



APPENDIX J. PLAN COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

J-1: Summary of MnSHIP Comments and Responses

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) released the draft **Minnesota 20-year State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP)** for formal public review on July 1, 2013, initiating a 30-day public comment period. A public hearing was held on July 29, 2013 with opportunities for people around the state to comment via video conference at MnDOT's offices and via an online webinar. This document summarizes the comments received throughout this process and provides MnDOT's responses to each point of feedback, where applicable.

During the 30-day comment period, 185 comments were submitted from key partners, businesses, and individuals. During the public hearing on July 29, 2013, a total of 46 individuals attended and nine testified. A complete record of comments received, including public hearing testimony, is included at the end of this appendix.

The range of comments received on MnSHIP included comments on Plan process, agency decisions on investment priorities, funding issues, impacts on social groups, health, the environment, the overall statewide transportation system, and discussion of individual roads and projects across the state. A list of the comment topics is provided below.

There were many comments that requested significant transportation investments be made to expand various corridors to improve safety, mobility, and economic competitiveness. MnDOT acknowledges that many of these projects will deliver benefits to various regions and the state as a whole. As outlined in the plan, MnDOT has a large, aging system that it must maintain and continuously rehabilitate. This requires a significant level of investment. The plan documents the fact that revenue growth has slowed and the purchasing power of this revenue is decreasing. The net effect is that inflation of construction-related costs will erode the buying power of revenues by nearly 60 percent by 2033, making it very difficult to maintain and rehabilitate the existing system. This fact, along with other factors described in the plan, has shaped the current investment priorities which include very few large highway expansions. More detail on how MnDOT determined its investment priorities can be found in the responses to the project-specific comments, below.

PUBLIC COMMENT TOPICS

Note: the comments are ordered topically and listed in no particular order.

Topic 1: Project/Corridor-specific Comments

- Hwy 5 in Carver County
- Hwy 12 between Ortonville and Hwy 59
- Hwy 14 New Ulm to Rochester
- Hwy 23 New London to Richmond
- I-35 Lakeville to I-35W/I-35E split
- 35W/494 Interchange
- Hwy 52
- Hwy 63
- I-94 Corridor between St. Cloud and Twin Cities
- I-94/494/694 Interchanges
- Hwy 99/111
- Hwy 169 Champlin to St. Peter
- Hwy 169 Tower to Ely
- Hwy 169 in Twin Cities Metro
- Hwy 212 Chaska to Glencoe
- Hwy 371
- I-394 to I-94 St. Paul
- I-494
- Dakota County Corridors

Topic 2: Investment and Funding

Topic 3: Decision-making Process

- Prioritization and Tradeoffs
- Social Equity
- Minnesota GO Vision
- MAP-21 Response
- **Government Accounting Standards Board Statement 34 (GASB 34)**
- Performance Measures
- Plan Assumptions

Topic 4: Agency Decisions on Investment Priorities

- Asset Management
- Traveler Safety
- Critical Connections
- Twin Cities Mobility

- IRC Mobility
- Regional & Community Improvement Priorities
- Bicycle Infrastructure

Topic 5: Impact of Plan Decisions

- Accessibility vs. Mobility
- Multimodal Transportation
- Project Support
- Health
- Environment
- Air Quality
- Complete Streets

HOW TO USE THIS APPENDIX

The main component of this appendix consists of comments received on MnSHIP, shown in **Appendix J-2: Responses to Public Comments**. Comments and subsequent MnDOT responses are organized by theme. Any comments that required both a response and subsequent changes to plan text are noted in each response. When comments referred to multiple themes, each component of the comment associated with that theme was broken out and listed within each relevant thematic response. Note that each comment is linked to a unique comment identification number. A list of commenters, respective IDs, and page numbers of responses to comments follows. All comments received on MnSHIP during the month of July are presented verbatim in **Appendix J-3: Public Comments**.

Changes made to the final document

MnSHIP includes information on investment amounts at the project level, district level, and program level as they are constantly being developed. To provide the most current information on project costs, and district and statewide investment totals, minor updates were made throughout the document to reflect these changes. It should be noted that none of these updates significantly affected planned investment priorities, statewide investment amounts or performance outcomes.

The table on the following pages presents a summary of changes made to the plan in response to the public review and comment period.

Topic	Location	Change Made to Final Document
Project/ Corridor-specific Comments	Appendix I-2	Added a line to clarify that Interstate 94 between the Twin Cities metro area and heading northwest to St. Cloud is illustrative of the type of capital improvements that could be supported if the \$12 billion funding gap were closed.
Investment and Funding	Executive Summary page ES-20 Chapter 6 page 143	<p>Added a new paragraph under “Priorities for Additional Revenue” describing the Corridors of Commerce program. The text reads:</p> <p><i>Corridors of Commerce is a new Minnesota program, established by the Legislature in 2013, that targets transportation routes identified as vital links for regional and statewide economic growth. The Legislature authorized \$300 million in trunk highway bonds focused on statewide expansion and completion projects determined from objective criteria and return on investment analysis, among other factors. In the absence of any new, non-bond revenue, the bonds would have to be repaid, with interest, from the \$18 billion in revenue available for MnSHIP. MnDOT will communicate additional information over the coming months and anticipates completing initial project selection by winter 2013.</i></p> <p>Text in Chapter 6 is identical until “... among other factors.” The text then reads:</p> <p><i>Many of the important projects discussed in Appendix I: Illustrative Project List of Unmet Needs are good candidates for potential funding under this program, including expanding US 14, Minnesota 23, and Minnesota 371; addressing congestion on I-94 from Rogers heading northwest; and extending Minnesota 610 in the north Twin Cities metropolitan area.</i></p> <p><i>In the absence of any new, non-bond revenue, the bonds issued as part of...</i> (identical to remaining text as depicted above)</p>
	Chapter 2 pages 26-27	For example, a <i>notable</i> series of transportation bonds were authorized in Minnesota Laws of 2008, Chapter 152... <i>More recently, Corridors of Commerce authorized \$300 million in bonds. In the absence of any new, non-bond revenue, the bonds would have to be repaid, with interest, from the \$18 billion in revenue available for MnSHIP.</i>
	Chapter 6 page 137	Added a line to clarify that the Interregional Corridor unmet needs are likely to be eligible for the program. The text reads: <p><i>Several of these needs may be eligible for the new Corridors of Commerce Program, discussed on page 143.</i></p>

Topic	Location	Change Made to Final Document
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	Chapter 2 page 31	<p>Added language under “Impact of MAP-21 on MnSHIP” consistent with the Executive Summary to clarify how MnDOT will respond to MAP-21 rulemaking. MnDOT acknowledges that the plan made assumptions about pending performance criteria based on available information, but many requirements will not be integrated into MnSHIP until the next update. The text reads:</p> <p>The program is intended to align investments on this system with MAP-21 performance measures and targets. <i>A single effective date for all MAP-21 measures is expected in Spring 2015. MnDOT made assumptions about pending performance criteria based on available information, but many requirements will not be integrated into MnSHIP until the next update. A performance measure assessing freight movement on interstates is one example of a yet-to-be-defined requirement.</i></p>
	Chapter 6 page 150	<p>Modified the first bullet under “Next Steps” to clarify that MnDOT will begin to evaluate how to integrate new measures into the next MnSHIP update as soon as information is released. The text reads:</p> <p>Monitor programming of federal revenue <i>and MAP-21 rulemaking</i>. . . to ensure that they are reflected in MnSHIP investment priorities. <i>Further, as MAP-21 performance measures take effect in Spring 2015, MnDOT will begin to evaluate how to integrate new measures into the next MnSHIP update.</i></p>
Social Equity, Air Quality	Appendix D	<p>Added to the appendix D-3: Environmental Justice Analysis, which was inadvertently not included in the draft plan.</p>
MAP-21 Responses, IRC Mobility	Chapter 1 pages 17, 19	<p>Modified the text under “Interregional Corridor Mobility” to clarify the definition of the IRC system as it relates to the NHS and to detail recent tweaks to the system and calculation of corridor performance. The text reads:</p> <p><i>As will be defined and discussed later, while all IRC routes are on the National Highway System (NHS), not all NHS routes are on the IRC system. MnDOT may modify the size of the IRC system and its measure for IRC system performance as MnDOT monitors MAP-21 rulemaking.</i></p> <p><i>MnDOT completed a review of the IRC system in 2011. Several recommendations were incorporated into MnSHIP:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Removed the distinction between medium and high priority corridors;</i> • <i>Identified supplemental freight routes that provide sufficient connectivity for freight movements in western and northern Minnesota. However, these routes are not considered part of the IRC system at this time.</i> • <i>Raised the interstate speed target from 60 miles per hour to 65 miles per hour and removed stub connectors from mainline performance calculations to better relate the performance measure to user experience.</i> • <i>Used passenger car equivalents (PCEs) in place of AADT in mainline performance calculations to better account for freight movements.</i>

Topic	Location	Change Made to Final Document
MAP-21 Responses, IRC Mobility	Chapter 2 page 31	<p>Added language under “Impact of MAP-21 on MnSHIP” consistent with the Executive Summary to clarify how MnDOT will respond to MAP-21 rulemaking. MnDOT acknowledges that the plan made assumptions about pending performance criteria based on available information, but many requirements will not be integrated into MnSHIP until the next update. The text reads:</p> <p>The program is intended to align investments on this system with MAP-21 performance measures and targets. <i>A single effective date for all MAP-21 measures is expected in Spring 2015. MnDOT made assumptions about pending performance criteria based on available information, but many requirements will not be integrated into MnSHIP until the next update. A performance measure assessing freight movement on Interstates is one example of a yet-to-be-defined requirement.</i></p>
	Chapter 3 page 59	<p>Clarified the text related to MAP-21 rulemaking and Interregional Corridor Mobility. The text reads:</p> <p>With the passage of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) <i>and identification of congestion reduction on the NHS as a national goal</i>, MnDOT will monitor rulemaking and evaluate whether it should make additional modifications to the size of the IRC system and the current performance measure.</p>
	Chapter 6 page 150	<p>Modified the first bullet under “Next Steps” to clarify that MnDOT will begin to evaluate how to integrate new measures into the next MnSHIP update as soon as information is released. The text reads:</p> <p>Monitor programming of federal revenue <i>and MAP-21 rulemaking</i>: ...to ensure that they are reflected in MnSHIP investment priorities. <i>Further, as MAP-21 performance measures take effect in Spring 2015, MnDOT will begin to evaluate how to integrate new measures into the next MnSHIP update.</i></p>
Twin Cities Mobility	Chapter 1 page 17 Chapter 5 pages 115-116	<p>Clarified the definition of managed lane, changing it to priced managed lane or MnPASS lanes as appropriate.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(continue on next page)</p>

Topic	Location	Change Made to Final Document
Twin Cities Mobility	Chapter 2 “Key Factors and Assumptions” page 44	<p>Adding clarifying text to the margin concerning congestion in the Twin Cities and the Urban Mobility Report. The text reads:</p> <p><i>2011 Ranking of Most Congested Metropolitan Areas, Populations Greater than 1 million (47 total):</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>15. Atlanta GA</i> <i>San Jose CA</i> <i>Pittsburgh PA</i></p> <p><i>18. Baltimore MD</i> <i>Riverside-San Bernardino CA</i> <i>Nashville-Davidson TN</i></p> <p><i>21. San Francisco-Oakland CA</i></p> <p><i>22. Minneapolis-St. Paul MN</i></p> <p><i>23. Tampa-St. Petersburg FL</i> <i>Sacramento CA</i> <i>Cincinnati OH-KY-IN</i> <i>Virginia Beach VA</i> <i>Orlando FL</i> <i>Las Vegas NV</i> <i>Charlotte NC-SC</i> <i>New Orleans LA</i></p> <p><i>31. San Antonio TX</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>*Congestion calculated as ratio of peak travel to free-flow travel time.</i></p> <p><i>Source: 2012 Texas Transportation Institute Urban Mobility Report</i></p>

Topic	Location	Change Made to Final Document
Multimodal Transportation, Social Equity	Chapter 1 page 16	<p>Added text under “Critical Connections” to clarify the investments in MnSHIP benefit many users of the state transportation system. The text reads:</p> <p><i>While the focus of MnSHIP is on identifying improvements in highway infrastructure, this infrastructure accommodates many users, including passenger vehicles, freight carriers, transit providers, bicyclists, and pedestrians.</i></p>
	Chapter 1 page 17	<p>Added text under “Critical Connections” to clarify the investments in Twin Cities Mobility benefit transit in many ways. The text reads:</p> <p><i>The strategies used to address Twin Cities Mobility needs also benefit transit in many ways. An example of this is the implementation of transit advantages on the highway system. Transit advantages include bus-only shoulders, high occupancy vehicles bypass ramps, and priced managed lanes.</i></p>
Health, Environment, Air Quality	Chapter 2 page 33	<p>Under “Impact of State Requirements on MnSHIP,” clarified the text that concerns state legislation for MnSHIP. The text reads:</p> <p>In 2010, state law further defined requirements for the <i>statewide highway 20-year capital investment plan (i.e., MnSHIP)</i>.</p>
	Chapter 2 page 35	<p>As part of Figure 2-3, clarified the text concerns state legislation for MnSHIP. The text reads:</p> <p>Chapters in MnSHIP Addressing Minnesota Legislative Requirements <i>for MnSHIP</i>.</p>
	Chapter 2 page 35	<p>Under “Impact of State Requirements on MnSHIP,” clarified the text concerns state legislation for MnSHIP. The text reads:</p> <p>State legislative requirements <i>specific to MnSHIP</i> and the <i>MnSHIP</i> chapter in which they are addressed are presented in Figure 2-3.</p> <p><i>In addition to the state legislative requirements specific to MnSHIP, the Minnesota State Legislature has also identified 16 goals of the state transportation system. These goals have guided the development of MnDOT’s Family of Plans. Appendix D: Federal and State Legislative Requirements includes a table that lists each goal and its connection to the Minnesota GO Vision, the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan, and MnSHIP.</i></p>

(continue on next page)

Topic	Location	Change Made to Final Document
Health, Environment, Air Quality	Chapter 2 page 39	Under "MnDOT Policy," added text to clarify how MnSHIP supports the 16 goals for the state transportation system. The text reads: Some of the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan objectives and strategies were applied at a broad scale throughout the MnSHIP planning process. <i>For example, while MnSHIP does not directly discuss environmental goals, it recognizes environmental stewardship as a guiding principle in determining highway investments. For more information, see Appendix D: Federal and State Legislative Requirements.</i>
	Appendix D	Added to the appendix how MnSHIP supports the 16 goals for the state transportation system.

