

# Appendix B • Public Input Summary

## Public Input Round One, February 2019

Long Range Transportation Plan 2045

Open House, February 26, 2019

Public Comments (direct quotes from written notes and comments are in *italics*)

---

### Long Range Transportation Plan Map/Table

- Sticky note referring to large “Suburban Development” area in southwest Rochester:  
Can Rochester afford these suburban expansions w/o raising existing homeowners’ taxes?
- Sticky note referring to yellow “25 Year Urban Service Area” between Towne Club Parkway SE/Eastwood Rd SE and 20 St SE:  
Should Town Club Parkway (sp?) be part of this 2045 plan?
- A markup directly on one of the maps noted that “Byron” was misspelled as “Bryon” on the legend.

### Transit System Characteristics

- **Transit Services in the Rochester/Olmsted County Area** (slide 5):  
“Question to Consider: Is there a need for improved Transit in Rochester or Olmsted County?”  
*Improve public perception of transit*

### Roadway System Planning

- **Priority Interchange Studies and Projects** (slide 7):  
“Question to Consider: Are there other major improvements or Interchange projects you think need to be

considered?"

*Byron future interchange locations need to be determined*

## Pedestrian Safety Planning

- **Analysis of Pedestrian Crashes in Rochester 2006-2015** (slide 5):  
"Have you experienced or observed any locations or areas where pedestrian safety is a concern?"  
*Traveling from parking lot from Cornerstone Hotel 6 St/6 Ave [SW]*

## Safety Planning and Network Screening

- **Pattern of Crash Locations in Greater Olmsted County 2006-2015** (slide 8):  
"Are there any specific areas in the county outside of Rochester where you feel safety improvements are needed?"  
*Hwy 14/Frontage Rd/Co Rd 5 Byron*  
*Leashes and Leads/Hwy 14*

## Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning

- **Planning Goals, Major Issues and Key System Development Principles** (slide 2):  
"Are there policy areas or key issues that you feel are missing from these lists?"  
*Ahh...consider snow and snow removal – Brian R Smith*
- **Community Input on Bicycle and Pedestrian Needs** (slide 3):  
"Are there other needs or issues people who have responded to these prior surveys have not identified related to walking and biking infrastructure?"  
[referring to Bicycle Friendly Community Survey results] *Weather? (not on list)(odd) – Brian R Smith*
- **Preliminary ROCOG Regional Bikeway Plan** (slide 8)  
"The ROCOG Plan seeks to build on the existing plans of local cities and State Agencies to fill in any gaps in service between cities or major regional destinations. Are there regional connections you would like to see?"  
*If the government (Rochester City) wants to build a ped/bike trail outside the city limits, then the City shall not*
  - 1) threaten to use eminent domain,*
  - 2) use " " – Brian R Smith*

- **Rochester Pedestrian System Planning** (slide 9):  
 “Are there existing locations where you see a need for improved Pedestrian Facilities?”  
 [first comment] *Improve pedestrian crossings on 2 St downtown, Broadway from 7th to 7<sup>th</sup>, 3rd Ave SE, 4<sup>th</sup> St SE*  
 [second comment] *Should it be mandatory to have covered walkways for sidewalks next to major construction? Downtown Rochester has whole blocks w/o sidewalks due to construction. – Brian R Smith ped & bike*
- **Safety and System Development Strategies for Successful Implementation** (slide 10):  
 [referring to “Safe Roadway Designs”] Use data to design new roads, ped, and bike transportation, safety data, not how many autos per fortnight can be pushed through... – Brian R Smith ped & bike
- **Plans for Rochester Network of Bikeways and Trails** (slide 4):  
 “Are there locations not shown on the Rochester Area or Downtown Rochester network plans where pedestrian or bicycle facilities are needed?”  
*Bike route on E Center St needs to extend at least to 11<sup>th</sup> Ave East, possibly 15<sup>th</sup> Ave East or coordinate [sic] access to the existing bike/trail a block north of Center Street.*
- **MnDOT and MnDNR Planning for Regional Trails and Bike Networks** (slide 6):  
 “Do you have any comments to offer regarding network plans the State Highway Department or Department of Natural Resources have developed for regional trails and bikeways?”  
*Bike trail to Oxbow.*
- **Regional Trails Plans in Southeast Minnesota** (slide 7):  
 “Do you have any comments to offer regarding plans underway for regional trails in the Rochester area?”  
 [first comment] [referring to Chester Woods State Trail map] *Red = existing trail...but the segment from RCTC to 50<sup>th</sup> is not done. This is false advertising!*  
 • *Also, the red line looks to be running along 20<sup>th</sup> St SE, south of Bear Creek. It does not. Also wrong. – Brian R Smith ped & bike*  
 [second comment] *To connect 20<sup>th</sup> St SE and Marion Rd to the DNR Chester Woods Trail @ 50<sup>th</sup> Ave SE follow Bear Creek! – Brian R Smith ped & bike*

## Conversations with Attendees

- Discussion of a good idea to use the Seneca property for the Downtown BRT Circulator. It's a good location with the surrounding streets/TH 14.
- Discussion of timing for the finalizing of the building of CSAH 5 extension from the Elk Run interchange over to CSAH 3.
- What will happen around the Elk Run interchange with the new owners? What are their plans (staff does not know, but staff can state that the interchange in place can handle very large levels of traffic).
- Good idea to upgrade CR 101 from gravel to hard surface. The person talking said he uses it regularly and lives in Roch south side.
- Comments on the intersection of 55<sup>th</sup> St NW and Chateau Rd as to no right turn lane and other comments.
- Interest from a couple of attendees as to the how/when for the final route of the Downtown BRT Circulator.
- Comments on understanding the need for upgrading 48<sup>th</sup> St NE to meet the need for future residential development, some concerns about a step to Officially Map the future right of way. Understanding that no projects showing on the draft LRTP street/highway map are funded at this time.
- Expressed need for a Downtown Circulator "hub" (further discussion revealed that this attendee meant "mobility hub" or "transit village") downtown, but not at 2 St SW and 2 Ave SW. Preference for original DMC idea of Central Station, north of Central Park.
- Importance of rebuilding US-52/I-90 interchange south of Rochester, because there are too many accidents there, and ever-increasing semi traffic increases the dangers at that interchange.
- Need for Collegeview Rd SE to be rebuilt as a 4-lane road, not reduced to 2-lanes.
- Need for frequent, free, accessible transit to encourage people to go downtown without using their cars.
- Need for safer bicycle infrastructure, especially a better way to separate cyclists and motorists at the intersection of E River Rd SE and Collegeview Rd SE; and on US-14/12 St SW/SE between US-52 and 11 Ave SE.
- Need for bicycle lanes to be convertible into auto lanes during the winter months.

## Public Input Round Two: Fall 2019

Long Range Transportation Plan 2045

Fall 2019 Outreach Report

Open House, October 15, 2019

Public Comments (direct quotes from written notes and comments are in *italics*)

---

### ROCOG Regional Active Transportation Network

- Sticky note pointing out location of Oxbow County Park
- Sticky note near Big Bluestem State Trail Planning Area asking:  
*Any thought of horseback riding trails?*

### Urban Area Active Transportation Projects in South Side of Rochester

- *Connect 27 & 28 on old rail bed*
- *Connect Gamehaven Trail to City trails*

### Urban Area Active Transportation Projects in North Side of Rochester

- *#45 and #208 are very important as the continue all the work on Cascade Lake Park*
- *East-west facility in 7<sup>th</sup> St ot 14<sup>th</sup> St NW would be good.*
- *Connect #120 to projects #45 and #208*
- *Space for bikes to cross Civic Center Drive at intersections is important. Don't end bike lanes at Civic Center Drive.*

### Park and Rides

- Referring to Downtown Circulator:  
*Consider outbound on Broadway and inbound on 3 Ave SE.*

*Need big station downtown for people to wait for outbound Circulator at peak hour.  
Must have high frequency.*

## Story Maps: on-line input Opportunity

- *StoryMaps is one of the best public engagement tools I've ever seen!*

## Street/Highway Projects thru Year 2045

- *#13-15: will this road be a street for neighborhoods or a bypass? Build as one or the other; it can't do both.*
- *#20 – can this be a Diverging Diamond Interchange?*
- *#35 – No thanks! High cost, no good congestion relief, and it's a larger barrier to bikes/peds/the neighborhood.*
- *Lots of detail about roads (prices, schedules, etc.) – we should have the same level of detail w/r/t transit projects to reflect the shift in policies that give higher priority to transit.*
- *Regarding the 60 Ave NW/Valleyhigh Rd NW interchange project:  
What is the plan for this road project (straightened roadway? Improved sightlines)?  
When is the project scheduled?  
When would Olmsted Co. take over 60 Ave NW from the township?*

## ROCOG 2045 Long Range Plan Regional Functional Designation Map

- *Sticky note pointing out a green dot on CR 4 east of the intersection with CR 3, northeast of Byron, which was not explained on the map's legend*

## Pedestrian Facility Gaps on Federal Functional Class Highways in Rochester

- *Interesting map!*

## Urban Area Active Transportation Network Plan Facility Types Typical Safety Concerns and Safety Solutions

- *Cyclists should have to take classes to learn safety, rules of the road. They should have to pay taxes for the upkeep of the road. They should have to buy insurance.*
- *How to reduce conflicts between bikes & cars? County Roads 8, 15, and 30 are really dangerous for cyclists and truck drivers. Especially conflicts with farm equipment.*

