloverleaf Cold Storage	F/L
84	10/22/04	Joseph D.	Strauss, Administrator	N. Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition	E/L
85	10/22/04	Paul	Nelson, Citizen	St. Paul	E
86	10/22/04	David	Greene	ISAIAH	E/L
87	10/22/04	John	Schmitt, Mayor	City of Shakopee	E
88	10/22/04	Phil	Krinkie, Representative	State Representative	E/L
89	10/22/04	Michael	Wietecki	Citizen	E
90	10/22/04	David	Van Hattum, Exec. Dir.	494 Commuter Services	E
91	10/22/04	Todd	Bornhauser	Lakeville Chamber of Commerce	F/L
92	10/22/04	Sandy	Fecht	Mn. Dept. of Natural Resources	F/L
93	10/22/04	Gary	Erickson Assist. Comm.	Hennepin County Public Works	L
94	10/22/04	Arnold	Eldal	Citizen	L
95	10/22/04	Scott H.	Neal, City Manager	City of Eden Prairie	L
96	10/22/04	Dennis	Thompson, Planner	DNR Environ. Policy Review	L

				Unit	
97	10/22/04	Dave	Carlson	Citizen	V
98	10/22/04	R.H.	Stafford, Chair	Washington County	L
99	10/22/04	Perry	Plank	Citizen	L
100	10/22/04	Michael	Leek, Comm. Dev. Dir.	Scott Co. Transit Planning Team Transit Review Board	E
101	10/22/04	Kathleen A.	Porta, City Clerk	City of Eden Prairie (Letter 2)	L
102	10/22/04	Mary	Bruton	The St. Paul Commission	F
103	10/22/04	Jack	Matasosky, CEO	APPRO Development Inc.	L
104	10/22/04	Kate	Garwood, AICP	Anoka Co. Highway Dept.	L
105	10/22/04	Kris	Wilson, Interim Exec. Dir.	Assoc of Metropolitan Municipalities	L
106	10/22/04	JoAnn M.	Kyral, Superintendent	National Park Service US Dept. of Interior	L
107	10/22/04	Jim	Dickinson, City Admin.	Ctiy of Andover	L
108	10/22/04	Jim	Seufert, Citizen	Brooklyn Park	CC (2)
109					
110					
111					
112					
113					
114					
115					
116					
117					
118					
119					
120					
121					
122					
123					
124					
125					
126					

* Data Center received to record.

POST— October 22, 2004, 5 P.M.

P1	10/24/04	Gene	Winstead, Mayor	City of Bloomington	E
P2	10/24/04	Mike	Gude, Citizen	St. Paul	E
P3	10/24/04	Bob	Roth, Citizen	City of Woodbury	V
P4	11/01/04	Craig L.	Ebeling, City Manager	City of Burnsville	L
P5	11/01/04	Cheryl	Hague, Citizen	-	CC
P6	11/01/04	-	Citizen	-	CC
P7	11/08/04	Duane	Grandy, Chair	Northstar Corridor	L

2030 Transportation Policy Plan Summary of Fall 2004 Public Outreach

Attendance at Open Houses and Public Hearing

	<u>Signed In</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
• Association of Metropolitan Municipalities 9-7-04	36	60
• Coon Rapids City Hall 9-13-04	30	45
• Inver Grove Heights Community Center 9-16-04	7	19
• SouthWest Metro Transit 9-23-04	20	31
• IDS Crystal Court 9-21-04		80
• St.Paul Skyway 9-22-04		55
• Mears Park Centre Public Hearing 9-27-04	25	40
Totals	<u>118</u>	<u>330</u>

Public Hearing Participants Registered to Speak

<u>Individual</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Written Comments</u>	<u>Testimony Transcribed</u>
Cathryn Zimmer	Not present		
Bruce Wakefield	Not present		
Lester Bagley	St. Paul Chamber/Central Corridor	X	X
Rick Beeson	St. Anthony Park Bank	X	X
Rep. Phil Krinkie	State Representative		X
Dean Zimmerman	Minneapolis City Council		X
Allan Lovejoy	Not present		
Wendy Wolf	Lakeville City Council member		X
Chris Wilson	AMM		X
Nancy Schouweiler	Dakota County commissioner		X
Aaron Gebauer	Citizen	X	X
Ted Kolderie	Citizen	X	X
Bryant Wallgren	Citizen		X
Robert Erickson	Not present		
Barb Thoman	Transit for Livable Communities		X
Russ Stark	Midway TMO	X	X
Michael Wietecki	St. Thomas Environmental Law Society		X
David Green	Isaiah		X

Devora Molitor	Citizen		X
Tom Hoffman	Not present		
Russ Adams	Alliance for Metropolitan Stability	X	X
Cordelia Pearson	Trust for Public Land		X
Peter McLaughlin	Hennepin County Commissioner	X	X
Matt Hollingshead	Sierra Club		X

Summary of Comments Received in Data Center as of 10/22/04

• Public Hearing Testimony	19
• Comment Line	3
• Mailed Letter	44
• Fax	12
• E-mail	30
• Comment Card	19
▪ I like the plan, move ahead	(7)
I like the concept of the plan, but have a concern	(10)
▪ I don't like the plan	(2)
Total Comments	127

Summary of Comments by Group

• Cities and townships	18
• Counties or associated joint powers groups	7
• Elected and government officials	19
• Advocacy groups	38
• Citizens	45

Total Comments 127

CATEGORY: Like Overall Plan

COMMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENTOR (letter or spoken)
Like Plan	None required	10, 20, 23, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 37, 51, 52, 53, 54, 71, 78, 94
Implement Plan ASAP	The Plan will be implemented as funding is available	11, 33
Support doubling transit system ridership	None required	82, 90, 94

CATEGORY: Like/Dislike Specific Mode

COMMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENTOR (letter or spoken)
No Reference to MWRRI (hi-speed rail)	Hi-speed rail from Chicago to Twin Cities is being examined by the affected states. It is presently unfunded and, therefore, is not shown in this fiscally constrained plan.	6
Encourage Biking	This plan includes a bike plan.	7, 31. 36. 49, 56, 97, 104
More Rail (LRT, Streetcar and/or Commuter), more Buses/Transit	The plan proposes transit investments (i.e. more bus and rail service) throughout the region. Those level of investments would require a significant increase in transit funding, about \$150 Million/year, between now and 2020, over current levels. It is difficult to imagine that higher funding levels could be reasonably expected.	7, 40, 43, 51, 52, 55, 64, 81, 82 85, 89, 94, 108
Encourage Carpooling	Council supports carpooling, MCS activities described in Chapter 2.	29
PRT	Untested technology, may have local applications, but not likely to be cost-effective as a regional mode until further demonstrated as a successful application..	9, 21, D
No More Highways, Favor Transit	The Council supports a multi modal transportation system. The various modes, including the auto, transit, bicycle and walking exhibit various advantages and disadvantages. The present and future population of the region will need all modes to serve their travel needs. No changes recommended.	25, 31, 77, 89
Suspicious that Busways will become Auto Lanes	Busways will be managed to insure public transit has a time advantage over the single occupant auto	28
Favor Transit Advantages & Bus-only Lanes	It is recognized that transit advantages are an integral part of providing travel time competitive transit	33, 34

