

# MAP-21 Input and Feedback from Stakeholders

## TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

### Compilation of questions submitted:

#### NATIONAL HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE PROGRAM (NHPP)

---

**Until performance targets are determined, should NHPP apportionment be transferred to STP to manage the current program?**

- Risk – don't know what targets will be. Maintain flexibility.
- Approaches:
- Invest in pavement with NHPP money, improve toward where we think target will be, OR Just transfer NHPP to STP to keep the program whole – but risk is possible later problems with targets.
- Managing the current projects programmed versus not meeting performance measures.
- Why would you?
- Yes
- Yes. If there are enough STP projects ready to be let and authorized (2013) 201415 if \$168 million goes to current STP projects NHPP should not be transferred to STP. IF MnDOT keeps the "state STP" funds, then yes.
- Need to fund performance targets to meet goals.
- As needed to manage commitments.
- The NHS pavement performance targets will largely determine the amount we have to invest in other areas.
- Would it be an advantage for a state to keep the self-developed targets low to ensure that funding is maintained? Wouldn't it be contrary to the goal of MAP 21?
- Is MAP 21 going to draw funds away from local priorities and give MNDOT more control over the overall program?
- Keep MAP -21 distribution and backfill the hole with SAFETEA-LU if possible.
- Should some HSIP funds be managed on a statewide basis, rather than allocated to ATPs? It should be managed and allocated by the local ATP.
- Transfer to STP only as necessary to meet current STIP (2013-2016), but may require project deferrals.
- Centrally programmed, with District input
- To the maximum extent possible, MnDOT should remain committed to the state and local projects in the current STIP. Agencies have planned for and contributed resources to these improvements to ensure their completion.
- We agree with the NHPP apportionment being transferred to STP until performance targets are determined. A target formula to allocate NHPP should be created and the funds allocated to each ATP and let the Districts balance their own program as they deem necessary. We also encourage the performance targets be flexible statewide so that some of the NHS routes could have a lesser performance target. The length, location, ADT, HCADT, and urban/rural sections could be some factors to consider a practical Performance Target. We believe some more rural type NHS routes could be maintained with a lower performance target that would be attainable and sustainable. This would give Districts some incentive to do the right fix at the right time which may allow for some NHS funds to be utilized on their non NHS routes. State Aid has a similar rule that allows for funding shifts should the local system be maintained to an acceptable condition.
- There should be flexibility to advance projects where the pavement numbers are low now so that in the near future we could have more flexibility to move funds from NHPP to STP as needed.
- Yes, but phase in.
- NHPP transferred to STP would be supported because locals would benefit

- Concern: Is D4 being penalized because our NHS routes are in better condition? Whole state penalized for one or two bad districts? Does the entire states NHPP need to be in good shape before money can be redistributed the funds to other categories? It sounds like the worse choices you've made in the last 20 years, the more money you get. Starve another area until their roads get bad. Frustrating.
- Suggestion: fund swap, each ATP should get same portion of funds, but the NHPP funds should be split differently. That way each District would receive the same amount of money, but the ones that had bad pavements would need to use their funds on the NHPP. If ATP 4 gives money to another district, they give money back to D4. Our federal dollars to another district, we receive state dollars. Every district is in a different state as far as targets, so several people are hoping for flexibility on the state dollars.
- Audience would just like a clear answer on how much the state aid system is going to get cut.
- HSIP - project funded higher. All but the big 3 counties struggled with finding projects. Smaller counties did 6 inch stripe, can they use HSIP funds to restripe?
- How can we use the additional HSIP money when struggling to spend money before?
- At grade RR projects, 100% eligible for federal funds for some of the twp and counties couldn't come up with match.
- Rail safety - likely managed with central HSIP dollars. This is favored because D4 has a high number of crossings.

### **How should NHPP funds be allocated (current target formula, revised target formula, centrally programmed, etc.)?**

- Coordinated process and pavement management model statewide, then district-level system. Management decides specific projects.
- Doesn't current target formula account for PM? Maybe revised target formula.
- Not current target formula.
- Current target formula not helpful moving forward- old formula and criteria. Revised target formula – maybe?
- Need to target based on conditions, still need central funding for major projects.
- Revise to reflect interstate miles
- Possibly revise if a difference can be made. For example some counties have no interstate which is a focus.
- Combination.
- Through a mix of the suggestions based on performance needs.
- Performance targets should drive the formula to pavements with the biggest risk.
- Balance some ATP, some central – like big bridges and corridors.
- Could be a waste of time, but it ought to happen. Little confidence.
- MnDOT should re-visit ATP target formula to respond to the expanded NHS system and the related performance requirements set forth under MAP-21. Target formula should reflect system size and take into account population.
- Our ATP felt our region is doing well on the NHS system. So there is concern about "losing" NHPP money that we need for other roads due to decrease in STP funds, in essence that they will lose funding because their system is good shape.
- If the feds want more money on the federal system, can the local share be offset with state dollars?
- A revised target formula for federal funds is supported that is more in line and that matches the MAP-21 priorities.
- Not centrally allocated both current target formula and to address the federal guideline, revise the target formula.
- The general conclusion is that the audience thinks it sounds like MNDOT wants to program more out of central office. It makes sense from the federal side, but rewards bad choices and takes local partners interaction and involvement away.
- staying as close to formula as much as possible would benefit our ATP
- A centrally controlled program is not supported. The local districts, ATPs, and counties know more of the local conditions and can program more accordingly.