J-2: Responses to Public Comments

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Project/Corridor-specific Comments							
Hwy 5	109	Letter	July 30, 2013	Robert J. Lindall	Southwest Corridor Transportation Coalition	The Coalition is also concerned about the lack of improvements planned for Trunk Highway 5 in Carver County which has serious safety problems. The only project planned for Highway 5 appears to be an unbounded concrete overlay in the year 2020.	Comments noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available. MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in this area advance the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.
Hwy 12	175	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Bill Powell		One of the things that I am concerned about is highway 12 from the junction of 59 west to Ortonville. It's a still narrow road from the 1950s has not been widened to modern day.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 4. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.
Hwy 14 Corridor	7	Web	July 2, 2013	Brian		Not including the expansion of Hwy 14 between New Ulm and Mankato tells me that MNDOT is not in touch with the wishes of area residents.	Comments on US Highway 14 have been forwarded to both District 6 and District 7. MnDOT acknowledges the importance of Highway 14 to Minnesota's economic vitality and quality of life. It is an Interregional Corridor (IRC) and key east-west connection for the movement of people and goods in southern Minnesota. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of this process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. (More on these categories can be found in Chapter 1, page 13, more information on the development of investment priorities can be found in Chapter 4, page 71). Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available. IRC performance is measured by tracking the percent of miles in Greater Minnesota that are within two miles per hour of average corridor speed targets. Highway 14 meets its average corridor speed target today and is projected to continue to do so through 2033. This is described in greater detail in Chapter 3, pages 58-60.
Hwy 14 Corridor	8	Web	July 3, 2013	Katie Nelson		The omission of the complete four lane Highway 14 expansion from Rochester to New Ulm shows that this plan is out of touch with the actual transportation priorities of the citizens.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	13	Web	July 10, 2013	Audra Shaneman		As the President of the New Ulm Area Chamber of Commerce, I'm disappointed that the HWY 14 expansion from Nicollet to New Ulm is not included in the 20 year plan for MnDOT.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	14	Web	July 11, 2013	Heather Bregel		Please make the four lane expansion of Highway 14 from Rochester to New Ulm a priority!	
Hwy 14 Corridor	15	Web	July 11, 2013	Fran Miller		Please expand hwy 14 from owatonna to rochester. It is a terrible road and unsafe	
Hwy 14 Corridor	16	Web	July 11, 2013	Shannon Barie		I am saddened by the avoidance of including Highway 14 in this plan.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	17	Web	July 11, 2013	Edith and Alfred Jandro		Recently Hwy. 14 was completed from Mankato to Owatonna. Why was it not extended to Dodge Center?	
Hwy 14 Corridor	18	E-mail	July 11, 2013	Steve Burnett		I am very disappointed that the Highway 14 project completion is not part of the 20 year plan.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	23	Web	July 14, 2013	David Janssen		I think we should make highway 14 from Owatonna to Rochester a top priority! It is a dangerous and busy highway.	

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Hwy 14 Corridor	24	Web	July 16, 2013	Tim Collins		Again southern Minnesota gets the short end of the stick. Hwy 14 should be a priority for the state to get completed from Rochester to New Ulm.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	34	Web	July 23, 2013	Robert Beussman		The omission of the complete four lane Highway 14 expansion from Rochester to New Ulm shows that this plan is out of touch with the actual transportation priorities of the citizens.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	42	Web	July 23, 2013	Jim Cox		We need your help in getting the highway 14 4 lane completed between Dodge Center and Owatonna.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	44	Web	July 23, 2013	Sandy MacIntosh		Ow can you possibly keep over-looking the stretch of Highway 218 between Owatonna and Rochester?	
Hwy 14 Corridor	58	Web	July 25, 2013	Kyle Skov		To me and all other residents of Southern Minnesota, the omission of the four lane Highway 14 expansion from Rochester to New Ulm is a huge oversight.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	72	Letter	July 19, 2013	Rep. Clark Johnson		Highway 14 is a prime example of an interregional corridor in need of funding.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	76	Web	July 26, 2013	Andrew Lenz		Highway 14 should be expanded into a 4-lane highway from North Mankato to New Ulm.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	81	Web	July 29, 2013	Ken Saffert		With the safety and commercial truck conflicts on TH 14 from New Ulm to Rochester, it is inconceivable that a 4 lane corridor is not identified in the 20 yr plan.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	88	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Amanda Duerr	US Highway 14 Partnership	We need to scrap this inadequate plan and move forward with one that actually addresses Minnesota's infrastructure needs—including the completion of Highway 14.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	89	Web	July 30, 2013	Robert Beussman		What is it going to take to get Highway 14 completed, New Ulm to Rochester?	
Hwy 14 Corridor	90	Web	July 30, 2013	Brian Tohal		An expansion of Highway 14 between North Mankato and New Ulm should be included in the 20 year plan.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	91	Web	July 30, 2013	Audra Shaneman		(. . .) HWY 14 should also be included in the 20 Year Plan! What would be the harm in putting it on that list? Even if it is just a token gesture to this community that our concerns have been heard by government officials, I would take that.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	94	Web	July 30, 2013	Les Tlougan		I urge you to include the HW14 upgrade to 4-lane from Owatonna to Dodge Center in your 20-year plan.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	95	Web	July 30, 2013	Lucy Gluth		Highway 14 from Nicollet to Mankato is probably the only highway in the state that doesn't allow passing for the extended length of that road. And it's also recorded that the Nicollet to New Ulm piece of Hwy 14 is also dangerous, requiring the "Extra Enforcement" signs.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	96	Web	July 30, 2013	Mila Quiring		I cannot believe that MNDot continues to ignore the need for a 4-lane highway between Nicollet and New Ulm.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	97	Web	July 30, 2013	Eric Dulka		Please reconsider including Highway 14 expansion from Nicollet to New Ulm in your upcoming consideration for highway improvements.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	98	Web	July 30, 2013	Katherine Austinson		MnDOT has NOT included the HWY 14 expansion from New Ulm to Nicollet in the 2014-2033 Highway Investment plan currently being finalized. (. . .) Please make provision for this project in the new plan.	

See page 10.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Hwy 14 Corridor	99	Web	July 30, 2013	Bob Schirlinger		My bother-in-law was killed in a head-on collision on highway 14. His name was Joel Dauffenbach. Pick-up vs. Semi. A divided highway would have saved his life.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	100	Web	July 30, 2013	David Albrecht		The MnDOT 20 year Highway Investment plan is deficiant in exclusion of completion of highway 14 in southern Minnesota between Mankato and Rochester.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	101	Web	July 30, 2013	Mary Ellen Domeier		For both safety and economic concerns, please address the New Ulm east section of Hwy 14, upgrading it to a four-lane.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	102	Web	July 30, 2013	Robert Domeier		The New Ulm east section of Highway 14 is unsafe.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	103	Web	July 30, 2013	Dick Seeboth		Given all the hearings & discussion about the HY 14 project Nicolett to New Ulm, I can't believe it still is not on the DOT 20 Yeqar Plan, How many more cemetary plots do we need to set aside?	
Hwy 14 Corridor	104	Web	July 30, 2013	Duane Lambrecht		New Ulm is the only city of it's size not lccated on a 4 lane highway, and as a former President of the Economic Development Corp., it does not allow us to even enter the bidding process for industries looking to relocate.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	108	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Pat LaCourse		I am writing to let you know my feelings on the highway 14 expansion between New Ulm and Rochester. I understand that budgets are tight but the lives lost on this highway have come at a high cost to all those involved.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	110	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Jeffrey E. McCool		Highway 14 between Dodge Center, Minnesota and Owatonna, Minnesota needs drastic improvement for safety of our citizens.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	111	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Cindy Dohrmann		On January 26th, 2001, myself and my parents were heading East on Highway 14 Between Dodge Center and Kasson. When an eighteen year girl lost control of her car and hit us head- on, then spun around and hit me in the driver side. This part of the highway where the accident occurred, is where the highway went from a 4-lane to a 2-lane.	See page 10.
Hwy 14 Corridor	112	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Eric Newgord	give us the 4 lane from New Ulm to Mankato and then the accidents will reduce, and the business will increase.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	113	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Beth Hodgman		If we can't get funding now to finish this project [Highway 14] we need get safety barriers up. WE need to notify the drivers that the road is narrowing back to 2 lanes that they need to reduce their speed.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	114	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Elaine DeMoss		I am writing in support of the 4-lane completion of Highway 14 between Owatonna and Dodge Center.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	115	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Steve Cremer		I would like to express my concern that MDOT is not including in the 20 year State Highway Investment Plan a portion of the Highway 14 four-lane expansion between Dodge Center and Owatonna.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	116	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Audra Shaneman		(. . .) HWY 14 should also be included in the 20 Year Plan! What would be the harm in putting it on that list? Even if it is just a token gesture to this community that our concerns have been heard by government officials, I would take that.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	117	Web	July 30, 2013	Steve Schneider		I would urge you to reconsider the prioritization of projects so that this one [Highway 14] is at a minimum included in the 20 year plan.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	118	Web	July 30, 2013	Bill Aufderheide		Please reconsider your current priority for the Hwy 14 project from New Ulm to Nicollet.	

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Hwy 14 Corridor	120	Web	July 30, 2013	Daniel Blaisdell		Please put the link between Dodge Center and Owatonna high on your priority list of projects to complete in the coming years.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	122	Web	July 31, 2013	Debbie Zahn		I'm sure you have all heard of the tragic accidents that have happened on Hwy 14 and they hopefully will decrease from Nicollet to Mankato....but what about from Nicollet to New Ulm!!	
Hwy 14 Corridor	124	Web	July 31, 2013	Opal Dewanz		We travel from New Ulm to Rochester many times and the two lane is really a danger. Having a four lane to New Ulm would also help bring business to town.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	126	Web	July 31, 2013	Gary Sonnenberg		Highway 14 is one of the busiest highways in a rural area. [...] ...include this important project that impacts lives as well as economy.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	127	Web	July 31, 2013	Kris Busse		Highway 14 is an economic lifeblood of southern Minnesota. this project must be included in order to assist the region in economic development and job growth.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	128	Web	July 31, 2013	Scott Kubicek		Now that 14 is complete to Mankato we are able to travel that direction easier. We now need to finish 14 to Rochester.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	129	Web	July 31, 2013	Jana Effertz		I would like to voice my support for the continued development and completion of HWY 14!	
Hwy 14 Corridor	130	Web	July 31, 2013	Barry Gillespie		To meet the demands of a growing economy, it is imperative that Highway 14 between Owatonna and Dodge Center receive the highest priority in planning highway improvements for the future in Minnesota, to safely move workers from one city to the next, to facilitate commerce and to support the growing health care industry in Southeast Minnesota.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	131	Web	July 31, 2013	Doug Voss		I have many customers from the Kasson/Rochester area. I worry every time they come to pick things up that they will be killed on that ridiculous stretch of Hwy 14.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	132	Web	July 31, 2013	Monte Mitchell		The completion of those stretches of highway 14 that are not four lane highways today is vital to economic growth in SE Minnesota.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	133	Web	July 31, 2013	Fred Knudsen		We frequently travel to New Ulm and Rochester. Although we are thankful that we can travel to Mankato on a four lane highway, it is time to complete the stretch from Dodge Center to Owatonna and the one from Mankato and New Ulm into a modern four lane expressway.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	134	Web	July 31, 2013	Dennis Heimerman		We cannot tell you how happy we are since the highway was finished from Owatonna to Mankato. We beg for the state to finish the other parts from Owatonna to Dodge Center and Mankato to New Ulm.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	135	Web	July 31, 2013	Tim McManimon		The safety and vibrancy of travel and commerce will improve dramatically with the completion of the remaining extensions of the divided highway [highway 14] that has been proposed for many years.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	136	Web	July 31, 2013	Dave Purscell		Frankly, I am amazed that we are STILL trying to complete Highway 14 over two decades after I moved to the area. Let me rephrase that... WE'RE still trying to complete Highway 14. Apparently it has pretty much just fallen off your radar.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	137	Web	July 31, 2013	Steve Deetz		Include the completion of HWY 14 as a 4 lane road between New Ulm and Rochester in the Highway Investment Plan.	

See page 10.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Hwy 14 Corridor	138	Web	July 31, 2013	John Connor		I would strongly urge the state of Minnesota to put Highway 14 on the improvement list and get the stretch of highway from Rochester to New Ulm completed to a four lane highway.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	139	Web	July 31, 2013	Gregg Draeger		The amount of traffic that feeds into Mankato from the west (as evidenced by your passing restrictions between Nicollet and Mankato) and between Rochester and Owatonna surely justifies the expansion and improvement [of Highway 14] for both economic development and safety reasons.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	140	Web	July 31, 2013	William Lawrence		Please continue your work on the development/completion of HWY 14.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	141	Web	July 31, 2013	Patrick McDermott		As the Chief Operating Officer for J-C Press in Owatonna, Minnesota, I want to express the importance of completing Highway 14 from Owatonna to Dodge Center.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	142	Web	July 31, 2013	Dr. Brian Gferer		Highway 14 as it is right now is extremely dangerous. The amount of traffic is to much for the road to handle in it's current state which makes it extremely dangerous. (...)i feel that the completion of highway 14 will allow the economic environment in southern Minnesota to grow providing more jobs and tax revenue to the state of Minnesota.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	143	Web	July 31, 2013	John Moorhouse		Let's get US HW 14 from Owatonna to Dodge Center completed.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	144	Web	July 31, 2013	Julie Rethermeier		Please continue to make the expansion of Hwy 14 a priority between Owatonna and Dodge County.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	145	Web	July 31, 2013	Tom Deetz		In terms of the HWY 14 project, I would like to see the road get completed as soon as possible for safety, business and other uses.	See page 10.
Hwy 14 Corridor	146	Web	July 31, 2013	Dave Klawkiter		The new section [of Highway 14] from Owatonna to Waseca is a wonderful Godsend; THANK you for that. While I am at it, Please also hear the importance of getting the section between Mankato and New Ulm completed soon.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	147	Web	July 31, 2013	Joel Schafer		Highway funding for the completion of Hwy 14 from New Ulm through Rochester should be a priority for the state.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	148	Web	July 31, 2013	John Havelka		Keep us the good work. We need a four lane Highway 14 between Rochester and Mankato. It is good for business! Do what you can to make this happen soon.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	149	Web	July 31, 2013	Tim Penny		Highway 14 reamins a top area of concern for those working on economic development in our souther Minnesota region.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	150	Web	July 31, 2013	Cory Michaelson		Please keep the continued development and completion of Hwy 14 from Owatonna to Rochester at the top of your priority list.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	151	Web	July 31, 2013	Amy Martinez		The Highway 14 between Owatonna to Dodge Center needs to be addressed sooner rather than later.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	153	Web	July 31, 2013	Jennifer Libby		As President/CEO of the Owatonna Area Chamber of Commerce and Tourism, I can state emphatically that the completion of Hwy 14 is critical to the continued vitality and growth of our business community which means jobs, prosperity, taxes and continued economic health.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	154	Web	July 31, 2013	Drew R. Campbell		Please include completing the needed improvements on Hwy 14 from New Ulm to Rochester.	

