

Appendix J
Comments Received
on the Draft LRTP
with MIC Responses
During Public Comment Period
from July 29 to August 30, 2019

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 1 Date: 7/31/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Lee Swenson Organization: AAAA

Comment: Because this is a regional plan I very much appreciate how the Hermantown projects are mentioned (6-22).

Response: Thank you for submitting comments in regard to the MIC's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Response Date: 8/9/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 2 Date: 7/31/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Lee Swenson Organization: AAAA

Comment: I feel the roundabout at Arrowhead and Ugstad Road (MN-04-02) is a critical project for moving vehicle transportation safely and more efficiently especially as Hermantown continues to grow.

Response: No comment needed.

Response Date: 8/9/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 3 Date: 7/31/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Lee Swenson Organization: AAAA

Comment: The other project Munger Trail Connection (MN-04-01) is a valued added project for me as any improvements in my city are welcomed.

Response: No comment needed.

Response Date: 8/9/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 4 Date: 7/31/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Lee Swenson Organization: AAAA

Comment: My only wish is that these two projects were not deemed as Long-Term projects and slated for work on 2030 to 2045. I advocate getting these two projects reclassified to Mid-Term projects just because of the future needs in a rapidly growing community ...

Response: Regarding the Hermantown comments, the projects and their projected timelines are provided to us by the jurisdictions – in this case the City of Hermantown. While I will include your comments in our database for this plan, and share them as appropriate, it will be a good idea (and likely more influential) for you to bring these up with your councilors, the mayor, or others in the City.

Response Date: 8/9/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 5 Date: 7/31/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Lee Swenson Organization: AAAA

Comment: The other project I'd like to comment on is the long-awaited Twin Ports Interchange (Can of Worms) project. Because of its size, and because it impacts so many people in all of our communities, I worry about information and communication. For example how I am to stay best informed of the progress on the multi-year project? Will there be an easy way for me to find weekly/monthly updates on the project? Will I easily find road closure maps that I can understand? Will there be alternate driving routes suggested? Will updates be listed at the MN 511 application on my smarter than me phone? Bottom Line: Where will I find information on how to drive to work and get here on time in the morning? How will I best get to the downtown or the other parts of Duluth when I need to do so relatively quickly? Heaven forbid but what will the snow emergency routes be over the course of the project?

Response: Regarding the Twin Ports Interchange Project, MnDOT has a very informative website that contains virtually all the information you are seeking. The link to the website is: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/d1/projects/twin-ports-interchange/index.html>. Note that their next public informational meeting is Monday, August 26 at Clyde Iron Works (11:30-12:30 and 6-7).

Response Date: 8/9/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 6 Date: 7/31/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Lee Swenson Organization: AAAA

Comment: Why ask these questions on the Can of Worms Project? Two reasons. ? I fear me reacting to traffic snarls rather than me knowing about resources that will give me some information on alternate routes that I can plan on. And because I want to reflect the needs of our seniors, and volunteers, who will continue to drive in the Hermantown and Duluth area.

Response: Regarding the Twin Ports Interchange Project, MnDOT has a very informative website that contains virtually all the information you are seeking. The link to the website is: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/d1/projects/twin-ports-interchange/index.html>. Note that their next public informational meeting is Monday, August 26 at Clyde Iron Works (11:30-12:30 and 6-7).

Response Date: 8/9/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 7 Date: 8/8/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Zach Sullivan Organization:

Comment: Great information, thank you for the work you do. I don't have many specific comments, but thanks for the info.

Response: No contact information provided.

Response Date: Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 8 Date: 8/8/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Zach Sullivan Organization:
Comment: Looking at how we spend our money on transportation is baffling.
Response: No contact information provided.
Response Date: Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 9 Date: 8/8/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Zach Sullivan Organization:
Comment: I am a huge fan of more bike paths and less roads/road construction.
Response: No contact information provided.
Response Date: Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 10 Date: 8/22/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Nick Baker Organization: Douglas County
Comment: Thorough presentation - Great display.
Response: No comment needed.
Response Date: Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 11 Date: 8/22/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Catherine Berquist Organization:
Comment: Bus service does not reach me where I live. I'm in a motorized cart and there is no sidewalk connection.
Response: No contact information provided.
Response Date: Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 12 Date: 8/22/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Catherine Berquist Organization:
Comment: Great bus service between Duluth and Superior and up Central Entrance, but can't get up Arlington Avenue towards Arrowhead Road.
Response: No contact information provided.
Response Date: Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 13 Date: 8/22/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Catherine Berquist Organization:

Comment: Need better sidewalk clearing in the winter including/especially at intersections. Unreliable clearing makes it impossible to get around.

Response: No contact information provided.

Response Date: Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 14 Date: 8/22/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Catherine Berquist Organization:

Comment: STRIDE is a life saver, but needs to be more available (less planned trips) like Uber.

Response: No contact information provided.

Response Date: Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 15 Date: 8/22/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Catherine Berquist Organization:

Comment: Need more housing options for people in motorized carts/wheelchairs along transit lines.

Response: No contact information provided.

Response Date: Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 16 Date: 8/24/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Dan Rau Organization:

Comment: A pedestrian and bike way on the main bridge connecting Duluth and Superior was a serious omission in the construction of the current Blatnik bridge, since there was one there for decades on the old Soo Line bridge.

Response: Thank you for your comments regarding the draft of Sustainable Choices 2045 – the Duluth-Superior Long-Range Transportation Plan. Your comments have been recorded into a database and will be shared with appropriate staff during Blatnik Bridge planning meetings. The comments will also be included in an appendix of the final of Sustainable Choices 2045.

Response Date: 10/5/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 17 Date: 8/24/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Dan Rau Organization:

Comment: A pedestrian way on the Blatnik Bridge could offer: 1) A practical bike and pedestrian route between the two cities, and 2) A great view of ships at the two adjoining docks and the shipyard, plus viewing ships going under the bridge.

Response: Thank you for your comments regarding the draft of Sustainable Choices 2045 – the Duluth-Superior Long-Range Transportation Plan. Your comments have been recorded into a database and will be shared with appropriate staff during Blatnik Bridge planning meetings. The comments will also be included in an appendix of the final of Sustainable Choices 2045.

Response Date: 10/5/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 18 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Jordan van der Hagen Organization:

Comment: I wanted to get in a point I would like to see addressed. I am curious to see if Interstate 35 as it runs through downtown is really necessary for the transportation needs of our community. I saw in the plan that it doesn't have nearly the usage that it's capacity warrants, whereas we see large amounts of congestion in areas adjacent to it (Canal Park, Bayfront, Etc.).

Response: Thank you for your comments regarding the draft of Sustainable Choices 2045 – the Duluth-Superior Long-Range Transportation Plan. Your comments have been recorded into a database and will be shared with appropriate staff during I-35 corridor planning meetings and other meetings. The comments will also be included in an appendix of the final of Sustainable Choices 2045.

Response Date: 10/5/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 19 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Jordan van der Hagen Organization:

Comment: I would be curious to see if converting I-35 to some sort of parkway would be a feasible option for the city, as I could see it alleviating much of the traffic issues related to traversing between Downtown and Canal Park, while also providing new, easier options for multi-modal transportation users. Not to mention all the real estate which could be opened up by slimming the 16 lanes of east-west traffic we see in downtown Duluth.

Response: Thank you for your comments regarding the draft of Sustainable Choices 2045 – the Duluth-Superior Long-Range Transportation Plan. Your comments have been recorded into a database and will be shared with appropriate staff during I-35 corridor planning meetings and other meetings. The comments will also be included in an appendix of the final of Sustainable Choices 2045.

Response Date: 10/5/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 20 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Jordan van der Hagen Organization:

Comment: I think converting I-35 to some sort of parkway would be a cool idea to see explored further in your planning process.

Response: Thank you for your comments regarding the draft of Sustainable Choices 2045 – the Duluth-Superior Long-Range Transportation Plan. Your comments have been recorded into a database and will be shared with appropriate staff during I-35 corridor planning meetings and other meetings. The comments will also be included in an appendix of the final of Sustainable Choices 2045.

Response Date: 10/5/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 21 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to review the Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council's metropolitan transportation plan – Sustainable Choices 2045. The MIC put significant effort in developing the plan. As shared at various meetings and noted throughout the plan, MIC staff did a tremendous job in reaching out to the Duluth-Superior community to gather public and stakeholder input. It is easy to see how this input shaped the final plan.

Response: No comment needed.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 22 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: After reviewing the plan, we shared our comments with the Federal Highway Administration – Minnesota Division. FHWA reviewed and agree with them. In a separate PDF document, we highlighted specific comments to various sections of the plan. These comments reflect input from staff in the Office of Transit and Active Transportation and the Office of Transportation System Management.

Response: No comment needed.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 23 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: System Performance Report (part 1). 23 CFR 450.324(f)(4) requires MPOs to include a system performance report within the metropolitan transportation plan that evaluates the condition and performance of the transportation system in regards the federally required performance targets. This requirement includes a progress report in comparison to system performance recorded in previous reports. Since this is the MIC's first MTP since the performance-based planning requirements were released, there cannot be a comparison discussion.

Response: Baselines were added to the performance measure tables in Chapter 5 using previous year targets. Some discussion of current condition and/or progress being made towards meeting the targets has been included, as well.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 24 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: System Performance Report (part 2). However, the plan should include baseline data and a discussion of the current condition and performance of the system so that comparison data will be available in future MTPs. The draft Sustainable Choices 2045 does not include baseline data for the federally required performance targets.

Response: Baselines were added to the performance measure tables in Chapter 5 using previous year targets. Some discussion of current condition and/or progress being made towards meeting the targets has been included, as well.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 25 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Fiscal Constraint (part 1). 23 CFR 450.325(f)(11) requires the metropolitan transportation plan to be fiscally constrained. Figure 4.3 (page 6-11) and the figure's notes indicate the plan is not fiscally constrained. Sufficient revenue is not shown for WisDOT nor the DTA. While the plan notes it is "reasonably expected" that WisDOT and DTA will receive the needed funds, it does not document why. The plan must provide some rationale as to support why these funds are "reasonably expected." This can be done by a brief discussion of past trends/history in receiving grants, one-time funding, etc.

Response: Better explanation of expenditures, revenues, excesses, reasonably expected additional funding, and fiscal constraint has been provided primarily in numerous locations throughout Chapter 6, as well as in Chapters 1, 3, and 4. This includes a fully new section discussing fiscal constraint in Chapter 6.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 26 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Fiscal Constraint (part 2). Additionally, the plan notes \$1.1 billion dollars in excess revenue. This counters the assertion that there are unfunded needs. It would be helpful to clarify how/why there really isn't a surplus.

Response: Better explanation of expenditures, revenues, excesses, reasonably expected additional funding, and fiscal constraint has been provided primarily in numerous locations throughout Chapter 6, as well as in Chapters 1, 3, and 4. This includes a fully new section discussing fiscal constraint in Chapter 6.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 27 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Operations & Maintenance. 23 CFR 450.325(f)(11)(i) requires metropolitan transportation plans to include system level estimates of costs and revenue sources to operation and maintain the system. Figure 4-3 (page 6-11) includes O&M expenditures, but none are identified for DTA. The list of project types on page 6-4 includes O&M, but the list of projects does not identify any O&M projects.

Response: Revisions were made. See Page 6-11 and Figures 6.2 and 6.7.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 28 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Data. 23 CFR 450.324(e) requires the MPO to use the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The federal regulations are silent in regards to the condition data. However, it seems reasonable that more up-to-date condition data is available than 2012 and 2014 as noted in Figures 5.1 through 5.4. At least in terms of the NHS, MnDOT most recently shared data in June 2019.

Response: Revision was made. Figures 5.1-5.4 replaced with figures with 2018 data.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 29 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: System Overview. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(1) requires the metropolitan transportation plan to include the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods over the planning period. While there is discussion of Level of Service and some system maps, there is limited discussion of transit. For example, what was transit ridership in 2018? What are the trends in transit ridership?

Response: Much more detail about transit and shuttle options in the MIC area has been provided in Chapter 5. This includes a new figure to show DTA ridership trends, positives of DTA, new ideas and improvements, mention that constructive comments were received regarding DTA and STRIDE service, and connection with other services.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 30 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Philip Schaffner Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: We appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments and look forward to working with you as you implement Sustainable Choices 2045. If you have any questions, contact Bobbi Retzlaff at (651) 366-3793 or bobbi.retzlaff@state.mn.us.

Response: No comment needed.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 31 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: WisDOT looked at the final draft plan and would like to confirm it's verbal comments related to WisDOT's projects and studies in the final draft plan.

