Corridor Investment Management Strategy
Marshall Meeting Summary 5/8/2012

The Minnesota Department of Transportation’s Corridor Investment Management Strategy (CIMS) is a corridor-based initiative that brings MnDOT together with its local, modal and state partners to identify opportunities for collaborative and innovative investment. It offers a means to share information and identify opportunities to apply MnDOT’s suite of lower cost, high benefit investment strategies that address safety, access and mobility.

The following summary conveys key themes and specific comments recorded by MnDOT staff during facilitated discussions at the CIMS outreach meeting on May 8, 2012 in Marshall, as well as written comments submitted by participants via completed participant guides and follow-up emails. As part of an ongoing, collaborative initiative between MnDOT and its partners, CIMS meeting summaries are intended to document what MnDOT has heard to this point in the CIMS process and offer potential starting points for further discussions around regional/local priorities and opportunities for lower-cost, high-benefit investments.

Meeting Overview

The CIMS meeting began with a short introduction from MnDOT District Engineer Jon Huseby, followed by a presentation from MnDOT staff members Brian McLafferty and Patrick Weidemann that described the CIMS initiative, the condition of the trunk highway system, MnDOT’s fiscal outlook, and the approaches that MnDOT is taking to advance objectives in the areas of preservation, safety, mobility and regional/local priorities (Click here to review the full presentation).

The presentation was followed by a discussion of MnDOT’s recent investments, programmed investments, and anticipated investment needs on two corridors:

- MN 23 (from I-90 to Willmar)
- US 212 (from South Dakota to the Twin Cities)

Each corridor was discussed at workstation where MnDOT staff walked participants through a series of maps that displayed information relating to MnDOT’s investment program. All map series are available for download on the CIMS website. After reviewing the maps, meeting participants were asked to describe their regional/community priorities and the needs, issues, and opportunities they see on the corridor. Examples of the questions posed include:

- What are your regional/community goals relating to economic vitality and quality of life?
- What community/economic development strategies is your city or county pursuing, and how could corridor improvements or system management strategies help advance them?
• Among the investments MnDOT needs to make in the years beyond the STIP to keep the system in a safe and sound condition, which are your highest priorities?
• Are there local system improvements or development plans that could be coordinated with MnDOT investments?
• As MnDOT develops improvements to keep the system in a safe and sound condition, what additional needs/issues/opportunities should MnDOT consider in project scope and design?
• What are the most critical issues on the corridor that may require investment beyond MnDOT’s planned improvements?

**Stakeholder Input**

**MN 23**

Much of the discussion around MN 23 centered on the benefit of capacity expansion to the regional economy. Participants expressed the view that making MN 23 a 4-lane highway from I-90 to Willmar would address the “gap” in the state’s network of 4-lane divided highways, and that addressing the gap would help the region grow. Participants also expressed the view that unless the capacity of MN 23 was increased there was a risk the region could lose existing employers. Many participants made the comment that the economic vibrancy of SW Minnesota warranted more investment from MnDOT than it was currently getting.

In lieu of a 4-lane expansion, many participants commented that MnDOT should focus on the efficient movement of goods and people along the corridor through the use of turn lanes, truck acceleration lanes, and passing lanes where possible (make MN 23 a “Super 2”). Additional study and follow-up with local stakeholders is needed to identify locations for potential passing lanes, but there was strong support for considering them as part of anticipated preservation projects in the ‘16-’21 window. Some participants also noted that speed limit should be raised to 65 mph west of Jasper.

There was also much discussion around safety on the corridor. Participants wanted to know how MN 23 ranked relative to other corridors in the state in terms of crashes/fatalities. There was confusion around MnDOT’s “high priority safety intersections” and the criteria used to identify them. There was strong consensus among the meeting participants that MnDOT’s safety priority on MN 23 should be the MN 23 / Lyon County CSAH 7 intersection. Meeting participants also commented that good pavement quality on the corridor is an important component of the region’s community/economic development strategy.

**Spot issues or critical priorities cited by participants**

- Lyon County CSAH 7 is #1 concern (high crash location)
  - Should not invest in CR 5 before CSAH 7
  - Interest in the intersection’s rank
  - What is MnDOT’s approach on that intersection?
  - “Should focus on reactionary not proactive” safety investments
Should not remove from list because solution is too expensive – CSAH 7 should still appear on map – CIMS maps need to updated to reflect input

- The MN 23 / Saratoga St. intersection in Marshall is also important
- The MN 30 / BNSF underpass floods regularly. MnDOT should consider addressing that issue as part of programmed overlay in 2015.
- Passing lanes.

**US 212**

A much smaller group participated in a brief discussion around MnDOT’s programmed investments and anticipated investment needs on US 212. The following comments were recorded:

- There is a short & narrow overpass by the RR tracks in Granite Falls – trucks hit it all the time
- The corridor is slow and winding near Montevideo
- Travel time on US 212 is increased by the many small towns the corridor travels through – perhaps travel time could be reduced with some bypasses, intersection modifications, or speed limit adjustments

**Next Steps**

MnDOT will soon be developing a new 20-year Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP) for the purpose of guiding future capital improvements on the trunk highway system. CIMS meeting summaries are one of many inputs to MnSHIP (click [here](#) to learn more about the process for developing MnSHIP and the various ways in which you can participate). Broadly speaking, the role of CIMS in the development of MnSHIP is twofold:

1. Promote the consideration of regional and community priorities and state/local collaboration opportunities in MnDOT’s performance-based planning process. Through MnSHIP, MnDOT districts will develop a universe of highway improvements necessary to meet and maintain system performance targets over the next 10 years. Information obtained through CIMS outreach will help MnDOT districts identify and prioritize performance-based investments with the potential to address local concerns and advance objectives relating to quality of life, economic competitiveness, and environmental health.

2. Provide a transparent, systematic, and collaborative approach to identifying and prioritizing regional/community improvement priorities not tied to system performance targets. Such an approach will help MnDOT and its external partners consider tradeoffs and balance spending levels across regional/community improvement priorities (RCIPs) and other key investment categories in the MnSHIP investment framework (traveler safety, asset management, and critical connections.)

MnDOT will also soon be developing a competitive solicitation as part of the CIMS initiative. MnDOT anticipates releasing proposed criteria and details on the application process in fall 2012 with a first round of applications due in early 2013. An additional next step is the development of “10-year Corridor Outlooks” for all of the corridors that were covered in this initial round of CIMS meetings. As presently conceived, corridor outlooks will function as snapshots of
programmed and planned investments, anticipated investment needs, and ongoing planning efforts on corridors over a 10-year period. These outlooks are intended to be short, easy to digest, and regularly updated.

Under the current schedule, outlooks for corridors covered in the initial round of CIMS meetings will be rolled out with the adopted version of MnSHIP in spring 2013. The outlooks will display what the new investment plan means at the corridor level. The outlooks will also be an opportunity for MnDOT to highlight CIMS-identified needs that are being addressed via a planned project, management strategy, a planning study, or an ongoing discussion between MnDOT and its partners.
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