## Should NHPP funds be used on non-MnDOT principal arterials?

- What are they? NHS connectors.
- Some but not anomalies of a jurisdiction.
- The formula should reflect amelioration of the biggest risk highway sections. Should be eligible but programmed based on condition.
- Yes
- Where are the gaps? If pavements are the biggest risk, need them funded first.
- Who will be ultimately responsible for system performance?
- Yes, but centrally funded
- NHPP funds should be used on non-MnDOT principal arterials.
- NHPP funding should be made available for qualifying local projects on designated principal arterial roadways. If eligible, should local PA routes be subject to meeting state's performance targets as required by MAP-21?
- NHPP used for all Principal Arterials (not just MnDOT's PAs.)
- Can you ignore investments in the non-MnDOT principal arterials? Ultimately it may take away flexibility in spending.
- A centrally controlled program is not supported. The local districts, ATPs, and counties know more of the local conditions and can program projects accordingly.
- No.
- After all the discussions below, the general conclusion was there wasn't enough information to know what the ramifications of this would mean to our ATP.
- If it would help to keep flexibility and those roads were chosen through the normal ATP process, yes. But if those roads would be held to the same standard and need more funding, no. Concerns would be that their condition would hurt the state average and make the adjustment from NHPP to fund STP higher would take longer.
- Does our district have any principals that are not Trunk Highways?
- A: Fergus has a couple I think from prior the turn back and maybe a few little chunks maybe in Moorhead or Alex. Follow up: Moorhead - 9th St. N RP 0-.07 Fergus S. - Union Ave (.575-.915), Lincoln Ave (0-2.177), Pebble Lake Rd (0-1.408)
- Can we add roads?
- A: Not at this time. MnDOT is working with the Feds on how this process will occur. Just because it is a principal in the future does not mean it will automatically be on the NHPP.
- FHWA took all the principals as of January 2012 as a starting point for the NHPP. Currently that would be TH 34 from 59 east, highway 59 entire stretch, i94, highway 10, Highway 210, highway 28 from Morris east, TH 7 from Ortonville east, TH 12 from 59 east, and a few short stubs in Moorhead, Alex., and Morris.
- Q: What Bridges can use NHPP funds? What is considered an on system bridge? If it is any bridge that could receive federal funding that would be all state aid roads? (local state aid system)
- Q: Will there be more shifts of federal funds to the interstate?
- Yes, not only to the interstate, but more funding shifted to the NHS. Principal arterials have been added to NHS so more roads will be able to use NHPP funds. However this will mean those roads will be held to the higher pavement and bridge standards than non NHS.
- More of an issue in metro area, more pressure put on the metro counties to locally fund principal arterials, worse fight for state money.
- Better to allow, whether it matters to D4 or not

## General Questions and Comments

- Q: How will our ATP projects be affected and how will the years 2013 to 2016 of the STIP be handled?
- A: Flexibility carried over in 2013, trying to hold 2013 STIP with as few changes as possible.
- Q: Will more money need to be spent on NHPP?
- A: A little more NHPP money will be programmed than before for the roads such as interstate and hwy 10.

- Q: Will we be moving forward later projects?
- A: Most likely, so we don't have to use all the flexible funds. We are currently in the process of looking for ways to adjust programs with as little change as possible to the projects that have been committed to.
- Q: Does the graph (impacts to 2013 STIP) account for principal arterial adding to NHS?
- A: Yes
- Q: What will the feds be using and what will MnDOT use?
- A: MN historically looks at ride and pavement quality. MnDOT is waiting for federal definitions to see how they describe poor/good. MN has already been setting targets for several years and has a good system to monitor pavement conditions, so once the feds have the direction set, we will be able to determine what that means for us.
- Q: Will the NHS be broken by interstate and non-interstate targets?
- Q: Will the feds set or monitor what the non NHS targets are?
- Q: How much money needed to bring condition up from poor or so we don't fall below minimum?  
A: Have a rough idea, but need to wait for federal direction.
- Q: How does our District look compared to statewide system? Better than average.
- Q: Can the State just set low targets so we meet them?
- Concern: The issue we see is if all the NHPP funds are used on the NHS system, there will be problems funding non NHS routes which will be having more sections in the poor category and taking more funds from the State Aid System.
- Q: Will each funding category have separate set of performance standards?
- Q: Will all roads or just NHS system have performance targets set?
- Q; Pavement quality - all state and state aid roads have info except municipal. State aid roads get evaluated every four years.
- Q: Concerns of cost to measure targets and monitoring targets on roads in MPO not on State Aid or TH. Who pays for this?
- Q: Are the federal feds going to have to go to MnDOT roads at expense of local roads until MnDOT roads up to speed? After they are up to speed will the split go back to normal?

## SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP)

---

Minnesota's performance on the National Highway System (NHS) and Interstate System could impact apportionment available for the STP program: Apportionment would automatically be transferred from STP to the NHPP program if Interstate performance targets are not met. Must demonstrate movement towards meeting performance targets on the NHS system.

- I think the \$168 million needs to be spent on STP as it has been programmed. Spend more NHPP on Interstate, leave STP out.
- See note above on flexible targets for NHS. Also, we feel the targets need to be reasonable so that they are attainable and sustainable. The automatic shifting of the STP to NHPP should be also in reverse when the interstate targets are met. On another note, the total amount of transportation funding is being reduced in terms of buying power and if the target for the NHS is too high, all the federal funding will be spent only on the NHS while the rest of the system fails. All transportation systems need to be in good condition for economic growth.
- We may need to look at more affordable fixes on the STP system and a lower expectation with slightly lower pavement targets.
- We need to look at if we are measuring the different systems (MnDOT vs Counties) in the same or very similar way since they are in line for the same STP funds.
- With emphasis now being placed on the NHPP system under MAP-21, there was concern that projects funded with STP dollars would need to be delayed or eliminated from the program altogether.
- MnDOT should promote a gradual transition toward meeting the new NHPP funding and performance requirements associated with MAP-21. There was concern moving too fast could be detrimental to other projects and priorities in the STIP.
- No? Here?

### **Should the funding for TA projects be managed statewide or should it be provided to the ATPs via a formula?**

- Original statewide process.
- Not sure, if the amount of funding is so small, it would be hard to send to the ATPs.
- Administered statewide
- Spend what is allowed under MAP 21
- ATP via a formula – closer to the customer.
- ATP managed
- Group felt that some of the TA funding should be managed by the ATPs similar to the current Transportation Enhancement program.

### **How does MnDOT use the 50% available statewide for TA projects?**

- Let the ATPs do it
- Solicitation by region.
- Solicitation in each ATP.
- 50% state share to STP program
- It was suggested that perhaps the 50% Statewide TA funding could be targeted to the ATPs by formula.
- Would like to use 50% of TA funds in outstate.

### **How are the competitive grant processes managed?**

- RDC staff, ATP , MPO
- RDCs.
- Does the ATP process meet the requirements for a competitive process?
- RDC continues , with MPOs. Capitalize on regional plans.
- Role for the RDCs/MPOs – they can help manage and facilitate these processes – have done it for TE in the past.
- Let the ATPs do it
- Statewide criteria developed.
- Locally.
- ATP managed grants

### **Does Minnesota continue to fund the Recreational Trails program?**

- Yes
- Yes, keep on the TA program
- Keep as part of TA – recreational trails eligible.
- Fund the Recreational Trails program
- The group recommended not opting out of the Recreational Trails program in order to transfer the TA funding to CMAQ. Recreational Trails funding may be one of the few sources of federal transportation funding that can be used for trail development.

## CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)

---

**Current practice has been to program all CMAQ funds in the Twin Cities Metro area: should this continue?**

- No.
- Works well, don't change.
- Keep the same
- Twin Cities only (not Duluth, St. Cloud)
- Do St. Cloud and Duluth have to monitor air quality so they do not fall out of nonattainment?
- Are projects to shift single occupant vehicle trips to transit, bike and walking CMAQ eligible?
- Current process is ok as is.

**Or should it be distributed to all nonattainment and maintenance areas (Metro, Duluth, and St. Cloud)?**

- Yes

**Should MnDOT program any of the CMAQ funds for MnDOT use?**

- Current system works.
- Keep the same as is.
- No. Money goes to transit. Process works, keep it. Already very political.

**Should measures and targets identified in the CMAQ plan change the focus of types of projects selected to ensure greatest emissions and congestion reduction?**

- Required in plan.
- Continue to fund rec. trails.
- That would leave a hole in TMO and Transit funding and funding transit is a great emissions and congestion reduction method!
- No
- It would leave a hole in transit funding and TMO. Yes to question. Transit should be focus.
- CMAQ now requires a plan. Do Duluth and Saint Cloud have or plan to develop plans?
- Current practice has been to program all CMAQ funds in the Twin Cities Metro area: should this continue?

## HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP)

---

### When should we begin to update the SHSP and how will this plan be best coordinated with HSP CVSP?

- Should update SHSP now – update when federal guidance comes out
- 2014 Enforcement with mandatory education if you get a ticket.
- TZD workshops
- Soon.

### What percentage of HSIP funding should go toward non-infrastructure/behavioral strategies?

- High – Enforcement and Education
- Some, but not sure how much?
- 10 – 20%

### Should some HSIP funds be managed on a Statewide basis, rather than allocated to ATPs?

- Statewide, not ATPs
- How much? What does that mean?
- Allocate to ATPs
- Statewide
- 10%
- Percent as needed for TZD, programmed by ATP
- ATPs run differently across the state, but it works well here in this region, want it to continue as is. Partnerships/engineers work well together, too competitive otherwise, continue use of targets is very beneficial for us. If it went away we would not have as much local input.
- Locals- our own local standards and targets really help.

### Will Minnesota's current interim goal of fewer than 350 fatalities by 2014 be the MAP-21 "State Performance Target" and what are the impacts of this or other targets?

- Yes, need to look for more innovative project to fund toward this as low hanging fruit is one. Keep funding what is already working however!
- Yes.

### ARE THERE ADDITIONAL POLICY ISSUES?

- Would HSIP be available for bicycle and pedestrian safety?
- Since SRTS has been a stand-alone federal project, managed by the central MnDOT office, will it become and ATP managed or District managed program since being lumped in with TA?/which have been ATP solicited?
- Add TA to first question under NHPP.
- With focus on meeting pavement quality requirements, will MnDOT shift money from highway expansion to maintenance?
- How will low-cost ITS solutions be included in HSIP?
- How do you decide what STP projects get delayed? What will be priorities?
- There is basically no public input to the Programming Update Workshop and TA work group. How can people think that works?
- Can you swap federal for state funds on a local project?
- What would the TA funds go to if they were transferred after a state opted out of the program?

- HSIP – should it be managed centrally or by ATP?
- HSIP funds should be allocated by the ATP and ATP should be part of the update of the SHSP.
- Need option to swap state money for federal money so locals can opt out
- Jurisdiction change = comprehensive need
- Work out mandates re state decider role for any project. Selection on NHPP system related issue – sole role of transit and recipient. Applies only for Metro.
- What about implications of all 7 required federal performance areas v. concentrating on only preservation and safety?
- How will rural minor collectors be funded in the future? This will be a big change moving forward.
- NHPP - should MnDOT take jurisdiction over city/county PAs that will become part of the NHS?
- STP, CMAQ, TA: Met Council needs to understand which of the new federal programs will be part of the regional solicitation process A formal agreement would be good to have.
- STP, TA – MnDOT should consider including its metro share of STP and TA funds in the regional solicitation process rather than creating a separate process.
- NHS – Any re-evaluation of the target formula should include mobility and intermodal or multimodal needs.
- NHS – will MnDOT include the MPO and stakeholders in developing performance targets for NHS system performance?
- Will the current performance measures match the active/proposed performance measures?
- If we choose to fund non-principal arterials the same criteria should be used statewide
- NHPP funds should be used on non-principal arterials (use the same criteria)
- CMAQ works well, don't change it.
- Who would be responsible for system performance and consistent performance measures?
- HSIP should be updated without waiting for the guidance
- NHPP funds should be distributed on a performance-need basis without regard to geography. Geography-based distribution creates winners and losers; real and perceived. Minnesota will be held accountable “as a whole” not on a district by district basis.
- Minnesota should shift from a numerical target for fatalities to a more “turn the curve” in a positive manner on the trend line on fatal and serious injury categories combined.
- Impact to statewide funding scenario of 62%(NHPP)/29% (STP)/9% (HSIP) formula percentages.
- Cooperative agreement program impact
- Target formulas statewide
- Bridge program and sufficiency
- With emphasis on NHS system, MnDOT minor arterials will be in poorer condition
- Any formula change should be based on performance based measures
- Performance measures – look at the gaps and reallocate funds to meet targets set by Feds.
- Performance measures – how do the current MnDOT performance measures and targets align with future decision by the Feds? Risk of MnDOT being off base or not in alignment with the targets set by FHWA. We should take some responsibility and go for working toward our targets. What would our pavements look like if we used the FHWA rating system?
- Some uncertainty about STP question is the key question from local levels. Keep the \$168M as is. If STP stays like now, it's workable. If it drops, it's problematic. If MnDOT keeps, best to keep it for MnDOT roads that are in poor condition.
- Should there be more MnDOT principal arterials?
- Will the locals have less opportunity to develop their priorities with the emphasis on NHBP?
- How will shift from SAFETEA-LU to MAP-21 affect future programming of local trail projects?
- Will effort be made to honor projects in 2014, 2015, and 2016?
- Will projects in 2013 – 2016 STIP be reviewed to see if they qualify under another program category? Has this already occurred?
- Would the TA competitive grant process be managed? Would the ATP establish a process for each district?