### Reported by Muhammad Khan

- *We got same turnout at the Open House that we used to get in the past. Public outreach via StoryMap was appreciated by Mike Wojcik and some others who attended the open house. There was a concern raised by a lady about the 40th St SW road upgrade project. She was talking about the gas pipeline project in SW side of Rochester especially in the vicinity of 40th Street SW. I am not 100% sure that she left something in writing about her concern.*

### Reported by Beth Davis

- *Greetings!*

*I'm liking the regional and urban pedestrian/bicycling improvements you are working into the 2045 transportation plan.*

*I am an Oronoco Township resident and we have limited-to-no options for commuting to and from Rochester mass transit wise. Park N Rides with good shuttle service to points in Rochester could be really helpful - I'm encouraged by your peripheral Park N Rides that you are thinking about.*

*One thing that our county and the City of Rochester has very little infrastructure for is electric vehicle charging. It would be great to plan on putting EV charging capabilities in these new Park N Ride lots. Mayo Clinic has done a HORRIBLE job with their EV infrastructure (they've done nothing to encourage EV commuting); the county could help reduce parking burdens downtown Rochester (and on the Mayo campus) by providing EV drivers/commuters with "charge N ride" options in these peripheral lots. I'm seeing an increasing number of EVs in this community and you can count the number of public EV chargers on basically one hand.*

*Thanks for listening,*

*Erik*

## Emailed Comments from the Public:

- Karen Cohen, of Pedestrian Bicycle Advisory Committee, emailed 9/24/2019 (Subject: RE: Transportation Plan Comments)

**SE--** There is a definite need to cross Hwy 52 near Broadway? Do you see the Willow Creek Trail doing that? If shoppers are using Walmart/Menard's area, how do you see them getting to the Target/Fleet Farm/movie theater/etc. area?

**Center City--RR Trail--**It was mentioned at one time to make a rail/trail if the RR ever gave up the tracks paralleling Broadway on the east side, Should that be mentioned in the plan or not since we don't know the RR's plans?

Intersection of 12th St. and Bdy--I know that intersection has been talked about many times, but is there any way to make it safe to cross from Fridell Middle School to Crossroads (and specifically ChickFillA which I've been made aware is directly across the street but kids can't safely get to it). I checked this out on my bike yesterday and came to the conclusion that perhaps the safest way at this time is to dash across Broadway which is absolutely not safe but I understand is what some kids are doing. To cross the street safely, one must either cross 12th St. and then Bdy. at the light at the intersection. Then take the bike trail to the light by HyVee and cross 12th St. a 2nd time. Then one must try to walk or bike with no sidewalks and in the traffic lanes or the ditch, which was VERY unsafe due to all the shopping auto and truck traffic. The other "safe" street crossing is to go north to the light by Graham Park and cross. Once across, you very soon have no sidewalk and must again walk or bike through traffic--again very unsafe. It just seems crazy that there are no sidewalks on the shopping side of the street and no way to cross the Broadway at that point.

**SW--**Any way of making 16th St. in the Apache Mall area more bike friendly? There is a sidewalk for peds, but nothing for bikers because 16th St. is crazy along that stretch with 4 lanes of traffic flying by and there is no bike infrastructure. I have only ever seen bikers riding on the sidewalk in that area--never on the street.



**NE and NW**--Both mention "on-road bike improvements" on Elton Hills Dr. but no mention of ped improvements at corners so you can safely walk across the street? Could that be added or is that not part of the plan?

[On 9/24/2019, Dillon Dombrovski replied: *We have a project with federal funding to add a pedestrian crossing to the south and west legs of that intersection and provide a trail along Crossroads shopping center on the south side of TH 14 that will extend to the entrance into HyVee. The funding for the project is programmed for 2021.*]

## Shops at University Square Dining Area; Public Comments; September 11, 2019; Bryan Law

1. Bus routes should be inbound/outbound, rather than loops.
2. Need to increase frequency on transit routes.
3. Need to fill gaps in the system of bicycle lanes on the streets (trails are great, but expand the bicycling network onto more roads).
4. Need more opportunities for people to get around town without a car.
5. Commenter liked the 55 St NW interchange with US-52 (project #20).
6. Collegeview Rd SE and E Circle Dr SE should have a left-turn-on-blinking-yellow-arrow signal.
7. 37 St NW through IBM (offramp approach to Marketplace) needs better traffic control to prevent back-ups onto 37 St NW.
8. The new 55 St NW to 48 St NE connection is really welcome.
9. Need better coordination of road closures (traveling east to west in summer of 2019 was really difficult due to multiple construction projects blocking alternative routes).
10. I want to be able to drive my car through the City of Rochester without having to get off and ride a bus.
11. I want more bus service to neighboring cities.
12. Bicycle planning should include more funding for enforcement; too many bicyclists ride on the sidewalks.
13. Rebuilding Co. Rd 117 (project #10) is probably a short-range project; which sounds good, because that road is in bad shape, and there is a lot of development in that area.

14. Co. Rd 104/US-14 interchange rebuild is very necessary for safety.
15. Co. Rd 101 (project #9) project is overdue by many years.
16. Park and ride system needs more frequent service during more hours of the day.
17. I would be interested in a nationwide, coast-to-coast bike trail.
18. What are the areas without City water and sewer? Are any of them planned to be served by the City?
19. Does the CSAH 4 and CR 104 interchange project depend the US-14/CR 104 (project #2) project?
20. Bike lanes on 2 St SW are unnecessary and undesirable.
21. Need bike connection between south Walmart and ShopKo, and Target South.
22. Need better north-south bike connections on south side.

### UMR; Public Comments; September 11, 2019; Bryan Law

1. I ride RPT Route 10. It's a long ride.
2. Need better options for getting downtown without a car.
3. Need for outreach to UMR students; establish a focus group for TOD and TDP planning.
4. What options are there for getting cars out of downtown? What about developers and owners of parking structures downtown? Are they at the table during these planning discussions?
5. What transit options help get cars out of downtown?

### Comments from September 11, 2019 LRTP/TIP Outreach at University Square Food Court; Ben Griffith

1. RPT's downtown routes are different for inbound and outbound, resulting in lopsided travel times (short ride in AM, long ride in PM or vice versa...) *(heard this same comment from at least 3 additional people...)*
2. More funding for bike routes and bike lanes, but not too fond of the sharrows because it doesn't feel safe riding a bike on the road, especially in areas just outside downtown core

3. Need to improve the current Park-N-Ride Facilities (shelters would be nice for the wait) and increase times to and from downtown (*heard this at least 4 times from different people...*)
4. Improve bus route times to make using the bus more convenient for workers and others
5. Improve bus stops and shelters to make waiting for the bus a better experience; improving the sidewalks (or building sidewalks where there are none currently) would be a big help
6. We need more parking in downtown Rochester, not bike lanes, and quit taking on-street parking away for bike lanes and Ubers!
7. Timelines should all be moved up—we need more roads now!
8. Make sidewalks wider; need more room for people, bikes, tables & chairs, and now scooters!
9. When will downtown circulator start? I want to use it now!
10. Funding for roads and transit should happen sooner, not later, to make it happen sooner
11. Would like to see more transit options; more routes, better routes, more frequent times
12. Need to improve sidewalks to get to bus stops and shelters, which also need to be improved
13. Sidewalk ends on 19<sup>th</sup> Street SW and lots of children in the neighborhood end up walking and riding their little bikes in the street
14. Whatever happened to ZipRail? Will Rochester ever get train service to the Twin Cities or anywhere else? Amtrak?
15. Need to complete and connect unfinished and disconnected bike paths
16. Use pull tabs in bars to provide tax money for transportation infrastructure
17. Need flexible bus service along Valleyhigh Road
18. Rochester will need the Primary Transit Network built out sooner than 2045

## Comments from September 11, 2019 LRTP/TIP Outreach at University Square Food Court; Dave Pesch

1. Approve of total transit plans: much better ways of getting around town without a car.
2. Agree that Hwy 14 East needs to be 4-laned in the near future out to at least Eyota.
3. Regarding Broadway, it's fine to have two auto lanes converted to bus lanes.
4. Like both versions of BRT systems: the city-wide and the Downtown Circulator.
5. A commercial developer stated that liked all of the future street/highway improvements and also the BRT systems.
6. Two Mayo Clinic visitors said they "love it" when seeing how the future transit system will work to get both locals and patients to Mayo. They would be fine parking in the parking ramps at the ends of the Downtown Circulator.
7. A person said that it's a good idea to upgrade 65<sup>th</sup> St from the 52 ramp over to at least 50<sup>th</sup> Ave.
8. Three people at different times stated that work needs to be done to improve how the West Circle Drive interchange works with Hwy 14 during the AM and PM peak work hours. One person said there is no reason Rochester should have the kind of traffic delays that are "all over the place" in the Twin Cities.
9. Support the planning to build out transportation on the West and NW side of Rochester to keep pace with future housing being built. Glad the Planners are staying ahead of things.
10. A Mayo Dept Head said that she would be willing to give up a downtown parking space ("which isn't easy to part with") when the ramps are built on both ends of the Downtown Circulator. She likes that the cars would be parked inside, and the riders would be waiting for the buses in a weather-protected space.
11. A member of RNeighbors liked all the transit plans and said she supported 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave as the route for the Circulator since it would push traffic over to Broadway rather than the other way around.
12. Two people who live west of Rochester but in Olmsted County said that CSAH 4 needs upgrading but also needs sight lines corrected.
13. A person identifying as a Senior Citizen said she really likes all the future transit options. She's not planning to be able to drive forever.

14. A local retail owner on the near North side of Downtown believes transit will help in attracting shoppers in places where parking will be difficult. Also supports bike trails that are not in the street (i.e. bike lanes).
15. A person said he'll be looking to see what the headway will be on the Downtown Circulator and also what the stations will look like. He's planning to keep an eye out for chances to weigh in on station placement and design.