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Hwy 14 Corridor	165	Web	July 31, 2013	Daniel Buck		Highway 14 in Southern Minnesota needs your attention! I feel the two lane expansion is needed for public safety more than industrial commerce.	<i>See page 10.</i>
Hwy 14 Corridor	166	E-mail	July 31, 2013	Michael Hodgman		I'm writing you today to urge you to include the four lane expansion of U.S. Highway 14 from Owatonna to Dodge Center and North Mankato to New Ulm in the plan.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	167	Letter	July 30, 2013	Jonathan G. Zierdt	Greater Mankato Growth	[We] would like to express the frustration of our members and the entire region over the lack of inclusion of the full expansion of Highway 14 from Rochester to New Ulm in the plan.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	170	Web	August 1, 2013	Les Schultz		As a city councillor I am well aware of the need for expansion on hwy 14 to Mankato, the request from businesses here now and those who want to expand, let alone the many tragedies of those killed on this roadway, please reconsider your 20 year plan!!	
Hwy 14 Corridor	172	E-mail	July 30, 2013	James Melborne		The people of southern Minnesota have been wanting and waiting for an expanded highway 14 from New Ulm to Mankato for the last 50 years and now you are telling us not even in the next 20?	
Hwy 14 Corridor	176	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Keith Keel		I can't believe that you can't get 13 miles of that double lane finished so we have a 14 from Mankato to Rochester.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	178	Web	August 1, 2013	Matt Kottke		I am writing in support of actions necessary to the funding and ultimate development/completion of the Hwy 14 project.	
Hwy 14 Corridor	179	Web	August 1, 2013	Dennis Meillier		I am writing in support of the Hwy 14 completion between Kasson and Owatonna. It has been a very long journey but we still have a ways to go.	
Hwy 14, 52, and 63	171	Letter	July 26, 2013	Kathleen Harrington		We commend MnDOT's thoughtful and comprehensive planning evidenced in the recently released 20-year Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP). However, we strongly urge you to reexamine the safety and economic needs of southern Minnesota and include upgrades of Highways 14, 52, and 63 as priorities in the plan.	<p>Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 6. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.</p> <p>In addition, Highway 63 is listed as one of four IRCs that currently is, or is projected to be, at risk of not meeting IRC travel time performance targets by 2033. This is described in greater detail in Chapter 3, page 58. Current priorities and funding levels, however, mean that MnDOT does not expect to fund any investment category to its full needs amount through 2033. Therefore, MnDOT does not expect to be able to deliver a program of capital improvements that wholly meets the expectations of both MnDOT and its stakeholders. Highway 63 will continue to be listed in the plan as an unmet need.</p>
Hwy 23	105	Web	July 30, 2013	Peter Ampe		I note there is no plan to complete the Highway 23 four lane from Paynesville to New London and from Paynesville to Richmond. I must object! I cannot believe the omission.	<p>Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 3 and District 8. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.</p>

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
I-35	41	Web	July 23, 2013	Wendi Anderson		It seems the roads that are listed are for smaller arterial roadways. What about the congestion on I-35 south of Burnsville?	<p>Comments noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.</p> <p>MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in this area advance the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.</p>
I-35	43	Web	July 23, 2013	Dan Wirth		I strongly believe that I-35 needs to be expanded to three lanes before the 35W & E split. 2 lanes is really limiting the growth of the whole Twin Cities area.	
I-35	45	Web	July 23, 2013	Jason Hanson		Please include a third-lane expansion for I-35 in the south metro. As the Metro area has grown, the levels of congestion have increased and safety has been impaired.	
I-35	47	Web	July 23, 2013	Minas Hovsepian		I35 needs to be expanded to 3 lanes in each direction from the Split in Burnsville South through at least the last exit in Lakeville.	
I-35	48	Web	July 24, 2013	Lisa Smethers		I-35 is a critical corridor serving Lakeville and the entire Metro area. As the Metro area has grown, the levels of congestion have increased and safety has been impaired.	
I-35	49	Web	July 24, 2013	Saundra Riha		Please add a third lane to I35 in Lakeville at least going south. It gets backed up every day at the Lakeville exits (hwy 70-exit 81, 185th street-exit 84 and hwy 50-exit 85) during rush hour.	
I-35	50	Web	July 24, 2013	Michael Henderson		I am wondering why I-35 between the Burnsville Split of I35W/E and Elko, MN isnt included in a 20 year plane to add a 3rd lane?	
I-35	53	Web	July 24, 2013	Susan O'Hagan		We believe that 35 W should be widen to 3 lanes, north and south, to alleviate congestion and provide a safer road on which to drive. Thank you for this important consideration.	
I-35	54	Web	July 24, 2013	Abe Zanto		I really feel that a third lane on both northbound and southbound I35 from the Burnsville split to at least county 70 in Lakeville are not only needed but would help in the safety of the ever increasing level of traffic on that stretch.	
I-35	55	Web	July 24, 2013	Terry Branham		I ask you consider we tens of thousands transitting I35 every day and our work does not take us to the stops by these luxury mass transit vehicles. Please get focused on our roadways as people and businesses are losing thousands of productive hours caught in parking lot traffic along I35 thru Lakeville.	
I-35	56	Web	July 24, 2013	Minas Hovsepian		[...] I would also like to see a 4th lane added from Highway 13 north until 106th and a 4th lane that starts and ends with each on and off ramp on 35W between 106th and 494 in both directions.	
I-35	60	Web	July 25, 2013	Kent deCook		Please include I-35 south through Lakeville and make it 3 lanes all the way to Elko. You just need to fill in the ditch like you did in stages from Burnsville up to I-494.	
I-35	62	Web	July 25, 2013	Milo and Jennifer Johnson		Please seriously consider major lane additions for I-35 from south of county rd 46 to at least Elko. This particular area is congested and very dangerous to all motorist traveling I-35.	
I-35	63	Web	July 26, 2013	Matthew Beukelman		Please explore the expansion of I35 south of the 35W/35E merge to add additional lanes with the 20 year investment strategy.	
I-35	64	Web	July 26, 2013	Paul Kath		I would like to see 35w in Lakeville expanded to 3 lanes especially going south from County 50 past County 70.	

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
I-35	65	Web	July 26, 2013	Doug Loeffler		Please upgrade 35W from hwy 46 to cty 70 to six lanes. Lakeville is a city of 60,000 people and growing and 35W in Lakeville is hurting the economy of Lakeville.	
I-35	70	Web	July 26, 2013	Trevor Radner		I'm reaching out as a concerned citizen to support the expansion of I35 through the Lakeville corridor.	
I-35	73	Web	July 26, 2013	Jason Just		Many people travel from Southern Minnesota and/or South metro areas and we need this wider freeway to make our State and metro area THE destination for all of the economy. Widen 35 through Lakeville!	
I-35	74	Web	July 26, 2013	Jessica Just		Interstate 35 from Highway 50 south to Highway 70 through Lakeville needs 3-lanes.	
I-35	75	Web	July 26, 2013	Jana Spanovic		Highway 35 in Lakeville needs 3 lanes. From Hwy 50 South to Hwy 70. It needs to be a TOP priority.	
I-35	78	Email	July 27, 2013	Janice and Richard Severson		My husband and I live on 178th Street West in Lakeville and urge that MnDOT consider putting an additional northbound and southbound lane on the Lakeville portion of I-35 within their twenty year plan.	
I-35	79	Web	July 28, 2013	Chris Hjort		I-35 is a critical corridor and the levels of congestion have increased and safety has been impaired. Please add the expansion of I-35 to 3 lanes to your 20-year State Highway Investment Plan for the Minneapolis metro area.	
I-35	80	Web	July 28, 2013	Al Just		The stretch of I35 all the way from Elko-New Market going North should be a three lane highway. This is easily seen with the miles of backup one witnesses each morning rush hour.	
I-35	83	Letter	July 29, 2013	Matt Little	Lakeville City Council	Lakeville strongly encourages the Minnesota Department of Transportation to include additional travel lanes, either as general purpose lanes or HOV/MnPass lanes, along the Interstate 35 corridor through Lakeville in the 20-Year Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan.	See page 16.
I-35	92	Web	July 30, 2013	Jeffrey Pederson		Please consider expanding the southern corridor of I-35 to 3 lanes beginning near County Rd 42 and ending around the Elko New Market.	
I-35	93	Letter	July 25, 2013	Suzanne Sandahl	I-35W Solutions Alliance	We understand that the plan is fiscally constrained. However, it does not meet the needs of the communities represented by the Solutions Alliance, much less the entire state.	
I-35	125	Web	July 31, 2013	Todd Severson		I would like to see the 35W expansion go further to the south into Lakeville, MN.	
I-35	155	Web	July 31, 2013	Greg Falvey		Please consider the number of accidents on I35 in Lakeville. Expanding to three lanes now would be much cheaper and safer.	
I-35	156	Web	July 31, 2013	Sue Falvey		Please consider the number of accidents on I35 in Lakeville. Expanding to three lanes now would be much cheaper and safer.	
I-35	157	Web	July 31, 2013	Peter Falvey		Please consider the number of accidents on I35 in Lakeville. Expanding to three lanes now would be much cheaper and safer.	
I-35	158	Web	July 31, 2013	Gregory Falvey		Please consider the number of accidents on I35 in Lakeville. Expanding to three lanes now would be much cheaper and safer.	
I-35	161	E-mail	July 31, 2013	Gary and Trish Sarff		I see other areas of I-35 north of us where a third lane and sound walls have been added recently. The area where we are at [Lakeville] should get the same consideration and action.	

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
I-35	164	E-mail	July 27, 2013	Todd and Heidi Severson		As a Lakeville resident I have personally witnessed the increased traffic congestion and noise on I-35 through Lakeville as I live close to the highway.	<i>See page 16.</i>
35W/494 Interchange, 494/169	22	Web	July 13, 2013	John Morgan		I suggest that a new interchange at 35W/494 is dire. (...) Much of our gridlock is attributed to cars having to merge the second they hit the bottom of the ramp. 494 at France is an example. The traffic merging onto 494, specifically from southbound France onto EB 494 brings the freeway to a halt. Another example is 169 SB in Eden Prairie. Now that the stoplights at 494/169 are gone it has pushed the delays south, as the traffic merging onto the freeway from Anderson Lake and Pioneer Trail bring the freeway to a halt.	<p>Comment noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.</p> <p>MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in this area advance the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.</p>
Hwy 14, 52, and 63	171	Letter	July 26, 2013	Kathleen Harrington		We commend MnDOT's thoughtful and comprehensive planning evidenced in the recently released 20-year Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP). However, we strongly urge you to reexamine the safety and economic needs of southern Minnesota and include upgrades of Highways 14, 52, and 63 as priorities in the plan.	<p>Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 6. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.</p> <p>In addition, Highway 63 is listed as one of four IRCs that currently is, or is projected to be, at risk of not meeting IRC travel time performance targets by 2033. This is described in greater detail in Chapter 3, page 58. Current priorities and funding levels, however, mean that MnDOT does not expect to fund any investment category to its full needs amount through 2033. Therefore, MnDOT does not expect to be able to deliver a program of capital improvements that wholly meets the expectations of both MnDOT and its stakeholders. Highway 63 will continue to be listed in the plan as an unmet need.</p>

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
I-94 West Corridor	1	Letter	June 11, 2013	Steve Bot and Rhonda Baack	I-94 West Corridor Coalition	[W]e would like to reiterate the importance of the I-94 expansion project from Hwy. 101 in Rogers to Trunk Highway 241 in St. Michael and the positive impact such an improvement would have on our residents and especially our businesses..	<p>Comments on the Interstate 94 West Corridor have been forwarded to both District 3 and Metro District. MnDOT acknowledges the importance of Interstate 94 to Minnesota's economic vitality and quality of life. It is a key Interregional Corridor (IRC) in the movement of people and goods throughout the state, for business as well as for recreation. Current conditions along this and other IRCs are well documented.</p> <p>MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of this process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. (More on these categories can be found in Chapter 1, page 13, more information on the development of investment priorities can be found in Chapter 4, page 71)</p> <p>IRC performance is measured by tracking the percent of miles in Greater Minnesota that are within two miles per hour of average corridor speed targets. Today, the Interstate 94 IRC from Highway 23 in St. Cloud to MN 241 in St. Michael is meeting its average corridor speed target, though certain segments do experience some congestion. However, it is one of four IRCs that are projected to not meet its average corridor speed target by 2033. This is described in greater detail in Chapter 3, page 58. There are additional congestion challenges along I-94 as you enter the Twin Cities metropolitan area.</p> <p>MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, which includes the southern portion of the Interstate 94 IRC. Investments in state highways in this area advance and must be included in the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities metropolitan area focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.</p> <p>Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available. The Interstate 94 IRC will continue to be listed in the plan as an unfunded performance-based need (see Chapter 6, page 137 and Appendix I-2). MnDOT is investigating possible improvements to Interstate 94 between the Twin Cities and St. Cloud should funding become available. MnDOT is also undertaking conceptual design work on the I-494/I-94 corridors from the Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport to Albertville. This will help identify needs, feasibility, timing, cost estimates, and possible phasing to implement managed lanes on these corridors.</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix I-2: Congestion and Chokepoint Challenges: added a line to clarify that the Interstate 94 IRC is illustrative of the type of capital improvements that could be supported if the \$12 billion funding gap were closed.
I-94 West Corridor	2	Letter	June 20, 2013	(Forwarded by Steve Bot)	City of Albany	The City of Albany does hereby request the Minnesota Department of Transportation to include the Interstate 94 West Corridor from Rogers to St. Cloud as an unmet performance based need for major capacity expansion in its year 2033 Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP).	
I-94 West Corridor	3	Letter	June 26, 2013	Representative David FitzSimmons	Minnesota House of Representatives	I-94 West is a main route of commerce and travel in Minnesota and the lack of funding in MnSHIP's 20 year plan is devastating for commuters and businesses who utilize I-94 every day.	
I-94 West Corridor	6	Letter	July 1, 2013	(Forwarded by Steve Bot)	City of St. Michael	The City of St. Michael does hereby request the Minnesota Department of Transportation to specifically include the Interstate 94 West Corridor from Rogers to St. Cloud as an unmet performance based need for major capacity expansion in its year 2033 State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP).	
I-94 West Corridor	19	Letter	July 11, 2013	(Forwarded by Lori Johnson)	City of Otsego	The City of Otsego does hereby request the Minnesota Department of Transportation to specifically include the Interstate 94 West Corridor from Rogers to St. Cloud as an unmet performance based need for major capacity expansion in its year 2033 Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP).	
I-94 West Corridor	21	Letter	July 12, 2013	FW from Scott Mareck	City of Sartell	The City of Sartell does hereby request the Minnesota Department of Transportation to include the Interstate 94 West Corridor from Rogers to St. Cloud as an unmet performance based need for major capacity expansion in its year 2033 Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP).	
I-94 West Corridor	22	Web	July 13, 2013	John Morgan		The other most pressing thing I see is the need for a 3rd lane from Rogers to St. Cloud in 94.	
I-94 West Corridor	25	Web	July 22, 2013	Joyce Schlangen		3 lanes each way from MPLS to St. Cloud is an absolute necessity. Who is coming up with your priorities that you can not figure this out? Anyone who commutes or even just drives to the "cities" occasionally can figure this out!	
I-94 West Corridor	26	Web	July 22, 2013	Doug Jungels		This corridor [I-94] is vital to the growth of business in outstate MN as well as the metro area. Widening to 3 lanes each direction is crucial to that growth and must be addressed instead of ignored.	
I-94 West Corridor	27	E-mail	July 22, 2013	Curt Tillotson		I cannot believe there is NO interstate through St. Cloud. Can you name another city of that size that doesn't have an interstate through it? This needs to be a priority over the next 20 years.	
I-94 West Corridor	28	E-mail	July 22, 2013	Keith Kennedy		I-94 is in desperate need of an additional driving lane in both directions.	
I-94 West Corridor	30	Web	July 22, 2013	Patrick Benson		The expansion of I94 between Rodgers and St Cloud is critical. the comuter volume alone should justify it, add in the freight and travelers you are selling it short.	
I-94 West Corridor	31	E-mail	July 22, 2013	Deborah Ampe		PLEASE consider a plan to make I-94 a 6 lane corridor, include this in the MnDOT budget - start now at setting up a budget for this project.	