Accelerate Implementation of Transit Advantages	service, which in turn does lead to the attraction of new riders. As transit service and facilities are added or expanded to meet expected growth, so too will transit advantages. No changes recommended.	
Object to Slipping Timeline for Transit Improvements from previous plans	The plan assumes aggressive levels of new transit funding that can be <u>reasonably</u> expected. It also takes into account the service reductions that needed to be implemented in response to the recent state budget deficits.	38, 40, 54
Should include more Specific Goals for Bike/Ped. mode share and minimum spacing standards. Also goals for TDM,	The region supports pedestrian and bicycle use in various ways which are recorded in the Plan. The plan does not set specific goals for any mode. No changes recommended.	38, 40
Wants more Responsibility Placed on Counties to Fill Bike System Gaps	Plan expects that bike system is primarily built by cities and counties, not MnDOT, depending often on who has jurisdiction over adjacent road.	60
Support matching transit service to demand	No response needed, this is shown in Chapter 4.	73
Should show 3 transit scenarios (like the 3 highway ones)	.Even though no separate transit scenarios are explicitly shown in the plan, Table 5-3 shows three levels of transit investments: maintain existing system, expand bus system, and add transitways. Tables 5-2 and 5-3 show funding requirements from current funding sources as well as from a new funding source.	40, 81
Should highlight more people walk to work than use transit	2000 census shows 69,000 take transit to work and 35,000 walk (in the 7-county area)	88
Object to doubling transit ridership, why do we need multi modal?	The Council supports a multi modal transportation system. The various modes, including the auto, transit, bicycle and walking exhibit various advantages and disadvantages. The present and future population of the region will need all modes to serve their travel	88

	needs. No changes recommended.	
Highway projects which expand capacity must be called "expansion"	All highway expansion projects are labeled expansion. Preservation and management projects do not add lanes.	89
TPP should promote more telecommuting	The plan does advocate telecommuting but ultimate decision lies with employers.	102
Strengthen Policy 10 (pages 46-47) on TDM to recognize TMA's/TMO's	TMA's/TMO's are recognized on page 27	102, 104
Like Strategy 11d, Coordinate with Adjacent Counties, since development pressures increasing there	No response needed.	104

CATEGORY: Comment on Specific Project - Transit

COMMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENTOR (letter or spoken)
Add Union Depot to Plan	A discussion of both St. Paul Union Depot & the Downtown Minneapolis Intermodal facility will be added to the section of Chapter 4 titled "Transit Facilities" (These are specialized facilities that would be needed in the downtowns to serve as termini/linkages of the various transitways converging downtown, over and above the passenger facilities required for usual bus service.)	2, 23, 48, 55, 62, 98, 102
Want LRT on Central Corridor	The selection of the preferred alternative has not been completed yet.	4, 19, 23, 55, 62, 80
No Reference to Riverview	Riverview is one of the arterial corridors in the plan, shown on Fig. 4-1.	6
Use UM Transitway for other Regional Express	Working with the University, additional opportunities for regional utilization of the U of M transitway will be considered as opportunities arise. No changes recommended	6
Support Tier I Transitway	No response needed.	67, 71
Complete Northstar ASAP	The Council supports completion of the Northstar Corridor ASAP.	13, 23, 80
Red Rock, Rush Line, Southwest should be built before 2020 (move up Tier II projects)	Under current and new funding sources that can be reasonably expected by 2020, it is difficult to imagine that these 3 corridors could be build before 2020.	23, 40, 62, 98
Add Express Bus to St. Paul from I-394	Non-stop service from I-394 to downtown St. Paul does not appear cost-effective. That travel need can be satisfied with one transfer in downtown Minneapolis.	32

Add Lake & Lyndale to Table 4-4	Both of these corridors are identified on Fig. 4-1. They will be added to Table 4-4, as will W. 7 th St. in St. Paul	58
Not Enough Consideration of suburb to Suburb transit, especially 494. Need Transitway "wheel" I-494/I-694 to connect "spokes"	Recognizing the growth of suburban markets, numerous suburb-to-suburb routes have been added in the past decade. The role of these services will grow as these markets mature. Recommended changes: Add (noted by underline) to second bullet on page 62, "Local routes, <u>including suburb to suburb services</u> , will benefit from expanded coverage and frequency..."	35, 60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 71, 73, 86, 90, 99
Put LRT, not buses, in center of 35W	A BRT option is more cost-effective because it does not require full reconstruction of the freeway south of 66 th Street.	47
Removing Red Rock from Tier I is inconsistent with Regional Master Plan (2000)	This plan updates and replaces the 2001 TPP and Master Plan recommendations	48
Transit concerns in Farmington - want service but subject to economic impact of joining transit taxing district	Farmington residents are already using MVTA Transit Services at park-ride locations outside of Farmington without contributing to the transit levy collected for capital investment (i.e. buses & park-rides)	66, 112
Support Cedar BRT	Plan does support Cedar BRT.	66, 73
Bus layover facilities along Hiawatha LRT	Bus facilities located close to rail transit facilities maximize connectivity and efficiency of bus routes and operations without ruling out the potential for high value redevelopment above or adjacent to the station. No changes recommended.	58

<p>Better description of service, facilities, and need in downtowns</p>	<p>Future downtown transit shelters are noted in Figure 4-5 as well as in the 2nd paragraph of Strategy 2 in Chapter 4. The last paragraph of Strategy 2 also acknowledges the need for more downtown throughput capacity. The last paragraph in Strategy 1 in chapter 4 on page 68 recognizes the downtowns as major transit trip destinations. The TPP is not a short-term, small scale implementation plan but rather a long-range, large scale directional plan. Recommended changes: Minor text modification to reflect this comment in Strategy 2 in Chapter 4.</p>	<p>58</p>
<p>Advocate for HOV/BRT instead of bus shoulders</p>	<p>The plan does recommend dedicated lanes in corridors with highest transit demand, such as I 394 and I 35W. In many corridors, shoulder bus lanes are more cost effective. No change recommended.</p>	<p>58</p>
<p>Inconsistency with Strategy 3B</p>	<p>Inconsistency cited is not apparent. The strategy prioritizes preserving, maintaining and replacing existing fleet, facilities and service. This strategy does not preclude new, expanded or enhanced fleet, facilities, and service. It is also comparable to its "sister" highway strategy. No changes recommended.</p>	<p>58</p>
<p>Counterintuitive with Strategy 6B</p>	<p>The list of five <u>competing</u> objectives is not ranked. Each is equally important. "Maximize fare revenues" does not necessarily equate to increasing fares. Recommended change: Possibly underline, italicize, or otherwise highlight the word "competing".</p>	<p>58, 81, 93</p>