## Comments from Rochester Planning and Zoning Commission, October 9, 2019

1. Does ROCOG still expect development between Rochester and Pine Island?

A: Dave mentioned that the comprehensive plan does not anticipate that the two municipalities would grow to be coterminous before 2040.

2. US-52/I-90: would be a shame to put that off any longer; it needs an upgrade soon.

A: Dave said that this project should be coming up shortly, and we could expect it in the TIP in the next few years.

## Comments from One Hour/One Topic, 125 LIVE, October 21, 2019

### Streets/Highways

1. What are your baseline objectives??

Dave: Safety improvements; congestion relief; better serving expected land use

2. What will happen with back road to Byron (i.e., alternative route to US-14)?

Dave: The US-14 Corridor Analysis will examine the connections to US-14 at cross streets, and this will consider alternative routes and how they interact with US-14.

3. How will 55 St NW/US-52 interchange be improved?

Dave: We build interchanges for much longer these days. Older interchanges became obsolete after the City grew. Now we anticipate that change and build for it.

Comment: Please don't do anything at US-52/55 St NW like at 19 St NW interchange.

Dave: 55 ST NW interchange will likely be like 19 St NW interchange.

4. What connections will be made on 75 St NW to connect it with the rest of Rochester?

Dave: 18 Ave NW, 50 Ave NW, etc.

5. US-63/I-90 – very dangerous. Is it going to be rebuilt?

Dave: Yes, it will begin in 2020. Highway 30 will be closed as a result.

### Active Transportation

1. How do we suggest new projects?

Muhammad: Comment on StoryMap. Email, call, even visit in-person.

2. Where will Stagecoach Trail go?

Muhammad: It's a study area, so the exact path is not determined yet.

3. If electric bikes are allowed on trails, what about electric motorcycles?

Muhammad: Vehicles allowed on trails are limited by their speed; must be below 15-20 mph.

4. What will be done at N. Broadway and 13 St (Sliver Lake dam area)?

Muhammad: Rebuilding Broadway is happening in stages, and that is the first of several interlocking road projects.

5. How are they dealing with congestion downtown?

Muhammad: Park and rides, City Loop

6. Are schools included on the ROCOG Board (to contribute to planning for getting kids to and from school)?

Muhammad: Yes, Rochester Public Schools (RPS) is on the Board. School transportation planning focuses on Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS), and RPS now has an SRTS Coordinator on staff.

### Transit

1. Current rider wants to know which service replaces other services (referring to Rochester Public Transit existing service; Primary Transit Network Bus Rapid Transit; and Downtown Circulator).

Bryan: None of these services will replace another. They will be 3 different services, all serving a different type of rider.

2. Discussion of difference between bus stops, which already exist, and BRT stations, which will require more infrastructure investment.
3. How will BRT turn around at the mobility hubs?

Bryan: The mobility hubs will have concentrations of housing, office, retail, commercial, and transportation uses – so there will be plenty of room for buses to turn around.

4. Question about elevated rail/monorail as part of Downtown Circulator

Bryan: That mode was considered as part of Integrated Transit Studies, and found to be too expensive and difficult to integrate with other transit services on the ground.

5. How does the system fit in with the small cities out in the County and their small park and ride lots.

Bryan: Those small-city park and ride lots are served by private-sector, for-profit carriers, so they are not part of this discussion of publicly funded and operated transit. However, those small-city lots and the commuter service that serves them do help keep cars out of downtown Rochester, and thus are acknowledged in the LRTP.

6. Current rider commented that the Rochester Public Transit (RPT) service and vehicles are great, and that RPT serves disabled passengers very well.

## Diversity Council Public Comments Aug 7, D. Pesch

### Street-Highway

- West Circle Drive interchange with Hwy 14 is way too congested and the traffic signals just seem to make it worse.
- Interchange at 52 and Hwy 14 works fine except for the back-ups when having to cross over traffic to get to a ramp.
- Hwy 52 has a merge from 14 sound-bound that doesn't work in the morning work drive hour.

- There are too many signals on West Circle Dr, it doesn't work like a beltway.
- Civic Center drive is ready for 6 lanes right now, not far out into the future.
- Like the project to fix the hills and turning in/out on 20<sup>th</sup> St SW west of South Broadway.
- Support the project to re-do the intersection just north of the N. Broadway "dam bridge". It's not great for cars, but much worse for walkers and bikers to get through.

### Transit

- BRT in Rochester is a great idea so that we could handle many work days without taking a car at all during the work part of the day.

### Bike/Ped

- ALL the bike paths should be plowed in winter, not just some downtown. With winter bikes and all the winter walkers, the time has come to do this. We have a great path system, just not in winter.
- The new scooters should not be allowed on bike paths. Isn't there a restriction for motorized unless it's wheelchairs?
- Very much support the plans to build out the walking/biking paths to the BRT future nodes from neighborhoods. Not enough that people living right there can get to the bus stop, others will walk/bike there also if it's kind of direct without crossing main arterial streets.

## Diversity Council Annual Celebration; Public Comments; Aug 7, 2019; Bryan Law

1. Comment praising separation of maps: bikes on one, transit on another.
2. Question about what kind of sidewalks and bike facilities were planned.
3. Question about how Primary Transit Network and Downtown Circulator are distinct from Rochester Public Transit's existing service. Comment that it would be good to have these varied transit options.
4. Question about how transit could be increased to allow more people to live and work in Rochester without a car.



5. Question about what exactly the Downtown Circulator is, what the Primary Transit Network is, and how these fit in with other plans (especially Planning 2 Succeed and the DMC Development Plan).

## Diversity Council Annual Celebration; Public Comments; Aug 7, 2019; Sandi Goslee and Muhammad Khan

1. Looking forward to ability to get rid of my car.
2. Great idea for getting Mayo employees to work without parking hassles.
3. Complete bike trails to Gamehaven.
4. Complete pedestrian/bike paths through Broadway (major north-south connector).
5. 6<sup>th</sup> St connection [needed?]

## Comments from Chamber of Commerce, Transportation Forum/Government Affairs Committee, October 11, 2019

1. How do you work out differences when different jurisdictions disagree (such as with the Collegeview Rd SE conflict earlier in 2019)?

Dave: ROCOG as the MPO doesn't have a lot of direct say in that sort of thing, but it does provide expertise, which can hopefully help in discussions.

2. Co. Rd. 104 is a bad turning movement. What is the plan there?

A: Dave pointed at the layout for the US-14/CR 104 interchange on the map.

3. Is the CR 104 interchange plan based on traffic counts?

Dave: Yes. We expect Rochester and Byron to grow toward each other with urban development (that is, water, sewer, small residential lots, streets instead of rural roads).

4. Does the CR 104 interchange plan for there not to be any at-grade crossings?

Dave: Yes. US-14 is planned to be a freeway in that area, with ramps and exits for safety, not at-grade crossings.

5. 65 St NW/US-52 interchange is difficult now at peak hour.
6. Note from MnDOT: the projects in the LRTP are unfunded – they’re just identified needs. Money to actually build these projects comes later.
7. If US-14/CR 104 interchange is not funded, is there an interim project for increasing safety there?

Greg Paulson: That county-led project will consider interim solutions.

8. Downtown Circulator: why only Broadway or 3 Ave SE? Why not outbound on one and inbound on the other?

Dave: That is a question for the City and their consultants. It’s a completely separate study from this.

9. Is there a model for public-private partnerships with regard to retail and other commercial development at transit villages?

Dave: Yes, there are models out there.

10. What factors go into prioritizing projects?

Dave: We have criteria that help determine short- and long-range projects, etc. The criteria deal with safety, traffic forecasts, etc.

11. What about transit?

Dave: We rely on prioritized projects from other planning entities and incorporate them into our plan.

12. Do we have local consultants that can do this work, instead of looking toward the Twin Cities, Chicago, and elsewhere?

Dave: The hope with these projects is to hire a consultant that has done this kind of work before. Since most of this kind of work has been done elsewhere, that’s where the qualified consultants are. MnDOT usually uses local subcontractors on its local road projects.

13. Is there a future for light rail in Rochester?

Dave: We have to follow the comprehensive plan, and it came up with BRT as the high-capacity transit solution. BRT is now basically doing what LRT used to do.

Ben: LRT isn't completely gone as a possibility. It is more in the background now, but it could be resurrected in the future.

14. How much have people in outlying towns been asked about the location of the park and ride facilities?

Ben: There have been low-level discussions, and we need to expand them

15. The Mayo West circulator terminus looks like it will clog up roadways at peak hour.

Ben: It's about removing those cars from downtown, where road capacity is even tighter than out on 2 St SW west of US-52.

