The City of Minneapolis appreciates the efforts of Metropolitan Council staff and committees that went in to preparation of the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan. The City believes that the web-based format of the plan will make it a much more user friendly document for cities, counties, and residents of the Twin Cities.

The City of Minneapolis offers the following specific comments on the draft TPP:

**Chapter 2: Policies and Strategies**

- Strategy 5b should explicitly reference *inter-city* passenger rail

- Strategy 9b should reference a multimodal *transportation* system rather than a roadway system to reflect the fact that some elements of the multimodal system are non-roadway based.

**Chapter 6: Highways**

- The Plan should reflect that the I-35W Bridge over the Mississippi River *has re-opened* in the fall of 2008.

- Table 6-36: I-35W at Washington Avenue, Project Status says, "Will be addressed with new I-35W Bridge." Has this work been completed?

**Chapter 7: Tranist**

- Transit Types of Service – LRT is described as "operating in an exclusive right-of-way." While this is generally true, there are locations where the right-of-way is not exclusive.

- Transit Types of Service – Commuter rail is described as having stops "approximately five miles apart" and "typically operate only in morning and evening commute periods." Many commuter rail lines including the Northstar line have stops much farther apart than five miles and many, including Northstar, have mid-day service as well.

- Transit Infrastructure – Should reference the new multimodal station being constructed near the Twins Ballpark.

- Strategy 13e: Transit Safety and Security – The City believes that effective urban design can contribute to transit safety and security and the strategy should reflect this.

- Strategy 15D should specifically reference "pedestrian *and bicycle* facilities…"

- Metro Transit's high-frequency network is not mentioned in the plan. These are routes within the arterial bus network which have a much higher frequency of

service than the arterial bus network. The high-frequency network should be identified as a fifth type of the regular route bus system in addition to local routes, arterial routes, express routes and long-distance express routes.

- The plan should include a map and more information about facilities on the high frequency arterial bus network – bus stops and bus shelters. These corridors provide a very high proportion of regional transit ridership, and their facilities (bus stops, bus shelters, and street/sidewalk corridors) are given very little attention, compared with the focus upon park-n-ride facilities.

- The plan does not recognize the fact that the major local bus corridors in Minneapolis provide the majority of ridership for the regional transit system. The role of the major urban arterial bus routes in helping the region to meet its goal of a doubling of transit ridership by 2030 should be explained (the primary transit network/high-frequency routes, such as Nicollet, Chicago, etc.) The bias in the plan appears to be that all the increase in ridership will come from suburban express routes. How do these arterial routes relate to future plans for the regional transitways?

- There should include more information about the plans for future transit centers; they are currently shown on the map on page 118, but unlike for park-n-ride facilities, there is no information about the schedule for constructing them.

- The plan should more strongly support development of intercity passenger rail. While this may not be specifically under the Metro Council's jurisdiction, the City believes that it is a vital component to the multi-modal transportation system and should be supported in the regional plan.

- Bus Rapid Transit: The statement the BRT is never "complete" like a rail project is inaccurate. Upgrades to various components of the rail transit system are also implemented. This statement should be deleted.

- Transitway Corridors to Study for Mode and Alignment: The Rush Line Corridor is mentioned in this section as undergoing an alternatives analysis but the Bottineau Corridor is not listed. It should also be included here, both LRT and BRT modes as well as several alignments are currently being considered.

- The paragraph on streetcars does not recognize the benefits of streetcar service for transit riders, as well as for development. The City recommends the following language related to streetcars:
    - **Streetcars** are a type of rail transit that can be operated with vintage cars, replica cars or modern cars. Streetcars typically operate in mixed traffic although they may operate in reserved lanes and may be given priority at intersections. They typically stop every few blocks and operate shorter distances than LRT with an emphasis on high frequency service with high accessibility. They travel more slowly than light-rail transit, which

operates in its own dedicated right-of-way and stops every one-two miles. Service is often faster than bus service due to faster boarding, faster fare collection, and intersection priorities. Streetcar service is particularly suitable for high volume local routes in urban areas. Streetcars may also be appropriate as a development tool for local units of government. The Council will collaborate with local units of government to determine where and when streetcars may be appropriate. However, if it is determined that streetcars are less cost-effective than buses and they are being constructed primarily as a development tool, streetcars should be funded primarily at the local, not regional, level. If streetcar service would replace bus service, then regional participation would be based on the anticipated regional cost savings. Federal or state grant funding for local streetcar lines should not compete with regional transit priorities unless streetcar is shown to be more cost-effective than bus or LRT.

- Transit Implementation Costs: This section includes the statement, "It is assumed that only one New Starts project is under construction at a time." What is the rationale for this statement? The Southwest Transitway currently has a target opening year of 2015, one year after opening of the Central Corridor LRT. If the Southwest Transitway is to meet its goal, it would require that both corridors be under construction at the same time.

**Chapter 9: Pedestrians and Bicyclists**

- Multi-Modal Projects. This includes the statement that "evaluation criteria will favor *highway* projects that accommodate…" The word highway should be changed to transportation or roadway to be more general in nature.