Support 35W BRT, extend HOV south of TH 13	Plan does support I-35W BRT. Initially buses can operate on shoulders south of TH 13.	73
Support Red Rock as Tier II	Agree	73
Need bus shoulders on 35E, 52, 494, 55	Not currently needed but can be added when number of buses and congestion warrant (example - TH 55 in Dakota County has no buses)	73
TPP has little incentive for Lakeville to join TTD, no funding for 35BRT or Cedar	Lakeville residents are already using MVTA Transit Services at at least 4 park-ride locations in Apple Valley, Eagan & Burnsville without contributing to the transit level collected.	73, 83, 91
Plan should articulate strategies to meet double ridership goal.	Goals and several strategies to double ridership are in Chapter 3. No change recommended.	58
Add commuter rail St. Cloud-Hastings west bypass of Minneapolis	Direct service from St. Cloud to Hastings bypassing Minneapolis may not be productive enough to be justifiable. That decision, however, could be made if both the Northstar and Red Rock Corridors are built if warranted by actual demand for the service.	80
Extend transitway across river into St. Croix County	No transitway is proposed in the plan that could be extended into St. Croix county. However, the express commuter bus line along TH 36 or I-94 could be extended in the future if ridership justifies and an operating authority in Wisconsin was determined..	80
Transit corridors do not serve north Minneapolis or northwest of downtown St. Paul	The Northwest BRT and Northstar Commuter Rail Corridors serve north Minneapolis.	86
West Metro received more transit \$ so move East Metro corridors into Tier I Disparity between West Metro and East	In large part, the provision of transit service and facilities in transitways corridors is driven by the strength of transit trip origins and	55, 86

Metro service and facility levels including express corridors and transitways.	destinations. The two largest transit trip destinations are the two central business districts. However, the relative strength of the two is not equal. Hence, the geographic disparity between the west and east metro areas. No changes recommended.	
No transitway in Scott County, bus on 169	The plan proposes an express commuter bus line into Scott County along TH 169.	87
Transitway stops should be linked to zoning, add stop later if zoning changes	Stops are generally determined by spacing and ability of cross street to accommodate buses.	80
Should have map of all high frequency transit routes	High frequency routes are shown on Fig.4-1, Arterial Corridors.	93
Show commuter express buses east of CR 19 on I-94 and from SW Wash. Co. to Bloomington on I-494. Extend I-94 East express corridor east of CR 19	In the near-term, there are no plans for express transit service beyond a planned park-and-ride facility in the vicinity of the interchange of I-94 and CR 19. However, within the 25-year time horizon of the TPP, it is conceivable that transit service might be extended further. The inclusion of an arrowhead on each of the transitway corridor lines indicates that the line could be extended further.	98
Show TH 10, 65 as express commuter bus corridors	TH 10& 65 are both on Figure 4-2, although much of TH 10 will be replaced by North Star	104
Put Bethel commuter rail in Tier II corridors (it is in County & MnDOT plan)	The plan already proposes a number of transitways that can be <u>reasonably</u> expected to be built by 2030, with existing funding sources and fairly aggressive assumptions for new revenues and provided in the developing plans.	104
How will cities & providers participate in "Grow Bus Ridership" on Page 79?	The Council always involves cities for service expansions.	104
More detail on support for dial-a-ride services	Support for dial-a-ride service will depend on available operating revenues and cost-effectiveness.	104

Include recommendations from St. Croix River Crossing Transit Feasibility Study	According to the TH 36 EIS, this study has not yet been done. No change recommended at this time	42

CATEGORY: Comment on Specific Project - Highways

COMMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENTOR (letter or spoken)
Complete 610 ASAP	The plan fully funds the completion of TH 610. It also supports moving TH 610 into MnDOT's 10-year Highway Work Plan. No change recommended.	13
Improve TH 10	TH 10 is classified as a management corridor. Over the 25 years of the Plan, \$1.32 Billion will be invested in a variety of projects to address safety and mobility needs. MnDOT's TSP will identify specific management projects. It is likely some investments will be included for TH 10. No changes recommended.	30
Want Stillwater Bridge	The plan includes the Stillwater Bridge. At one time Minnesota's share of the project was fully funded in the TIP. The cost was split between the Metro Area and the rest of the State. The plan assumes the same funding arrangement will be followed when a decision is reached. Due to the high cost of mitigation, the plan assumes mitigation funds will come from non-traditional highway sources. No changes recommended	14, 15
Build Crosstown ASAP	The Crosstown Project is in the TIP. As soon as an agreement on design is reached between Minneapolis and MnDOT, this project can proceed. No changes recommended.	16, 60, 61, 67, 71, 75, 108
Want I-35W - 46 th to I-94 ASAP	This project is now designated as an expansion project in the Plan. This will provide for the	71, 75, 108

	<p>added lane in each direction north of 46th Street. This is an expensive project and will not be feasible to add to MnDOT's 10-year Work Plan unless a significant increase in resources becomes available.</p> <p>No changes recommended.</p>	
Against I-35W/Lake Street Access	<p>MnDOT is working with Minneapolis to reach an agreement on reconstructing the crosstown project and on I-35W north of 46th Street. Minneapolis has a number of concerns and has stated it wants direct access to Lake Street. MnDOT has tentatively agreed to this, so the reconstruction can move forward. The negotiations will determine what will be built.</p> <p>No changes recommended.</p>	17
35W/494 is most important regional interchange, build if 30% more money is available	<p>There are many important projects that need to be built in the region including the I35W/494 interchange. The council intends to work with MnDOT and local government to determine what the priority should be for use of additional funds if they become available. This interchange will be on the list of needs.</p> <p>No changes recommended.</p>	60, 61, 67, 68, 71
Improve I-494 sooner	<p>Earlier implementation of I-494, an obvious unmet need, will only be possible if new resources over and above the "constrained plan" level are made available.</p>	68, 70
Reclassify TH 3 to Principal Arterial and improve TH 3	<p>The Council is committed to do a functional classification study once this plan is adopted to determine the need for more Principal Arterials. TH 3 is one of the corridors that will be considered for reclassification. See page 135, item 5 and page 101.</p>	45, 66, 73

	No changes recommended.	
Expand TH 3 as Minor Arterial	TH 3 is an A Minor Arterial (Expander) and this would be eligible for STP funding for expansion.	69
Reclassify TH 55 to Principal Arterial	The Council is committed to do a functional classification study once this plan is adopted to determine the need for more Principal Arterials TH 55 is one of the corridors that will be considered for reclassification. See page 135, item 5 and page 101. No changes recommended.	57, 68, 72
TH 13 from TH 169 to I-35W is not addressed	TH 13 is a management corridor. Over the 22 years of the plan. \$1.32 Billion will be invested in a variety of projects to address safety and mobility needs. MnDOT's TSP will identify specific management projects. It is likely some management investments will be included for TH 13. No changes recommended.	59, 71, 46, 75, 108
Concern about Elimination of Improvement Category (essentially TH 169 & 62)	MnDOT and the Council agreed that the improvement category was inconsistent with the performance targets that were incorporated into the state plan and the original intent of the category when it was made part of the TPP and TSP. The definition of management corridor has been expanded and includes virtually all the activities that would be included in the improvement category other than reconstruction. Reconstruction without expansion of a highway is hardly ever done in the region. There are \$1.32 Billion allocated to management investment during the plan period. No changes recommended	60, 61, 67, 68, 70, 75

