

Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan (SMTP) Comments

City of Minneapolis staff comments:

- General: Overall the plan is thorough, well-written and organized.
- Page 11: Under Guiding Principles – Ensure accessibility. Equity is missing from this principle.
- General: Chapter 2 - While the existing transportation system is evaluated and conclusions are drawn/statements are made – no casual relationships/findings are provided that explain trends/statistics. There should be similar summaries or snapshots for each mode that summarize trends, and the how/why these trends are exhibited. Unqualified statements need to be qualified.
- Page 19: The last paragraph in the Streets, Roads & Highways section, provides some statistical conclusions about injuries and crashes but neglects to offer factual or causal information such as weather, speed, etc.
- Page 21: Under Congestion in the Twin Cities – It states that “There was an increase in freeway congestion in 2015”, but doesn’t state why. Was it tied to construction in the system, etc.?
- Page 22: Under Bicycling & Walking, 2nd paragraph – This paragraph should note that the increase in bicycle commuting is directly correlated with increased investment and infrastructure improvements (improved and expanded facilities – including protected bikeways, etc.). In addition, the numbers provided date from 1993 to 2010. There are updated statistics that could be inserted here that further demonstrate the outlined trend.
- Page 22: Under Bicycling & Walking, 3rd paragraph – How do the statements about fatalities and serious injuries mesh with those provided on Page 19? When it is stated that fatalities and serious injuries involving bicyclists and pedestrians remained unchanged - what is the number or percentage for context?
- Page 24: Under Public Transit in the Twin Cities – It is stated that “Total ridership was 98.8 million in 2015”. Additional context should be provided here – is it the highest ever recorded? Or could mention trend – that there has been continued growth since 2009 as transportation options/enhancements continue to increase/expand. A similar statement is made on Page 26 relative to Public Transit in greater MN. That context is missing here.
- Page 28: Under Intercity Bus & Rail Passenger Service – Trends/context are missing here.
- Page 29: Under Freight Rail – Trends/context missing here. Was there increased volume, cars, shipped products, materials, goods?
- Page 30: Under Air – Trends/context missing here.
- Page 32: Under Ports & Waterways – trends/context missing here.
- Page 36: Under Transit – Should reference that future streetcar is included in this category.

- Page 42: Under Urban & Rural Population Trends, 2nd paragraph – It states that “A growing urban population will use transportation in different ways that people do today”. – include examples here.
- Page 43: Under Economy, 2nd paragraph – It states that “Shippers are developing new methods to more efficiently transport freight...” – Where? How? Provide context.
- Page 44: Under Economic Sectors & Employment Patterns – The information in the margin – “MnDot defines congestion by the percent of freeway miles below 45 miles per hour during peak periods.” – should be located in the text, just like all other information in the margins.
- Page 50: Under Technology, 2nd paragraph – It states that “More widespread drones could have positive impacts...” Such as? Asset management elements, bridge inspections, imaging for environmental conditions, etc.?
- Page 56: Under Activities - The summary of engagement activities is comprehensive. But how many actual participant responses were received in total? It is stated under Audience – that 56% provided some demographic information – but what is that number? It would be helpful to have that information in order to put the number into perspective.
- Page 58: Under Results – Were there no geographic (zip code) trends/conclusions? Could you be more explicit here to suggest the value of these statistical summaries and how they will be used? For environmental justice provisions outlined on page 68?
- Page 59: The top 5 most important individual trends are outlined – are there any others that are worth mentioning?
- Page 60: Be more explicit here to suggest the value of these statistical summaries and how they will be used. For environmental justice provisions outlined on page 68?
- General: Chapter 5 – How were the existing performance measures originally determined? This would be helpful from a background perspective.
- Page 88: First paragraph - “Last-mile link” – is industry jargon – explain in this context.
- Page 88: This is the first reference to single-occupancy vehicle in the document. There are also references on Page 98 and 100. It seems that this term should be introduced far earlier in the document.
- Page 94: Last paragraph – Should technology be mentioned here as having a potential role in inspections?
- Page 98: 2nd paragraph – Should freeway lids/land bridges be called out in this section?
- Page 99: In the margin, last sentence – Why was this target likely not achieved?
- General: Chapter 6 – The work plan activities defined in this chapter are quite broad and qualitative.
- Page 102: First bullet –Is this the first reference to project selection processes in this document? This concept or idea that there is room for improvement should be referenced earlier in the document. Are there other types of projects that should be noted here?
- Page 102: Second bullet – Are there specific areas of concentration that should be outlined here?
- Page 103: Third bullet – What other safety topics? New? Ongoing?

- Page 104: 2nd bullet – Freeway lids/land bridges?
- Page 105: There are several references to all highway assets. What are these technically? Is this information appropriate within the margin? This would be helpful to know from a context stand point.