## ROCOG Memo

**Date:** December 4, 2019  
**To:** ROCOG Policy Board  
**From:** Bryan Law, Principal Planner  
**Subject:** Results of Fall 2019 Outreach for Long Range Transportation Plan

**Action:** Information Item

### Gathering Public Input

From August through December 2019, ROCOG staff have been engaged in a multi-pronged outreach effort to solicit public comments for the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). This effort included traditional means such as public meetings and press releases, and techniques new to ROCOG such as social media and the use of StoryMaps. One of the major goals of this outreach effort was to elicit comments from the public about the individual projects that staff had identified in the draft modal plans, as approved by ROCOG throughout the summer of 2019. The following is a list of the outreach efforts made by ROCOG staff this fall:

#### Presentations to Organizations

- Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee, August 20, 2019
- Intercultural Mutual Assistance Association, September 17, 2019
- R Neighbors/Council of Neighborhoods, September 17, 2019
- Olmsted Co. Township Officers Association, September 26, 2019
- Citizens Advisory on Transit, September 26, 2019
- Olmsted County Planning Advisory Commission, October 3, 2019
- City of Rochester Planning and Zoning Commission, October 9, 2019
- Chamber of Commerce Transportation Forum, October 11, 2019
- One Topic, One Hour (at 125 LIVE), October 21, 2019
- County Committee of the Whole, November 19, 2019

- Rochester City Council Study Session, December 2, 2019

### Pop-ups

- Diversity Council Annual Celebration, August 7, 2019
- Shoppes at University Square food court, September 11, 2019
- University of Minnesota Rochester, September 11, 2019

### Digital Outreach

- ROCOG Website
- ROCOG Facebook page
- StoryMaps

### Other

- Static display at Government Center, Sept. 23-27, 2019
- Post-Bulletin press release, October 4, 2019
- Open House, October 15, 2019

As a result of these efforts, ROCOG recorded 334 responses with various members of the public. Of these, 141 were responses made in-person, eight were emailed to staff, and 185 were generated through StoryMaps.

The nature of the responses were varied: 211 were comments about a project listed on ROCOG draft maps; 55 were general statements about various planning topics; 46 were questions (either direct to staff or rhetorical); 11 were input on the method of this plan; ten were suggestions for projects not listed on the maps; and one was a comment on StoryMap in response to another user's question on StoryMaps.

The public input was mostly directed to the modes of transportation ROCOG was presenting. The Active Urban mode got the most responses, with 133. Next was Street/Highway, with 98 responses. The tally of other responses were as follows: 45 for Transit; 24 for Active Regional; eight for Transit Park and Ride; three for roads and transit in a combined response; and one for active and transit in a combined response.

### Themes and Patterns to Comments:

Since so few responses came via email (only 2%), this analysis will concentrate on the responses the public provided in-person or via StoryMaps.

## Ratio

The in-person responses were 76% of the responses received via StoryMaps (141 interactions vs. 185). Put another way, there were three in-person responses for every four StoryMaps responses. This suggests that StoryMaps can reach a large audience, and that it could be even more effective with more marketing. At the very least, it seems clear that StoryMaps is a very useful companion effort to traditional in-person methods of outreach.

## Nature of Responses

The responses received in-person were different in nature from those received via StoryMaps. Of 141 in-person responses, only 23% were comments on specific projects, while 37% were general statements and 26% were questions. Conversely, of 185 StoryMap responses, 95% were comments on specific projects. In large part, this is to be expected, since StoryMap users could only comment by clicking on a specific project. There was no way for StoryMaps users to make general statements about planning issues. By restricting the opportunity to comment only within individual projects, ROCOG's StoryMap effort imposed a discipline on users, and they largely stuck to the task of commenting on the individual projects. In this way, the StoryMap effort was better at achieving the goal of getting comments on individual projects than the in-person efforts were.

The two types of outreach can complement each other, of course. ROCOG staff expected – indeed, wanted – people to come to in-person events out of general curiosity about the subject, become better informed about the topics and projects in the LRTP, and then visit the StoryMap later after their interest in particular projects had been piqued.

## Mode:

The responses received in-person and via StoryMaps were focused on different modes. Out of 141 in-person responses, Transit was most often the subject, 31% of the time. The other modes were mentioned in the following proportions in in-person responses: Street/Highway, 28%; Active Urban, 18%; Active Regional, 4%; roads and transit combined, 2%; active and transit combined, 1%. The number of responses for each mode are listed in Table 1, below.

In contrast, out of 185 StoryMap responses, Active Urban was most often the subject, 55% of the time. The other modes were mentioned in the following proportions in StoryMap responses: Street/Highway, 31%; Active Regional, 10%; Transit Park and Ride, 4%. The number of responses for each mode are listed in Table 1, below.

**Table 1: In-Person and StoryMap Responses by Mode.**

Mode	Total Comments	In-Person Comments	StoryMap Comments
Active Urban	127	25	102
Street/Highway	97	40	57
Transit	44	44	0
Active Regional	24	6	18
Transit Park and Ride	8	0	8
roads and transit	3	3	0
active and transit	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>304*</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>185</b>

\* The total does not add up to 334, because some responses were not obviously about any particular transportation mode.

### Top Projects Receiving Comments

With over 160 projects listed across the various modes, 334 responses works out to an average of just over 2 responses per project. It is perhaps not surprising that no one project dominated the responses. However, there were some projects that rose to the top in users' minds.

Out of 141 in-person responses, the Downtown Circulator was the subject of 8% of them. Other top projects were mentioned in the following proportions in in-person responses: Street/Highway #2, 4%; Transit Primary Transit Network and Circulator, 3%; Street/Highway #20, 2%; Street/Highway #35, 1%; Street/Highway #22, 1%. The number of responses for the top projects, and a brief description of each numbered project, are listed in Table 2, below.

Out of 185 StoryMap responses, Street/Highway #2 was the subject of 3% of them. Other top projects were mentioned in the following proportions in StoryMap responses: Street/Highway #35, 3%; Street/Highway #27, 3%; Active regional #3, 2%; Street/Highway #6, 2%; Street/Highway #20, 2%; Street/Highway #22, 2%. The number of responses for the top projects, and a brief description of each numbered project, are listed in Table 2, below.

What is most striking in this examination is five projects scored among the top of in-person or StoryMap responses, but received no attention in the other column. Nevertheless, some common ground can be found between in-person and StoryMap responses: Street/Highway projects 2, 20, 22, and 35 are on both lists

**Table 2: Top In-Person and StoryMap Responses by Project.**

Project	Total Comments	In-Person Comments	StoryMap Comments
Transit Circulator [NB: the Downtown Circulator was not listed as a specific project on StoryMap because the concept was not in a firm enough state at the time StoryMap was being built and released to the public]	11	11	0
Street/Highway #2 (US-14/ CR 104 interchange)	10	5	5
Street/Highway #35 (widening Civic Center Dr NW)	7	2	5
Street/Highway #20 (relocate 55 St NW/E Frontage Rd intersection)	6	3	3
Street/Highway #27 (rebuild S Broadway from 9 St SE to 16 St SE)	5	0	5
Active regional #3 (connecting Chester Woods Trail with Rochester trail system)	4	0	4
Street/Highway #22 (N Broadway and 14 St NE intersection)	4	1	3
Street/Highway #6 (US-14 and W Circle Dr NW interchange)	4	0	4
Transit PTN and Circulator (both BRT systems combined in a comment)	4	4	0



### Top Specific Needs Identified

Some responses described specific unmet needs, and these responses could be organized into some common categories. Out of 141 in-person responses, 10% noted the need for transit routes that better serve riders. Other specific needs were mentioned in the following proportions in in-person responses: better bike/ped connections, 9%; travel without a car, 6%; reduce conflict between users, 6%; improve road safety, 5%; traffic back-up relief, 4%; upgrade pedestrian facilities, 2%; increase in road capacity, 1%. The number of responses for the top specific needs identified in in-person responses are listed in Table 3, below.

Out of 185 StoryMap responses, 8% noted the need to improve road safety. Other specific needs were mentioned in the following proportions in StoryMap responses: traffic back-up relief, 5%; reduce conflict between users, 3%; and ADA compliance, 1%. The number of responses for the top specific needs identified in StoryMap responses are listed in Table 3, below.

Once again, there are five specific needs identified by either in-person or StoryMap responses that are not mentioned at all in the other column. Nevertheless, “Improve road safety,” “traffic back-up relief,” and “reduce conflict between users” are specific needs identified on both lists.

**Table 3: Top In-Person and StoryMap Responses by Specific Need Identified by Response.**

Specific Need Identified by Response	Total Comments	In-Person Comments	StoryMap Comments
improve road safety	21	7	14
better bike/ped connections [NB: 4 such comments were emailed to staff]	17	13	0
traffic back-up relief	16	6	10
transit routes that better serve riders	14	14	0
reduce conflict between users	13	8	5
travel without a car	9	9	0
upgrade pedestrian facilities	3	3	0
ADA compliance	2	0	2
increase in road capacity	2	2	0

### Top Specific Solutions Suggested

Out of 141 in-person responses, 6% called for more transit routes/frequency. Other specific solutions were suggested in the following proportions by in-person responses: new paved connection, 4%; complete planned trail connections, 3%; different route alignment, 1%; prohibit electric scooters on paths, 1%; signal improvement, 1%. The number of top in-person responses suggesting specific solutions are listed in Table 4, below.

Out of 185 StoryMap responses, 4% said that projects must include bicycle facilities. Other specific solutions were suggested in the following proportions by StoryMap responses: accelerate project schedule, 1%; add travel lanes, 1%; flatten road for better visibility, 1%; single point urban interchange, 1%. The number of top StoryMap responses suggesting specific solutions are listed in Table 4, below.

No suggested solutions are on both lists.

**Table 4: Top In-Person and StoryMap Responses by Specific Solution Suggested by Response.**

Specific Solution Suggested by Response	Total Comments	In-Person Comments	StoryMap Comments
more transit routes/frequency	8	8	0
must include bicycle facilities	8	0	8
new paved connection	6	6	0
complete planned trail connections	4	4	0
accelerate project schedule	2	0	2
add travel lanes	2	0	2
different route alignment	2	2	0
flatten road for better visibility	2	0	2
prohibit electric scooters on paths	2	2	0
signal improvement	2	2	0
single point urban interchange	2	0	2

A few patterns seem to emerge from the responses received in-person vs. those received via StoryMap. Some consensus seems to exist on the priority of Street/Highway projects 2, 20, 22, and 35. Similarly, both sets of responses agreed that the projects in the plan need to “Improve road safety,” provide “traffic back-up relief,” and “reduce conflict between users.” But beyond these items of agreement, the responses received in-person and via StoryMap show quite different

conceptions about what projects are most important and what unmet needs are most in need of addressing. And the two sets of responses are vastly different in the solutions they suggest to address the region’s transportation planning needs.