Response: No comment needed.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 32 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: 1.a. (p. 6-27) short term project listing 2020 – 2024 confirms the projects listed are also in the TIP with the same dollar amounts & scheduling.

Response: This was confirmed.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 33 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: 1.b. (p. 6-27) long term project listing 2030 – 2045 confirms the project listing & existing cost estimate.

Response: This was confirmed.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 34 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: 1.c. part 1 (p. 6-27) medium term project listing 2025-2029 Blatnik bridge. WisDOT has expressed concerns about this item. There is no Blatnik Bridge project nor is there a study to identify alternatives at this time. WisDOT requests the Blatnik Bridge be removed from the project list and shown instead on the study list on page 6-32 under the "projects identified for study". WisDOT would prefer not to list a project estimate at this time, given that no study identifying alternatives has been started to even guess at the funding needs.

Response: Revisions to address this have been made. Revisions include a note of Figure 6.7, a description of the Blatnik Bridge at the start of the Project List section of Chapter 6, revisions within the Project Lists, and within aspects of better explanations of expenditures, revenues, excesses, reasonably expected additional funding, and fiscal constraint provided primarily in numerous locations throughout Chapter 6, as well as in Chapters 1, 3, and 4.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 35 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: 1.c. part 2 (p. 6-27) In response to the MIC's intention to provide some estimate for planning purposes, WisDOT can agree with using an estimate of \$200m each for MnDOT and WisDOT if that estimate is accompanied with a footnote or asterisk clearly stating the dollar amounts for any project coming out of the study reflect the fact that significant funding beyond the usual program funding the MPO usually receives will be required to implement study results. The intent of this request is to ensure the Blatnik Bridge is accurately reflected as an upcoming study not subject to plan fiscal constraint requirements and to meet the MIC's needs to include it accurately for planning purposes. The Blatnik Bridge should be shown as a study, rather than a project wherever it is referenced in other parts of the plan. For example, on maps and in the fiscal constraint table.

Response: Revisions to address this have been made. Revisions include a note of Figure 6.7, a description of the Blatnik Bridge at the start of the Project List section of Chapter 6, revisions within the Project Lists, and within aspects of better explanations of expenditures, revenues, excesses, reasonably expected additional funding, and fiscal constraint provided primarily in numerous locations throughout Chapter 6, as well as in Chapters 1, 3, and 4.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 36 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: 2.a (p.6-7) Estimated revenues in the side bar should reflect \$8m for WisDOT NW Region (shown as \$800,000).

Response: Revision was made of this typo.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 37 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: 2.b.i. (p. 6-11 Figure 4-3) The WI state revenue \$ amount should be changed to reflect the \$8m yearly estimate from page 6-7, inflated at the revenue inflation rate of 2% shown on page 6-7 as well.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 38 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: 2.b.ii. (p. 6-11 Figure 4-3) The WI expenditure, planned project cell should either be blank (no projects are ready to be moved from their study to implementation phase) or if referring to the potential Blatnik Bridge study results, be clearly footnoted to indicate no alternatives study has been initiated – the costs are for planning purposes only.

Response: Revision was made. It is in a note of Figure 6.7 and discussed in a Blatnik Bridge section on page 6-14.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 39 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: 2.b.iii. (p. 6-11 Figure 4-3) Footnote 2 (about expectations of revenues for the Blatnik) should reflect the fact that, whatever alternative comes out of a Blatnik Bridge study would likely be of significant size to require funding from WI and MN outside of the usual amounts for the Region. Since the Blatnik Bridge study has not been initiated, the project does not need to be accounted for in the fiscal constraint table.

Response: Revision was made. It is in a note of Figure 6.7 and discussed in a Blatnik Bridge section on page 6-14.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 40 Date: 9/17/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Diane Paoni Organization: Wisconsin DOT

Comment: Please contact Dena and I if you have any questions.

Response: No comment needed.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 41 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Cover Page disclaimer: Clause 13.3 of the 2019 state grant also includes a disclaimer requirement. The second to last sentence must be modified to read "The contents to no necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the U.S. Department of Transportation, Minnesota Department of Transportation, or Wisconsin Department of Transportation."