Need E-W Arterial in Dakota County near CR 70 or CSAH 86/TH 19	Expansion of CR 70 is an A Minor Arterial (Expander) and this is eligible for STP funding This corridor will also be studied for expansion for a future principal (See Page 101 & page 135, Item 5)	65, 73, 74, 83, 91, 103, E
Concern that Co.Rd. 70/TH 50 needs more study as Principal Arterial (qualified support for PA) - potential impacts of widening road	A corridor study of CR 70 would need to be undertaken before improvements to determine any impacts and potential mitigation . No change recommended.	65
Want TH 12 from CR 6 to Delano improved	This plan is financially constrained. TH 12 improvement will only be possible if new resources beyond "constrained plan" become available. No change recommended.	72
Recognize Lafayette, Hastings as expansion project	The Plan addresses these two bridges on Page 90. The Hastings Bridge is recommended as a four-lane bridge to replace the existing two-lane bridge. The Lafayette Bridge is recommended to be replaced with adequate lane and shoulder width that does not exist today. No added through lanes are recommended because the north terminus at East 7 th Street does not have capacity to handle added traffic. The reconstruction that would be needed to accommodate such volumes would be excessively expensive and would require significant property acquisition. Changes: The text on Page 90 should be changed to note the Hastings Bridge would be widened from two to four lanes.	73
Improve 35W between 494 and Lakeville	This plan is financially constrained. 35W improvement will only be possible if new resources beyond "constrained plan" become	73

	available. No change recommended.	
Identify specific projects for constrained +30%	The Council, working with MnDOT, the counties and cities, will conduct an analysis to determine highway needs on PA and "A" Minor Arterials to accommodate the regions growth to 2030. This analysis will include the need for new and/or expanded Principal Arterials, new or expanded "A" Minor Arterials, and new or reconstructed interchanges on PA and "A" Minor Arterials. The analysis will include trunk highways, county and city "A" Minor Arterials The 2030 Transit Plan defined in this document will be assumed in place for the purpose of the analysis. MnDOT's TSP will be utilized to the extent possible.	73, 79
Address bridge needs like Hastings, regardless of available funds	The Plan on Page 90 addresses critical fracture bridges and other emergencies which may require projects to be advanced quickly and moved into the TIP. No changes recommended.	73
MnDOT will provide list of Safety and Mobility Management Investments	These will be incorporated into this plan if they are received in time.	76
Support "No Build" for Stillwater Bridge	The Council has supported a replacement for the Stillwater Bridge since the early 1990's. The Council supports the ongoing negotiation process to allow a decision on this project. No changes recommended.	80
Want improvements to 35W north of TH 36, possible funded by MnPass	This plan is financially constrained. 35W improvement will only be possible if new resources beyond "constrained plan" become available.	84

	No change recommended.	
Object to highway expansion as 3 rd priority - need for expansion by 2030 Need flexibility - preservation should not always be 1 st priority	The Council believes the most cost-effective investment the region can make is to maintain and to manage the highway system to maximize its safe use. The Council also understands select expansion projects are needed to accommodate growing demand from the individual and due to commerce. All three types of funds will be expended simultaneously as long as the total funds exceed the need for maintenance/preservation and management. No changes recommended.	88, 93
Agree with inclusion of NW River Crossing	No response needed.	104
Do not need a functional classification study of roads	This study would primarily examine whether more principal arterials are needed.	93
Complete TH 41 Bridge	Due to financial constraint, this is shown in the plan for right of way reservation only. No change recommended.	75, 108
Show Manning Avenue (Wash. Co.) as future Principal Arterial	This will be examined in functional class study and will be noted on page 101.	98
More acknowledgement of county role in highways, minor arterials	Importance of county role is in plan. No change recommended.	104
Should expand list of unmet needs, including 2 nd ring and more clear vision of needs	The "Unconstrained Needs" map is from 1998 - MnDOT will provide new map	79, 104
MNRRRA covers Mississippi River Corridor - MNRRRA priority for river crossing is: 1) expand existing bridge, 2) add parallel, 3) new corridor. Premature to show new corridor in NW and so of 494 in	Both of these river crossings beyond 10-year work plan and further scoping/study will be done. Refinements can be shown in subsequent TPP. No change recommended at this time.	26, 106

this Plan.		
Show additional Mississippi River Crossing between 494 and Hastings	" " "	79, 98
Concern there are no acceptable locations for a new bridge between Hastings and 494	" " "	26, 92, 106
Table 4-8 does not show any additional funds going to highway maintenance - does this mean all highways can be kept in excellent condition with existing revenues?	No, they can be maintained in sufficient condition to meet MnDOT performance standards.	40
Council should estimate how many parking spaces are needed to accommodate new highway capacity	Methodology to do this is unknown. No change needed.	43
TPP should include MnDOT Metro operating budget	This is a regional long-range plan. Total current year operating budgets for any agency is unnecessary.	43
Clarify if IRCs are treated "fairly" in total or only inside I-494/I-694 ring	IRC's by definition are only outside the I-494/I-694 ring	42

CATEGORY: Funding/Financing

COMMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENTOR (letter or spoken)
Favor Value Pricing	<p>The Council has stated its support for pricing of new highway capacity as a tool to manage traffic and raise revenues (Strategy 13d). The Council is working closely with MnDOT as the I-394 MnPASS project is designed, built, and put into operation. The Council and the TAB are working with MnDOT on the MnPASS System Study (which includes both FAST and HOT Lanes). Hopefully, this work will convince the public of the benefits of pricing. At that time, the council will review the position it has taken in this plan on policies and the project scope to determine if changes for more support of pricing or less are appropriate. No changes are required at this time.</p>	1, 33, 40, 79
Too many highway \$ go outstate vs Metro Council should advocate change.	<p>The council has been an advocate for the region receiving a fair share of highway funds since the 1988 TPP was prepared. The Council is now participating in the MnDOT evaluation of regional targets. This will help determine the share of Federal and State Highway Funds that will go to the various Area Partnerships that cover the state. No changes recommended.</p>	5, 74, 79
Cost of Plan is Too Expensive, Fiscally Irresponsible	<p>This plan clearly states the Region needs a significantly higher level of funds to adequately serve the residents and businesses of the region. Many other comments favor spending more</p>	9, C, D