### Suggestions for Other Projects

Ten of the 334 comments were suggestions for projects that were not shown on the draft modal plan maps. The mode that received the most suggestions for new projects was Street/Highway, with six. Active Urban received three, and Active Regional received one. The most common category of response was “better bike/ped connections,” with three. “Improve road safety” and “traffic back-up relief” each received two responses. The remaining responses were alone in their categories: “upgrade pedestrian facilities”; “increase in road capacity”; and “signal improvement.”

**Table 5: Suggestions for Other Projects**

Active Regional	I would be interested in a nationwide, coast-to-coast bike trail.	Better bike/ped connections
Active Urban	Need bike connection between south Walmart and ShopKo, and Target South.	Better bike/ped connections
Active Urban	East-west facility in 7th St or 14th St NW would be good.	Better bike/ped connections
Active Urban	Sidewalk ends on 19th Street SW and lots of children in the neighborhood end up walking and riding their little bikes in the street	Upgrade pedestrian facilities
Street/Highway	CSAH 4 needs upgrading but also needs sight lines corrected.	Improve road safety
Street/Highway	CSAH 4 needs upgrading but also needs sight lines corrected.	Improve road safety
Street/Highway	Agree that Hwy 14 East needs to be 4-laned in the near future out to at least Eyota.	Increase in road capacity
Street/Highway	Collegeview Rd SE and E Circle Dr SE should have a left-turn-on-blinking-yellow-arrow signal.	Signal improvement
Street/Highway	37 St NW through IBM (offramp approach to Marketplace) needs better traffic control to prevent back-ups onto 37 St NW.	Traffic back-up relief

Street/Highway	65 St NW/US-52 interchange is difficult now at peak hour.	Traffic back-up relief
----------------	---	------------------------

### Survey 1-2-3 Comments

Part of the StoryMap gave users the opportunity to describe projects they would like to see that were not in the ROCOG draft modal plan. ROCOG received a total of 12 comments: nine regarding Street/Highway, two regarding Bike/Ped; and one regarding Transit. Users were invited to assign a priority level to their suggestions, and these can be seen in Table 6, below.

**Table 6: Survey 1-2-3**

Mode	No. of Comments	Highest Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Not Assigned a Priority
Street/Highway	9	2	6	0	1
Bike/Ped	2	2	0	0	0
Transit	1	0	0	0	1
Total	12	4	6	0	2

The suggested projects could also be assigned a rationale. That is, what purpose would the project serve? Users could select all the rationales that applied, and could provide their own by choosing “other.” The tally of suggested project rationales is as follows:

Safety: 7

Filling a gap in service/network: 5

Address underserved area/population: 3

Quality of life improvement: 3

Increase property values: 4

Upgrade of existing facility: 5

Other: 1

Much like the responses to the projects listed in StoryMaps, the Survey 1-2-3 users gave Safety as their highest priority in suggesting transportation projects.

## Public Input Round Three: Summer 2020

2045 LRTP Outreach

Questions and Comments Received from July through September 2020

---

### Citizens Advisory on Transit

July 23, 2020

- Comment: Would like to see a recommendation about ensuring curb-cuts for pedestrians, and especially wheelchair users, to have better access to sidewalks

Staff Response (not during meeting, but later): The plan does have goals and objectives related to safety and increased accessibility throughout the pedestrian system, as well as planning the pedestrian and bicycle systems in coordination with surrounding land use planning. The 2045 LRTP is not likely to get into the level of detail that would be necessary for municipal policy on where curb-cuts should go, but jurisdictions that use this plan should be aware of its recommendations for the active transportation mode and their effect on land use.

- Question: Will financial information be available for review?

Staff Response: Yes, that is a big part of the final chapters of the plan

- Question: Will Lime scooters and Nice Ride bikes be part of the transit hubs?

Staff Response: There has been some discussion of how bicycles and especially bicycle parking fit into the transit villages. The shared mobility of Lime and Nice Ride certainly fit the vision and intent of multi-modal transit hubs.

### Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee

August 12, 2020

- Question: When visiting the StoryMaps, do you want us to rank the projects?

Staff Response: No need to rank; just give comments. However, feel free to tell us if you think a particular project is important, a high priority, etc.

## Transportation Technical Advisory Committee

August 27, 2020

- Committee voted unanimously to recommend adoption of the 2045 LRTP

## Citizens Advisory on Transit

August 27, 2020

- Comment: I like the cost breakdown [by mode and across 25 years]. It makes everything more understandable, and it makes the total costs less shocking.

Staff Response: Yes, the totals are big, but it is important to remember that they are over 25 years.

- Question: Does ROCOG revisit this plan from time to time.

Staff Response: Yes, updates are required at least every 5 years. If conditions change in such a significant way between updates that what is described in the current plan is no longer accurate, the plan can be amended before the next update.

## Virtual Open House #1

Date: September 8, 2020

Subject: ROCOG 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan – Virtual Outreach

Attendees: Bryan Law, Jennifer Garness, Mark Engel, Ben Griffith, Marty Cormack, Brett Ostby, Steve Jorgensen, Paul Claus, Matt Lynch, and Dave (Guest)

[11:58 AM] Law Bryan

This meeting will be recorded, and available for later review on the ROCOG website.

Edited

### Matt Lynch (Guest)

Hi Bryan! Knowing that active transportation and recreation are key goals for ROCOG's LRTP, what is the plan to communicate that among all types of users to be mindful of each other to coexist? Specifically, what is the ROCOG communication plan so that people respect that these roadways are meant for both recreation and transportation, by foot, by bike, and by motorized vehicle?

### Staff Response

One of ROCOG's main roles is to foster communication among different agencies and road authorities. Avoiding conflicts between different modes is a big part of road design and ROCOG works with road authorities to make sure safe use of different modes is incorporated into their projects. This Plan has goals and objectives about ensuring strategies like Complete Streets are followed, as a way of reducing conflicts between different modes.

### Brett Ostby (Guest)

how are these ped and public transit priorities aligned with lower income areas and BIPOC community areas traditionally underfunded?

we recently saw that the Public School District ISD 535 completely ignored these communities in selection of a new school location

### Staff Response

ROCOG is in the process of updating its Title VI plan, which assesses how plans may or may not disproportionately affect areas with high concentrations of low-income and/or populations of racial and ethnic minorities. This is part of our planning at ROCOG, and after doing a Title VI analysis, we can say that areas in the ROCOG planning area with higher concentrations of low-income and/or populations of racial and ethnic minorities are not adversely affected by the final projects, such as a rebuilt road.

### Paul Claus (Guest)

Will the BRT phase 1 be two lanes east and west?



### Staff Response

It will be one lane in each direction for general traffic, and one lane in each direction that will be a BAT lane, or Business Access and Turns. This will be between US-52 and the Civic Center/Government Center/Library loop. The inside lanes will be for general traffic, and the outside, or curb-side, lanes will be BAT lanes, only for transit vehicles and for general traffic making a right turn onto a side street or into a driveway.

### Marty Cormack (Guest)

When you see the huge volume of cars coming in from Kasson/Byron and Stewartville, how will transit be addressed to replace part of that volume of cars?

### Staff Response

This is a big consideration in the siting of the large park and ride facilities. For example, a park and ride facility doesn't currently exist on US-14 west of Rochester, and establishing one there has been a high priority for Rochester Public Transit for many years. They are planned in areas where we hope to be able to entice commuters to park their car on the outskirts of the City, rather than in downtown where parking is scarce. On the edges of town, where land is plentiful and less expensive, the geometry of sprawl works in our favor, and it is preferable to park cars there than in the center of the City.

### Paul Claus (Guest)

I'm guessing the BRTs will create choke points for single vehicles and make it more desirable to use alternate transportation.

### Staff Response

That's about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the strategy. Transit vehicles don't cause congestion; single-occupant vehicles cause congestion. If all the people in single-occupant cars rode a bus instead, that would free up a lot of space on the roadways. That said, there will be more traffic downtown as employment there grows, and every strategy we can use to make it more desirable for people to choose an alternate form of transportation will relieve that much more congestion on the roads.

Marty Cormack (Guest)

What part of the plan is motivated to reduce carbon emissions, and how much is just downtown congestion motivated?

Staff Response

This is another question where part of the strategy of getting people out of their cars and using an alternate mode of transportation will help reduce carbon emissions. Some transit is being planned with electric buses. They don't have a carbon footprint of zero, but they do have zero tailpipe emissions. So they're a step in the right direction. Also, the bus garage will be fitted with solar panels to help with the charging of the electric buses, which will further reduce the use of fossil fuels in operating the transit system.

You said the plan would not further disadvantage BIPOC, How will it fix current disadvantages?

Staff Response

Transit and road projects are designed to serve all areas of the City and region. I happen to know that transit takes a lot of care to site bus stops in areas with higher transit propensity (i.e., areas with high poverty, low income, low rates of car ownership, etc.).

Wouldn't it be better to start the transit in Kasson or Stewie to avoid car use.

Staff Response

The Plan does address park and ride facilities served by Rochester City Lines in the communities outside Rochester. We expect this part of the system will grow in the future.

Brett Ostby (Guest)

not adversely affecting BIPOC and low income is insufficient. These areas need above average funding to make up for past inequities. How do we move from not-adverse to providing these areas more investment?

Staff Response

That is an important consideration, and it is in the plan, but I can't call to mind the exact way to answer that at the moment. I'll get a better answer to this question.

[Staff Response later: Chapter 9 addresses this, especially with regard to environmental justice. Some active transportation and transit projects will improve mobility options for environmental justice populations in Rochester. The overall goals in the Plan are set based on USDOT Planning Factors, which include planning for accessibility and mobility; protecting and enhancing the environment; and improving the economic vitality of the area.]

Marty Cormack (Guest)

My issue on the carbon, is if folks still drive 80% and transit the last mile or 2, you don't substantially reduce carbon.

Staff Response

This is one of the reasons why the strategy of having park and rides in communities outside Rochester is an important part of the transit solutions in this Plan. There are a lot of incremental steps we have to take in reducing carbon.

Matt Lynch (Guest)

Thank you for fielding this discussion and gathering responses to get back to us.

So how do you integrate the Park and Ride from Kasson and Stewie to the plan?

Staff Response

This Plan mostly addresses publicly funded transit. Since the park and ride facilities in communities outside Rochester are served by a private, for-profit company, Rochester City Lines, they aren't part of a publicly funded system. The Plan does include them, and of course those facilities could one day be served by a publicly funded transit service.

Regional Public Transit?

Staff Response

Rochester Public Transit fixed route doesn't operate outside the City limits, and if you're talking about even crossing county lines, the operation of such a system gets pretty complicated. You would need something like a Regional Transit Authority, and the state legislature has been reluctant to establish such authorities in recent years.

Brett Ostby (Guest)

How can Mayo policy help facilitate these plans, how much are you working with Mayo?

### Staff Response

We get feedback from Mayo. Their main transit attention has been on the park and ride facilities and the development of Downtown Rapid Transit. They operate their own shuttles, and they are pretty open about wanting to get out of the transportation business. Mayo wants its employees, patients, and other visitors to be able to rely on public transit. Part of that public transit is funded by the Mayo Clinic. They have a lot of direct involvement in the projects like Downtown Rapid Transit and other projects in the DMC district.

Would they pay Olmsted to do that?

### Staff Response

They might, but they seem fairly satisfied right now with the transportation planning they are seeing from the City of Rochester.

Matt Lynch (Guest)

I'm noticing some of the participants' in today's call are avid cyclists and people that enjoy recreation outdoors. How might ROCOG be willing to partner with community groups to offer specific amenity planning (e.g. rumble strip placement on a shoulder), policy (e.g. ordinances to prevent dogs from chasing people) and connectivity to regional parks/points of interest (e.g. Oxbow, Whitewater, Chester Woods)?

### Staff Response

That last part is what you'll see more of in the Plan. We identify more needs having to do with infrastructure – for example, bike connections from Rochester to Chester Woods, or Gamehaven. We have more direct and concrete things to say about those projects, because one of ROCOG's main roles is to enumerate and help plan where federal transportation dollars will be spent in the area. There are mentions in the Plan about what individual communities can do to improve their roads, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities; but ROCOG doesn't have a lot of direct say in how those get done. ROCOG's role is more about supporting such efforts and perhaps helping to convene the different entities in a planning effort.

### Steve Jorgensen (Guest)

In glancing at the Planned Projects on the website, I'm encouraged to see very many routes adding 5 - 8 foot shoulders on many county road projects. This would be greatly appreciated. Salem road existing shoulders are amazing and a great example for other projects. Thanks for including those updates. I highly support those plans.

### Staff Response

Thank you very much.

### Marty Cormack (Guest)

Do you know when the bike trail to Gamehaven will get built?

### Staff Response

I don't off the top of my head. It is in the plan, but I don't remember a specific schedule for it.

### Brett Ostby (Guest)

Matt, much of that used to be the role of BPAC in ROCOG. How much are the present planners working with PBAC at the city.

### Staff Response

ROCOG works with PBAC, usually when invited, and usually during a big planning effort like this one. We have presented this Plan to them for their input. So we work with them when planning for pedestrians and bicycles. Similarly, we work with the Citizens Advisory on Transit.

### Marty Cormack (Guest)

Will reconstruction of Valley High County 4 have a bicycle friendly shoulder?

### Staff Response

I don't know off the top of my head. That would be a great question that could be answered by checking the StoryMaps.

Steve Jorgensen (Guest)

Project #7 on the site

Staff Response

Thank you.

Matt Lynch (Guest)

How cool would it be to ride your bike to see a black bear from safe distance?

Staff Response

Safe distance is important.

Oxbow!

:)

Staff Response

Ah, yes, I like the idea of seeing one at Oxbow on my bike. One project I've been interested in is the bicycle trail connection to Chester Woods, because I like to ride my bicycle, and I like to fish, and I'd really like to combine the two pursuits.

Brett Ostby (Guest)

Thank you for your work Bryan et al. I hope we see most of these plans take shape!

Staff Response

Thanks.

Matt Lynch (Guest)

That sounds awesome, Bryan.

Staff Response

Thanks.

Marty Cormack (Guest)

Thanks for taking the time for us.

Staff Response

Thanks.

Steve Jorgensen (Guest)

bike fishing!

Staff Response

Matt Lynch (Guest)

Thank you all!

Staff Response

Thanks.

Paul Claus (Guest)

thank you!

Staff Response

Thanks.

Steve Jorgensen (Guest)

Thanks Bryan - great information!

Staff Response

Thanks.

Let's all add our comments on the story map. Many of the projects only have one comment!

#### Staff Response

I would encourage you to contact us if you have further questions and comments, and spread the word to others who might like to learn more about the Plan. The StoryMaps are a great way to get comments on individual projects.

Marty Cormack (Guest)

Thanks

#### Staff Response

Thanks.

Ben Griffith

Good Job Bryan!

#### Staff Response

Thanks.

### Virtual Open House #2

Date: September 9, 2020

Subject: ROCOG 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan – Virtual Outreach

Attendees: Bryan Law, Jennifer Garness, Ben Griffith, Charlie Reiter, Unknown User (Guest), Ken (Guest), Michael O'Connor (Guest), Kelly (Guest)

Kelly (Guest)

What is the red dotted line running on 3rd Ave SE? – relating to Rapid Transit System



## Staff Response

That dotted line is showing a possible corridor for Phase 2 of the Downtown Rapid Transit. It's unclear at the moment if it would travel on S. Broadway or on 3 Ave SE. There are several considerations about Business Access and Transit (BAT) lanes, how that will shift traffic, and where the southeast transit village might be located. The development of the southern leg and the southeastern transit village got more complex, and so the City decided to phase in the 2 St SW/SE leg of the project first, and continue working toward a solution for Phase 2.

## Question

Wasn't the design already presented to and approved by the City Council?

## Staff Response

There was a locally preferred alternative (LPA) for both the 2 St leg and the southern leg that the Council adopted. But this was amended very recently, and the Council adopted a new LPA that phases in the development.

## Michael O'Connor (Guest)

Any plans for bike to work facilities, where cyclists can clean up, and also secure their bike

## Staff Response

Securing bikes and bike parking is definitely in the Plan. As for wash-up facilities, other cities have looked into that in their bicycle planning and have had varying levels of success with it. Facilities like that may not be called for directly in this Plan. It's a level of detail that this long-range plan might not typically get into. As more finer-grain bicycle planning is done, recommendations for such facilities might be the type of thing you could see in those plans.

## Further Staff Response to last two questions

The City has been looking at the Fullerton lot, AMPI site, and the K-Mart site for the southeast transit village, and including the railroad corridor as a possibility for the Downtown Rapid Transit to use as its alignment. If a bridge is built at 6 St SE, it could figure into the plans, too.

As for bike facilities, the City has a bicycle master plan which gets into the details about facilities that are complementary to the infrastructure.

Michael O'Connor (Guest)

Have you considered impact of electric bikes!

Staff Response

I'm not sure if there's anything in the plan specifically about electric bikes.

Follow-Up Question (mostly inaudible)

Staff Response

It sounded like you were saying that electric bikes could give people the opportunity to ride longer distances or through terrain that they might find too challenging without the electric assist, and that there is a need for more charging facilities for electric bikes throughout the region. Those questions would have answers very similar to what we said earlier, about other bicycle plans getting into that level of detail more than this one does. More infrastructure for charging electric bikes would encourage more people to ride.

Kelly (Guest)

If 3 Ave SE is chosen for the Downtown Rapid Transit, and especially if there are BAT lanes, that will make it harder for people in the Sunnyside neighborhood to get into and out of the neighborhood.

Staff Response

That's definitely part of what made the southern leg of the Downtown Rapid Transit planning so complex, and the needs of Sunnyside are never far from planners' minds when discussing the southeastern transit village and Rapid Transit service to it.

## StoryMaps

(comments made between August 19 and September 14, 2020)

Streets and Highways

- Project #22: Rebuild, inc improvements to bike/ped movements; 14 St NE Intersection w/North Broadway  
Comments

This is one of the most dangerous intersections for walkers, scooters and bikers in the city. It should be a very high priority. I agree with eliminating right turns onto 14th when heading north on Broadway.

Edited on 8/26/20 at 8:46 PM

- Project #24: Reconstruct; Ph 1 of Broadway: Civic Cntr Dr to 9 St SE, In DMC

Comments

Definitely needs pedestrian and bicycle facilities, preferably protected.

Edited on 8/26/20 at 8:53 PM

- Project #25: Reconstruct; Ph 2 of Broadway: Civic Cntr Dr to 9 St SE, In DMC

Comments

Needs protected bike and pedestrian facilities.