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 42 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 1-5 first paragraph: This statement is confusing. How can you have \$199M of unfunded needs with a \$1.1B surplus?

Response: The values were updated and the text revised to better explain fiscal constraint and what appears to be a contradiction. Similar revisions were made in Chapters 3, 4, and 6.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 43 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 1-5 third bullet: CMAQ performance measures do not apply to the MIC; nor does the plan include any.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 44 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 1-6 first bullet: Add bullet.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 45 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 2-7 Objective 3-4: Seems odd this targets/measures are only called out for safety. What about meeting the federally required PM2, PM3 and transit targets? Shouldn't this be an objective under one of the goals?

Response: A similar objective (4-7) was added to meet PM2, PM3, and transit targets.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 46 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 2-7 Objective 3-4: Is the objective to only meet the requirement to have targets? i.e., we have targets so we are addressing the performance measures? Or is the objective to meet/move towards achieving the targets?

Response: No, the objective is not to only meet the requirement to have targets. Obviously the objective is to meet (or achieve) the targets - and not only for PM1, but also PM2, PM3, and transit.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 47 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 2-9 Objective 5-3: Why is only the port called out? What about the airport?

Response: The LRTP Committee supported calling out only the port as it is a unique and very significant economic driver and cultural identity in the MIC area. The airport is a part of other objectives, such as those addressing tourism, freight, modal connections, and mobility.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 48 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 2-10 sidebar: Is something missing? Otherwise, add a period to the sentence and delete the parens.

Response: Revisions were made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 49 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 2-10: last paragraph: This section must be updated. The plan includes the federally required measures/targets.

Response: Revisions were made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 50 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 3-3 first bullet: What about the states? It calls out national grades, but what about MN and WI?

Response: It was a local report card prepared by ASCE (not the MIC). ASCE included a companion summary of national grades, but not state grades.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 51 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 3-3 fourth bullet: This bullet is confusing, particularly since the previous bullet included non-roadway needs. Again, this is confusing since page 1-5 notes a surplus.

Response: The values were updated and the text revised to better explain fiscal constraint and what appears to be a contradiction. Similar revisions were made in Chapters 1, 4, and 6.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 52 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 3-4 second paragraph: Use the actual number 18%, particularly since the actual state and national numbers are used. Will also coordinate better with data on page 4-24.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 53 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 4-9 Figure 4.2: Many images are blurry.

Response: We have done our best to address this and make them as clear as possible. All of plenty readable in the final document.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 54 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 4-15: For all the bullets that state "selection of this option was inverse with age" - clarify what this means.

Response: Added "In this section "inverse with age" means that the older the person, the less likely the person was to select the given option." at the beginning of this entire section for clarity.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 55 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 4-21: Why the comparison to national rather than state? Should include MN and WI states in addition to national number.

Response: First, it is what was prepared by our consultant and Figure 4.3 is the best visual of this point. Some MN data was provided in the next paragraph, as was a reference to additional related data in Appendix E. Second, since a federal code was not referenced requiring state comparisons, the suggestion, while understandable, is not required.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 56 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Chapter 4: What about bike? Ped? Transit? Rail? This chapter is about primary data and results, but there is basically no discussion on these modes. How many people are using transit? etc. etc. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(2) notes the plan must include existing and proposed transportation facilities. Since this chapter discusses LOS, it seems odd none of the other modes are mentioned. Yes, there is discussion in the MetroQuest survey results, but what about how people travel to work? etc.

Response: First, the comment "there is basically no discussion on these modes" is confusing. Roughly six pages were devoted to details of how people use these other modes, and additional information in Appendix E was referenced on page 4-7. However, additional information and figures regarding your comments have been included on pages 4-6, 4-7, and 4-8. Further, additional transit ridership information has been included on page 5-13 and 5-14.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 57 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-2 third paragraph: This last sentence is confusing. We've moved from building wider roads to??? And is the implication we are going to continue building facilities to accommodate growth whether forecast or not? Or is that what happened in the past?

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 58 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-2 sidebar: Replace "medical" with healthcare or medical services.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 59 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-3 first paragraph: Consider defining mobility and access. What is meant by each? What is the relationship between the two concepts?