- Pg 6 – FTA – does Fixed Guideway include passenger rail projects?
- Is there a funding pool for freight rail projects?
- HSIP funds – can townships access those funds to fund signs on rural public roads?
- Will a rumble strip on a pavement presentation project be eligible for HSIP
- Will some of the additional funds allocated to HSIP program be targeted to implementing county safety plans? (could HSIP funds be a piece of a larger local project?)
- Study Rail Bottlenecks and what highway/road issues might be programmed – crossing-bridges-connecting roads to ports that transportation could do and access for road expansion
- Will MAP-21 allow metro to capture too much of money: e.g. 50% by population and 50% any where – Metro could get it all.
- Is there an option for local/townships to access HSIP

#### **WHAT IS THE KEY POLICY ISSUE ON THIS LIST AND WHY?**

- TEs have been an important part of our regions projects and work. Several of our projects are on the ATIP/STIP for after 2013.
- SRTS has also been an important area of work.
- HSIP and how the increased funding will be used. Would pedestrian and bike safety on or crossing of highways be included?
- Continuation of STP and STIP project programming and making sure those projects are completed even if they are shifted a year or two back, but not dropped.
- Until performance targets are determined should NHPP apportionment be transferred to STP to manage the current program? This is important so local units of government know what the impact will be to projects already programmed in the STIP.
- Need change to target formula
- Build on existing partnerships and expertise for TA competition – e.g. RDCs
- The impact on funding programs that are/could be part of the regional solicitation is most important.
- We should be pro-active to reach performance measures for the NHPP funds. That way we can have flexibility in the future.
- Funding needs to shift away from geographic-based to performance based.
- Minnesota needs to address the issue of pavement condition on a “whole state” basis; geographic distributions have created condition disparities as districts shift their distributions to major projects, capacity projects, and bending to local political pressures.
- If funding continues to flow geographically, how can those geographic areas are held accountable for the performance measures and targets?
- ATPs need to base their decisions and approvals from a regional perspective “does this proposed project have regional significance?”
- ISTEAs – decentralized? MAP-21 – centralized?
- STP questions with priority on performance on NHS to impact STP apportionment
- Priority on NHPP with increase and CMAQ with congestion management remaining same, it may shift money to NHS rural system.
- Will the state be cutting back on investment in expansion to meet performance targets for system condition?
- STP funding question is the key for local government. Keeping the \$168 million in the current STP program.
- HSIP need to move forward now to update the SHSP now and make adjustments when guidance is available – need to incorporate CVSP when engaging stakeholder groups through TZD regional workshops. Follow county highway safety plans to fund HSIP projects (and district) and don’t need to involve ATPs.
- Enhanced mobility for seniors – funds reduced in “smaller urban” areas, which is a problem. These areas may not have cabs/buses and our senior population is growing. How will we address this?

- NHPP and STP – funding, targets and allocations. Target formula needs to follow STIP guidance so that pavement is a bigger percent of the formula versus only 35% of the formula. Funding needs to follow the performance targets.
- Need to also address the SHP and its update using the regional TZD groups as part of the process.
- NHPP – how its implemented statewide/district-wide/ATP wide? Bi state.
- What is the future role of the ATPs? Minnesota’s ATP process is an example that others in the country wish to replicate. We should continue with ATPs process under MAP-21. The more decisions and priorities that can be made at the ATP level, the better.
- Distribution of TA funding: Distribute 100% of the TA funding to the ATPs. The 50% based on population should be distributed based on ATP population totals; the 50% TA statewide portion should match the TA dollars that were distributed based on population. Each ATP can then set priorities for the use of these funds.
- How should CMAQ funds be distributed? MnDOT should continue to target funding for CMAQ projects to the Twin Cities metro area.
- Funding of HSIP projects: HSIP dollars should be targeted to the ATPs. Rail crossing projects should be eligible for HSIP. Decisions over the selection of projects to fund with HSIP dollars should be made by the ATP. Current distribution of HSIP
  - TA competitive scoring
  - MnDOT plan or “DEED” type agency or Feds?
  - Off system bridges – ATP – sub targets
  - Flexibility of use for fed documents
  - Rumble strips allow for funding in project
  - HSIP rural roads have high fatality
  - Allow incoming of safety into project cost
  - Trail maintenance also important

## PLANNING PROVISIONS

- What do performance measures look like for smaller MPOs? Bi-state MPOs?
- Challenging for a bi-state MPO. Do they set the same targets for both states, different targets for different states? How do you get the MPOs and MnDOT to agree on targets? What targets do you use to fund projects – do you meet MPO targets or MnDOT targets?
- Do our existing Area Transportation Partnerships sufficiently incorporate the input of nonmetropolitan local officials?  
They may not feel that way. Need to ask them.
- How do we balance the call for performance based planning with the call for greater involvement of stakeholders? To balance we use the RDCs, the city and county engineers and the MPOs. Keeps the politics out of it. We also use transit, tribal liaisons and rail.
- There were concerns with the new RTPO in bill. How will that work with RDC’s crossing into different ATP’s and different Districts?
- MPO: Where does the MPO fit with the rest of the group? Will we need to restructure after hitting 200,000 population? What does it mean when it hits TMA status?
  - More flexibility year to year, balances out in the long run
  - Implications: Who pays for data collection? Not cheap.
  - In Urban section, ride measure not valid and should not be used, possibly pavement condition.
  - Most places don't collect data for traffic operations of a corridor for STP
  - Who sets performance targets for STP roads? Who measures them, who pays to collect data?
  - What's the performance standard for urban roads (travel time?, pavement condition?)
  - Large MPOs won’t want to reduce their funding to cover the new, small MPO –Mankato.
  - ATP is advising group to RTPO
  - Like performance based IF local involvement is part of setting the standard

- Prefer if “emotion and politics” were removed from award decisions.
- If ATP role remains, as is, under SAFETEA-LU, then yes, if ATP role is diminished under MAP-21, then no. (Policy Question 5)

#### COMMENTS ON THESE ISSUES:

- I think the balance of local non-metro area officials on the ATPs are good. Minnesota is well off to meet the performance standards since they have included them earlier than other states. MnDOT also has a good track record of inputting measures and targets in some statewide plans already, although many ATPs don't consider performance standards in their solicitations so there may be a learning curve.
- NHPP: MAP-21 emphasizes the Performance to NHS as first priority. NHPP is currently under-programmed. The risk of transferring NHPP to STP is greater than trying to keep current program whole.
- NHPP – must keep NHS Connectors (perhaps also add some) eligible for NHPP.
- How will MnDOT A-minor arterials get funded?
- Need to balance central programming with ATP programming.
- What does distribute “by population” mean?
- HSIP. Development of new SHSP must coordinate with statewide multi-modal plan. This did not occur in the past and lack of coordination with OSMMP would cause problems.
- Issues with bi-state MPO's asset management, performance measures and targets – do not match from one state to another. How to resolve?
- Different measures for rural and urban.
- What do you think Minnesota will accomplish with the new performance requirements? We are already doing this.
- Do our existing area transportation partnerships sufficiently incorporate the input of non-metropolitan local officials? ATPs work well.
- What will Minnesota achieve with performance orientation – build on existing work, make greater progress, minimize funding disruptions, focus money to priority systems?
- What are implications – perhaps STP system suffers in some areas, already good and growing disparity, with target formula.
- Will this help improve coordination across districts for NHPP system?
- What are roles?
- ATPs? Folks are comfortable and used to this but they vary. Sub allocation versus performance based. District projects are performance based but locals not so much for MPOs shift from exp. To maintenance.
- Issues where district boundaries; ditto state boundaries occur – different approaches, targets, priorities.
- Concerns re limits of federal measures – e.g. mobility versus access, system condition versus usage
- Need balance
- Questions: Do our existing ATPs sufficiently incorporate the input of non-metro local officials? Yes, however, the districts program projects very differently and right now, performance measures do not guide investment decisions. More consistency among the districts and how they program projects would be good.
- It may provide more accountability or a better connection between MnDOT investments and priorities. More transparency, more understandable. Will this actually change how MnDOT invests in its system or will politics still influence investment decisions?
- Concerned that minimum target conditions could reward areas that have not invested in their pavements, for example, at the expense of other areas that have tried to meet pavement targets.
- Will MnDOT develop different targets for urban versus rural areas?
- Challenging if we all set different targets: perhaps start with a base; MPOs can set better standards; will need authority to direct investments.
- District 6 works well with elected officials not participating in the ATP
- With the new requirement for performance measures, one would expect to see greater consistency geographically.

- There is potential for performance measures on Interstates requiring a greater or disproportional amount of the total pot of dollars.
- MnDOT and MPOs will need to visit and normalize their targets and reach agreements.
- The new requirement that transportation plans include specific targets can be very beneficial if: 1) The set of measures is more focused (fewer) on what is most important; 2) the results are truly able to answer the questions “are Minnesotans truly better off” by having achieved this result; 3) the measures are linked to Minnesota’s Quality of Life.
- My experience in a rural ATP is that cities and counties are very well represented and can happen if there are guidelines set up by the ATP that are faithful to Federal ideals.
- What will Minnesota accomplish with the new performance requirements?
- What are implications of Minnesota targets?
- Minnesota’s emphasis on performance measures and public input has put Minnesota at an advantage of moving forward with MAP-21.
- Overall performance of NHS system with performance standards may change way of doing business.
- Roadways in fairly good shape on NHS.
- Bridges good with another large need coming in the future.
- Opportunity to show the nation that need for funding based on a good system.
- Will change view of how many miles of roads we need to maintain.
- Need to make sure information that feeds asset management and performance measurement is reliable.
- Investing in the core system to keep it in good shape is a good idea.
- Too many details about performance measures still uncertain.
- ATPs do not provide adequate input and cooperation for local government officials
- Challenge for non-MnDOT NHS miles – state is accountable but does not have control over what happens on those roads.
- How will the relationship between MPOs and state be operationalized? MPO plans feed directly into state plans or just connect up with state plans in some fashion?
- MnDOT and MPOs can have different target, but MnDOT investment would still need based on MnDOT statewide targets to maintain statewide consistency. MPOs could set own targets – they may want higher target levels but MnDOT investment still needs to be based on statewide
- What do you think MnDOT will accomplish --- more maintenance? Less capacity? MnDOT will do what they want not what we need. People off system will get nothing.
- What are the implications of minimarkets...less service for the state of Minnesota? Shift more cost to others (locals)
- How should the roles in target setting be defined? MnDOT set target and ATPs approve. MnDOT needs to set targets at the lowest level they can to give the system flexibility.
- We should do no more in target setting than required by Feds. Place the lowest requirements on the system that are allowed.
- Do existing APO incorporate input of non-metro local officials? Don’t know.
- MPO is a representative of ATP, therefore, has some input but this must balance with needs district wide.
- Challenging if each group (MnDOT or MPO) is setting different targets.
- Bi-state; which state do you follow if state measures are different?
- ATP does incorporate the input of local officials, works well.
- MnDOT oversight in MPO target setting.
- Geographic consistency.
- Performance management needs smaller MPOs, bi-state MPOs; will be best if minimal number of MPOs.
- Existing ATP versus non-metro local; work needs to be done to make non-metro local officials have inputs that are empathetically listened to.
- I think policy should decide the structure of investment. Geographical consistency will be achieved.
- Specific measures and targets should target quality of life for ordinary Minnesotans.

## Key Policy Issue

- What is the future role of the ATPs? Minnesota's ATP process is an example that others in the country wish to replicate. We should continue with ATPs process under MAP-21. The more decisions and priorities that can be made at the ATP level, the better.
- Distribution of TA funding: Distribute 100% of the TA funding to the ATPs. The 50% based on population should be distributed based on ATP population totals; the 50% TA statewide portion should match the TA dollars that were distributed based on population. Each ATP can then set priorities for the use of these funds.
- How should CMAQ funds be distributed? MnDOT should continue to target funding for CMAQ projects to the Twin Cities metro area.
- Funding of HSIP projects: HSIP dollars should be targeted to the ATPs. Rail crossing projects should be eligible for HSIP. Decisions over the selection of projects to fund with HSIP dollars should be made by the ATP. Current distribution of HSIP

## Transportation Funding and General Comments

- Concern: how will allocation of funds to the MAP-21 categories affect ATP target distribution?
- Concern about STP funds being transferred to NHPP due to poor statewide performance
- Local jurisdictions have resources committed to future projects in the 2014-2016 timeframe (environmental studies, design work, right of way acquisition). How will MAP-21 affect funding those previously committed projects? Projects in the STIP have been treated as a commitment to the local ATP partners.
- What will be programmed centrally vs programmed by the ATP's? If the ATPs have to meet performance targets and a great deal of funding is going to the NHS system, what's left for the locals?
- Will ATPs that don't meet performance measures affect funding for the ATPs that do meet the performance criteria?
- Are there benchmarks or time frames for performance that need to be met before achieving the overall goal for pavement quality?
- Concern: The loss of federal funds at the local level will drastically affect community development based on comprehensive land-use plans.
- Is the legislature aware of how MAP-21 will impact local infrastructure?
- Concern about and future solicitations and funding levels for the TE and SRTS programs.
- Our group would like to stay as close to the current funding formula as much as possible without knowing what the revisions would entail.
- Our group has a similar concern about being heard throughout the process.
- For the most part we would like to keep local ATP control for most of the issues listed. Without knowing the targets we would like to keep the current STIP program.
- The ATP process needs to continue. The locals need to make the decisions. A decentralized approach is needed.
- Group felt the current District 3 ATP structure and membership generally fulfilled the nonmetropolitan local official input requirements set forth under MAP-21. The group could not speak for other districts/ATPs.
- ATP - works well here in this region, want it to continue as is. If it were to change, there are concerns about not getting enough local input.
  - Our MPO had a concern about how they fit in with the ATP.
- Our MPO had a question: Who sets performance targets for STP roads in the MPO? Who measures them, who pays to collect data? They had concerns about costs of collecting data.
- What's the performance standard for urban roads (travel time? pavement condition?). Ride quality cannot be a factor in town.
- How would RTPOs work when existing RDCs cross into two different ATPs/districts?
- Good to have a goal; but how to establish a goal that is balanced? (*what do you mean by balanced?*) Performance measures must be tied to peer groups. (*Peers - areas with similar characteristics and issues?*) Should accomplish better allocation of resources to needs. (*It will do this, or this needs to happen?*)

- Better interstate bridges. Distribution of funding toward interstate bridges.
- MPO/MnDOT coordination is needed.
- There will be a painful adjustment as we evolve to a modally neutral, NHS-dominated system for federal dollars and an increased need for state sources of funding.
- Yes, through city, county and the local community engineers and planners.
- Using our existing ATP structure, by utilizing the Regional Development Commissions, could satisfy the involvement of local officials and stakeholders.
- Question: Will NHS and bridge performance measures include facilities for/ADT of non-motorized modes, and fatalities and severe injuries for non-motorized modes?
- Local facilities are integral to the planning and operation of state and Federal transportation systems. How will this interdependency be defined as a performance measure?
- How will the performance measures reflect Minnesota's changing demographic, economic and environmental challenges now and into the future? How can we (MnDOT) get specific measures to capture the effects of the growing aging population, the increased cost of energy and the need for environmental sustainability?
- How will public health, community livability and economic development be integrated in the measures?

## Planning Provisions

- What will MN accomplish with the new performance measures and targets?
- What are the implications of having minimum condition targets for Interstate pavement and bridge condition?
- How should roles be defined since both the MPO and MnDOT are to set targets?
- What are the implications of the new requirement that the statewide transportation plan include specific statewide measures and targets?
- Do ATPs sufficiently incorporate the input of non-metro officials?
- Interstate should improve, but possibly at the cost of other highways and bridges not on the NHS system.
- Measures: May set targets for interstates and bridges that exceeds funding. This erodes funding available for non-Principal Arterials. If Congress targets federal funds to a much smaller segment of the federal system, then states will be forced to increase funding for the remaining (non-PA) miles.
- MnDOT and MPO targets should be consistent.
- Specific measures and targets in the state plan may limit flexibility.
- ATP 1 does involve non-metropolitan local officials. Most other ATPs do the same.
- Can the Performance Measures for non-Interstate Principle Arterials be different in Greater MN? This may help with the overall funding of all Trunk Highways.
- Existing ATPs do a good job of incorporating input from non-metro local officials.
- As related to MN (National Performance Goals) convert STP funds to get caught up. How do we do both to address pavement issues. Congestion issues may emerge if we take \$\$ away from STP. What was the thought process for putting both conditions in the mix for funding. How do we coordinate the achievement of both Pavement and Congestion goals—?(significant)
- How are we actually going to be measured? Will climate and highway miles be taken into consideration by individual states (Example: How will freight movement come into play relative to congestion?)
- Timeframe for when APO/MPOs need to incorporate specific targets into plans - will it be before the 18<sup>th</sup>?
- Do APO/MPOs move forward w/place holder targets until final determination is made?
- What is the difference between RDCs and RTPOs?
- Performance targets – A region in Northern MN versus a growing metropolitan area can be completely different in context. How is interpretation going to be addressed by region? Is there going to be a cookie cutter approach or is each districts going to be given opportunity to decide?
- It will force funding into the right areas to ensure best use of funding.
- MAP-21 is more prescriptive, resulting in some loss of flexibility in the use of federal funds by the states. This may limit choices for the use of the funds.

- MnDOT needs to ensure the tools and evaluation criteria used in measuring system performance are standardized. In regards to national performance goals, MnDOT should ensure the tools and criteria are consistent with those used by other states (e.g., apples to apples comparison).
- MnDOT should coordinate with the MPOs to develop performance measures. At a minimum, there should be a common set of core measures developed for these agencies. Each agency can develop additional measures as necessary over and above the core set of measures.
- Performance measures need to be set at the right level, not too high or too low.
- Implications of minimum condition targets – this will focus \$ on pavement conditions and bridges – important, but will this completely eliminate some other transportation components?
- Minimum levels on Interstate?
- Must obligate funds until measures are met?
- Require reshuffling programs – or new funding levels?
- Traffic congestion performance measures?
- What will they look like and how will they be implemented?
- ATP’s new spirit of cooperation?
- If the statewide transportation plan is to include specific measures – will they be able to be regionally distinguishable, or one state, one measure?
- ATP’s currently involve a representative from cities and counties. It needs the intent of partnership and cooperation. Works well as set up
- Minimum standards on the NHS bridges and Interstate could reduce the amounts available to the A-minor arterials depending on the minimum standards.

# MAP-21 Input and Feedback from Stakeholders

## TECHNICAL SESSION 1: FREIGHT AND TRANSIT

### TRANSIT AND FREIGHT

---

#### **Pending FTA guidance, how should the revised Elderly and Disabled (Sect 5310) program be implemented in Minnesota – statewide or separate Metro/Greater MN?**

- 5310 should be implemented differently in Metro and in Greater MN because needs are different.
- Retain required transit/human services coordination, study requirements to help ID higher ROI approaches
- Yes, separate those – the needs are so different.
- Transit – should separate Metro from Greater MN. There is a huge need for elderly programs in smaller urban areas as baby boomers age. Oftentimes, there are no transit options available (or cabs) for older drivers in smaller communities.
- Transit – separate Metro/greater MN on 5310
- Funding incentive to invest in freight route or re-direct projects
- Intermodal facilities
- Issue regarding how MnDOT currently funds truck parking at state rest areas and how it prioritizes against other safety and roadway projects.
- Elderly and Disabled (5310) should be implemented statewide, not separate.
- How to influence FTA guidance – seek measures based on investment, type of transition on a statewide basis.
- Question: Some ATPs have funded bus replacements with STP funds. With less STP funding, is there more transit funding available in MAP-21 to fund bus replacements?
- The extension of operating assistance to 5310's (private-non-profits) should be carefully implemented in coordination with the existing and public systems - to ensure there is no duplication.
- The Transit program should be implemented statewide and should be seamless throughout the state. Eliminate the administrative boundaries between the Twin Cities and Greater Minnesota. The performance measures should be customer based, specifically on convenience, access and safety. As Mike said, include bike and pedestrian in transit system planning and investment plan.
- Separate metro from greater MN process. By separating the process delays can be avoided (because Greater/Metro decisions/approvals needed). It will expedite the process.

