

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: 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: 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: Organization: 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: Organization: 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: Organization: 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: Organization: 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: Organization: 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: