

- UNAPPROVED -

**MINUTES
PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT/TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 13, 2026
4:30 PM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Craig Schafer and John Alcorn

MEMBERS ABSENT: James Lozinski

STAFF PRESENT: Jason Anderson, Director of Public Works/City Engineer; Eric Hanson, Assistant City Engineer; Geoff Stelter, Senior Engineering Specialist; E.J. Moberg, Director of Administrative Services

OTHERS PRESENT: None

Call to Order

Schafer called the meeting to order at 4:36 pm.

Director Anderson requested that Item Six: Review and Discuss US 59 Truck Bypass and Three: Project ST-001-2026 Chip Sealing on Various City Streets be swapped just in case time runs short.

1. Approval of Minutes

MOTION MADE BY SCHAFFER to approve the minutes of the November 25, 2025, meeting as presented, SECOND BY ALCORN ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED 2:0.

2. Project ST-014 (139-122-009/139-124-005): S 4th & Country Club Intersection Reconfiguration and Reconstruction - Consultant Selection Process

The S 4th Street and Country Club Drive intersection currently operates under traffic signal control today. The traffic signal was installed in 1983, and it is well out of compliance with current accessibility standards. The skew angle at this intersection creates a safety hazard for both motorized travelers and pedestrians. Both S. 4th Street and Country Club Drive are Municipal State Aid Street (MSAS) routes. The City of Marshall receives a significant amount of funding for the maintenance and improvement of MSAS routes. With this funding, there is also a mandate from MnDOT that engineering standards are complied with and MSAS rules are followed to both utilize the funds for improvements and continue to draw "needs" that result in MSAS fund disbursement. With these considerations in mind and understanding that an improvement needs to be made at this intersection to ensure compliance with current standards, engineering staff received Council support to solicit proposals for an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) at the January 26, 2021, meeting. At the February 23, 2021, meeting, the City selected Short Elliot Hendrickson (SEH) to perform the ICE and generate the report. Following a July 6, 2021, PI/T meeting, the City Council accepted the ICE report at their July 13, 2021, meeting and recommended drawing 3 or 5 for the intersection. Following this Council meeting, City staff hosted adjacent property owners for an informational session on August 9, 2021, to present the proposed changes and seek input. This project is currently identified in our 2027 CIP. City engineering staff has garnered two federal LRBP grants that total \$824,000 for this project. Additional project funding will come from the water, sewer, and stormwater utility for utility work on South 4th Street, and MSAS funding for all remaining costs. Prior conversations with Council and property owners have promoted Layout 5, and staff believes that there was support for Layout 5 back in 2021. With the project nearing, we'd like to re-confirm Layout 5 or hear input otherwise. Staff will likely request hiring a consultant to aid in project design and permitting for this project, and with the federal standards and process. This item was again presented to the Public Improvement/Transportation Committee on 06/10/2025. At this meeting, City staff re-confirmed the PI/T Committee's commitment to Layout 5, which included a split T intersection with one mini-roundabout. Staff also informed the Committee of our intent to hire an engineering consultant to assist with project plan design and federal standards. At the 06/10/2025 meeting, the PI/T Committee recommended Layout 5 to the City Council, with a mini roundabout to the west and a ¾ or full intersection to the east. City staff would like to discuss the process for selecting an engineering consultant. Staff would like to send to a couple of firms to provide engineering services

and would like the PI/T Committee to assist with consultant selection in mid-January, with proposals returned by February 5th. Staff would like the three members of the PI/T Committee and two Public Works staff members to be the Proposal Review Committee. The Review Committee will be given proposals to read and a score sheet to privately rank engineering proposals. Cost of engineering proposals to be determined. All costs are State Aid eligible.

Alcorn questioned the number of quotes needed to hire a consulting firm. Director Anderson stated that no specific number of quotes were needed for professional services. However, having a small number of quotes was welcome to ensure competitiveness and affordability. Alcorn asked if the February 5th deadline would be enough time to receive proposals since it was already the middle of January. Hanson confirmed February 5th should be plenty of time as he had already reached out to a couple firms and the firms were already preparing proposals. Schafer and Alcorn both agreed with keeping the number of consultant proposals small but competitive.

MOTION MADE BY ALCORN that the Committee recommend that City staff move forward with requesting engineering proposals for design of the Project ST-014 and convene the Proposal Review Committee once all proposals are submitted, SECOND BY SCHAFFER ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED. 2:0.

6. Review and Discuss US 59 Truck Bypass

City staff has been asked to consider requesting a US 59 truck bypass to route heavy truck traffic around Marshall on MN 23 to County Road 33. The request began as a discussion between a Planning Commission member and City Engineer over a year ago. After discussion, City staff brought forward the request to the traffic engineer's office of MnDOT District 8. City posed the question in spring 2025 of whether it was possible to sign a truck bypass and what that process would look like. The response that City staff received indicated that the MnDOT traffic office did not believe that signing a US 59 truck bypass would significantly reduce truck traffic along the corridor. The shortest truck bypass would add 2.1 miles to the journey, as it would route US 59 traffic around Marshall on MN 23 and then back to US 59 on County Road 33. Further, MnDOT traffic officials were concerned that creating a bypass route could create some confusion with the traveling public as MN 23 carries quite a bit of through truck traffic, and additional signage at the signalized intersection of MN23/US 59 isn't desirable. In their view, the signage may cause more disruption and confusion, and the benefit just isn't there due to the route being so much longer and less direct and intuitive. The purpose of discussing this item is to assist in determining the level of interest in this topic amongst City Council members. City staff believe we may have discussed this topic at a past PI/T Committee meeting, but we are not finding record of the discussion in our minutes to verify this. While City staff are sympathetic to the idea that there is too much truck traffic through downtown Marshall, we do understand the response from the MnDOT traffic engineers and their belief that the signing of a truck bypass will likely be ineffective at best and may cause driver confusion at worst.

Schafer partially agreed that a reduction of truck traffic on Main Street would be welcome but noted that changing truck routes can be difficult. Schafer suggested to help alleviate some of the dangerous trucks that MnDOT could sign the downtown district as being "Center Lane" or "Left Lane" only for thru trucks. Schafer also suggested possibly lowering the speed limit to 25 MPH from First Street to Seventh Street. The combination of lowering the speed and traffic lights could cause GPS navigation algorithms to divert to a better bypass route. The group discussed concerns that could come up diverting truck traffic to County Road 33 such as increased congestion and an increase in vehicles before and after school lets out at the High School. Also, the need for Lyon County to agree to the use of their road as a bypass. Director Anderson added that the most successful bypass routes were by design and not created after roads had already been built. Anderson addressed lowering the speed limit on Main Street that MnDOT would need to conduct a speed study to determine what the appropriate speed should be and MnDOT could possibly find that the speed should be increased instead of decreased. Alcorn was also in agreement with Schafer on reducing the number of semi-truck traffic going through downtown. Anderson pointed out that using Google Maps showed that using MN 23 and diverting to County Road 33 was one minute slower than going through the middle of town even though the distance traveled was a bit further. The group continued the discussion of congestion on County Road 33 and the train overpass.

MOTION MADE BY SCHAFFER that Committee recommends no action through the MnDOT regarding this item and table for now, SECOND BY ALCORN. ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED 2:0.

4. Project ST-002-2026: Bituminous Overlay Project

Current project estimate for mill and overlay is \$626,860.00, including all streets shown below (excluding “Alternate Streets”) and ADA sidewalk ramp work. The 2026 Capital budget includes \$650,000 for this project. It is staff’s intent to include the alternate street if bids are advantageous and we can keep the project cost below the CIP budget of \$650,000.

Street	From-To
Carrow Street (Mill All)	Horizon Dr. - East College Dr.
Michigan Road (Edge Mill)	Lake Road - MMUA Training Center Road
McLaughlin Dr. (Edge Mill)	Mustang Trail - O’Connell Street
Service Road (Edge Mill)	McLaughlin Dr. - 1st connection to East College Dr.
Camden Dr. (Mill All)	James Avenue - Southview Dr.
Margaret Avenue (Mill All)	Susan Dr. - Boyer Dr. (Walmart Service Road)
Scott Street (Edge Mill)	Genesis Avenue - Windstar Street
Washington Avenue (Mill All)	Bruce Street - Van Buren Street
Van Buren Street (Mill All)	Washington Street - Jefferson Avenue
Evergreen Avenue (Mill All)	Van Buren Street - Parkside Dr.
Ellis Avenue (Edge Mill)	Canoga Park Dr. - South End

Alternate Streets	From-To
Canoga Park Dr. (Edge Mill)	T.H. 59 - Canoga Park Dr./Circle

Director Anderson added that the newest roads on the list were from 2006, and the oldest was from 1998, which had far exceeded its expected life span. Commission members discussed Margaret Ave (Walmart Service Road) and how the overlay would be like the service road that loops around Hobby Lobby/Ashley Furniture.

MOTION MADE BY SCHAFFER that the Committee recommend to City Council to authorize advertisement for bids for Project ST-002-2026: Bituminous Overlay Project, SECOND BY ALCORN ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED 2:0.

5. 2026 State Aid Overlay Project

Current project estimate for mill and overlay is \$500,660, including all streets shown below and ADA sidewalk ramp work. This project is identified on our CIP at \$400,000, but it did not include the intersection of Susan Drive near US59. Utilizing updated project quantities and our most current cost estimate arrives at \$500,660. The project will be funded with Municipal State Aid Street (MSAS) dollars. The current MSAS account balance is (\$1,181,854). Our low balance threshold is (\$4,000,000).

Street	From-To
South 6th Street (Mill Edge)	Saratoga Street to Kendell Street
South 4th Street (Mill Edge)	Elaine Avenue to T.H. 23
Windstar Street (Mill Edge)	Saratoga Street to Scott Street
Susan Drive (Mill All)	Intersection off T.H. 59

Director Anderson added that about 20 of the 80 streets within the city were state aid and this project was also included in the request for Municipal State Aid Street Funds Advance that was on the agenda for the regular council agenda tonight. Committee members agreed with the project and proposed streets.

MOTION MADE BY ALCORN that the Committee recommend to City Council to authorize advertisement for bids for the 2026 State Aid Overlay Project, SECOND BY SCHAFFER ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED. 2:0.

3. Project ST-001-2026: Chip Sealing on Various City Streets

The estimated total project cost is approximately \$153,635 including all streets shown below (excluding “Alternate Streets”). The 2026 Street Department budget includes a \$165,000 line item for this project.

BASE BID STREETS			
Street	From-To	Street	From-To
Michigan Road	N. T.H. 59 - MERIT Training Road	Maple St.	S. 2nd St. - S. 1st St.
Michigan Road	MERIT Center Gravel Road - Atlantic Ave	Service Drive	Jewett St. - O’Connell St.
Charles/Hill/Minnesota	2025 Construction area	Madrid Circle (Airport Park)	Channel Parkway - Channel Parkway

Grimes St.	S. 2nd St. - Williams St.	Floyd Wild Drive	Canoga Park Dr. - E. Southview Drive
South 2nd St.	Country Club Dr. - George St.	Canoga Park Drive	T.H. 23 - Canoga Park Circle
Lucille St.	S. 4th St. - S. 2nd St.	O'Connell St.	Service Dr. - Birch St.
Williams St.	Grimes St. - Maple St.	N. 7th St.	W. Fairview St. - Kossuth Ave

ALTERNATE STREETS			
Street	From-To	Street	From-To
South Bend Avenue	Southview Dr. - Camden Dr.	Marguerite Avenue	Southview Dr. - Camden Dr.

In recent years staff and PI/T Committee have discussed the merits of a spray-on pavement rejuvenator product in lieu of the chip seal program. In the past, City staff has not felt comfortable pursuing the use of spray-on rejuvenators because they were not well-studied and there are many products on the market that all claim results. Beginning in 2023, the MN Local Road Research Board (LRRB) has begun studying 12 different spray-on rejuvenators to study effectiveness. Through this research, four products have shown the most promise for improving pavement longevity. One of these products is Reclamite, and this is the product that City staff has been reviewing and considering. Though the LRRB report indicates that Reclamite does appear to have a beneficial impact on pavement binder by reducing pavement stiffness, the duration of the study was not long enough to quantify the length of the benefit. It is theorized in the report that most spray-on rejuvenators will require reapplication every 2-3 years, though Reclamite was a product that did appear to still influence pavement creep stiffness at the 3-year mark. In summary, while City staff does believe that Reclamite may be a good product for the City to consider in future years, we believe that we should continue to monitor these studies and look for a little more conclusive evidence regarding the duration of the benefit from treatment, so we can better make a cost-benefit comparison to chip sealing. We do know that a good chip seal lasts upwards of 7 years; if a spray-on rejuvenator costs a similar price to apply and must be re-applied every 3 years, it effectively costs twice as much, and you are also disrupting property owners and traffic more frequently. It is staff's recommendation that we continue with the chip seal program for 2026 and keep monitoring alternatives in the industry. In staff's opinion, there are much larger entities than Marshall that should adopt use of a specific rejuvenator before Marshall decides to make the change. The Street Department budget includes \$165,000 for chip sealing work. Staff intend to award a contract that does not exceed this amount.

The Committee had further questions regarding the effectiveness of Reclamite. Hanson further explained the testing that was being conducted by the Local Road Research Board (LRRB), of which the Minnesota Department of Transportation is a member of. Ramsey County, Rosemount, Richfield and Woodbury have used Reclamite and are still in the early phases of results. Anderson was still hesitant to be an early adopter of the product until more data and use cases became available. Alcorn asked how much, if any, saving could be had by switching to Reclamite. Anderson said the saving would probably be small currently because the product costs more and would have to be reapplied more often than chip sealing. Alcorn mentioned that another alternative would be to do nothing on the streets and let them deteriorate until they need to be reconstructed at a greater cost.

MOTION MADE BY SCHAFFER that the Committee recommend to City Council to authorize advertisement for bids for Project ST-001-2026: Chip Sealing on Various City Streets Project, SECOND BY ALCORN ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED 2:0.

Other Business

There was no further business.

Adjourn

Being no further business, MOTION MADE BY ALCORN to adjourn the meeting, SECOND BY SCHAFFER ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED 2:0. Meeting adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Steven Anderson, City Clerk