

## MATS 2045 MTP – MDOT and FHWA Comments

### John Lanum (Performance Measures)

- The chapter is generally well written and adequately covers the background of transportation performance measures.
- The first sentence on page 77/74 of the Performance Measure chapter should maybe be rewritten. It could say, “This plan, as any plan should, includes a process for...”
- Page 109/106: the Public Transit Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) rule originally became effective on July 19, 2019.
- Page 111/108: though the first paragraph of the Performance Measure chapter details this, there should be a last sentence of this System Performance Report that would say: “This data will also be used to monitor progress toward the attainment of the performance measure targets.”
- The table on page 113/110 should show the text and numbers as this:

<b>Measure (5-year rolling average)</b>	<b>Baseline Condition (2016-2020)</b>	<b>2022 Targets (2018-2022)</b>
<b>Number of Fatalities</b>	<b>1,028.2</b>	<b>1,065.2</b>
<b>Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT</b>	<b>1.051</b>	<b>1.098</b>
<b>Number of Serious Injuries</b>	<b>5,673.2</b>	<b>5,733.2</b>
<b>Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT</b>	<b>5.778</b>	<b>5.892</b>
<b>Number of Non-motorized (Pedestrian and Bicycle) Fatalities and Serious Injuries</b>	<b>762.8</b>	<b>791.6</b>

### Brad Sharlow (SUTA)

Overall, they did a solid job discussing the planning process, and how they went about developing this plan. It appeared to cover all the essential pieces and laid things out very well.

My one comment, which I have brought up in several MPO plans recently, is that there is no reference or link to the new state long-range transportation plan ([Michigan Mobility 2045](#)), and how their plan seeks to coordinate with what is being done at the statewide level. I would encourage that they add a brief paragraph at least mentioning it somewhere in their document, and coordination that is needed accordingly.

**Katie Beck (SUTA, modeling)**

The [modeling chapter] language is accurate and sufficient and I have no additional comments/changes.

**Elisha Wulff (Freight)**

I think the freight components look great! My only comment would be to either look in the MM2045 plan or contact us because we have more recent freight data figures to update those they reference.

**Rog Belknap (TAMC)**

I have no comments or edits to suggest.

**Richard Bayus (EJ)**

I would say overall [MATS] did a pretty good job on the EJ section. I have no substantial comments on the EJ portion of the document.

**Donna Wittl (AQ Conformity Specialist)**

I have reviewed the document for the air quality topic and specifically the air quality section. The content in the document is acceptable since the MPO is in an area that does not have any air quality requirements.

**Christina Ignasiak (FHWA)**

- Really appreciate your comprehensive attention to performance measures and funding sources
- Agency consultation - great that this comprehensive list is included
- Expand on transit planning/improvement next steps related to transit study recommendations; consider connecting transit improvements more strongly to meeting transportation needs in EJ section
- Are there regionally significant projects you could highlight more prominently? Perhaps the road diet project (p. 44/41)?
- Resiliency and flooding issues could relate to projects that may be eligible for the new IJA PROTECT funding; consider mentioning that you will be convening stakeholders for project development, or some other next step that you could reference to show that resiliency is a high priority in your MTP when applying for PROTECT funding
- COVID not addressed at all; even a general statement in executive summary about unknown/unfolding impacts, any connection to congestion, how COVID affected your public

participation process, and/or how COVID affected your MTP update development process would be helpful

- New planning emphasis areas: these just came out, so addressing them in this update is not required, but it could still be helpful if you notice opportunities to mention them

### **Lindsey Dowswell (SPS)**

- Overall, a thorough and helpful long-range plan that has an understandable and comprehensive vision that integrates federal and regional priorities, and gives excellent planning, regional history, and transportation system background information.
- On page 18/15, in the Demographics – Base Year Population, Household and Employment Data section, the sentence “This data was then reviewed and approved by MATS Technical and Policy Committees in April 2015” needs an updated approval date for the new data.
- Transit: On pages 39/36 (Transit Coordination), 42/39 (Aging Population), and 43/40 (Midland County Public Transportation Study), the plan raises the issue that transit needs in the area are not being met – but then the project lists, both fiscally constrained and unfunded, do not list any projects related to improving transit service based on the Transit Study recommendations (i.e., fixed route transit) or any other planning efforts. Can more be said about the specific next steps for expanding transit, either based on the Transit Study recommendations or further planning efforts? This could be helpful for programming the IIJA Carbon Reduction funding.
- Climate resilience: The major flooding events highlighted in the plan on p. 43/40 raise questions about planning for increased precipitation and climate resilient transportation infrastructure. Can more be said about next steps for addressing this transportation issue (by convening stakeholders, developing projects...) in the region? This could be helpful for programming the IIJA PROTECT funding.
- On page 55/52, I may be missing something, but it looks like some of the totals in the far right column of the revenues table are showing the 2036-2045 numbers only rather than the sum of the whole row.
- On page 67/64, it states “Agencies contacted regarding environmental mitigation are included in the appendix.” I may be missing something again, but I didn’t see that specific list in the appendix.
- On page 69/66, the map of MATS Area Endangered, Threatened & Special Concern species is a little confusing to me. Since the map is showing that all of MATS’ area is habitat for these species, an item in the legend showing how “endangered/threatened/special concern species habitat” is symbolized in the map would be helpful.
- On page 81/78, in the agency contact list, East Michigan Council of Governments (in the third column) and Saginaw County Road Commission (in the first and third columns) are listed twice.
- On page 103/100, on the Midland County Species Review List – it may just be my PDF viewer, but it looks like the Source credit is somehow showing up on top of the text of the sixth row from the bottom, making it unreadable.