Edited on 8/26/20 at 8:55 PM

- Project #27: Reconstruct; Broadway: 9 St SE to 16 St SE

Comments

Must add bike and ped facilities either lanes or trail along side. It is far too dangerous the way it is with all the speeding traffic on Broadway.

Edited on 8/26/20 at 8:59 PM

- Project #35: Reconstruct to 6 lanes fr TH 52 to Broadway; Civic Center Dr

Comments

Do not go to 6 lanes. It will make getting across too dangerous plus more lanes will just make traffic worse. Hasn't Los Angeles shown you can't build you way out of traffic problems by adding more lanes?

Edited on 8/26/20 at 9:10 PM

### Active Transportation – Regional

- Regional Project #1; Provide 5'-6' asphalt shoulders along CSAH 1 from 97th ST SE south to the TH 30

Comments

- ▶ This would have been ideal this year as there are detours for many from the I90/Hwy 63 construction. It still gets used today.

- ▶ I frequently ride this road, and from MN 30 to 97th is the scariest part especially around the curves near Pleasant Grove. A shoulder would be great!
- ▶ can we provide a protected bike lane a shoulder is not safe
- Regional Project #2; Correct shoulder width deficiency under Canadian Pacific Railroad Overpass on TH14 east of the entrance to Chester Woods Park.  
Comments
  - ▶ Yes, please,
- Regional Project #3; Construct off-road trail or path connecting west end of Chester Woods Regional Trail near Meadow Dr SE with Rochester Trail system at the intersection of East Circle Dr and TH 14.  
Comments
  - ▶ I hope that the Chester Woods trail gets built soon so I can ride it before I die. (I'm 64). I've been waiting more than a decade for this.
- Regional Project #4; Construct off road trail connecting Chester Woods County Park with Eyota and Dover.  
Comments
  - ▶ Paved or "off-road?"
  - ▶ Fishing, hiking, kayaking (yes!) would all be accessible by bike - very awesome! Thanks!
  - ▶ Long overdue; please add.
- Regional Project #5; Provide 4'-5' asphalt shoulders on CSAH 14 from TH 63 east to CSAH 11.  
Comments
  - ▶ This is now CSAH 33. Please add a shoulder.
  - ▶ is there a separate bike multiuse path alongside the highway is preferable to use of shoulders
- Regional Project #6; Provide 7'-8' paved shoulders on MN 247 from east of TH 63 east to Wabasha County line.

## Comments

- ▶ Can coordination be made with Wabasha County so there is safe access all the way to the Great River Ridge Trail via Plainview? This is great!
- ▶ Yes please add; especially needed near Potsdam for folks riding CSAH 11.
- Regional Project #7; Provide a minimum of 6' asphalt shoulders on CSAH 4 from CSAH 5 to CR 104.  
Comments
  - ▶ This is fantastic - I NEVER ride Valley High because of the lack of shoulder however an ideal destination is Oxbow Park for me - especially by bike.
  - ▶ Yes, please; CSAH 4 is way too busy to ride a bike past 60th Ave without a safe shoulder. This is a very pretty ride, we just have never been able to ride it on a bike.
- Regional Project #8; Provide a minimum of 4' asphalt surface along CSAH 16 starting from CSAH 20 to 31st Ave SW.  
Comments
  - ▶ See: [rochesterendurance.com/library](http://rochesterendurance.com/library) and <https://www.strava.com/heatmap> will show how these routes are frequented by people on bikes. Please consider wider shoulder - not only for recreation but pulling cars off of roadway as well - for safety!
  - ▶ Yes a shoulder there is very much needed with the increased traffic with the MN 30 re-route. 4' would be the minimum required; wider would be better.
- Regional Project #9; Provide a minimum of 4' asphalt shoulders along CR 104 from CR 117 to CSAH 34.  
Comments
  - ▶ Part of this is now CSAH 44. Shoulders are needed as use increases.
- Regional Project #10; Provide 5'-6' paved shoulders on CSAH 3 from south of CSAH 25 to CSAH 34.  
Comments
  - ▶ This is a very frequent road bicycle route that could benefit from shoulders.

- Regional Project #11; Provide a minimum 4' asphalt shoulders along CSAH 15 from State Highway 30 to CR 117.  
Comments
  - ▶ Shoulders make me feel safer - rumble strips help keep a motorist in their lane - frequently see texting and driving on this stretch of road with a lot at stake. Please consider rumble placement to maximize shoulder width to keep us vulnerable ones safe!
- Regional Project #12; Provide 6'-8' asphalt shoulders along CSAH 35 from ¼ mile west of TH63 to CSAH 8.  
Comments
  - ▶ This is especially needed with the increased traffic due to the MN 30 re-route.
- Regional Project #13; Provide 5'-6' asphalt shoulders along Highway 30 from Stewartville to Chatfield.  
Comments
  - ▶ Can these shoulders be even wider? Ideally 8' so two cyclists can ride comfortably side-by-side? These routes are frequented by group rides. See: [rochesterendurance.com/library](http://rochesterendurance.com/library) for more routes
  - ▶ There are limited E-W bicycle routes in that part of the County, so this would make for a safe route to Cummingsville and Chatfield.
- Regional Project #14; Provide 5'-6' asphalt shoulders along CSAH 10 from Interstate 90 to Maple St in Dover.  
Comments
  - ▶ CSAH 10 has great shoulders everywhere else. This would complete it.
- Regional Project #15; Provide a minimum of 4' asphalt shoulders along CSAH 2 between CSAH 10 and Highway 42.  
Comments
  - ▶ Yes please.
  - ▶ can we consider making a protected bike lane or totally separate way for cyclists to safely use these county highways? a simple shoulder is very dangerous for cyclists

- Regional Project #16; Construct off road trail or path to connect south end Great River Ridge Trail to future Chester Woods Trail.  
Comments
  - ▶ I want to be able to ride this before I die (I'm 64). It's been talked about for years. Please do it.
- Regional Project #17; Provide 7'-8' asphalt shoulders along CSAH 12 /100th Street NW between from 50th Ave NW to CSAH 3 to connect Oronoco with Douglas Trail.  
Comments
  - ▶ Yes please add, I avoid this road on my bike because of high volume and no shoulder.
  - ▶ Is the asphalt to be located on the North or South side of CSAH 12/100th St? Like the idea. Thanks
- Regional Project #19; Provide 7'-8' asphalt shoulders along CSAH 11 from CSAH 36 (Marion Rd) to TH 14.  
Comments
  - ▶ Would be great to continue it north from Hwy 14 to Viola Rd where it would meet similar East/West shoulders. At least get rid of the rumble strips on Co. 11. They force cyclists into the traffic lanes.
  - ▶ Will this continue all the way to Hwy 247? That is the only North to South connector near Rochester city limits and permits shorter loops from Rochester. That will encourage entry-level cyclists to give it a go.
  - ▶ is there a plan for protected bike path

### Active Transportation – Urban

- Urban Project # 28: Pedestrian-Bicycle Facility; Construct Willow Creek Trail from north of Willow Creek Middle School to Gamehaven Regional Park  
Comments
  - ▶ We need a safe alternate to Gamehaven from SE Rochester via bicycle. Please expedite this.
- Urban Project # 404: Future Study Area; Conduct study of how to create on-street north-south bicycle corridor on east side of central Rochester area

### Comments

- ▶ Can the study look at additional east-west routes too? The existing trail that hops the tracks isn't the fastest route most times, Center or 4th SE would be better for a bike system.
- Urban Project # 405: Future Study Area; Conduct study of options for pedestrian and bicycle facility along Salem Rd and 12th St SW from Fox Valley Dr SW to Zumbro River  
Comments

- ▶ Something that connects the two sides of the highway for bikes and peds would be very good.

### Transit – Park and Ride

- Project #1: North P&R Study Area to eventually locate a Park & Ride surface lot or ramp  
Comments
  - ▶ This would be very useful to have. We live in Oronoco but come to Rochester nearly daily and would make use of this to help get us back and forth to work.
- Project #3: East P&R Study Area to eventually locate a Park & Ride surface lot or ramp  
Comments
  - ▶ Perfect location for a P&R, especially after CSAH 9 project is complete and the road can handle added traffic
- Project #6: IBM TOD P&R Study Area to eventually locate a Park & Ride surface lot or ramp  
Comments
  - ▶ I like the idea of having a park & ride and future TOD on the north side of IBM, especially if it makes connections to Target, Mayo NW, and other stores easier for pedestrians.

### Transit – Primary Transit Network

- No comments on these projects



## Phone Calls Directly to ROCOG Staff

(August 19 through September 23, 2020)

- On September 16, 2020, Jerry West called Bryan Law and left a voice message. In the voice mail, West said that he wanted County Road 101 between St Bridget's Road and CR 1/11 Ave SE to be paved, as it is a busy roadway used by residents of SE Rochester to get to the Shoppes on Maine shopping area. Law called West back later on the 16<sup>th</sup>. West repeated his desire to see that road improved and expressed worry that the project wasn't scheduled for construction. Law explained that it is an important candidate for future programming, but it still needs funding to be secured and needs to be fit into the schedule of projects, along with other worthy construction projects. West indicated that this project should be a high priority, and Law assured him that its importance was understood by the planning community in the region.