Response: This has been covered on page 1-2, and has now been reiterated in the sidebar on page 5-18.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 60 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-3 fourth paragraph: Leading with driving - i.e., "driving, walking, cycling..." - indicates that the top priority, even for short trips, will continue to be making it easy for people to travel by personal automobile. Consider revising if the intent is to promote alternative means of travel.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 61 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-4 first paragraph: The LRTP never seems to answer these questions. Instead, it defers to an implementation plan.

Response: Provided more clarity.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 62 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-5 sidebar: The header implies converting the one-way system back to two-way, but the text box only focuses on the history of the one-way system.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 63 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-5 third bullet: Consider rewording the bullet to clarify what is part of existing maintenance demands and what is a new demand.

Response: No action needed.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 64 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-6 first bullet: Public health benefits extend beyond physical inactivity to include social cohesion, safety, stress reduction, improved environmental health and more. Consider adding the ability to support healthy people and environment as an opportunity rather than listing physical inactivity as a challenge.

Response: Revision was made. Bullet added.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 65 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-11: Hard to believe there is not more current data.

Response: Revision was made. Figures 5.1-5.4 replaced with figures with 2018 data. One paragraph added for clarification on page 5-12.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 66 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-12: Would like to see more connection of active transportation and the transit system. Almost anyone using fixed route transit is using public active transportation (exceptions when you have a stop right outside your residence and someone drops you off). These modes and networks share a special interconnection that is unaddressed with the exception of the bullet on ADA sidewalk improvements and sidewalk condition bullets.

Response: Revision was made. Significant revision to this section to highlight our transit system and note interconnections locally and regionally. Transit is also briefly summarized on page 5-34.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 67 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-12: What about intercity bus?

Response: Revisions were made. Improved listing of inter-city options are provided in the text and in the side bar. They are also briefly mentioned on the revised page 5-34.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 68 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-12 first bullet: Add missing).

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 69 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 5-13 first paragraph: Add "a" - serves as a full-service.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 70 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 5-13 second paragraph: Delete "Minn." and "Wis."
Response: Revisions were made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 71 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 5-16 last paragraph: Urban minor collectors are eligible. Rural minor collectors are not.
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 72 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 5-18: Where's a discussion of transit performance?
Response: Revision was made. Transit system and performance language in Chapter 5 was rewritten and/or reorganized to provide a better explanation.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 73 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 5-21: Pg 5-21 and 5-22 seem to be reversed.
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 74 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 5-30 title: Aren't these DTA targets? Not MN and WI targets?
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 75 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 5-31: What about transit?
Response: Significant revisions to the transit section on pages 5-13 and 5-14, as well as revision on page 5-34 better highlight transit and shuttle service in the MIC area.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 76 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 6-3 first paragraph: Not per page 1-5 - there's a \$1.1B surplus.

Response: Better explanation of expenditures, revenues, and fiscal constraint has been provided in Chapter 1, 3, 4, and 6.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 77 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 6-5 Figure 6.1: Difficult to read the legend.

Response: Figure 6.1 was corrected to coordinate with the project lists and enlarged to be more legible.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 78 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 6-6 sidebar: What about state gas taxes and other fees/revenue?

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 79 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 6-7 first paragraph: In 2.00%, suspect these are "O's" and not zeroes.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 80 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 6-7 last paragraph: How can it currently exist if the data is five years old?

Response: Revisions were made to address this concern. Explanations of why 2014 data was used were provided, as well as reasons why improvements since then can be expected. Some 2018 data was included.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 81 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 6-8 sidebar: What is defined as "critical infrastructure"?

Response: Definition of "critical infrastructure" was added.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 82 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 6-9 first paragraph: Change WISDOT to WisDOT. This occurs numerous times throughout this chapter.

Response: Revisions were made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 83 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 6-9: What about O&M needs? Do the estimated revenues include O&M needs? If no, there is likely a bigger gap.

Response: Revisions were made. See Page 6-11 and Figures 6.2 and 6.7.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 84 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 6-11 notes: #2 and #4 do not show fiscal constraint. Need to explain why these funds are assumed/reasonably expected. Is there a previous history of receiving the funds/grants?

Response: Better explanation of expenditures, revenues, and fiscal constraint has been provided in Chapter 6, as well as Chapters 1, 3, and 4.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 85 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Chapter 6 Project Lists: Page 6-4 provides project type definitions, yet these project types are not always listed. For example, Twin Ports Interchange is not a project type. Neither is intersection control, ITS, etc. O&M is shown for transit but not roadways, yet the definition also hints at roadways.

Response: Revisions have been made. The project type list and definitions in chapter 6 have been revised to reflect what is in the project lists. Project type in the project lists have been provided by and/or confirmed as appropriate by the jurisdictions. Figure 6.1 has been revised with what is in the project lists. An explanation of the Twin Ports Interchange as a project type has been provided in Chapter 6.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 86 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 6-34 first paragraph: "was" not "were".
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 87 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 6-34 third paragraph: What thresholds were used? This should be discussed in the text. Also need to discuss the area's minority populations since there has been discussion in the plan so far.
Response: Revisions were made. Appropriate population demographic information was added to the sidebar on page 6-38.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 88 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Chapter 6 Map 6.1: Missing map legend. What is this map showing?
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 89 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 6-36 last paragraph: This doesn't mean there are no concerns.
Response: We agree. Our language does not indicate there are no problems, only that none have been received thus far, during the development of the plan.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 90 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 7-12 first paragraph: 2045
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 91 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 7-12 first paragraph: and WisDOT
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 92 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 7-13 sidebar: Change to singular - The tribe does not.
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 93 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 8-2 first paragraph: Update plan name.
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 94 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 8-8 first paragraph: Put plan name in italics.
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 95 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 8-10 third paragraph: Not all of the plans listed are modal or long range. Consider renaming section to Minnesota Transportation Plans.
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 96 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 8-12 fourth paragraph: Check with District - perhaps should reference CHIP.
Response: No action needed.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 97 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Orgnization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 8-12 seventh paragraph: Current rail plan is called Minnesota State Rail Plan. Update link - see Minnesotago.org for list of all current plan links.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 98 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Orgnization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 8-13: Add the Port and Waterways Plan.
<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/ofrw/waterways/pwp.html>

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 99 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Orgnization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 8-13: Add the Minnesota Statewide Regional ITS Architecture Plan. A potential summary could be: The 2018 plan provides a common framework for the planning, design, implementation, integration and operation of ITS throughout the state. It reflects the state's compliance with the National ITS Architecture and supports system integration and coordination between different transportation stakeholders.

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 100 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Orgnization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 8-13 second paragraph: ecommend adding MnDOT District 1 Bike Plan as another Minnesota Modal plan. The D1 bike plan identifies bicycle investment routes for targeted improvements in bicycle facilities throughout the entirety of District 1.
<https://www.dot.state.mn.us/bike/district-bicycle-plans.html>

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 101 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Orgnization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Page 8-13 fourth paragraphs: Different font size?

Response: Revision was made.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 102 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Page 8-13 sixth paragraph: Why are WisDOT plan titles italicized and MnDOT plans are not?
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 103 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Appendix E Page 5: If intended to reflect 2018 conditions, why is 2015 ACS data being used?
Response: Revised. 2018 changed to "as current conditions as reasonably possible".
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 104 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Appendix E Page 7 first paragraph: The study defined millennials as those born between 1982 and 2003.
Response: Revision was made.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 105 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Appendix E Page 7 Table 4: Since the plan is to 2045, why include 2050?
Response: It hurts nothing to include 2050 data AND helps to show how the MIC area is anticipated to have the aging bubble earlier than the state and nation.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 106 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:
Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT
Comment: Appendix E Map E-1: Need consistency in ACS data. Some is referencing 2016 and others 2015.
Response: All maps use 2016 data. At the time maps were prepared there was not 2017 or 2018 data available. Further our consultants prepared our trends document (essentially Appendix E) using 2015 data presumably for the same reason.
Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comments Received on the Draft LRTP with MIC Responses

Comment ID: 107 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Appendix E Map E-2: What about Hispanic? Per the USDOT EJ order 5610.2, minority includes Hispanic.

Response: The map represents all non-white people, so it includes hispanics.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal:

Comment ID: 108 Date: 8/28/2019 Submittal Type:

Name: Organization: Minnesota DOT

Comment: Appendix E Page 37: The study is referencing 2017, yet Figure 11 only includes data until 2016. Can you add the 2017 data?

Response: Revision was made. The figure was updated and is now Figure 16.

Response Date: 10/10/2019 Response Submittal: