We employed a multi-faceted engagement strategy to gather input across a broad range of geographic and demographic groups.

### 12,450 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8-MONTH ENGAGEMENT PERIOD (2015/2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fair outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Stakeholder forums**
  - 150 responses

- **We conducted ongoing, statewide engagement, taking our program on the road and meeting with people where they live, work, and play.**

### Highlights

- **State Fair outreach**
  - 5,500 responses

- **Workplace events**
  - 250 responses

- **Community events**
  - 900 responses

- **Stakeholder briefings**
  - 550 responses

### Engaging Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>125 events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,450 attendees (estimated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**statewide**

### Social Media and Web Engagement

- **Facebook**
  - 250K+ views

- **Twitter**
  - 47,200+ impressions

- **Email**
  - 11,000+ recipients

- **Website**
  - 7,500+ sessions

- **Web surveys**
  - 2,300 responses

- **Social media surveys**
  - 2,800 responses

- **Emails**
  - 7,500+ sessions
WHAT IS THE SMTP?

MnDOT’s Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan (SMTP) guides Minnesota’s transportation stakeholders towards the Minnesota GO Vision by focusing on the relationship between transportation and the environment, economy and people in our state.

The SMTP goes beyond MnDOT and beyond the state highway system. Every four years the plan considers the status of the transportation system, key changes occurring in the state, and how those changes should influence the transportation system going forward.

ENGAGEMENT FOCUS

The SMTP’s first phase of outreach focused on sharing information about how Minnesota is expected to change in the next 20 years and understanding which of those changes were most important to Minnesotans.

This process sought to understand the challenges and opportunities that Minnesotans prioritized for action in the updated SMTP.

Outreach was conducted at standing meetings, community events, and at workplaces in an attempt to meet people in places that they typically visit, rather than asking them to make time for a separate meeting. Participants had the opportunity to respond to a series of questions through either an online survey or on paper worksheets.
How important is it for MnDOT to plan for different areas of change?

### Environment Changes
- **Public**
- **Stakeholders**

*Rated higher by:*

Environment was the top ranked trend area overall

### Transportation Behavior Changes
- **Public**
- **Stakeholders**

*Rated higher by:*

Men, Asian, White, and Ages 21-35, 36-50, 51-65, 66+

### Population Changes
- **Public**
- **Stakeholders**

*Rated higher by:*

American Indian or Alaska Native

### Economic Changes
- **Public**
- **Stakeholders**

*Rated higher by:*

Men, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic, Multiple Races/Ethnicities

### Technology Changes
- **Public**
- **Stakeholders**

*Rated higher by:*

American Indian or Alaska Native, Ages 20 and under

---

**How did different regions respond?**

We looked at participant zip code data to see if different parts of the state had different trend area preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater MN</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="2" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="3" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="4" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="5" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="2" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="3" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="4" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="5" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Most important  
5 = Least important
### Top five Minnesota trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aging Infrastructure</td>
<td>The priority should be on maintaining existing assets rather than expansion of assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urban &amp; Rural Population Trends</td>
<td>Recognize different contexts and have different goals / objectives for each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Be aware of climate change and plan ahead for impacts, specifically where impacts may disrupt transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Environmental Quality</td>
<td>Build an environmentally-friendly transportation system - less pollution, improved health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transportation Behavior</td>
<td>Make sure to understand how transportation behaviors are going to change in the future. Develop system priorities accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THESE TOP 5 TRENDS WERE RANKED HIGHLY ACROSS ALL RESPONDENT GROUPS.**

However, different trends were important to different groups of people. We noted where some trends may not have fallen in the top 5, but were still relatively important to those groups.

**Rated as top 5 in specific groups**

- **Aging Population**
- **Multiple Races**
- **Ages 20 and under**
- **American Indian or Alaska Native, Hispanic**
- **Economy & Employment**
- **Mobility as a Service**
- **Health Trends**
- **Black or African American, Hispanic**
- **Black or African American, Ages 20 and under**
- **Electrification & Alternative Fuels**
- **Autonomous Vehicles**
- **Racial Disparities & Equity**
- **Freight Rail**
- **Public-Private Partnerships**
- **Mobile Technology**
- **New Logistics**
- **Dynamic Road Pricing**
- **Sensors, Monitors, & Big Data**
- **Unmanned Aircraft Systems/Drones**
- **Demographic Trends**
- **Teleworking & e-Shopping**
- **Ages 20 and under**
- **American Indian or Alaska Native, Ages 66+**
- **Ages 20 and under**
- **American Indian or Alaska Native, Hispanic**
- **Ages 20 and under**
- **Ages 20 and under**
WHAT IS MnSHIP?

The Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP) decides and communicates capital investment priorities on the state highway system—a network of roads that includes interstates, U.S. and state highways, and serves automobiles, commercial vehicles, motorcycles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit.

MnSHIP supports the guiding principles from the Minnesota GO Vision and link the policies and strategies in the SMTP to improvements on the state highway system.