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
I-94 West Corridor	32	Web	July 22, 2013	Bob Nathe		I now call Rogers home, but it is a concern that expanding I-94 to St. Cloud is not a priority. (...) The I-94 corridor is crucial to sustaining Minnesota as an economic driver.	
I-94 West Corridor	35	Web	July 23, 2013	Matt Voigt		I94 lane expansion from rogers to St. Cloud should be a high priority or at least to Monticello.	
I-94 West Corridor	36	E-mail	July 23, 2013	Nancy Kalthoff		We need more lanes of traffic from St Cloud to Rogers on I 94.	
I-94 West Corridor	37	E-mail	July 23, 2013	Mark Geller		I have been following the news that MnDOT is considering delaying the proposed expansion of I-94 between St. Cloud and Rogers for up to 20 years due to funding shortages. I am curious. Approximately how many vehicles travel this corridor on a daily basis?	
I-94 West Corridor	51	Web	July 24, 2013	Joseph Walz		I travel [I-94 to St. Joseph, MN] once or twice a week. I need to schedule my time to avoid the traffic mess. Never on Sunday evenings, Friday evenings, or during any rush hours.	
I-94 West Corridor	61	Web	July 25, 2013	John Buttweiler		I can hardly believe that I94 is not on a priority list to be widened.	
I-94 West Corridor	66	E-mail	July 25, 2013	Patricia Weber		I do not want to think about what the traffic will be in 20 years if the 94 corridor between St. Cloud and the metro area is not improved before that time.	
I-94 West Corridor	67	E-mail	July 25, 2013	John E. Buttweiler		I can hardly believe that I-94 is not on a priority list to be widened.	
I-94 West Corridor	68	E-mail	July 25, 2013	Joanne Loch		I too am a commuter from St Cloud to Eden Prairie and use the I94/494 corridors daily. It would be a great benefit to have these roads widened.	
I-94 West Corridor	71	Letter	July 24, 2013	Lawrence E. and Sandra J. Moorhouse		[W]e want you to know the importance of restoring this I-94 expansion to the final draft of the 20 year plan.	See page 19.
I-94 West Corridor	77	Web	July 27, 2013	Alex Gillach		Widen I-94 to six lanes from where it goes down to four near Rogers all the way to Albertville.	
I-94 West Corridor	82	Letter	July 26, 2013	Virgil Hawkins	Wright County	Wright County does hereby request the Minnesota Department of Transportation to specifically include the Interstate 94 West Corridor from Rogers to St. Cloud as an unmet performance based need for major capacity expansion in its year 2033 Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan.	
I-94 West Corridor	84	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Doug Weiszhaar	Central Minnesota Transportation Alliance	Please reconsider the SHIP plan and find a way to rectify the funding gap for the Interregional Corridor System, especially I-94.	
I-94 West Corridor	85	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Jon Habben	GNP Company	The I-94 corridor is critical to our business, and we strongly support enhancements that would improve three main areas of our business: 1) safety for our team members; 2) decreased traffic delays, which have a direct cost impact on our business; and 3) provide us with the ability to meet customer needs.	
I-94 West Corridor	86	Letter and Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Angie Stenson	St. Cloud APO	The St. Cloud Area Planning Organization does hereby request the Minnesota Department of Transportation to include the Interstate 94 West Corridor from Rogers to St. Cloud as an unmet performance based need for major capacity expansion in its year 2033 Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP).	

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
I-94 West Corridor	87	Letter and Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Patti Gartland	Greater St. Cloud Development Corporation	Please reconsider the SHIP plan and find a way to rectify the funding gap for the interregional Corridor System, especially I-94.	
I-94 West Corridor	152	Web	July 31, 2013	Robert Olson		[I]f 200 million was spent on Interregional Corridor Mobility, MN/ Dot could tackle projects such as the expansion of I-94 from Rogers to Albertville.	
I-94 West Corridor	160	Letter	July 31, 2013	Jodi L. Teich, P.E.	Stearns County	The County of Stearns does hereby request the Minnesota Department of Transportation to include the Interstate 94 West Corridor from Rogers to St. Cloud as an unmet performance based need for major capacity expansion in its year 2033 Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP).	
I-94 West Corridor	169	E-mail	July 31, 2013	Mark Geller		It most likely is true, as reported in the Star Tribune this past weekend, that the I-94 corridor expansion is being pushed back due to lack of funding. I can't imagine the cost in today's dollars. But that does not eliminate the need for it.	
I-94 West Corridor	173	Letter	July 29, 2013	Esther Klein		I am concerned about the urgency of widening I 94 between St. Cloud & Mpls. Traffic is so heavy at times now already that traffic actually comes to a dead stop.	
I-94 West Corridor	177	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Steve Bot	I-94 West Coalition	As the Commissioner spoke to, there's unmet needs and at a minimum we would see I-94 needing to be one of those unmet needs. If MnSHIP's the preservation plan and corridors of commerce is maybe the mobility plan then maybe we're getting somewhere for Minnesota. But as it sits today, this plan and saying we will do nothing on corridors like 14 is mentioned or like 94, it just doesn't work for citizens of Minnesota or the businesses or the economic vitality and things that are mentioned as being so important.	See page 19.
I-94 West Corridor	180	Letter	July 26, 2013	Dr. Bea Winkler	Pine Cone Pet Hospital	MnDOT has numerous existing and recent plans, including the I-94 Inter-Regional Corridor Plan (2002), the Central Minnesota Regional Freight Study (2011), and the 2028 Statewide Highway Investment Plan (2009), all of which identify performance-based expansion needs for the I-94 West Corridor.	
I-94 West Corridor	181	Letter	July 26, 2013	Robert White	Greater St. Cloud Development Corporation	MnDOT has numerous existing and recent plans, including the I-94 Inter-Regional Corridor Plan (2002), the Central Minnesota Regional Freight Study (2011), and the 2028 Statewide Highway Investment Plan (2009), all of which identify performance-based expansion needs for the I-94 West Corridor.	
I-94 and Hwy 23	46	Web	July 24, 2013	Jenny Burger		I am glad to hear that there is talk of expanding the lanes on 94 to the St. Cloud area. Along with this or even BEFORE this happens the I94 and Hwy 23 intersection should be made into a cloverleaf.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 3.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
I-94/494/694	183	Letter	July 26, 2013	Klayton Eckles	City of Woodbury	We appreciate the efforts of MnDOT to develop a 20-year plan for improvement of the state's highway infrastructure, and we strongly encourage the state to include both physical improvements and study of the I-94/494/694 interchange in the 20-year plan.	Comments noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.
I-94/494/694	184	Letter	June 20, 2013	Giuliani Stephens	City of Woodbury	Given the importance of I-94 to the state and regional transportation system, we feel it very disappointing the I-94 Corridor has not been given a higher priority.	MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in this area advance the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.
Hwy 99/111 Overpass	123	Web	July 31, 2013	Steven Johnson		I believe an overpass similar to the one in construction being done right now to the West of North Mankato at #41 is needed South of Nicollet. Not because Nicollet needs it, but with the heavy semi traffic on these roads (99 & 111) I feel that it is a safety issue.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 7.
Hwy 169 Corridor - North	20	Web	July 12, 2013	Alexis Leitgeb		As the Superintendent for ISD #696, I am very concerned about HWY 169 from Tower, Mn. to Ely, Mn.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 1.
Hwy 169 Corridor - North	107	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Bill Erzar		Safe clear areas need to be established in the ROW's from the fog line out 42 feet as we talked about and discussed/suggested by Mr. Jon Chiglo and Mr. Mike Barnes of the St. Paul office, on their tour of Highway 169 this past March with Task Force members and District One Staff. (This comment can also be found in Traveler Safety on page X.)	Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 1.
Hwy 169 Corridor - North	185	Letter	July 30, 2013	Rudy Semeja	Highway 169 North Task Force	Safety was and has been our main thrust, but we have opponents to a much needed project, neglected for years and years. We want the highway [169] to be done with wide 8' shoulders, passing lanes, etc.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 1. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Hwy 169 Corridor	76	Web	July 26, 2013	Andrew Lenz		169 should be expanded and widened, not just resurfaced, from 94 south to 494 with at least one more lane in each direction to make it a viable north-south alternative to the less congested 100 and 494, and made into a freeway with bypasses around smaller towns down to Mankato.	Comments noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available. MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in this area advance the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.
Hwy 169 Corridor	77	Web	July 27, 2013	Alex Gillach		Widen 169 and make it a true 6-lane-plus freeway from Champlin all the way to Belle Plaine. Widen it and get rid of all the stoplights!	
Hwy 169 Corridor	176	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Keith Keel		I'm a concerned citizen, I live in St. Peter, and I read where they are going to just resurface the southbound lane from St. Peter to Le Sueur and not do anything but a flood thing on the northbound lane.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 7. MnDOT acknowledges the potential benefits of elevating and resurfacing the northbound lane of Highway 169 from St. Peter to Le Sueur. However, funding is limited and as such, to protect the entire corridor from flooding, the intent of this project is to ensure that at least one lane of traffic in each direction can be accommodated during a flood event. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.
Hwy 212	76	Web	July 26, 2013	Andrew Lenz		Highway 212 should have the non-4-lane gaps widened to make it a continuous freeway from Chaska to Glencoe.	Comments noted and will be forwarded to Metro District and District 8. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available. MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in this area advance the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.
Hwy 212	109	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Robert J. Lindall	Southwest Corridor Transportation Coalition	[W]e believe that US Highway 212 needs to be completed to a four-lane highway all the way to Norwood Young America and ultimately farther west.	
Hwy 371	174	Letter	July 12, 2013	Rich Siegert and James Sabas	Paul Bunyan Expressway Coalition	The Paul Bunyan Expressway Coalition considers Highway #371 from Little Falls to Bemidji a high priority. Much of this road has been completed with 4 lane highway from Little Falls to Nisswa. Completing the balance of the roadway is our mission and goal.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to Districts 2 and 3. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
I-94 – 394 to St. Paul	76	Web	July 26, 2013	Andrew Lenz		Interstate 394 eastbound into downtown/onto 94 to St. Paul from the western suburbs is congested for several hours a day during the morning and evening rush hours as well as other times.	Comments noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.
I-94 – 394 to St. Paul	77	Web	July 27, 2013	Alex Gillach		Fix 394 to and from 94 - there needs to be at least three or four lanes in each direction from the western suburbs to St Paul. It can take two hours from Minnetonka to St Paul in the mornings AND evenings!	MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in this area advance the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.
Dakota County Corridors	163	Letter	July 31, 2013	Kathleen A. Gaylord	Dakota County Board of Commissioners	We are very disappointed at the lack of projects identified in Dakota County during the MnSHIP planning horizon. The inability to address safety, operational, and mobility issues on State highways in the County will have a direct effect on the safety, economic growth, and quality of life of those that will live and work in Dakota County over the next 20 years. Specific corridors that clearly will need attention within the MnSHIP timeframe include large sections of TH 77, TH 13, US 52, TH 3, TH 55, and I-494. Several of these corridors have safety needs that warrant particular attention.	Comments noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT is committed to delivering a multimodal state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation needs. MnDOT uses an extensive performance-based planning process to establish investment priorities for available resources, integrating federal and state laws, policy goals and objectives, technical information on system conditions, performance management, revenue projections and input from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. As part of the plan development process, maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Investment and Funding							
Investment and Funding	9	Web	July 4, 2013	Joanne Sherek		What plans do you have for the totally unexpected that will drain resources?	MnSHIP recognizes that more or less revenue may become available over the life of the plan. The possibility of new revenues for state highway improvements could be considered as a means of attaining better outcomes and managing key risks identified in MnSHIP. If future funding is less than expected, however, MnDOT would continue to apply risk-based planning to address performance and agency objectives in all investment areas. More information can be found in Chapter 6, page 142. MnSHIP also has a Small Program investment category. These investments are not specifically prioritized within the plan but make up a part of the overall investment each year. Small Program dollars typically respond to short-term, unforeseen issues or are used to fund one-time specialized programs. More information on Small Programs can be found in Chapter 1, page 21.
Investment and Funding	25	Web	July 22, 2013	Joyce Schlangen		Use our transportation dollars for roads vs rail! We pay for roads and that is what we want!!	MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. MnSHIP identifies investments on the state highway system that accommodate multiple modes of transportation, such as Bicycle Infrastructure and Accessible Pedestrian Infrastructure. However, MnSHIP investments do not directly deal with rail. Transit investments in Minnesota can be explored in greater detail in the MnDOT Greater Minnesota Transit Plan and in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan. Rail investments can be explored in greater detail in the MnDOT Minnesota Comprehensive Statewide Freight and Passenger Rail Plan.
Investment and Funding	27	E-mail	July 22, 2013	Curt Tillotson		You simply don't have enough funding to please everyone.	MnSHIP identifies an estimated \$30 billion in investment needs over the next 20 years, with only \$18 billion in expected revenue over the same period, resulting in a \$12 billion funding gap. Given this disparity (described in more detail in Chapter 2, page 28), MnDOT does not expect to fund any investment category to its full needs amount through 2033.
Investment and Funding	39	Letter	July 23, 2013	Susan Haigh	Metropolitan Council	The Metropolitan Council is committed to a partnership with the Minnesota Department of Transportation that advocates for and seeks legislative agreement to ensure our transit and transportation network receives needed funding to keep our economy competitive on a national and global scale. I look forward to our continued work on this important issue.	MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council to establish investment priorities in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in the Twin Cities are consistent with the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements. However, investments in the state highway system in the Twin Cities, as well as Greater Minnesota, are not expected to address the full needs amount for any MnSHIP investment category. MnDOT recognizes the need to increase revenue to fund unmet needs as identified in MnSHIP. As described in Chapter 6 of MnSHIP, the Transportation Finance Advisory Committee (TFAC) analyzed potential revenue sources and non-traditional approaches to transportation funding and financing. Additional options for new revenue streams continue to be explored by MnDOT.
Investment and Funding	72	Letter	July 19, 2013	Representative Clark Johnson	Rep.clark.johnson@house.mn	The plan demonstrates the formidable challenge to provide new long-term funding for our roads. The fiscal restraints are severe with only \$18 million of a \$30 million needed. I will remain an advocate in the House of Representatives for increased funding for roads. I want to thank the Department of Transportation for following a thorough commenting process related to the 20 year State Highway Investment Plan. I look forward to continuing to work with you to assure that Minnesotans have access to efficient and safe transportation.	MnDOT is committed to working with its transportation partners to achieve statewide transportation objectives. MnSHIP identifies an estimated \$12 billion funding gap, but recognizes that more or less revenue may become available over the life of the plan. The possibility of new revenues for state highway improvements, as described in Chapter 6, page 142, could be considered as a means of attaining better outcomes and managing key risks identified in MnSHIP. MnDOT recognizes the need to increase revenue to fund unmet needs as identified in MnSHIP. As described in Chapter 6, the Transportation Finance Advisory Committee (TFAC) analyzed potential revenue sources and non-traditional approaches to transportation funding and financing. Additional options for new revenue streams continue to be explored by MnDOT.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Investment and Funding	93	Letter	July 25, 2013	Suzanne Sandahl	I-35W Solutions Alliance	<p>Reliance on borrowing, while providing funds to advance projects, is an unsustainable long-term strategy and burdens the state with additional interest costs. Immediate revenues are needed.</p> <p>The report identifies a critical reason why increased funding is necessary. The bond rating of the state and local units of government will be negatively affected if our major infrastructure assets are allowed to deteriorate below the standard set by GASB 34. Increasing the amount of borrowing for roads and bridges can also damage our bond credit ratings. We do not support Minnesota spending an unnecessary amount of revenue on debt service when that scenario can be avoided.</p> <p>We urge MnDOT to take an aggressive stand and devise a revenue funding plan to raise the missing \$12 billion.</p>	<p>MnDOT recognizes that current funding levels are not expected to address the state's full \$30 billion state highway investment need over the next 20 years. As described in Chapter 1, page 27, MnDOT uses transportation bonds to accelerate the delivery of projects and to avoid construction cost increases due to inflation. While bonding is an important financing tool, MnDOT's current policy is to allow no more than 20 percent of annual state revenues to go toward debt repayment.</p> <p>MnDOT recognizes the need to increase revenue to fund unmet needs as identified in MnSHIP. As described in Chapter 6 of MnSHIP, the Transportation Finance Advisory Committee (TFAC) analyzed potential revenue sources and non-traditional approaches to transportation funding and financing. Additional options for new revenue streams continue to be explored by MnDOT. For additional information, refer to Chapter 6, page 142.</p>
Investment and Funding	109	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Robert J. Lindall	Southwest Corridor Transportation Coalition	<p>We don't understand why the Corridors of Commerce program is not mentioned anywhere in the MnSHIP plan [...]</p>	<p>Corridors of Commerce is a new Minnesota Program, established by the Legislature in 2013, that targets transportation routes identified as vital links for regional and statewide economic growth. The Legislature authorized \$300 million in trunk highway bonds focused on statewide expansion and completion projects determined from objective criteria and return on investment analysis, among other factors. The \$300 million is a down payment on closing the \$12 billion funding gap. In the absence of any new, non-bond revenue, the bonds would have to be repaid, with interest, from the \$18 billion in revenue available for MnSHIP. MnDOT anticipates communicating additional information over the coming months and completing initial project selection by early 2014. More on the topic of bond financing can be found in Chapter 2, page 26.</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Summary page ES-20, Chapter 6 page 143: added a description of Corridors of Commerce. Chapter 2, page 26: added a line to clarify Corridors of Commerce authorized \$300 million in bonds, which must be repaid with interest over time. Chapter 6, page 137: added a line to clarify that the IRC unmet needs are likely to be eligible for the program.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Investment and Funding	121	Letter	July 31, 2013	Margaret Donahoe	Transportation Alliance	<p>Providing the public and decision makers with a clear and compelling vision for the future of the highway system is critical for building the support we need to secure additional revenue. This plan does not provide a vision for a future highway system that supports economic growth while addressing key safety problems and community priorities. The plan must describe how projected revenue will be invested, but the plan can also provide a much more robust picture of what could be done with additional resources. The list of projects developed by the Transportation Finance Advisory Committee (TFAC) that could be completed with additional revenue is a rather barebones and vague list of smaller, low-cost projects that does not paint a picture of the future we want to have in Minnesota. [...]</p> <p>In researching needs analysis conducted by other states, we have found that Wisconsin has identified a \$900 million per year shortfall for state highways over the next 20 years, Colorado has estimated that the cost to maintain its infrastructure is \$53 billion higher than anticipated revenues through 2035, Arizona has identified a funding gap of \$62.7 billion over 20 years, Michigan needs an additional \$1.4 billion per year for its roads and bridges and Ohio's highway budget faces a \$1.6 billion annual shortfall. Our members believe that the identified unmet need of \$600 million per year for 20 years in Minnesota understates the real needs on the trunk highway system, leaving out important needed projects.</p>	<p>As outlined in the plan, MnDOT has a large, aging system that it must maintain and continuously rehabilitated. This requires a significant level of investment. The plan documents the fact that revenue growth has slowed and the purchasing power of this revenue is decreasing. The net effect is that inflation of construction-related costs will erode the buying power of revenues by nearly 60 percent by 2033, making it very difficult to maintain and rehabilitate the existing system. This fact, along with other factors described in the plan, has shaped the current investment priorities which include very few large highway expansions. Even with greater investment in asset management in Years 11-20, the highway system conditions are expected to decline from existing levels.</p> <p>MnDOT acknowledges that numerous other factors should be considered and carefully balanced to support the state's economic vitality and quality of life. MnSHIP defines the 20-year investment need of the state trunk highway system as \$30 billion, based on policy-driven performance measures and other key system goals. MnDOT recognizes that there are likely many needs beyond what have been identified in MnSHIP; however, these needs are significantly higher than available transportation revenues.</p>
Investment and Funding	176	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Keith Keel		<p>This third thing that I'm asking, and I like a lot of things that Governor Dayton has done, but why did he veto a 5 cent a gallon tax that would really help our roads in this state when we got a dollar fluctuation in gas prices from 3 to 4 dollars, we can't stand a 5 cent a gallon for the user fee? They're talking about 10 dollars for registration of cars now. Cars that drive 4 to 6 to 8 thousand miles a year, we should be getting the people that are driving the 20 or 30 thousand as a user fee to pay for these roads that they are driving on. I guess that's all I would have.</p>	<p>MnDOT recognizes the need to increase revenue to fund unmet needs as identified in MnSHIP. As described in Chapter 6 of MnSHIP, the Transportation Finance Advisory Committee (TFAC) analyzed potential revenue sources and non-traditional approaches to transportation funding and financing. Additional options for new revenue streams continue to be explored by MnDOT. For additional information, refer to Chapter 6, page 142.</p>
Prioritization and Tradeoffs							
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	12	Web	July 8, 2013	Justin Femrite		<p>The following statement, as included in the report, speaks well to the continued comments we have provided on the plan: "The investment mix is not well-aligned with the public's preferences". We continue to advocate for additional money being invested to improve mobility on the existing Trunk Highway system.</p>	<p>MnSHIP represents a diverse investment approach that seeks to enhance the state's economic vitality and quality of life. This is a challenge given the large and growing statewide need for investment in the state highway system in Asset Management, Traveler Safety, Critical Connections, and Regional and Community Improvement Priorities. Current priorities and funding levels, meanwhile, mean that MnDOT does not expect to fund any investment category to its full needs amount through 2033.</p> <p>MnDOT established different investment priorities for the first 10 years than the second 10 years. The investment direction in the first 10 years reflects stakeholder input well and manages key risks. To respond to and manage key risks, the second ten years of MnSHIP shift toward a primary focus on preservation of existing assets. Even then, the condition of existing assets continues to decline.</p>
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	26	Web	July 22, 2013	Doug Jungels		<p>More dollars absolutely need to be spent in outstate MN instead of the Twin Cities Metro.</p>	<p>MnSHIP represents a diverse investment approach that seeks to enhance the state's economic vitality and quality of life. Investment priorities are set with MnDOT's performance-based planning process, as well as an involvement process that included the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. MnSHIP identifies investments throughout the state in both Greater Minnesota and the Twin Cities metropolitan area.</p>