## Emails Directly to ROCOG Staff

(August 19 through September 23)

- From: julie gay  
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 11:23 AM  
To: Griffith Ben  
Subject: from Julie Gay  
I am looking for someone who in 30-60 minutes can educate me on transportation financing is done.  
I mean educate - just by your answering this email doesn't mean you have to do it.  
For example one question: on forecasts for long-range even five years out how reliable are the numbers?  
Please let me know if you can think of anybody?
- On September 16, 2020, Bryan Law replied:  
Julie –

I could probably answer your questions. One thing that might help is to look at the presentation I gave to the Citizens Advisory on Transit on August 27. That presentation was all about the financial information in the Long Range Transportation Plan, especially as it relates to transit. The agenda packet for that meeting is here:

<http://rochestercitymn.iqm2.com/Citizens/calendar.aspx>

I see that the recording of the meeting isn't uploaded yet, but my PowerPoint presentation is included in the packet. That would be a good start. If you still have questions, let me know when I could schedule a Skype or Teams call with you (I'm still working from home, so I don't have my office phone for outgoing calls).

-----  
Bryan Law, AICP  
Principal Planner  
Olmsted County (MN) Planning Department  
Rochester-Olmsted Council of Governments

- **From:** julie gay  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 16, 2020 3:47 PM  
**To:** Law Bryan  
**Subject:** from Julie Gay  
Questions - Are parking, ramps and lots included in Planning?

I can understand figuring numbers five years out, but 10 years or more? How are those numbers even considered to be reliable?

I consider a fine point to be cost of moving people from transit hubs to downtown - costs are buses, maintenance, congestion. Yet it is not known yet how many will be working from home?

In figuring costs at times bid numbers don't match allocation and the process is either put off or restarted. When this happens any chance the city or county should have figured differently?

My quest started when I saw a proposed budget for DMC through the end of its 20-year time period. Transit was just over \$17 billion. How is putting a number of that amount even possible or reasonable?

Finally - what is the secret to the city seemingly getting all the state or federal dollars wanted over time?

A little brownie working somewhere?

I remember a consultant making a presentation which was like just a few pages. Within a few weeks a 315-page report appeared with same title and different numbers. Hmmmmmmmmm.

With all the master plans for transit is there any way any of them can be considered applicable at least through 2022? Planners do what with numbers under these conditions which can be seriously impacted?

- On September 17, 2020, Bryan Law replied:

Julie –

Thanks for the chance to answer your questions. My responses are below, in red.  
Please let me know if you have other questions.

-----  
Bryan Law, AICP  
Principal Planner  
Olmsted County (MN) Planning Department  
Rochester-Olmsted Council of Governments

- From: julie gay  
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 3:47 PM  
To: Law Bryan  
Subject: from Julie Gay

Questions - Are parking, ramps and lots included in Planning?

Most of the parking considerations in the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) have to do with large park and ride facilities on the edges of downtown Rochester (to serve the Downtown Rapid Transit BRT service), farther out on the edges of the City (to be served by Rochester Public Transit Direct routes, as happens today), and in other communities outside of Rochester (served today by Rochester City Lines).

The expansion of park and ride service is a crucial strategy for achieving the desired mode shift called for in DMC and City Comprehensive Plans, from having about 70% of commuter trips into downtown Rochester today made in single-occupant cars to having only 43% to 50% of all peak period commuter trips made by single-occupant cars 20 years from now. Attracting more downtown workers to park and ride facilities served by express bus will be key to help manage the growth in traffic as the downtown sees increased employment and economic activity while still assuring adequate street capacity and parking availability for expected patient, customer and visitor growth.

Our main focus is to think about how to move a growing number of people in and out of downtown within the capacity of the existing street system, which will require more use of transit. There will still be a need to add parking, but as long as the amount of added commuter traffic during the peak hours is minimized the street system should function reasonably well and others, including the City as well as private developers, can plan with some flexibility for where parking is best located.

I can understand figuring numbers five years out, but 10 years or more? How are those numbers even considered to be reliable?

The way we think about planning for 20 to 25 years in the future is to look at it as an example of what-if planning, where we ask a question or define a scenario and then assess changes that could result if that scenario comes to pass. In the case of the LRTP, the primary what-if question for us to assess is what changes may be needed in terms of transportation if the city grows from a population of 120,000 people today to 150,000 or 160,000 people and employment grows from 110,000 today to 150,000 in 20 to 25 years. Those are the fundamental assumptions that drive the planning project. Those assumptions lead the planners to think about where more housing will be located, where the additional jobs will be located, where services and retail may be located, all of which then go into thinking about the travel implications these assumptions will have and what new transportation needs that generates.

Once the anticipated needs are identified, the financial analysis in the plan uses past construction cost and funding trends to estimate the level of future funding needed for transportation projects in the plan, adjusted for inflation, based on what projects are anticipated to be built, and when. Most projects costs can be estimated for planning purposes using similar past projects as a guide, with adjustments for expected inflation in future years. So we can have a fairly good idea of how costs will change, based on past experience.

Obviously, economic conditions change over long periods of time, and nothing in the future repeats past patterns exactly. We have a better idea of what costs and funding will be like in the short-term than two decades from now. But that is one of the reasons for LRTPs like this to be updated every 5 years. The recommended projects get reviewed, re-evaluated, and costs are recalculated. Moreover, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which lists the projects scheduled to happen in the next 4 years, gets updated annually. Projects in the TIP, especially in the first year of scheduled projects, have real commitments of funding to them, and the annual update process gives the jurisdictions and ROCOG the chance to carefully examine the upcoming projects and how they fit in with the long-range planning.

I consider a fine point to be cost of moving people from transit hubs to downtown - costs are buses, maintenance, congestion. Yet it is not known yet how many will be working from home?

The long-term impact of remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic response is a question that planners have been considering since stay-at-home orders began in March 2020. There is no way for us to know yet if this pandemic is going to result in long-term changes to the way Americans work, or if commuting to a physical workplace every day will become the norm again once public health is no longer jeopardized by gathering people in denser environments such as on a bus or at an office. For now, the 2045 LRTP transportation recommendations are based on the assumption that things will largely return to the way they were before the pandemic, which from the perspective of transportation investment would reflect a high-cost scenario. Course corrections that dial back what is needed certainly can happen as time passes, and we would imagine that when the next plan update is due in five years, we will have a much better idea of the lasting impacts of this time, and the way COVID-19 has changed commuting and other travel will figure prominently in that next plan update.

It is important to recognize that the long range plan is a strategic tool, not a budget document; decisions still need to be made on a regular basis as to whether to move ahead with recommendations in the plan. Also, the plan can be amended before the next update is due. So, if the COVID-19 response has clearly changed the way we all commute so drastically and permanently that it makes our analyses and recommendations obsolete, then the plan may need amending. Such a drastic change in decades-old commuting patterns within 5 years is difficult to imagine right now.

In figuring costs at times bid numbers don't match allocation and the process is either put off or restarted. When this happens any chance the city or county should have figured differently?

Costs for projects often change, for many reasons, most of which are outside the control of the city. We believe every public entity tries to generate realistic project cost estimates with the best information they have available at the time, but everyone recognizes that conditions or prices can change. This is one of the major reasons for amendments that we have to make to our plans, especially the TIP.

My quest started when I saw a proposed budget for DMC through the end of its 20-year time period. Transit was just over \$17 billion. How is putting a number of that amount even possible or reasonable?

I'm not familiar with a number that high for anything involved in DMC. The original plan called for an investment of \$585 million in public money to stimulate the private-sector investment of \$5.6 billion. Transit was a big part of the DMC plan, but only a part of that total (there was also a lot for street improvements, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, property development, etc.). The 2045 LRTP examines DMC-related transit costs and funding, along with all the other parts of public transit in Rochester. That analysis is in Chapter 16 of the Plan which you can link to here: ([https://www.co.olmsted.mn.us/planning/rocog/Documents/2045%20Plan%20Update/Chapter16\\_508.pdf](https://www.co.olmsted.mn.us/planning/rocog/Documents/2045%20Plan%20Update/Chapter16_508.pdf)).

The total estimated cost for all types of transit service across the entire City for the 2021-2045 period are estimated at about \$1.2 billion, and that includes the Downtown Rapid Transit, neighborhood fixed route service, direct service to the park and rides, ZIPS dial-a-ride paratransit, and the Primary Transit Network.

Finally - what is the secret to the city seemingly getting all the state or federal dollars wanted over time?

A little brownie working somewhere?

I'm sure the City could offer up examples of grants and other funding opportunities from the state and federal governments that the City did not get, or for which they got an amount lower than they had requested. Just in the last few years we can think of examples, such as the North Broadway reconstruction, safety improvements at the TH 14/TH 52 interchange, funding to build the Willow Creek Trail, among other grant requests that the city was unsuccessful in getting selected.

I remember a consultant making a presentation which was like just a few pages. Within a few weeks a 315-page report appeared with same title and different numbers. Hmhmhmhmhm.

We are not in a position to comment on the work that prompts this question, and would defer to the author to respond to your question about different numbers. In general terms, it's not uncommon to see a presentation of study

results that focuses on the findings of a study without presenting all the background work and data that went into developing those findings, which might be the case in the situation you cite.

With all the master plans for transit is there any way any of them can be considered applicable at least through 2022? Planners do what with numbers under these conditions which can be seriously impacted?

### Staff Response

It is important to note that the various plans by design focus on different timeframes, different geographies and different levels of detail. The LRTP is intended to look at the long term and address questions like whether new services should be considered, to what extent existing service would need to be expanded, or what magnitude of costs these changes would imply. When thinking about the short term, one of the most important transit plans is RPT's Transit Development Plan (TDP), which is intended to look at changes needed in next 5 to 7 years, thus reflecting what is happening now and what can be expected in the next few years. The TDP plays a much bigger role in terms of deciding what to actually budget for in the near term. The TDP was last updated in 2017 and is due for another update in 2022. This document gets into more details about the short-term planning for transit in the City, including where routes should go, how often they should operate, what fares should cost, etc.