#### **How should Minnesota try to influence FTA guidance for the new Asset Management and Safety programs and revised Urbanized, Non-Urbanized and Elderly & Disabled programs?**

- MnDOT should provide a template for asset management and safety plans.
- Individual programs seem like a lot of paperwork, etc – duplicative work can be done more efficiently by combining systems (multi county or regional).
- Some can be standards, but some need to be individualized. Some transit systems can do fleet management, some are not comparable (country wide –vs- small urban).

## Freight

- How will the National Freight Network impact the Minnesota IRC system?
- I-94 is the only one in the IRC system. How is freight movement incorporated into programming NHPP projects?
- Will MnDOT's investment strategies for roadways be impacted by National Freight Network?
- Will the Statewide Freight Plan identify projects (recommended)? What is a Freight Project?
- Truck Size and Weight harmonization
- Truck Parking at state rest areas
- Will MnDOT identify corridors or hubs to help set investment strategies for the National Freight Network?
- Will there be national performance criteria developed to trigger needs on the National Freight Network in addition to those under the NHPP for Interstates?
- It would be helpful to have examples of sample projects to better define "Freight Projects."
- We encourage freight projects on the non-interstate system (Principle and Minor Arterials, and some key Major Collectors) be included in the statewide freight plan. These roadways are the backbone of the rural areas and farm to market routes that drive rural economies.
- Will MnDOT identify corridors or hubs to help set investment strategies for the National Freight Network?
- Will there be national performance criteria developed to trigger needs on the National Freight Network in addition to those under the NHPP for Interstates?
- It would be helpful to have examples of sample projects to better define "Freight Projects."
- MnDOT discussions focusing on pavement smoothness not on congestion - should not ignore congestion. How are performance measures for freight going to be determined?
- *Increased* weight standards could accelerate damage to roads how will that be addressed.
- There was a discussion on weight limits. North Dakota has higher gross limits than Minnesota.
  - Will MAP 21 look at uniform weight limits across the country?
  - There is a concern in western Minnesota about competitiveness with ND, but uniformity would be good for freight transport as a whole.
- There seem to be facilities missing, why is that?
- The Ohio River appears to be a freight corridor, but not the Mississippi or the St. Lawrence Seaway?
- Why is the 35 Duluth to Des Moines link missing?
- What about I-90?
- How do we safeguard the intrinsic qualities and livability of our state and the quality of our communities while planning and accommodating freight movement into the future?
- Import the I-94 corridor and nothing else?
- I Like freight plan id projects, but the district/road authorities need to be coordinated with so other modes or "issues" that the freight project did not consider.
- Truck Size – on all the I system as well as the road networks so it connects and gets from one location to another
- Truck Parking – YES overnight truck parking is needed at rest areas or "designated" parking areas – such as "Truck Stops" etc.

## Transit Asset Management:

- In developing a transit asset management system, MnDOT should not only take into account age, mileage, and maintenance history in determining useful life and replacement needs of rolling capital.
- MnDOT should consider the following items in developing its Transit Safety Plan: defining what the plan entails, who will prepare the plan, and who will enforce and implement the plan.
- Consensus: FTA funds separate between metro and greater MN.
- Comment: Lots of 12 passenger buses acting like taxis in rural Minnesota. Minivans may be more cost effective.
- Cost effectiveness based on rides and how this will effect urban vs. rural splits.

- Question: Isn't non-motorized transportation eligible for funding by STP, CMAQ and HSIP, with bike and ped specifically is called out in these funding programs, not just in TA?

## COMMENTS ON THESE ISSUES:

- Having worked with the Metropolitan Council's JARC and New Freedom Solicitation and now working in Greater MN Transportation, they have different needs, requirements and performance measures so there should remain separate Metro and Greater MN solicitations.
- How will smaller transit systems meet performance measures? Access needs to be maintained in the rural areas.
- Freight should be more multimodal versus highways only; rail, water, etc. Mississippi River, Great Lakes...
- Are there freight efforts focused only on I-94?
- Transit performance measures in rural areas will be hard to meet. Its access versus efficiency and you can't be good at both at the same time. And access in rural areas is very important.
- Might re-categorize some roads as a freight network (I-35)
- The National Freight Network will bring greater focus to the I-94 corridor in the state.
- The NFN will have a positive effect on investment strategies as the I-84 corridor will likely see the benefit of synergy of programs.
- Any emphasis on truck size and weight harmonization is a big positive as greater harmony benefits cross-country freight movement.
- Truck parking at rest areas is good, in fact, that is why most areas came to be is safety for truck operators.
- Freight – ahead of the curve.
- Transit: separate programs
- Freight – trucks are pushing for larger vehicles, weights are increasing.
- National system will show Minnesota's weakness
- Freight program manager?
- What about livable communities' emphasis?
- National Freight System should not be new issue for MN since it is on the NHS it will be a first priority already.
- Truck parking at rest areas should be provided for up to 8 – 10 hours.
- Truck weight needs to be consistent with road weight capacity. It should NOT be allowed where the benefits in the private system outweigh the cost to the public system.
- Is there a funding incentive to invest in freight funding?
- Keep everything as simple as possible, keep the existing eligibilities.
- We support BRT on 35S since no other work is likely to happen (keep them high priority)
- Don't expect the NFN to impact us a great deal.
- If a county governing body designates a particular route as a freight corridor to encourage truck use then it should qualify to compete for funds.
- Uniform truck size and weight with surrounding states should be a priority (take advantage of opportunity to get trucks on the state system and off the local roads).
- Questions about the organization of transit - Metro versus Rural in the ATP
- MnDOT used to divide out money by district, and then agencies went to the state for more funding.
- Transit seems inefficient in rural settings. Lots of 12 passenger buses acting like taxis in rural Minnesota. Minivans may be more cost effective.
- When should busses be cut and it should become a social services issue or at what point is it considered to unproductive to provide services?
- If cost effectiveness is based on rides, how will this effect rural/urban splits.
- MPO gets \$ directly from FTA, so should the ATP funding all go to Rural?
- Weight of trucks - ND higher limits than MN. Are there any thoughts of changing that? There should be uniformity from state to state on NHS system. Not having that uniformity hurts development in MN. Have the feds considered requiring uniformity to make all systems a national freight system?
- Will elderly and disabled bus programs limit usage?

- Will the IRC system be ineligible for freight funding?
- Will the NFN increase the targets on the interstate system that it is part of?
- What is the return on investing in rest areas vs private facilities?
- Would it make sense to ID freight projects in the same way as major projects in the HIP?
- Elderly and disabled 5310 program should be implemented through separate population groupings, administered through RDC, MPO's
- Rest Areas – Would we consider Oasis as in other states?
- What would mitigation for congestion on freight routes be?

# TECHNICAL SESSION 2: ENVIRONMENTAL STREAMLINING, TRIBAL TRANSPORTATION, INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS; RESEARCH; ALTERNATIVE FINANCE

## ENVIRONMENTAL STREAMLINING

---

**MAP-21 requires the US DOT to get public input for ideas for additional categorical exclusions. This is currently underway. What ideas do you have?**

- Piggyback onto existing or do several ideas for one meeting.
- MnDOT should consider synchronizing the state and federal cultural resource requirements for state fund only and federal funded projects.
- MnDOT should utilize MAP-21 streamlining provisions ASAP.
- What does it mean that the State can assume responsibility for CEs? Does this mean review and approval? Would it apply to a 5307 project?
- Environmental streamlining should enable projects that conduct planning level environmental studies to lead to right of way (ROW) acquisition substantially prior to NEPA completion, with ROW eligible for federal reimbursement. This used to be permissible and enabled cost-effective ROW acquisition. The rules must accommodate this approach to control costs related to speculative real estate purchases.
- Will all CE's be exempt from Fed review including the full federal oversight projects?
- Can more approval of design exceptions be delegated to the state?
- Additional CE categories may have limited benefit due to Minnesota requirements for environmental documents.
- We suggest that all work within the current ROW should be a categorical exclusion as the area has already been disturbed.
- We suggest that the ACOE (Army Core of Engineers) be required to accept the Technical Evaluation Panels wetland assessment on all transportation projects.
- Set guidelines to categorical exclusions by impact size.
- Develop parameters/rules to allow for categorical exclusions on NEPA when impacting less than 10 acres of wetland (example) and or when spending less than \$2 M in federal funds (example).

**MAP-21 emphasizes programmatic approaches to the environmental review process. What ideas or suggestions do you have that would help with programmatic mitigation? (a Minnesota example is the wetland banking program)**

- Simplify as much as possible.
- Historic bridges
- Make CEs to be consistent for FHWA and FTA
- If a project falls under a CE, then a noise study should not be required.
- Convene program coordinators to address mitigation, but begin with avoidance and minimization of impacts.

### **How will ITS projects compete with traditional projects in a performance based plan?**

- Compete against each other, NOT against internal programs
- Compete with other ITS projects
- Added benefits to a traditional project may compete better
- Standalone – shouldn't compete against roads and bridges. Compete against other ITS projects.

### **Should federal funds be used for operations of ITS systems?**

- What are the requirements for these funds?
- Think there are many low cost construction based technologies to implement; signal control, intelligent compaction; more
- What are the tails?
- Not 100% but a certain percentage.
- Criteria should be established for ITS projects that start to show public benefit and user and safety impacts.
- We agree to allow ITS project to be federally funded.
- We prefer that federal funds not be used to pay for operational costs, including ITS costs.

**MnDOT is supportive of funding SHRP 2 implementation**

- Yes!

**MnDOT will likely compete for funding in all three categories: Reliability, Capacity and Renewal**

**MnDOT is pursuing lead state status on projects that support our Strategic Vision and position us as a global leader.**

- We support MnDOT Research to position us as a global leader.

### Organizing P3 Office that oversees Project Procurement Processes and ensures Transparency

### Municipal Consent Risk for Private Investors

### Negotiation of Cost Participation with Trunk Highway Funds

- Policy needs to be looked at; MnDOT never pays their fair share. Lousy but reality.

### Ongoing broad enabling legislation that gives flexibility to use all tools and techniques being promoted by Federal Government

### Dedicated State Funding Match for P3 and Economic Development Projects

### Debt Service Limit Policy and Availability payment P3s

### Accounting for Value of P3 Procurements vs. Traditional

### Finding Projects where the Private Sector is interested

#### COMMENTS ON THIS SECTION:

- Categorical exclusions: ITS, travel demand management; bike/ped investments that enhance access to transit.
- Programmatic – greenhouse gas aggregate pool of emission reductions including credits for MnDOT, innovative project staging
- Environmental streamlining; the addition of projects with limited federal funding (less than \$5 million or less than \$30 million at less than 15% federal share) could significantly improve delivery of local federal projects. Looking forward to the federal guidance or the opportunity to be involved in developing more details as to how it is applied to local projects.
- It is great that CEs have been extended or reconsidered. My hope is that these extensions have no strings attached. A highway authority should be able to make changes to its infrastructure within its own right of way limits as long as the use afterward is no significantly different.
- Hopefully CEs in urban areas will be able to be comparable to those for rural areas
- Something really must be done to address the overlap and layers of rules applied by state and federal areas; how many agencies does it take to regulate surface water cleanliness? There is a punchline in there somewhere but the overlap is just crazy.
- ITS solutions will continue to often be competitive on a cost basis;
- Research is an important aspect of keeping MnDOT as a world leader.
- We must continue to look for ways to better leverage our shrinking pot of transportation dollars.
- Local government units will need to be allowed to raise transportation funds and be willing to bear a greater cost share. This will require greater flexibility on MnDOT's part.
- Highway right of way should be free from SHPO review as those areas have already been disturbed; additionally areas cleared by SHPO should be free from subsequent reviews within a reasonable statute of limitations.
- Increase CEs and programmatic agreements.
- Work in right of way should be a CE
- Add more general permits with multi-agency
- Audits of streamline process
- ITS is the future and Federal funds must be applied for!

- What about tolling? More!!
- Expand use of project memos.
- We could decide that man is part of the environment and that some impacts are ok! WE could decide that roads, trains, planes, cars, trucks are noisy and that if you build or buy your home next to a road you accept that impact!
- Environmental issues started as a way to stop progress and more and more being used that way.
- I believe alternative financing is just a way to avoid addressing the real issue which is “we need to be willing as a nation to pay for what we want”. Therefore, increase the gas tax, put an annual fee on electric cars, and put comparable fuel tax on other fuels (I believe most are currently covered). None of the alternatives can deliver the service (roads) at less cost to the end user.
- How soon in NEPA process can you purchase R-O-W.
- Yes federal Funds should be used for ITS as it becomes more common to our transportation system
- Streamlining the wetlands mitigation process and right of way acquisition process – hold agencies accountable for their review timetable.
- Truly rural road safety research