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	27	E-mail	July 22, 2013	Curt Tillotson		I firmly agree that the Twin Cities needs to be the #1 priority.	MnSHIP represents a diverse investment approach that seeks to enhance the state's economic vitality and quality of life. Investment priorities are set with MnDOT's performance-based planning process, as well as an involvement process that included the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners. MnSHIP identifies investments throughout the state in both Greater Minnesota and the Twin Cities metropolitan area.
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	40	Web	July 23, 2013	Kirt Garrison		Priority should be given to maintaining the roads and bridges that we currently have. It's lunacy to spend anything on bike paths or other projects that are merely nice to have when we have roads that are falling apart.	MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. MnSHIP identifies investments on state highways that accommodate multiple modes of transportation. In planning for Bicycle Infrastructure, MnDOT typically makes investments in shoulders and low cost pavement markings for bike lanes as part of larger highway pavement and bridge improvement projects, and seeks to ensure that bike facilities on state highways connect to those that are built and maintained by counties, cities, and other regional and local jurisdictions. In some instances, MnDOT invests in Accessible Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure to meet legal requirements.
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	109	Letter	July 30, 2013	Robert J. Lindall	Southwest Corridor Transportation Coalition	The list developed by the Transportation Finance Advisory Committee (TFAC) of projects that could be funded with additional dollars does not include any improvement to US Highway 212 and only lists MN5 in a list of 17 routes in the metro area that are identified as chokepoint challenges. It is not clear what work is envisioned on TH5 or where exactly that work would take place along the corridor.	Comment noted. The Transportation Finance Advisory Committee (TFAC) developed an illustrative list of the types of projects that could be supported if the \$12 billion funding gap were closed, demonstrating that there are unfunded needs in all investment categories throughout the state. More information on the TFAC list of projects can be found in Chapter 5, page 97.
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	121	Letter	July 31, 2013	Margaret Donahoe	Minnesota Transportation Alliance	<p>While we understand the need to focus the majority of resources on maintenance and preservation of the existing system, some recognition of the need to fund mobility and community priorities in the future should be included in the plan. Even if the legislature does provide some additional highway funding, it is not likely to be enough to meet the needs and so we believe the distribution of currently projected revenues in the second 10-year portion of the plan should be better balanced among the various needs. [...]</p> <p>With the new MnSHIP plan, MnDOT prioritizes investments in maintenance and preservation by focusing on pavement performance measures and standards set by MnDOT with little acknowledgement of the need to meet performance measures in other areas like congestion reduction, mobility enhancement and freight traffic movement. [...]</p> <p>Despite public input requesting greater investment in mobility needs, the 20-year highway investment plan devotes 35.6% of total resources to pavement condition. No other category comes close to this level of investment. The next highest investment level is 16.9% for improving bridge conditions and every other category has a lower investment level with only 4.4% of resource directed to traveler safety and only 2.7% of resources devoted to interregional corridor mobility. [...]</p>	<p>MnSHIP represents a diverse investment approach that seeks to enhance the state's economic vitality and quality of life. This is a challenge given the large and growing statewide need for investment in the state highway system in categories that include Asset Management, Traveler Safety, Critical Connections, and Regional and Community Improvement Priorities. Current priorities and funding levels, meanwhile, mean that MnDOT does not expect to fund any investment category to its full needs amount through 2033.</p> <p>MnDOT currently tracks mobility on the IRC system as well as in the Twin Cities. As described in Chapter 2 (page 44), MnDOT tracks congestion on Twin Cities urban freeways by evaluating the percentage of miles that vehicles are traveling below 45 mph during peak periods. MnDOT tracks the percent of IRC miles performing within 2 mph of average corridor travel speeds.</p> <p>MAP-21 will require MnDOT to adopt a measure for metropolitan area reliability or congestion on NHS roads. MnDOT will be responsible for leading the development of a target to address this measure after the FHWA establishes the measure in spring 2014. MnDOT will coordinate with the Metropolitan Council and other key stakeholders when it begins the process of developing the target.</p> <p>Currently, MnDOT promotes Twin Cities mobility through a variety of approaches that include operational enhancements, low-cost solutions, multi-modal investments and strategic capacity investments. It is an innovative approach that allocates limited available resources for the most system-wide benefit.</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2 page 31: added language consistent with the Executive Summary to clarify how MnDOT will respond to MAP-21 rulemaking. MnDOT acknowledges that the plan made assumptions about pending performance criteria based on available information, but many requirements will not be integrated into MnSHIP until the next update. Chapter 3, page 59: clarified the text related to MAP-21 rulemaking and IRC mobility Chapter 6, page 150: clarified under next steps that MnDOT will begin to evaluate how to integrate new measures into the next MnSHIP update as soon as information is released.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	152	Web	July 31, 2013	Robert Olson		While each category takes a significant cut in funding, there was even a way to allocate 200 million on bicycle infrastructure, which is very considerate considering the small percentages of Minnesotans who rely on this form of transportation to get to work, get out of town for vacation, or to run their business. With that being said if 200 million was spent on Interregional Corridor Mobility, MN/Dot could tackle projects such as the expansion of I-94 from Rogers to Albertville.	<p>MnSHIP represents a diverse investment approach that seeks to enhance the state's economic vitality and quality of life. This is a challenge given the large and growing statewide need for investment in the state highway system in categories that include Asset Management, Traveler Safety, Critical Connections, and Regional and Community Improvement Priorities. Current priorities and funding levels, meanwhile, mean that MnDOT does not expect to fund any investment category to its full needs amount through 2033.</p> <p>MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. MnSHIP identifies investments on state highways that accommodate multiple modes of transportation. In planning for Bicycle Infrastructure, MnDOT typically makes investments in shoulders and low cost pavement markings for bike lanes as part of larger highway pavement and bridge improvement projects, and seeks to ensure that bike facilities on state highways connect to those that are built and maintained by counties, cities, and other regional and local jurisdictions. In some instances, MnDOT invests in Accessible Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure to meet legal requirements.</p>
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	159	Letter	July 31, 2013	Barb Thoman and Dave Van Hattum	Transit for Livable Communities	<p>We urge faster progress on the expansion of safe, accessible facilities for walking and bicycling. [...]</p> <p>Preservation/maintenance should be a higher priority. Minnesotans should not accept that pavement and bridge conditions will get worse than they are today over the next 20 years (pg. 136). Investment in mobility projects needs to be curtailed to ensure that the state meets its goals for bridge condition and pavement quality. [...]</p> <p>The three funding approaches/scenarios across the investment categories create a false choice of asset management OR bike and pedestrian expansion. We believe that alternatively grouping asset management with expanded bicycle and pedestrian options is internally consistent; when more people bicycle and walk there are far fewer highway assets to maintain. [...]</p>	<p>MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. MnSHIP identifies investments on the state highway system that accommodate multiple modes of transportation, such as Bicycle Infrastructure and Accessible Pedestrian Infrastructure.</p> <p>The Vision guides MnDOT in its commitment to delivering a state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation priorities. To establish these priorities, it relies on an extensive performance-based planning process. Maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. (More on these categories can be found in Chapter 1, page 13.)</p> <p>As described in Chapter 4, MnDOT developed performance levels for each investment category and then packaged them into three scenarios or approaches. These approaches were used to demonstrate a range of possible objectives that MnDOT could pursue as well as to illustrate trade-offs in performance and risk management within each approach. The approaches intended to generate discussion at the outreach meetings and not to portray a direct tradeoff. More information can be found in the summary of fall public outreach in Appendix G-1.</p>
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	163	Letter	July 31, 2013	Kathleen A. Gaylord	Dakota County Board of Commissioners	Investments identified in the MnSHIP do not support planned growth in the region. This is particularly true with regard to growth planned within the Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA) but outside the I-494/694 ring. This lack of investment in the Trunk Highway system will compound the significant challenges on the minor arterial system under County jurisdiction, which already stands-in for an underperforming Trunk Highway system in many parts of the County.	<p>MnSHIP represents a diverse investment approach that seeks to enhance the state's economic vitality and quality of life. Investment priorities are set with MnDOT's performance-based planning process, as well as an involvement process that included the public, MnDOT Districts, and transportation partners statewide. Unfortunately, not all needs and projects can be accommodated given the level of funding available.</p> <p>MnDOT works collaboratively the Metropolitan Council to establish investment priorities in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in the Twin Cities are consistent with the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.</p>

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Social Equity							
Multimodal Transportation	159	Letter	July 31, 2013	Barb Thoman and Dave Van Hattum	Transit for Livable Communities	The Plan provides insufficient attention to social equity. While the Plan notes a Guiding Principle of the Minnesota GO Vision is that “the system must be accessible and safe for users of all abilities and incomes” the Plan has no discernible strategies for achieving this goal regarding low-income Minnesotans. Minnesotans at the low end of the income spectrum far more frequently rely on public transit to get to critical destinations, including employment and job-seeking. The Plan should clearly define MnDOT’s role in increasing public transit options (which it can do with flexible federal funding and through the way it designs trunk highways). This omission is especially egregious since MnDOT sets an aspirational goal for those who can afford to drive by defining congestion as anything less than travelling 45 miles per hour. What is a comparable aspirational goal for other system users? In line with MnDOT’s risk management approach, we encourage the Department to consider the recent U.S. District Court decision in Wisconsin regarding the question of the inclusion of transit as part of major highway investments.	<p>MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO 50-year Transportation Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. Within the context of the state highway system, this plan seeks to ensure accessibility and safety for all Minnesotans, providing access to key resources and amenities. (More information on how Minnesota Go and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan guide and inform MnSHIP can be found in Chapter 2, page 39.)</p> <p>While MnSHIP identifies investments on the state highway system, it accommodates investments in different modes of transportation, such as Bicycle Infrastructure, Accessible Pedestrian Infrastructure, and transit. While the focus of MnSHIP is on investments in highway infrastructure, this infrastructure is used by various transportation modes, including transit. Mobility strategies used in the Twin Cities include an array of strategies that mitigate and manage congestion. An example of this is the implementation of transit advantages such as bus-only shoulders, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) bypass ramps, and managed lanes.</p> <p>Additional information on plans for public transit options in the Twin Cities can be found in the Metropolitan Council’s 2030 Transportation Policy Plan. Separate from MnSHIP, MnDOT describes its 20-year strategic plan for public transportation in Greater Minnesota in the Greater Minnesota Transit Plan 2010-2030.</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix D: describes environmental justice considerations, including how MnSHIP addresses social equity. • Chapter 1, page 16: added text to clarify that while the focus of MnSHIP is on identifying improvements in highway infrastructure, this infrastructure accommodates many users, including passenger vehicles, freight carriers, transit providers, bicyclists and pedestrians. • Chapter 1, page 17: added text to clarify the strategies used to address Twin Cities mobility needs also benefit transit in many ways. An example of this is the implementation of transit advantages on the highway system. Transit advantages include bus-only shoulders, high occupancy vehicles bypass ramps, and priced managed lanes.
Minnesota GO Vision							
Minnesota GO Vision	159	Letter	July 31, 2013	Barb Thoman and Dave Van Hattum	Transit for Livable Communities	The Plan should set a goal for reducing gross and per capita VMT. MnDOT should plan for a scenario of no future growth in vehicle miles travelled, even with projected population growth. Such a goal would reflect a MnDOT contribution to meeting state goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It would also reflect the increasingly important role that transit options and walkable communities play in economic competitiveness. Also, the Plan notes that 1/3 of the need vs. funding gap can be attributed to a very high inflation rate affecting future construction costs, and which result from increased costs of fuel, materials and equipment. If indeed fuel and material costs can be expected to rise substantially above general inflation rates into the foreseeable future, this highlights the need to make it easier for Minnesotans to drive less and avoid rising fuel costs.	Comment noted. MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO 50-year Transportation Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. MnSHIP identifies investments on the state highway system but accommodates investments in different modes of transportation. This vision guides MnDOT in its commitment to delivering a state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation priorities. The connection between this plan, Minnesota GO, and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan is described in more detail in Chapter 1, page 10.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
MAP-21 Response							
MAP-21 Response	2	Letter	June 20, 2013	(Forwarded by Scott Mareck)	City of Albany	MnDOT should acknowledge the importance of addressing freight bottlenecks as consistent with MAP-21.	<p>MAP-21 directs the USDOT to identify highway bottlenecks that cause significant freight congestion. In Minnesota, MnDOT will soon undertake an update to the Minnesota Statewide Freight Plan that will also identify freight bottlenecks. MnSHIP supports these efforts, and with its Twin Cities Mobility investment category it further establishes priorities related to improving traffic flow and providing bottleneck relief at spot locations. Finally, MnSHIP incorporates the MAP-21 national goal areas for the National Highway System, including the goal of freight movement and economic vitality. (More information can be found in Chapter 2, page 30.) MnDOT acknowledges that the plan made assumptions about pending performance criteria based on available information, but many requirements will not be integrated into MnSHIP until the next update.</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2 page 31: added language consistent with the Executive Summary to clarify how MnDOT will respond to MAP-21 rulemaking. MnDOT acknowledges that the plan made assumptions about pending performance criteria based on available information, but many requirements will not be integrated into MnSHIP until the next update. A performance measure assessing freight movement on interstates is one example of a yet-to-be-defined requirement. Chapter 3, page 59: clarified the text related to MAP-21 rulemaking and IRC mobility. Chapter 6, page 149: clarified under next steps that MnDOT will begin to evaluate how to integrate new measures into the next MnSHIP update as soon as information is released.
MAP-21 Response	6	Letter	July 1, 2013	(Forwarded by Steven Bot)	City of St. Michael	MnDOT should also acknowledge importance of addressing freight bottlenecks as consistent with MAP-21.	
MAP-21 Response	19	Letter	July 11, 2013	(Forwarded by Lori Johnson)	City of Otsego	MnDOT should also acknowledge importance of addressing freight bottlenecks as consistent with MAP-21.	
MAP-21 Response	21	Letter	July 12, 2013	(Forwarded by Scott Mareck)	City of Sartell	MnDOT should also acknowledge importance of addressing freight bottlenecks as consistent with MAP-21.	
MAP-21 Response	82	Letter	July 26, 2013	Virgil Hawkins	Wright County	MnDOT should also acknowledge importance of addressing freight bottlenecks as consistent with MAP-21.	
MAP-21 Response	84	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Doug Weiszhaar	Central Minnesota Transportation Alliance	[T]he new federal transportation authorization bill (MAP-21) calls for State DOTs to address freight bottlenecks as part of a performance based approach to maintaining the National Highway System.	
MAP-21 Response	87	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Patti Gartland	Greater St. Cloud Development Corporation	[T]he new federal transportation authorization bill (MAP-21) calls for State DOTs to address freight bottlenecks as part of a performance based approach to maintaining the National Highway System.	
MAP-21 Response	160	Letter	July 31, 2013	Jodi L. Teich, P.E.	Stearns County Board of Commissioners	MnDOT should also acknowledge importance of addressing freight bottlenecks as consistent with MAP-21.	
MAP-21 Response	180	Letter	July 26, 2013	Dr. Bea Winkler	CEO, Pine Cone Pet Hospital	As you know, the existing federal transportation authorization bill, MAP-21, requires states to address freight bottlenecks, such as I-94, using a performance-based planning and investment approach.	
MAP-21 Response	181	Letter	July 26, 2013	Robert White	Greater St. Cloud Development Corporation	As you know, the existing federal transportation authorization bill, MAP-21, requires states to address freight bottlenecks, such as I-94, using a performance-based planning and investment approach.	
Government Accounting Standards Board Statement 34 (GASB 34)							
GASB 34	121	Letter	July 31, 2013	Margaret Donahoe	Transportation Alliance	While there may be some potential for the state's bond rating to be downgraded due to pavement condition, it would be important to see some evidence of a bond rating agency taking that action to assess the likelihood of this possibility. In reviewing, states and municipalities that have had their bond ratings reduced, the most common reason cited has been pension liabilities and levels of debt versus revenue. We have not been able to find a state whose bond rating has been downgraded due to the condition of roadway pavement.	<p>Government Accounting Standards Board Statement 34 (GASB 34) requires that states report the value and condition of their major infrastructure assets. MnDOT responds to GASB 34 by setting performance thresholds for state highway infrastructure, including pavements and bridges. MnDOT is committed to protecting the state's assets by maintaining them to these thresholds. MnDOT acknowledges that there is some uncertainty associated with the potential impact of GASB 34; however, MnDOT identified this as a key risk to manage. While the investment direction in MnSHIP focuses on meeting GASB 34 thresholds, the condition of existing infrastructure will worsen three to four times relative to current levels.</p> <p>In addition to GASB 34, MnDOT must also respond to MAP-21 performance requirements for the National Highway System (NHS). This includes legislation that sets targets for NHS bridges in poor condition and an expected USDOT target for Interstate pavement condition (described in Chapter 2, page 30).</p>

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Performance Measures							
Performance Measures	159	Letter	July 31, 2013	Barb Thoman and Dave Van Hattum	Transit for Livable Communities	As MnDOT develops a new congestion measure (pg. 45), we recommend a metric that focuses on total travel time (not the amount of delay) to better reflect what drivers are most concerned with. By this metric, traffic congestion in the Twin Cities region is 24th among 25 peer regions (See Metropolitan Council, Metro Stats, March 2013, Journey to Work). A travel time (as opposed to delay) metric better reflects the integration between land uses and transportation systems (which the Plan notes on pg. ES-8, but never elaborates upon). The new congestion measure should also provide greater focus on reliability – i.e. can delays generally be anticipated, and to what extent can delays be avoided by the choice to use a MnPASS lane (as a paying customer or carpooler) or to use convenient public transit or bicycle routes.	As described in Chapter 2, page 44, MnDOT tracks congestion on Twin Cities urban freeways by evaluating the percentage of freeway miles that vehicles are traveling below 45 mph during morning of evening peak periods. MAP-21 will require MnDOT to adopt a measure for metropolitan area reliability or congestion on NHS roads. MnDOT will be responsible for leading the development of a target to address this measure after the FHWA establishes the measure in spring 2014. MnDOT will coordinate with the Metropolitan Council and other key stakeholders when it begins the process of developing the target.
Performance Measures	106		July 30, 2013	James Stoutland		MnDOT appears to be doing the best it can with the limited funds it receives. There is one fundamental flaw in the targets however. There can be segments of roads that can stay in the poor category forever (and actually become very poor), but yet the targets can be met by keeping the rest of the system in the fair and good range. There should be some limitation on how long a stretch of road can remain in the poor category.	The preservation of the functional and structural integrity of Minnesota's highways is a priority for MnDOT. Timely repair and replacement reduce long-term costs, and MnDOT understands that Minnesotans' satisfaction with overall state highway maintenance is greatly affected by highway smoothness. When deciding which roads to improve, MnDOT uses a performance-based planning process as well as involvement from the public, MnDOT districts, specialty offices, and other transportation partners.
Plan Assumptions							
Prioritization and Tradeoffs	162	Letter	July 31, 2013	Ethan Fawley	Fresh Energy	The plan rightly notes the likely reality that vehicle miles traveled will grow less than in years before 2004 or not at all. The plan recognizes the impact that this reality will have on gas tax proceeds for transportation, but it does not explicitly acknowledge the benefits of less VMT growth (i.e. less demand for new highway expansion). MnDOT should make it clear that it has updated its assumptions for VMT growth both in its revenue projections and also in its highway planning and prioritization. The era of 2 percent annual VMT growth is over and 1 percent annual growth is also most likely high. MnDOT should plan for no or little growth in VMT and ensure that is reflected in this plan.	MnDOT projections regarding VMT and transportation revenues are discussed in Chapter 2, and in greater detail in Appendix E. The plan acknowledges on Chapter 2, page 29, that while many of these trends have a positive impact on the environment, the gas tax is one of the major current sources of both federal and state revenue.
Asset Management							
Asset Management	22	Web	July 13, 2013	John Morgan		[P]lease quit wasting taxpayer dollars by doing things half-baked. After 2 or 3 rebuilds and hundreds of millions of dollars, the 494/169 interchange still isn't done right. And please quit relying on traffic clogging cloverleafs at major junctions. Every other city in America has seen the folly in this and uses flyover ramps and stack interchanges. Thank you.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT works collaboratively with the Metropolitan Council in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in state highways in this area advance the priorities established in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan, which is currently being updated. Investments in Twin Cities Mobility focus on active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements.
Asset Management	29	Web	July 22, 2013	Chad Gibbish		Diamond grind/level grind(or whatever it's called)all concrete roads like Hwy 77/Cedar Ave. [...] Have they experimented with shredding different types of materials to mix in the tar/cement to see if the surface would better hold up to the elements? Would it be possible to put flashing LED lights on 'Reduced Speed Ahead' signs?	Comment noted and will be forwarded to MnDOT's Office of Materials and Road Research and Office of Traffic, Safety and Technology. MnDOT will continue to apply strategies to make the best use of resources when undertaking projects in all investment categories. More information on the type of strategies used to maximize the benefits of pavement projects can be found in Chapter 5, pages 100-104. More information on MnDOT's safety strategies can be found in Chapter 1, page 15 and Chapter 5, pages 110-113.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Asset Management	107	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Bill Erzar		There are also areas in some of the mill and overlay project areas that could use a little extra work to create a few more passing areas and also filling and grading some corners to bring the corner grade elevation up to help prevent the inertia of throwing you out off the outside of the corner over the bank. These have been mentioned and discussed with Michael Kalnbach and Duane Hill (District One).	Comment noted and will be forwarded to MnDOT's Office of Materials and Road Research and District 1.
Traveler Safety							
Traveler Safety	20	Web	July 12, 2013	Alexis Leitgeb		I hope that the safety of our children in North East Minnesota will be at the top of your priority list as you work through the future plans for spending funds and for correcting area highways.	MnDOT recognizes that vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death for people under the age of 35. MnDOT seeks to meet aggressive safety targets by implementing District Safety Plans, addressing sustained crash locations, and investing in education, engineering, enforcement, and emergency services with the Toward Zero Deaths program. More information on MnDOT's safety strategies can be found in Chapter 1, page 15 and Chapter 5, pages 110-113.
Traveler Safety	38	Web	July 23, 2013	Peter Breyfogle		I recommend that MnDOT spend safety money on bike safety messages as well. Click it or Ticket and Drunk Driving are messages that have been heard enough. There is an increased percentage of deaths and injuries to vulnerable users and that needs to be heard. Emphasize should be placed on attentive driving.	In addition to participating in the Toward Zero Deaths program, MnDOT works with local partners to coordinate bicycle and pedestrian improvements and promote safety and awareness through the Share the Road campaign.
Traveler Safety	107	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Bill Erzar		Safe clear areas need to be established in the ROW's from the fog line out 42 feet as we talked about and discussed/suggested by Mr. Jon Chiglo and Mr. Mike Barnes of the St. Paul office, on their tour of Highway 169 this past March with Task Force members and District One Staff.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to District 1.
Critical Connections							
Critical Connections	10	Web	July 5, 2013	Allen Lovejoy		"Last mile" access to employment and manufacturing is essential to a growing economy. Some years back I believe it was MnDOT which had an "Access to Markets" program that sought to improve critical links between the NHS and industrial areas - particularly for trucks. I think the Plan discussion of "Critical Connections" should seriously consider resurrecting such a program and define those links deserving of special attention in support of our economy, such as access to barge traffic along Hwy 13 in Savage, and from BNSF Intermodal yard to I-94 in St. Paul. The current federal "Intermodal Connectors" list is a hodge-podge and does not represent a serious look at such connectors.	MnDOT recognizes the importance of last-mile connections, and includes key intermodal connectors defined by the USDOT in its highway capital investment plans. As part of the upcoming Minnesota Statewide Freight Plan, MnDOT will review the investments needed to maintain and improve its freight network.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Critical Connections	72	Letter	July 19, 2013	Representative Clark Johnson		The guiding principle to Ensure Regional Connections in the Go MN 50 year vision adopted in 2011 seems to be ignored. The 2012 Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan identifies Critical Connections as a goal.	<p>MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. MnSHIP identifies investments on state highways that accommodate multiple modes of transportation.</p> <p>The Critical Connections key objective described in the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan has been translated into an investment area that includes Twin Cities Mobility, IRC Mobility, Bicycle Infrastructure, and Accessible Pedestrian Infrastructure.</p> <p>MnDOT is committed to delivering a state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation priorities. To establish these priorities, it relies on a performance-based approach that identifies investment needs. Maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. MnSHIP identifies a \$12 billion funding gap. Due to this MnDOT does not expect to fund any investment category to its full needs amount through 2033.</p> <p>At this time MnDOT is meeting its performance target associated with IRC mobility, though several needs are projected to arise in Years 11-20. Over the life of the plan, MnDOT will also spend significant money to ensure existing connections are maintained in a state of good repair.</p>
Twin Cities Mobility							
Twin Cities Mobility	22	Web	July 13, 2013	John Morgan		Also, auxiliary lanes need to be incorporated as standard operating procedure. [...] Auxiliary lanes are almost like having an extra lane and make such a huge difference.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT considers several strategies to improve traffic flow and provide bottleneck relief at spot locations in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. These projects include freeway and intersection geometric design changes, short auxiliary lane additions, and traffic signal modifications to ease merging and exiting traffic.
Twin Cities Mobility	56	Web	July 24, 2013	Minas Hovsepian		[T]he Highway Robbery MN Pass Lane didn't solve any of the traffic issues, it just allowed a few people with disposable income to benefit. [...] I would also like to see you open the MN Pass to other states transmitters or remove the monthly fee from the MN Pass. I hold an I Pass from Illinois that is good from WI to New England and doesn't charge any fees, but MN's charges a fee even if you don't use it and it is only good in MN.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to Metro District. MnDOT pursues several strategies to address mobility issues within the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Investments in active traffic management, spot mobility improvements, priced managed lanes, and strategic capacity enhancements are described in Chapter 1, page 17.
Twin Cities Mobility	159	Letter	July 31, 2013	Barb Thoman and Dave Van Hattum	Transit for Livable Communities	<p>We question why the Plan projects that traffic congestion will increase (pg. ES-16) when future travel volumes are difficult to predict, especially given the dramatic changes noted above. [...]</p> <p>Page 44 (sidebar) provides a misleading picture of the severity of traffic congestion in the Twin Cities. This sidebar should be removed. The language conveys that the Twin Cities metro region has above average levels of traffic congestion, stating, "The Twin Cities area was ranked the seventh most congested of 32 metropolitan areas of similar size in 2010." The same Urban Mobility Report finds that the Twin Cities is the 16th largest metropolitan area in the U.S. but ranks 25th in traffic congestion. In fact, the Twin Cities metro area is the largest of the 32 "large" metropolitan areas in the large category and thus is not "similar in size" to the majority of regions in this peer group. Rather our region is often appropriately compared to many of the regions in the Very Large Category used in the Urban Mobility Report.</p> <p>Managed lanes should be more explicitly defined. It appears managed lanes and MnPASS lanes are used interchangeably (pg. 17), which has not been the case in public presentations by MnDOT to date. The Plan should clearly define the difference between the two.</p>	<p>MnDOT employs forecasts from the Federal Energy Information Administration (EIA) to develop travel volume projections (presented in Chapter 2, page 26 and in greater detail in Appendix E).</p> <p>MnDOT further recognizes that current congestion and reliability issues are likely to worsen and will need to be managed in order to preserve and improve quality of life, safety, and air quality in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The sidebar on page 44 has been modified to more accurately show the rankings based on the study cited.</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1 page 17, Chapter 5 pages 115-116: changed language associated with managed lane to priced managed lane or MnPASS as appropriate. Chapter 2 page 44: added clarifying text to the margin concerning congestion in the Twin Cities and the Urban Mobility Report.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
IRC Mobility							
I-94 West Corridor	1	Letter	June 11, 2013	Steve Bot and Rhonda Baack	I-94 West Corridor Coalition	While representing only 1.6% of MnDOT's Interregional Corridor System, this stretch makes up 40% of the system's congestion. From the Fish Lake Interchange to Trunk Highway 241, crash rate and severity are double that of the state average.	<p>MnDOT acknowledges the importance of the Interregional Corridor (IRC) system, an essential transportation network for moving freight and supporting businesses. The IRC system connects the largest regional trade centers in Minnesota with each other and with neighboring states and Canada. This system consists of Greater Minnesota's most heavily traveled roads, accounting for only two percent of all roadway miles in the state (3,000 miles), yet carrying about 30 percent of all statewide travel.</p> <p>MnDOT is committed to delivering a state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation priorities. To establish these priorities, it relies on a performance-based approach that identifies investment needs. Maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other areas are closely evaluated. MnSHIP identifies a \$12 billion funding gap. Due to this MnDOT does not expect to fund any investment category to its full needs amount through 2033.</p> <p>Investments in the IRC Mobility category are specifically targeted to improve corridor travel time on IRCs. Investments in other categories (such as traveler safety, pavement condition, and bridge condition) may occur on the IRC system but are not included in the IRC Mobility category. For example, there are a number of Regional and Community Improvement Priority (RCIP) projects on IRC corridors which, when completed, will enhance the mobility of the corridor over and above the current corridor performance target. Because these are projects that address needs other than those triggered by the IRC Mobility performance measure, they are not categorized as IRC Mobility Improvements.</p> <p>MnDOT issues one-time and recurring solicitations that could also fund improvements on the IRC system. The \$300 million Corridors of Commerce program is one such example. The recurring Corridor Investment Management Strategy (CIMS) and Transportation Economic Development (TED) solicitations are also possible sources of funding for performance-based investments on the IRC system. More information on the CIMS and TED solicitations can be found in Chapter 2, page 46.</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1 page 17: clarified the definition of the IRC system as it relates to the National Highway System (NHS) and to detail recent tweaks to the system and calculation of corridor performance. Chapter 3, page 59: clarified the text related to MAP-21 rulemaking and Interregional Corridor mobility Chapter 6, page 149: clarified under next steps that MnDOT will begin to evaluate how to integrate new measures into the next MnSHIP update as soon as information is released.
IRC Mobility	3	Letter	June 26, 2013	Representative David FitzSimmons		Though unsuccessful in passing specific funding legislation for I-94, perhaps more disappointing is the fact that MnSHIP's plan has no funding for any Interregional Corridor improvements. [...] It disappoints me that, of the 10 key investment categories in the MnSHIP, the only category to not receive funding is the interregional Corridor System, despite the fact that the other categories are slated to receive as much as \$5.4 billion over the next 20 years.	
IRC Mobility	72	Letter	July 19, 2013	Representative Clark Johnson		<p>I am disappointed that the plan includes no funding for Interregional Corridor Mobility. The MN Legislature and current long-term DOT planning support interregional corridor mobility.</p> <p>The Corridors of Commerce language in the Omnibus Transportation Finance Bill clearly expresses support by the Legislature to improve interregional corridor mobility. [...]</p> <p>Interregional corridor mobility should have funding in this plan.</p>	
IRC Mobility	84	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Doug Weiszhaar	Central Minnesota Transportation Alliance	MnSHIP's plan actually states that by 2033, the four interregional Corridor Systems will be failing to meet their performance targets. Despite the future failing grade of the interregional Corridor System, there is no funding provided by MnSHIP.	
IRC Mobility	87	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Patti Gartland	Greater St. Cloud Development Corporation	MnSHIP's plan actually states that by 2033, the four interregional Corridor Systems will be failing to meet their performance targets. Despite the future failing grade of the interregional Corridor System, there is no funding provided by MnSHIP.	
IRC Mobility	121	Letter	July 31, 2013	Margaret Donahoe	Transportation Alliance	Our Alliance members are concerned that important investments in interregional corridors and other important projects are not even acknowledged as needs by the Department. The expansion of 2-lane segments of highway in key corridors was supported by the legislature during the 2013 Session through the creation of the Corridors of Commerce program. The completion of Highways such as 14, 23, 169, 212, 10 and others should be acknowledged even if adequate funding is not projected in the future. The development of a future plan should not be governed by dollars available but by the needs of the highway system. The Corridors of Commerce program should be included in this new plan along with a discussion of the need to re-direct \$300 million in funds to this program.	

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
IRC Mobility	152	Web	July 31, 2013	Robert Olson		While I do understand that funding for the next twenty years severely is deficient to the needs of the State, but MN/Dot must not ignore the needs of one of the categories that affect a majority of the residents and businesses in the State of Minnesota. The clear neglect of the Interregional Corridor Mobility portion of the plan is very unacceptable and should not occur. [...] And honestly, if you give Interregional corridor mobility the 2.7% of the 18 million, you will provide 486 million dollars that will have immediate impact and will be felt by a majority of this great state.	See page 35.
IRC Mobility	177	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Steve Bot	I-94 Coalition	[T]here's only one category, one category, that receives zero dollars out of all the 10 categories and that's IRC mobility. To me that's very disturbing and shocking, especially when a lot of testimony taken, a lot of input was gathered. That input, while it may have been heard, it was certainly not reacted to. I guess that's a big disappointment along a large corridor stretching all the way through Minnesota both in terms of freight, mobility, congestion, safety and economic vitality.	
Regional and Community Improvement Priorities (RCIP)							
RCIP	109	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Robert J. Lindall	Southwest Corridor Transportation Coalition	Another major concern is the lack of commitment to Regional and Community Improvement Priorities (RCIPs) including programs such as the Corridor Investment Management Strategy (CIMS) and the Transportation Economic Development (TED) program. Given the relatively small amount of funding that has been directed to these projects and programs and the ability of these projects to attract and leverage private and local funding, it appears needless to eliminate all funding from these programs in years 11-20 of the plan. The Department should make a commitment to re-direct a small amount of funding from maintenance and preservation to these innovative and important regional programs and projects.	<p>MnDOT acknowledges the importance of funding Regional and Community Improvement Priorities (RCIPs), which are collaborative investments that respond to regional and local concerns beyond system performance needs. MnDOT intends to continue its statewide and internal RCIP solicitations over the first 10 years of the plan, where funding is available, and make targeted investments at the district level.</p> <p>MnDOT is committed to delivering a state highway system that accounts for and addresses statewide transportation priorities. To establish these priorities, it relies on a performance-based approach that identifies investment needs. Maintaining and improving mobility for all modes, traveler safety, critical preservation needs of roads and bridges, and other investment areas are closely evaluated. (More on these categories can be found in Chapter 1, page 13.)</p>
RCIP	121	Letter	July 31, 2013	Margaret Donahoe	Transportation Alliance	MnDOT has developed some innovative and effective programs in recent years such as the Transportation Economic Development Program and Corridor Investment Management Strategy that have the potential to leverage additional dollars and increase the overall level of resources directed to transportation. It's discouraging that the new 20 year plan does make a commitment to continue funding these programs out into the future. Some resources could be re-directed to maintain these new programs.	<p>MnSHIP does identify investments in the Corridor Investment Management Strategies (CIMS) and Transportation Economic Development (TED) solicitations as continuing through the first ten years of the plan, to 2023. More information can be found in Chapter 5, page 123.</p> <p>Current priorities and funding levels, however, mean that MnDOT does not expect to fund any investment category to its full needs amount through 2033. Therefore, MnDOT does not expect to be able to deliver a program of capital improvements that wholly meets the expectations of both MnDOT and its stakeholders.</p>

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Bicycle Infrastructure							
Bicycle Infrastructure	4	Web	July 1, 2013	Greg Thesing		It appears that you are using 1.4% of the budget on a welfare project (bicycle infrastructure). It has no funding source of its own. Spending millions of dollars on a non revenue generating project is plain unwise. Roads and bridges cause gas tax, vehicle registration and sales tax revenue to be generated. While bicycle infrastructure is "nice," it is not a "need." Remember, this is taxpayer money that special interest groups are requesting on their projects. Look at spending that affects the largest number of people.	<p>MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. Bicycle facilities are an important and growing part of this multimodal transportation network.</p> <p>In this MnSHIP update, MnDOT continues its practice of investing in Bicycle Infrastructure (such as bike lanes, signage for bike routes, crossings, and shoulder maintenance on identified routes) as part of larger state highway improvement projects such as pavement rehabilitation or bridge reconstruction. Beginning with this MnSHIP update; however, MnDOT will track bicycle infrastructure investments separately in order to better assess and address bicycle investment needs.</p> <p>In making Bicycle Infrastructure investments, MnDOT seeks to ensure that bike facilities on state highways connect to those that are built and maintained by counties, cities, and other regional and local jurisdictions. MnDOT also works with local partners to coordinate bicycle and pedestrian improvements and promote safety and awareness through the Share the Road campaign.</p> <p>MnDOT is currently undertaking a Statewide Bicycle System Plan, which will provide a statewide inventory of current and planned biking facilities. The study will identify a priority network for bicycling throughout the state. It will also help MnDOT prioritize Bicycle Infrastructure investments as it implements MnSHIP.</p>
Bicycle Infrastructure	5	Web	July 1, 2013	Vernon Jorgenson		I think the cities are going way out of line with the bike lanes, some really are obstructing traffic. I also feel the too many bike riders are ignoring traffic laws and nothing is being done about it.	
Bicycle Infrastructure	11	Web	July 7, 2013	Roberta Haight		I live in Ogilvie, MN, I would like to see more work done to connect bike paths [...]	
Bicycle Infrastructure	33	Web	July 23, 2013	Steve Marquardt		If the "plan shall incorporate all modes of transportation including bicycle commutation and recreation and provide for the interconnection and coordination of different modes of transportation," then why are SHOULDERS being REDUCED from widths of 6 or 7 feet to only one (1) foot in recent highway resurfacing projects?	
Bicycle Infrastructure	38	Web	July 23, 2013	Peter Breyfogle		While I applaud MnDOT for finally calling out bicycling infrastructure as a part of the strategic plan; I think it deserves funding closer to it mode share and a goal to increase its mode share.	
Bicycle Infrastructure	162	Letter	July 31, 2013	Ethan Fawley	Fresh Energy	The transformative nature of \$50 million invested in biking and walking is much greater than \$50 million invested in road maintenance. Given how far investments in walking and biking go, we would suggest MnDOT allocate additional resources in these areas over the coming 20 years. This would help meet the needs of changing preferences while providing a lot of other public benefits while having only a very marginal impact on pavement quality.	
Accessibility vs. Mobility							
Accessibility vs. Mobility	10	Web	July 5, 2013	Allen Lovejoy		The Plan would do well to focus even more on "Accessibility", as a complement to "Mobility." MnDOT should have a vested interest in logical land use patterns that can bring workers and employment centers in greater proximity. Serving very low density areas, and shuttling commuters long distances between jobs and home is wasteful and not fiscally sustainable. Expansions in capacity within a corridor should require more responsible local administration of zoning to support such a logical land development pattern.	<p>Comment noted. MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. Accessibility is an important component of this transportation system.</p> <p>Measures for accessibility are being evaluated by MnDOT and the Metropolitan Council. However, these measures are still in their infancy and will undergo additional development before being incorporated into MnDOT's performance-based planning process or the Annual Minnesota Transportation Performance Report.</p>

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Multimodal Transportation							
Multimodal Transportation	10	Web	July 5, 2013	Allen Lovejoy		I support the Plan's homage to Multi-Modal Transportation. Growth in Mobility - particularly in the Metro Area - will come from non-auto trips: transit, walking and bicycling. This is not only good for public health, it is fiscally responsible - as opposed to costly roadway capacity expansions.	<p>MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO 50-year Transportation Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. MnSHIP identifies investments on the state highway system that accommodate multiple modes of transportation, such as Bicycle Infrastructure and Accessible Pedestrian Infrastructure and benefit others, such as transit. Transit investments in Minnesota can be explored in greater detail in the MnDOT Greater Minnesota Transit Plan and in the Metropolitan Council's 2030 Transportation Policy Plan.</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1, page 16: added text to clarify that while the focus of MnSHIP is on identifying improvements in highway infrastructure, this infrastructure accommodates many users, including passenger vehicles, freight carriers, transit providers, bicyclists and pedestrians Chapter 1, page 17: added text to clarify the strategies used to address Twin Cities mobility needs also benefit transit in many ways. An example of this is the implementation of transit advantages on the highway system. Transit advantages include bus-only shoulders, high occupancy vehicles bypass ramps, and priced managed lanes.
Multimodal Transportation	11	Web	July 7, 2013	Roberta Haight		I live in Ogilvie, MN, I would like to see more work done to [...] have a train to at cloud and Minneapolis.	
Multimodal Transportation	76	Web	July 26, 2013	Andrew Lenz		There are also NO buses from the western suburbs to downtown St. Paul and back – fix this please.	
Multimodal Transportation	168	E-mail	July 31, 2013	Mark Sulzbach	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	Address the type of strategies MnSHIP will provide in supporting multimodal travel with local land use policies that encourage pedestrian, biking, and transit-friendly urban form and design as well as promoting the use of alternative fuels.	<p>MnSHIP supports the vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system as set forth in the Minnesota GO Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. MnSHIP identifies investments on the state highway system that accommodate multiple modes of transportation, such as Bicycle Infrastructure and Accessible Pedestrian Infrastructure and benefit other, such as transit. Transit investments in Minnesota can be explored in greater detail in the MnDOT Greater Minnesota Transit Plan and in the Metropolitan Council's 2030 Transportation Policy Plan. While MnDOT does not have any authority over individual travel choices or local land use decisions, it does plan, facilitate, and promote the use of transportation alternatives.</p>
Project Support							
Project Support	40	Web	July 23, 2013	Kirt Garrison		[A] lot of the congestion and frustration in the metro area could be reduced with a small amount of planning. Blow up a north/south route and an east/west route and finish the project instead of seeing how many millions of traffic cones and barrels can rot alongside the roads when almost every route is compromised. Whoever the contractor is for the 494 project in Bloomington should either hire 3 or 4 more people, which would effectively double their staff, or start working another 3 or 4 hours a day, which might possibly bring them up to part time employment. There is NO excuse for that road to be in the shape it's in when 35E can be rebuilt in a summer. Fix what we have, and fix it efficiently, and people will be much happier with you.	Comment noted and will be forwarded to MnDOT Metro District.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Project Support	119	E-mail	July 30, 2013	Bill Sierks		I would also suggest that MnDOT develop language providing a meaningful incentive (not sure of the amount, but something equivalent to the early completion bonuses that are very effective in motivating contractor behavior) on public projects for companies that agree to provide over 80% of Tier 3 off-road equipment on any project awarded before 2020, and an equivalent incentive for contractors exceeding the on-road diesel percentages.	Recommendations regarding incentives and early completion bonuses will be forwarded to MnDOT's Office of Construction and Innovative Contracting and Office of Environmental Stewardship.
Project Support	168	E-mail	July 31, 2013	Mark Sulzbach	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	MPCA also recommends that MnDOT develop language that provides a meaningful incentive (something equivalent to the early completion bonuses that are very effective in motivating contractor behavior) on public projects that agree to provide over 80 percent of Tier 3 off-road equipment on any project awarded before 3030, and an equivalent incentive for contractors exceeding the on-road diesel percentages.	
Project Support	159	Letter	July 31, 2013	Barb Thoman and Dave Van Hattum	Transit for Livable Communities	To the extent possible, the Plan should include the costs of Project Support (11% of projected spending) not as its own catch all category, but within the cost category that most accurately applies (pavement repair, mobility, safety, etc.). Doing this will provide greater transparency and accountability.	
Health							
Health	159	Letter	July 31, 2013	Barb Thoman and Dave Van Hattum		The Plan should make a direct connection to health outcomes. We're excited about the possibility of greater collaboration between transportation and health planning to achieve synergistic outcomes. We strongly support a MnDOT commitment to the "Health in all Policies" initiative of the Minnesota Department of Health.	<p>MnSHIP supports the Minnesota GO Vision for a transportation system that maximizes the health of the people, the economy, and the environment of Minnesota. The plan recognizes how changing highway use in Minnesota may have health benefits in local communities (see Chapter 1, page 8). Investments in transportation can directly encourage active living, and MnDOT partners with the Minnesota Department of Health and local governments to advance health-related goals beyond the scope of MnSHIP (see Chapter 6, page 147).</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2, page 33-35: clarified the difference in state legislative requirements related to MnSHIP and broader goals of the state transportation system. Referenced on page 35 how MnSHIP supports the 16 goals for the state transportation system. More information can be found in Appendix D.
Environment							
Environment	84	Hearing Testimony	July 29, 2013	Doug Weiszhaar	Central Minnesota Transportation Alliance	We would also like to see additional use of recycled materials in construction to continue MnDOT's leadership in green technologies.	<p>Recommendations regarding construction materials and construction impacts will be forwarded to MnDOT's Office of Construction and Innovative Contracting, Office of Environmental Stewardship (OES), and Office of Materials and Road Research.</p> <p>Changes made to the final document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2, page 33-35: clarified the difference in state legislative requirements related to MnSHIP and broader goals of the state transportation system. Referenced on page 35 how MnSHIP supports the 16 goals for the state transportation system. More information can be found in Appendix D. Chapter 2, page 39: noted that while MnSHIP doesn't directly discuss environmental goals, it recognizes environmental stewardship as a guiding principle in determining highway investments. More information can be found in Appendix D.
Environment	168	E-mail	July 31, 2013	Mark Sulzbach	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	State how MNSHIP will minimize and mitigate impacts of transportation construction, operations and use on the natural environment with specific emphasis on water quality, wetland loss, and roadside erosion.	
Air Quality							

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Air Quality	52	Web	July 24, 2013	Mary Theresa Downing		Please don't forget to include plans to decrease traffic and its attendant air pollution, which has health costs for all of us, in the State Highway Investment Plan.	MnSHIP supports the Minnesota GO Vision and the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan's objectives and strategies for a transportation system that maximizes the health of the people, the economy, and the environment of Minnesota. MnDOT recognizes environmental stewardship as a guiding principle in determining state highway investments (see Chapter 2, page 37).
Air Quality	57	Web	July 24, 2013	Thue Rasmussen		It is very important for DOT to include plans for air quality improvement integral to other developments.	The legislation that created MnDOT was amended in 2008 and again in 2010 to include environmental considerations as goals for the state transportation system. These include increasing the use of high-occupancy and low-emission vehicles, promoting bicycling and walking as energy efficient, non-polluting forms of transportation, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector.
Air Quality	59	Web	July 25, 2013	Erik Ostrom		I don't know how you can have a 20-year plan in the 21st century that doesn't directly confront climate change. The need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is going to affect how we use our roads - what kind of vehicles we use, what kind of trips we make. And the climate change that's already underway is going to change the weather that wears on our roads. I appreciate the nods to bicycling and walking, which in many cases can reduce carbon emissions. But climate change needs to be a first-class consideration, not something mentioned in passing here and there.	While MnDOT does not have any authority over individual travel choices or local land use decisions, it does plan, facilitate, and promote the use of transportation alternatives. In addition, MnDOT is pursuing approaches to make its own large fleet more fuel efficient. MnDOT is increasing its use of cleaner fuels along with other strategies to reduce emissions and improve energy efficiency in its fleet and facilities.
Air Quality	159	Letter	July 31, 2013	Barb Thoman and Dave Van Hattum	Transit for Livable Communities	The Plan also fails to identify the disproportionate impact of harmful emissions from highway use on low-income and environmental justice communities.	Finally, MnDOT recognizes that roughly half of all roadway travel in Minnesota occurs within the Twin Cities metropolitan area, which contains just nine percent of the total roadway miles in the state. MnDOT and the Metropolitan Council work together to develop plans that account for and address these conditions. Changes made to the final document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2, page 33-35: clarified the difference in state legislative requirements related to MnSHIP and broader goals of the state transportation system. Referenced on page 35 how MnSHIP supports the 16 goals for the state transportation system. More information can be found in Appendix D. Appendix D describes environmental justice considerations, including how MnSHIP addresses social equity.

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Air Quality	69, 168	E-mail	July 31, 2013	Mark Sulzback	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	<p>We would like to see MnDOT address in the Draft MnSHIP the comment we raised on the Statewide Plan regarding provision of additional Environmental Performance Measures that are tracked as surrogates for greenhouse gas (GHG) and air toxics emissions from transportation sources.</p> <p>Address how MnSHIP will reduce transportation-related air emissions to improve air quality and human health. [...]</p> <p>State how MnSHIP will reduce Minnesota's contribution to global concentrations of GHG to meet the emission-reduction goals in the Next Generation Energy Act of 2007.</p> <p>MnDOT should consider strategies to reduce diesel emissions, such as implementing construction contracts that require the use of equipment with clean diesel engines and use of clean diesel fuels to protect air quality in the construction area especially when dealing with multi-year projects. [...]</p> <p>Minimum diesel emission standards for vehicle and equipment that were established in 2007-2013. All on-road class 6 and larger diesel vehicles and all off-road diesel equipment (including those operated by sub-contractors) used for construction and major repair of public roadway projects in Minnesota must meet the following minimum standards:</p> <p>75 % of the off-road diesel equipment must be Tier-3 or better by 2015; and by 2020 50% must be Tier 4 or better, with the remainder Tier-3.</p> <p>75% of on-road heavy duty diesel trucks must be 2007 and newer by 2015; and by 2020 at least 50% must be 2010 or newer, with the remainder 2007 or newer.</p> <p>Use of these emission standards will also benefit the health of equipment operators and other workers on site. Reduced emissions will also reduce complaints at projects near residential areas or at high pedestrian areas</p>	See page 40.
Air Quality	162	Letter	July 31, 2013	Ethan Fawley	Fresh Energy	<p>The future quality of life, economic prosperity, and environmental stewardship of Minnesota all hinge on our ability to address the challenge of climate change. Yet, the plan completely ignores transportation's role in global warming. This continues a trend from the Statewide Multimodal Plan and is a big step back from the 2009 plan. There is not a single mention of climate change anywhere in this plan. There is talk of risks, but even there, the impacts of climate change—which are already starting to be felt in MnDOT's maintenance budget—are completely ignored. It is a glaring omission and also fails to meet one of the statutory duties of the Transportation Commissioner in state statutes Section 174.02. We strongly urge MnDOT to review and implement most of the recommendations in TRB Special Report 290 Potential Impacts of Climate Change on U.S. Transportation. That should start by revisiting the risk-based planning work to include climate change realities. We also urge that MnDOT add back in the performance measure on fuel consumption as was used previously and implement strategies to reduce emissions in this plan.</p>	

Comment Topic	Comment ID	Comment Format	Date	Name(s)	Organization	Comments	Responses
Complete Streets							
Complete Streets	159	Letter	July 31, 2013	Barb Thoman and Dave Van Hattum	Transit for Livable Communities	It would also be helpful if the Plan explicitly addressed full implementation of MnDOT's Complete Streets policy, in particular for investments in the Regional and Community Improvement Priorities (RCIP) category.	MnDOT is in the process of finalizing a Complete Streets Policy aimed at creating an integrated, multimodal transportation system that is safe, accessible, and efficient for all users and is respectful of context. The application of Complete Streets policy is relevant to all of MnDOT's activities, including capital improvements on state highways. MnSHIP acknowledges the importance of Complete Streets in Chapter 2, page 39, and works towards implementing the policy by funding improvements in the Bicycle Infrastructure, Accessible Pedestrian Infrastructure, and Regional and Community Improvement Priorities investment categories.
Complete Streets	182	Web	July 31, 2013	Matt Steele		Without recognizing the fundamental difference between a road and a street, we're doomed to continue our path of spending excessive amounts of money trying to engineer our roads into streets and our streets into roads. This is also a public health issue, since unsafe road design is the leading cause for fatal injuries to youth and the primary preventable cause of death for people under 50.	

J-3: Public Comments

The following website is the section of this appendix that contains all comments received on MnSHIP during the month of July. Each comment is presented in full with a unique identification number visible on their first page in the upper left-hand corner.

<http://www.mndot.gov/planning/mnship/pdf/plan-all-comments.pdf>