MnDOT’s capital investments on the state highway system are separated into 13 investment categories. The plan is fiscally constrained and its expenditures align with projected revenue over the 20 years of the plan.

ENGAGEMENT FOCUS

In general, the questions asked during MnSHIP public engagement were meant to gain input on what investments MnDOT should prioritize. MnDOT asked:

a. Which of the three draft investment approaches was preferred?

b. What investment categories are most important and should be prioritized for investment?

c. What should MnDOT invest in? This was an open ended question allowing participants to communicate their priorities for investment and include priorities which may not have been identified in the previous questions.
WHICH APPROACH ADDRESSES YOUR PRIORITIES?

A Highway surfaces
B Bridges
C Supporting infrastructure
D Highway ownership
E Rest areas/weigh stations
F New safety investment
G Twin Cities area mobility
H Greater MN mobility
I Bicycling
J Walking
K Regional/local priorities
L Other

PREFERENCE & AVG RATING:
We asked participants to rate each approach and select their favorite. Preference shows
the number of participants who selected the approach. The average rating is for all
participants on a scale from 0-100.

HOW DID DIFFERENT REGIONS RESPOND?
We looked at participant zip code data to see if different parts of the state had different
preferences. The map to the right shows the top approach for each MnDOT district. The graph to
the right shows what percentage of Greater MN and Metro participants prefer each approach.

APPROACH A
Preference: 250 | Avg Rating*: 70.4
Prioritize investments in repairing and maintaining existing state highways, bridges, and supporting infrastructure.

APPROACH B
Preference: 302 | Avg Rating*: 68.7
Balance repairing and maintaining existing state highways, bridges and supporting infrastructure with strategically investing in reliable travel times.

APPROACH C
Preference: 224 | Avg Rating*: 63.2
Emphasize investments in biking, walking, ensuring reliable travel times, and regional and local priorities.
Where should MnDOT Invest?

**What should MnDOT focus on?**

1. **Highway surface/pavements**
2. **Bridges**
3. **Supporting infrastructure**

These top 3 categories were ranked highly across all respondent groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED APPROACH</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Minnesota:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Area:</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 32% preferred
  - Addressing bridge and pavement needs along with the financial impacts of deferred maintenance outweigh other approaches.

- 39% preferred
  - A balanced approach addresses immediate needs while also investing in future, long-range goals and mobility needs.

- 29% preferred
  - Investing in mobility and non-motorized infrastructure aligns with likely future of transportation system based trends.

- Rated as top 3 in specific groups:
  - Greater MN, Hispanic / Amer. Indian or Alaskan Native
  - Stakeholders, Black or African American, Hispanic
  - New safety investment
  - Metro area, Asian
  - Greater MN, Hispanic
  - Twin Cities area mobility
  - Greater MN mobility
  - Black or African American
  - Ages 20 and younger
  - Bicycling
  - Rest areas & weigh stations
  - Walking
  - Highway ownership

All respondents statewide
WHO PARTICIPATED?

A first for MnDOT, we collected optional, anonymous demographic data on participant zip code, age, gender, and race/ethnicity. When asked, 56% of participants provided at least some information. We analyzed the data monthly and used it to identify underserved communities and introduce new engagement methods to broaden the project reach.

- **Men**: 50% (47% State of Minnesota, 53% Minnesota GO respondents)
- **Women**: 50% (50% State of Minnesota, 50% Minnesota GO respondents)
- **White**: 88% (87% State of Minnesota, 86% Minnesota GO respondents)
- **Black or African American**: 6% (5% State of Minnesota, 6% Minnesota GO respondents)
- **Asian**: 5% (5% State of Minnesota, 5% Minnesota GO respondents)
- **American Indian or Alaskan Native**: 1% (1% State of Minnesota, 1% Minnesota GO respondents)
- **Multiple**: 1% (1% State of Minnesota, 2% Minnesota GO respondents)
- **Hispanic**: 5% (5% State of Minnesota, 5% Minnesota GO respondents)

---

**AGE**
- **20 and younger**: 3% (21% 1 - 5, 24% 6 - 10, 25% > 10)
- **21-35**: 24% (20% 1 - 5, 20% 6 - 10, 25% > 10)
- **36-50**: 25% (20% 1 - 5, 20% 6 - 10, 25% > 10)
- **51-65**: 34% (20% 1 - 5, 20% 6 - 10, 34% > 10)
- **66+**: 13% (12% 1 - 5, 13% 6 - 10, 12% > 10)

---

**PILOTING A NEW PARTNERSHIP:** To help reach identified underserved communities, MnDOT teamed up with TPT/ECHO (Emergency, Community, Health, and Outreach).

- **10 Community events**
- **3 Engagement specialists**
- **3 Language translations**
- **300+ Underserved community surveys completed**

---

**Reaching Underserved Communities**

**Pilot Partnership**