	<p>money on a variety of transportation projects, not less. However, the ultimate decision to invest more lies with the State Legislature and Congress, not the Council</p> <p>No changes recommended</p>	
Need more and/or dedicated Transit \$	<p>The Council agrees and has stated so in the Plan.</p> <p>No changes recommended.</p>	12, 23, 54, 60, 65, 73, 79,81, 86, 102, 104
Regional Transit should be supported by Regional Tax (not just users)	<p>It is appropriate for users to pay, but it is not possible to fund transit only from user fares. In 2001, the legislature replaced a regional property tax operating levy with a percentage of the Motor Vehicle Sales Tax funds. Imposing a new regional tax for transit lies with the legislature, not the Council.</p> <p>No changes recommended.</p>	23, 62
Concerned about FTA cost-effective criteria a <u>sole</u> evaluation measure for transitways	<p>The FTA cost-effectiveness criteria is not the sole evaluation measure, even though it is a very important one. As discussed on Pages 44 (Strategy 7c) and 65, other evaluation criteria should also be used.</p>	23, 63
Increase gas tax and use for both highways & transit	<p>The Council supports additional revenue for transportation but has not taken a position in favor of increasing the gas tax. Using gas tax for transit would require a constitutional amendment, a significant barrier to implementation</p>	N
Charge toll to all SOV and Commercial Vehicles on Congested Highways & provide free transit	<p>Auto and truck owners and operators pay significant taxes and fees to build and maintain streets and highways. However, the Council supports innovative transportation financing mechanisms , including a variety of pricing techniques which may raise revenue and help to</p>	27

	<p>manage traffic. MnDOT will soon open the I-394 HOV Lane to paying users. If this is successful, additional applications of pricing may be feasible. No changes recommended.</p>	
Index taxes to inflation since 1998	<p>The Council supports additional revenue for transportation. The indexing of present funding sources would maintain the purchasing power of these revenue streams without future legislative approval. Such a decision, however, lies in the hands of the legislature. No changes recommended.</p>	32
Current fiscal realities are not reflected in plan, need additional resources, want more Council advocacy for funding	<p>Many comments favor spending more money on a variety of transportation projects. This plan clearly states that a significantly higher level of funds to adequately serve the residents and businesses of the region is needed. The Council is committed to work with all stakeholders to identify potential new revenue sources for transportation but the ultimate responsibility lies with the legislature and the Governor. No changes recommended.</p>	23, 53, 59, 62, 65, 70, 71, 73, 74, 79, 82, 83, 75, 91, 93, 98, 100, 104, 105
Add more detail on previous Transit cuts	<p>The level of detail in the Plan is appropriate for a long-range plan of this nature. No changes recommended</p>	54, 79
Chapter 5 does not address inadequacy of transit taxing district	<p>Only communities within the transit taxing district contribute to the property tax levy used to service the debt on capital transit bonds. Some residents from communities outside the taxing district are transit users but do not contribute to the transit capital levy. Agreements between individual communities and the council can be entered into on a</p>	62

	voluntary basis. No agreement has been signed yet.	
Concern that local government will need to fund regional transportation needs	If MnDOT and the region cannot provide regional facilities, travel will still take place and will likely use the next best alternative, which may be local facilities. This is one of the reasons the Council is an advocate for more resources because the region's growing population and commerce will create more travel demand. No changes recommended.	65, 69, 73, 74, 76, 79, 83, 91, 103, E
Do not focus TEA 21 funding on principals and minor arterials and state aid system. They have other federal funds available and this subsidizes long trips.	State aid roads do not have access to any other federal funds. In a region the size of the TCMA many trips are long and it is appropriate to spend state and federal money on roads that serve long trips.	40, 79
HPP Policy is too restrictive	In response to local govt. concerns on new HPP policy, The Council has worked with MnDOT on proposed revisions. Changes have been made to page 119.	67, 73, 82, 98
RALF is Council's best program, levy to maximum, concern about increased ROW cost	The Council annually reviews the balance in the RALF account, the anticipated paybacks and the estimated outlays to determine how much should be levied. No changes recommended.	67, 82
Find funds to increase transit during highway construction Transit's interim role mitigating roadway construction impacts.	Transit has and can continue to play a role in alleviating the travel impacts of many major highway re-construction projects. Using highway funds for transit services has been done in the past on a case-by-case basis - TDM policy changed to reflect this.	66, 73

<p>Need \$ for non-MnDOT Principal Arterials</p>	<p>The council recognized these facilities and their improvement needs (pg. 99 & 100). If additional funds are available, these facilities' mobility and safety needs will be evaluated and funds allocated to non-MnDOT Principal Arterials, if justified. No changes recommended.</p>	<p>69, 73</p>
<p>Unconstrained needs are more than \$14 Million. Plan should more clearly acknowledge consequences of underfunded system</p>	<p>The Unconstrained Scenario does not record all transportation needs to accommodate the 2030 regional development. The TPP states that the shows expansion projects on the Trunk Highway System would hold the level of congestion to the 1998 level. The Council will complete a study that will more fully describe such needs. Changes will be made to the text on page 80 to reflect this change. The Council, working with MnDOT, the counties and cities, will conduct an analysis to determine highway needs on PA and "A" Minor Arterials to accommodate the regions growth to 2030. This analysis will include the need for new and/or expanded Principal Arterials, new or expanded "A" Minor Arterials, and new or reconstructed interchanges on PA and "A" Minor Arterials. The analysis will include trunk highways, county and city "A" Minor Arterials The 2030 Transit Plan defined in this document will be assumed in place for the purpose of the analysis. MnDOT's TSP will be utilized to the extent possible. Add this study description to Chapter 7 Work Program.</p>	<p>76, 79, 82, 98. 104</p>

<p>Concern about FAST lanes, could be used to bypass expansion projects in plan, won't work</p>	<p>FAST Lane projects are intended to be selected from MnDOT 10-year Highway Work Plan, which includes the TIP. The only exception would be if the private sector would be funding 100% of the cost of the project. Projects in the TIP are in priority order by year. A FAST Lane project that would advance a TIP project would not negatively effect other projects. The other projects in the 10-year Work Plan do not have definitive priorities, even though tentative program years are indicated. Given the FAST Lanes are intended to bring private sector contributions, there does not seem to be a significant negative impact by one project before another.</p> <p>No changes recommended.</p>	<p>78, 104</p>
<p>A majority of toll revenues should finance transit & existing SOV lanes. Do not toll HOV - consider toll on SOV lanes</p>	<p>The council has stated its support for pricing of new highway capacity as a tool to manage traffic and raise revenues (Strategy 13d). The council is working closely with MnDOT as the I-394 MnPASS project is designed, built, and put into operation. The council and the TAB are working with MnDOT on the MnPASS System Study (which includes both FAST and HOT Lanes). Hopefully, this work will convince the public of the benefits of pricing. At that time, the Council will review the position it has taken in this plan on policies and the project scope to determine if changes for more support of pricing or less are appropriate.</p> <p>No changes are required at this time.</p>	<p>80</p>

<p>Constrained +30% does not show much, should have constrained +50%</p>	<p>It is difficult to anticipate a specific increase in transportation funding. The +30% scenario was developed to illustrate what could be done with additional funds rather than being a specific recommendation about the "right" level of funding. No changes recommended.</p>	<p>82</p>
<p>Need to raise gas tax by \$.20 or as much as \$.50 to fund scenarios & improve efficiency</p>	<p>The Council supports additional revenue for transportation but does not have a position in favor of increasing the gas tax rate. The Council does not recommend a specific type of revenue source, instead provides an evaluation of a variety of sources typically used for transportation which is on the Council website.</p>	<p>104</p>
<p>Council should demonstrate possible funding options</p>	<p>The Council supports additional revenue for transportation. The Council does not recommend a specific type of revenue source, instead provides an evaluation of a variety of sources typically used for transportation which is on the Council website.</p>	<p>79, 82, 102</p>
<p>Equity concerns RE: FAST/HOT Lanes - do not put into hands of private firms</p>	<p>The council is participating with MnDOT in the MnPass System Study. One of the policy issues being discussed with the Policy Advisory Committee is the role of the private sector in such projects. No changes recommended..</p>	<p>86</p>
<p>Should quantify effect of FAST/HOT Lanes on need for highway funding</p>	<p>The council is participating with MnDOT in the MnPass System Study. This study will not be completed until February 2005. The potential funding impact of one or more projects has yet to be determined but it appears, however, that FAST/HOT Lane strategies will make a relatively small funding contribution on a</p>	<p>88</p>

	<p>system wide basis. No changes recommended.</p>	
Should recommend where dollars come from for plan investments	<p>This is shown in Chapter 5, Finance No changes recommended.</p>	88
Reverse highway & transit allocations (less to highway, more to transit) shown on Table 5-4	<p>The region requires a multi modal transportation system. The recommended allocations are based on the existing and future demand expected for different modes. No Changes recommended.</p>	89
Disagree with 20% cap on project cost increases	<p>This policy will be modified in response to comments received.</p>	93
Do not support use of Metro Bikeways map in funding decisions	<p>The Metro Bikeways Map has been developed using only those bikeways identified by local units of government in their comprehensive plans, so should not inhibit the flexibility of local agencies.</p>	93
Should be option to pay back local agencies who advance fund projects	<p>As one method to address concerns about restricting HPP funds, the Council is recommending that advance funding projects beyond the 10-year Plan be one option to provide more flexibility. The concern is that the larger units of government, with more resources, have an advantage over smaller, less well financed units. The council will work with MnDOT to finalize the provision to use HPP funds. These modifications will be recorded in this plan and in MnDOT's TSP. Recommended change to text in Chapter 4.</p>	93
Do not give priority to bike projects with greatest number of users	<p>The potential use of bikeway facilities serves as a surrogate measure for the cost-effectiveness of the investment, just as current and future ADT's are a factor in selecting roadway projects.</p>	93

<p>Concern that locals must fund scope changes greater than 20%</p>	<p>The Council does not support the idea that locals should fund the cost of regional projects when they exceed 20%. This process is an attempt to fund projects consistent with the policies and priorities in the fiscally balanced TPP. The concept is to hold the project to the defined scope and costs through the planning period up to implementation. There are many opportunities to modify the project or the plan as the project concept matures. The region is committed to funding the most cost-effective projects. This cannot be done if there is no limit on the scope or cost of projects. No changes recommended.</p>	<p>69</p>
<p>Plan oversimplifies/underestimates fund needs</p>	<p>MnDOT has continued to refine costs since the draft TPP was issued in August, costs will be updated in the final document.</p>	<p>69, 79</p>
<p>Concern about Policy 12, doesn't recognize extenuating circumstances to change funding priorities</p>	<p>This concern is addressed in two places in the plan. On page 90, the concern about critical fractured bridges which may have to move ahead of other projects in the TIP is discussed. The last sentence also recognizes there may be other emergencies that would require moving projects into the TIP. In addition, additional language is being recommended in Chapter 4 to recognize natural disasters that may require a change in regional priorities.</p>	<p>69, 79</p>
<p>Implementation of new transit should not reduce current bus operating budget</p>	<p>The current bus system is expected to continue to be the backbone of the transit system even when transitways and express commuter bus corridors are full implemented.</p>	<p>104</p>
<p>On Page 86, recognize that local</p>	<p>Agreed. No changes recommended.</p>	<p>104</p>

governments have made substantial investments in regional roads when the project is significant to them		
If local units really want to move a regional project ahead, they must be willing to fund it or require developers to do so	Agreed. No changes recommended.	104
Recognize on Pages 86 & 116 that advance funding will take more future resources than anticipated	The bonding/advance funded projects have increased in cost since they were first proposed. These additional costs may need to be accounted for out of 2008-2030 funds. This is not clear at this time since MnDOT has stated increases in federal funds would be used in part to pay for these projects. No changes recommended.	104
Andover does not support concept that all state and federal transportation funds should be consistent with TPP	The city's expressed desire to have state and federal money spent on A Minor Arterials is consistent with the TPP.	107

CATEGORY: Land Use/Transportation Relations

COMMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENTOR (letter or spoken)
Against long cul-de-sacs, further explain well connected streets	Cul-de-sacs are typically built by or approved by local government. The Council encourages local government to build an interconnected local street system to allow locally oriented trips on these streets as opposed to using minor arterials. The construction of a few cul-de-sacs, even if they were quite long, would not mean a city's comprehensive plan is inconsistent with the Transportation System Plan No Changes are recommended.	18, 40
Plan should require local plan & <u>zoning</u> to be consistent	Zoning is required to be consistent with the local comprehensive plan. Zoning is a local decision. No changes recommended	38
Should reference relation between transportation and health and sprawl and obesity	Recent research shows some relationship, although it is inconclusive. No changes recommended	38, 40, 56
City support AMM comments	See responses to individual AMM comments which are #105	39, 41, 42, 60, 66, 68, 70, 101
Strategy 18b&d - tie land use development to road capacity needs. This requires new revenue stream , such as impact fees	Impact fees are not currently legal in Minnesota, so this would require legislative action	50
TPP calls for high density mixed use but Council can't guarantee transit or roads to serve it	Policy 18 will be re-written to clarify this issue.	39, 41, 42, 50, 58, 60, 66, 68, 70, 74, 79, 87, 100, 101, 105
Plan supports park & ride lots - should be more open to ramps in dense areas A more consistent and open approach with regards to surface vs structured park and	High-density mixed-use projects along major transitways would be areas of highest land cost, high potential demand, and/or where a shared parking joint-use venture is possible. A structured facility would contain less impervious surface than a surface facility of	50, 68

ride facilities	equal capacity, thereby reducing storm water run off. Recommendations: Minor text modification to reflect this comment in Paragraph 5 of Strategy 2 on page 72.	
TPP calls for interconnected local streets - Regional Principal Arterials should be adequately built to do this	Principal Arterials are intended for longer regional trips. If cities and counties do not build adequate collector streets and minor arterials, shorter trips are forced onto freeways, causing more congestion.	60
Identify additional centers of job intensity in both TPP & Framework	This will be done in corridor studies with communities in the comprehensive plan update process.	40
Plan needs more emphasis on need for local network to serve local trips	This is already addressed. No changes recommended.	73
Provides no highway improvement to growth centers, such as Lakeville & Shakopee, and redevelopment like TCAPP, Twin Lakes (Roseville) and NW quadrant of 35W/694	Plan is financially constrained, funds are not available for all road expansion needs.	74, 84, 87, 103, E
Strategy 18f (Needs & Opportunities of Job Concentrations) is most important strategy in plan	No response needed.	89
Expand incentives to increase employment density in suburbs. Importance of encouraging suburban employment density	The Council recognizes the importance and has encouraged this through programs such as Livable Communities grants. Cities are encouraged to further these concepts in their local comprehensive plans No changes recommended.	90, 99

<p>Policy 18 states that in order for a local comprehensive plan to be in conformance with the Regional Transportation System, cities must plan for the forecasts allocated to them and they must do so in a manner that does not add traffic to already congested roads. This is unrealistic and unachievable in most parts of the region, given the congested state we are already in and the lack of funding to address existing problems or future needs.</p>	<p>Policy 18 will be re-written to address this comment.</p>	<p>39, 41, 42, 60, 62, 66, 68, 70, 74, 79, 100, 101, 105</p>
<p>Stance that transit will affect future travel patterns is unrealistic, no documentation on traffic reduction potential of mixed use is unproven</p>	<p>Research to date is mixed. No changes need in TPP</p>	<p>93, 99</p>
<p>Page 6 wording on comprehensive plan conformance is misleading as to legal requirement, clarify "musts" for plan content</p>	<p>This is a general summary of statutory requirements. No Change recommended.</p>	<p>39, 41, 42, 60, 66, 68, 70, 93, 101, 105</p>
<p>Reduce amount of growth (60% households, 40% jobs) planned for "Developing Communities"</p>	<p>TPP was given this number from the Regional Blueprint. No changes needed to TPP.</p>	<p>89</p>
<p>Should focus plans on "subareas" - over time, suburbs add jobs & commuter's travel shortens, "travel time budget"</p>	<p>The comments are consistent with the Development Framework strategies which will be addressed by communities in the next round of local plan updates.</p>	<p>99</p>
<p>Need full cost mechanism for roads & transit that factors in public cost of development served</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p>	<p>102</p>
<p>Various comments on natural resources</p>	<p>Some edits have been made. No change recommended for requested mission changes (such as funding natural resources protection from transportation or hiring a naturalist on transportation staff). Many of these issues will be addressed by the Council's Natural Resource Task Force and in the Water Resource</p>	

	or Recreation Open Space Policy Plan	

Category: AVIATION

COMMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENTOR (letter or spoken)
Significantly changed circumstances prevail at region's airports and with the airline industry - concerned that MC believes 1996 Aviation Policy Plan should remain in effect. It is unclear whether the APP will be updated or remain as a separate system plan, or fully integrated into the TPP. The Aviation Policy Plan (APP) is important to the region but marginalized in TPP - need much stronger MC role.	This significant uncertainty as to the future of the aviation industry is why the 1996 APP was not fully revised at this time; only a revision of the land use compatibility guidelines for aircraft noise has been included in the TPP. A number of planning activities/actions need completion before additional guide revision is commenced. The exact form of the APP and its integration with TPP has not been determined and will require additional discussion and review.	58, 95
Activity at MSP is already at 2020 forecasted levels - higher activity has many impacts that the MC should address now, not in 2007.	The major airport dual-track high forecast scenario for MSP has been used in the most recent forecasts prepared by the MAC for the Part 150 noise program update, addressing noise impacts. MAC staff are also evaluating potential financial, operational and environmental impacts of the proposed Vision 20/20 development program. These efforts, along with opening of the new "North/South" runway in late 2005, would be an appropriate time to develop new long-term aviation forecasts.	58
MAC has decimated the noise mitigation program in the 60-64 DNL noise zone for MSP and MC has been silent on this issue.	The Council has participated in mitigation efforts for MSP-area communities. MAC has recommended termination after the 2007 program is implemented. It is expected that new forecasts will indicate whether additional noise mitigation is warranted.	58
MC land use compatibility guidelines threshold of 60 DNL is undercut by continued use of a 45 DNL interior noise threshold.	FAA requires a DNL descriptor in the Part 150 for program approval and funding eligibility. This includes the use of a 45 DNL interior noise threshold. To change to a 45dba interior noise level could require a complete re-evaluation of the noise mitigation effort as now constructed.	58
Question of simply "growing MSP" needs evaluation [and] development of a statewide strategy - MC should be an integral partner in such an effort.	The Council has and will continue to work with MnDOT, MAC, affected communities and user groups concerning systems development. MC is currently participating with MnDOT Aeronautics in update of the statewide airport system plan and strategy initiatives.	58, 105
Local community representation and notification should be made if the 1996 APP is updated/revised/otherwise changed.	Comment noted.	95

Improvements to MSP and/or the development of new or existing airport, exclusively for air freight, should take place outside the Metropolitan area.	The 2030 TPP includes reference to policy and implementation strategies for potential development of a regional distribution center. Any decisions on sites/services would need to be coordinated with the MAC, MnDOT, Counties, Communities and system users.	95
Reliability and improvements to reliever airports is critical to absorb additional demand [at MSP] as the region grows; the MC should be advocating regional system development.	The Council has approved the long-term comprehensive plans for runway and building area development at Anoka County-Blaine and Flying Cloud Airports. These facilities, along with St. Paul Downtown airport, represent the region's response to the FAA and the market to have a "business-jet ready" system. Projects at these airports should receive top funding and implementation priority.	58, 104
Under the system plan section of the TPP the document states that an adjustment may be needed in the role of different reliever airports in the region.	The Council has recently examined implications of the new light sport aircraft category on the entire system. These findings will be considered in next update of the aviation system plan; also, see response above.	95
TPP document does not include appendices.	TPP appendices are not normally included as part of the TPP draft for public hearing. Public hearing report and full draft of appendices will be provide for public review at Transportation Committee meetings prior to MC adoption of TPP.	95
Land use compatibility guidelines should not be incorporated into TPP until APP update completed.	Appendix L includes the compatibility guidelines amendment adopted in 1999, the guideline changes as discussed by the APP Task force and accepted by the Council, and other changes requested to provide consistency with the MSP Part 150 Update; therefore, no reason to delay adoption.	95
MC should adopt in 2030 TPP a commitment that Flying Cloud Airport will not be subject to further expansion or change in its [Minor] use designation.	MC has approved Flying Cloud long-term comprehensive plan and continued Minor airport use designation. No change is recommended.	95

CATEGORY: Miscellaneous

COMMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENTOR (letter or spoken)
Plan considers CO - not air toxics, carcinogens and particulates	The Plan is required by federal law to address CO. The Council is working with a group of public and private groups to implement strategies to reduce particulate matter and precursor emissions that cause the formation of ozone. There are no federal or state air toxins regulations/standards at this time. No changes are recommended.	20, 24, 40, 80
Live with congestion, some tactics can slow it	The Council understands the region will never be congestion-free. Many policies and investments attempt to slow the rate of congestion or to provide alternatives that are attractive to a spectrum of the region's population making a variety of trips. No changes recommended.	22
Treatment of disabled community on MT & MM vehicles	Metro Transit, as well as the other regional transit service providers, are committed to customer service excellence. The treatment of our customers, particularly the disabled, is out top priority. No changes recommended.	3
Doesn't like Unconstrained Scenario	No response needed.	38, 40
More consideration - freight Add several freight planners	The Council will continue to work with MnDOT and CTS on freight planning.	44, 79, 104
Need 10 ton system on local highways as well as MnDOT roads	No change needed.	73
Model forecasts with various land use densities	This was done as part of RDF plan development, TPP is based on RDF land use.	80

Should include more information on transit in peer cities	This is done in a biannual audit (2001 & 2003 are on Council website). We will reference availability of this data in Chapter 2	40, 104
Natural resource protection, not just mitigation, in facility planning & design	Strategy 11c and Policy 17 address this. To the extent that it legislatively or administratively mandated, natural resource protection is currently considered during the planning and design process for transportation facilities, and will continue to be into the future. The NRI can be used to better protect resources. Recommended change: Policy 17 has been strengthened to encourage use of the new Natural Resources Inventory in developing transportation projects.	26, 40, 96
Natural resource protection in higher density initiatives promotion	Similar to above Recommended change: Similar to above	96
Preserve natural resources, open space that would otherwise be lost by construction of transportation facilities	Similar to above Recommended change: Similar to above	80
Reduce water pollution runoff through water quality assessments	Appropriate for project level planning (EIS). No change recommended to system plan.	80
Charge for parking, restrict amount of parking.	The Council did a study of parking issues in 1999.. No change recommended.	40, 43, 80
Watch potential rail abandonments for future preservation, especially Butcher spur over 35W	Council is on MnDOT notification list for rail abandonments. No change needed.	84
Amend strategy 11b - all roads should have bike and pedestrian facilities, even freeways & expressways	Plan includes bike and pedestrian policy and plan, and encourages bike/pedestrian facilities that cross barriers such as grade separated roads.	85, 97

Should acknowledge grassroots groups' efforts in promoting transit	Council appreciates this support and the participation of their members on many Council advisory committees.	86
Plan endorses smart growth or "cramming"	The TPP is consistent with the Development Framework which supports development patterns and densities appropriate to achieve cost-effective and efficient use of regional infrastructure.	88
DNR support for Polity 4 and Policy 17 - recommend adding a reference to Mississippi River Critical Area which affects Red Rock Corridor and Mississippi Bridges	Strategy 17d has been changed to reflect this.	92
Lack of future vision, 2000 highways same as 2030	The plan includes many changes and expansions of existing highways as well as some new alignments such as 610 and 212. No change recommended.	93
Expand benchmarks to include safety and system condition and corridor benchmarks	Benchmarks were adopted as part of RDF and are only repeated here to set context. However, staff agrees and has been working with MnDOT to find an appropriate safety benchmark even though it is not mandated by RDF. MnDOT has performance measures for system condition. No change recommended.	40, 93
Strengthen reference to access management	Access management is referenced in strategies 11a, 11f, 12f and 13v as well as Chapter 4. No change recommended.	93, 98, 102
Add discussion of highway cost-effectiveness analysis	Method is in MnDOT State Plan. No changes recommended	40
Add comparisons of highways in peer regions (like transit)	Interesting concept, not necessary in Plan but could explore for next Transportation Audit	40
Include map or definition of existing "freight villages".		102

Page 17 reference to "non-existent TDD" should clarify how this "plays" into transportation	TTD still exists - id defines the area taxed for transit capital improvements.	104
Installation of 3 bicycle racks on transit vehicles as new vehicles are purchased for fleet replacement	Transit vehicle bicycle racks will tend to outlast the vehicle itself. As such, racks are typically transferred from a retired vehicle to a replacement vehicle. However, as the vehicle fleet is expanded to meet the expected growth, vehicles on select routes could be considered for fitting with higher capacity bicycle racks. Suggestion will be given to Transit Operations. No change needed in the plan.	56
Various specific bus service improvements requests	Work shifts and express markets not currently served by transit will be pursued as demand for these market segments grow. No changes recommended.	25, 32
Add back in a revised Strategy 1E	Transit Market Area 1, by definition, contains the characteristics necessary to provide the most productive transit service combined with the greatest coverage. Such quality and quantity of transit service creates greater transportation choice in the marketplace without placing demands or restrictions on communities or individuals. Recommended change: Re-introduce a modified Strategy 1E.	102
Better description of the recent ridership decline situation	No change recommended, ridership decline is included only for "context".	79, 93
Should be goal for reduced energy use - this is TEA 21 planning factor	TEA 21 planning factor is "promote energy conservation" and does not require a goal. This plan includes extensive plans for transit TDM to reduce energy use. No change required.	40

Should include estimates of fuel used by walking, transit and private car.	Walking does not directly consume fossil fuel. Others have not been calculated but would vary by fuel efficiency in auto vehicle fleet as well as VMT which was predicted as part of developing this plan (Chapter 1) No change recommended.	43
Should include estimates of new impervious surfaces due to roads in this plan.	Has not been calculated, no has regionwide impervious surface from development (roftops) which far outweighs additional road surfaces.	43

CATEGORY: Editorial Comments

COMMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENTOR (letter or spoken)
Detail Changes to Bike Text	Specific technical text and map changes will be reviewed and considered on a case-by case basis. Any necessary changes will be made.	56
List Transit Corridors alphabetically within Tiers so no priority is implied	" " "	48, 98
Add more detail on Small Metro Transit Systems	" " "	54
Edits on Corridor descriptions - Cedar, Southwest, Northwest	" " "	62
Unconstrained needs map shows more than Regional Highway System	" " "	76
Want more definition of management, expansion and preservation	" " "	78
Correct endpoints for 610 in Table 4-9 & 4-12	" " "	78
Object to false mantra "cannot build its way out of congestion..." page 82	" " "	88
Changes suggested to Regional Blueprint language on pages 1-4	" " "	89
Several changes to strategies by page	" " "	89, 102
Use words like high capital cost & subsidy for both highways and transit	" " "	40
Need more concise definition of congestion	" " "	99

Several detailed comments adding natural resource references to strategies by page	Some changes will be made, most are more appropriate for project (rather than system) level planning or will be given to Parks & Water Resources staff for consideration in their plans	26, 96
More detail on Hiawatha LRT (page 18)	Chapter, Existing System, is intended only as a summary to set context for future plans. Hiawatha detail	40, 79
Various other specific text & map edits requests	The document will be continually double-checked for accuracy until the document is finalized and adopted.	8, 40, 46, 58, 62, 66, 67, 73, 76, 79, 93, 98, 100, 102, 104
All maps should show entire 7 county area.	Some maps were expanded to address this comment, but some maps contain detailed information on one portion of the region (i.e. downtowns or MUSA) that would not be visible on a map encompassing a larger area.	104