

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses**

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

### Chapter 1

|                  |   |   |     |       |  |
|------------------|---|---|-----|-------|--|
| <b>1.1 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D-1   | RE: Ch.1 p.4 - How Was This Plan Developed? |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | The header doesn't seem to fit for all of the bullets below. Was Metroquest used in this planning process or was that 2045? I thought it was a different platform this time, like Surveymonkey. |   |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Section revised for clarity   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                   | Yes | p.1-4 |  |

|                  |  |  |     |       |  |
|------------------|--|--|-----|-------|--|
| <b>1.2 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D-1                                  | RE: Ch.1 p.6 - Key improvements, Minnesota DOT |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Revise first project description (with suggested text) |  |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Revised in accordance with suggested text              | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                      | Yes | p.1-6 |  |

|                  |  |  |     |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|-----|--|--|
| <b>1.3 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, FHWA - MN  | RE: Ch.1 p.4, How Was This Plan Developed? |     |  |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | The MPO is strongly encouraged to include a documented amendment process. Not sure if it should go in this chapter or elsewhere in the MTP |  |     |  |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | The MTP amendment process will be documented in the MIC's updated Public Involvement Plan, and included in the final MTP as an Appendix    | <b>**Addressed in Plan?</b>                | n/a |  |  |

|                  |  |                           |     |       |  |
|------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|-------|--|
| <b>1.4 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT Central Office   | RE: Ch.1 p.3              |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Ch1 p.3, Spell out IJJA, Add BIL<br>Ch1 p.3, Sidebar : Be consistent in using either LRTP or MTP. Because you used MTP in the intro, I would recommend sticking with MTP. Using both will confuse folks. |                           |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Searched all chapters and made these edits.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.1-3 |  |

|                  |   |                           |     |              |  |
|------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|--------------|--|
| <b>1.5 From:</b> | Community member  | RE: Ch1 p.2               |     |              |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Typo on p.1-2. I'm having trouble with the embedded hyperlinks too. I'm guessing that anything in blue is a hyperlink to a page. Maybe this is not intended, but it would "beef" up the document for reference points for those in the crowd that like to interface with a document in that manner. |                           |     |              |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | PDF revised so the hyperlinks are active throughout.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | All chapters |  |

### Chapter 2

|                  |  |                               |     |                 |  |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------|-----|-----------------|--|
| <b>2.1 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT Central Office   | RE: Ch.2 pg.7 - Objective 4-6 |     |                 |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | What about PM1 (safety)?<br>Spell out NHS<br>What about PTASP (Public Transit Area Safety Plan)?                               |                               |     |                 |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | PM1 is covered under Objective 1-4.<br>NHS has been spelled out.<br>Addressed PTASP in Chapter 5, performance measures section | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>     | Yes | p.2-4<br>p.5-47 |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                  |  |   |     |       |  |
|------------------|--|---|-----|-------|--|
| <b>2.2 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT Central Office   | RE: Ch.2 pg. 9 - Incorporating Strategies & Tactics |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | My understanding is that you are using the performance measures as strategies - I would reword this sentence to redirect the focus to that rather than stating there are no other strategies in the MTP. |   |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | The last sentence of the first paragraph on page 2-9 was revised based on this comment.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                           | Yes | p.2-9 |  |

|                  |  |                           |     |                           |  |
|------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|---------------------------|--|
| <b>2.3 From:</b> | Reviewers 1 & 2, WisDOT Central Office   | RE: Ch.2 pg 4 – Goal 3    |     |                           |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | <p>Recommend explicit integration into the MTP of the goals and objectives contained within the Wisconsin Strategic Highway Safety Plan listed below and also on page 8-16 of the draft MTP Sustainable Choices 2050.</p> <p>I would recommend referencing the 11 emphasis areas since they have the purpose of achieving the safety goal of reducing fatalities, injuries, and crashes. Specifically, this could be added on page 2-6 of the MTP.</p> <p>The fatalities, injuries, and crash reduction topic could be added into the goal and the 11 emphasis areas could be referenced under a separate objective or within objective 3-4. I don't believe each emphasis area needs to be listed out, but some reference would be helpful so a user can know what they are looking for if they want to review the WisDOT SHSP.</p> |                           |     |                           |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Added explicit reference to the 11 emphasis areas of the SHSP to Safety and Security goal on p.2-4 and on p.16 of chapter 8 (Planning Coordination). Also added MIC-Area Safety Plan to our list of projects 'For Study' in Chapter 6.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.2-4<br>p.6-59<br>p.8-16 |  |

### Chapter 3

|                  |   |                           |     |       |  |
|------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|-------|--|
| <b>3.1 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.3 p.2              |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | If you have the reference, would be more helpful to list the titles/topic of each chapter or appendix.      |                           |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Revised the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 3-2 to simplify the text and address this comment. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.3-2 |  |

|                  |   |   |     |       |  |
|------------------|---|---|-----|-------|--|
| <b>3.2 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.3 p.6 -- federally-defined poverty threshold |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | This is out of date. If you want to leave it as it, note which year it is from.   |   |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | The values noted were incorrect and have been revised. The new values are \$13,788 and \$52,386, which are 2021 Poverty Thresholds that came from the US Census Bureau, 2022. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                           | Yes | p.3-6 |  |

|                  |   |                                  |     |       |  |
|------------------|---|----------------------------------|-----|-------|--|
| <b>3.3 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.3 p.8- Policy Development |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Not sure what this is referencing - the two year MPO budget/work plan cycle? Or within jurisdictions?                                   |                                  |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | This is meant to be a general comment, not a specific budget. The first bullet under subsection 20 on page 3-8 was revised for clarity. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>        | Yes | p.3-8 |  |

|                  |                            |                                     |     |        |  |
|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----|--------|--|
| <b>3.4 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1       | RE: Ch.3 p.9 – figure 3.1 reference |     |        |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Where is this located?     |                                     |     |        |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Figure 3.1 has been added. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>           | Yes | p.3-10 |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                  |  |  |     |  |
|------------------|--|--|-----|--|
| <b>3.5 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.3 p.8/9 – Unknown Impacts of Emerging Technologies & Trends |     |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | [include] e-bikes  |  |     |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | No change since e-bikes are generally considered a micromobility option, which is listed under section 22. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | n/a |  |

### Chapter 4

|                  |  |                              |     |                         |
|------------------|--|------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
| <b>4.1 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.4 pp.3-5 – Page order |     |                         |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Is this figure covering some of the Step 2 info? A header is missing as well as it seems like some context for the bullets on the following page.<br>This is out of order. 4-4 and 4-5 pages should be switched. |                              |     |                         |
| <b>Response:</b> | This was addressed by adjusting the order of text.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>    | Yes | p.4-3<br>p.4-4<br>p.4-5 |

|                  |   |                           |     |  |
|------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|--|
| <b>4.2 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT Central Office  | RE: Ch.4 pg. 10 - Summary |     |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | “In fact, 12 of the 40 projects in the final list were added during the Step 2 reality check.”<br>There may be questions about why this was the case. I know you explained this at TAC, but would be helpful to add context here.     |                           |     |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Pages 4-4 and 4-5 list the reasons a project would be included under the “Post-Scoring Reality Check”. Listing the 12 projects and the specific reasons why each was added during Step 2 is not necessary or useful in this document. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | n/a |  |

|                  |  |  |     |        |
|------------------|--|--|-----|--------|
| <b>4.3 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT Central Office   | RE: Ch.4 pg. 10 - Summary - project type and varieties |     |        |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Might be helpful to note that there are no roadway capacity expansion projects included on the priority list. (This could be a helpful reference when the MN state GHG requirements come into play). |  |     |        |
| <b>Response:</b> | This was added to the fourth bullet under the Summary.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                              | Yes | p.4-10 |

|                  |   |                           |     |  |
|------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|--|
| <b>4.4 From:</b> | Reviewer 3, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.4                  |     |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Good work. I read through the document this morning and I think the performance-based planning section, chapter 4, is well done.    |                           |     |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | It was developed with input from TAC members and is an important new development in our planning and project programming processes. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | n/a |  |

Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

Chapter 5

|           |   |                           |     |  |
|-----------|---|---------------------------|-----|--|
| 5.1 From: | Reviewer 1, FTA   | RE: Ch. 5 Transit section |     |  |
| Comment:  | <p>Thank you very much for allowing me the opportunity to review and comment on the draft MTP. I have reviewed for key requirements in 23 CFR 450.324. I must admit it is a lengthy document and there was a lot of scrolling back and forth between sections, so I apologize if I missed anything. I've listed below some items that I was either unable to find or feel as though perhaps some more clarity could be provided. Again, it is possible that I was looking in the wrong part of the document and if that is the case you can direct me to where I can find the corresponding information.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are a few references throughout the document to a "future bus rapid transit study" to be completed by DTA. Is this additional and separate to the Better Bus Blueprint?</li> <li>2. "The current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan;" <a href="https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(1)">https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(1)</a> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. I see that you are updating the annual ridership chart to provide more up to date data for DTA (currently it only goes up to 2018), however I am not seeing any projected transit demand (or ridership) over the period of the plan (through 2050)</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. "A description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with § 450.306(d)." <a href="https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(3)">https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(3)</a> <i>Prescott comment: this has been addressed on page 5-28</i></li> <li>4. "A system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in § 450.306(d), including progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data;" <a href="https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(4)">https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(4)</a> <i>page 5-##</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 5-33 lists your 4 year targets for the transit asset measures, however I am not seeing any data supporting your progress in comparison with previous reports. <i>Prescott comment: considering this is our first year debuting "Performance-Based Planning", the MIC will be addressing this more closely as this program progresses.</i></li> <li>b. I am not seeing these elements as related to the Public Transit Agency Safety performance measures</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |                           |     |  |
| Response: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transit section updated to include Better Bus Blueprint info; BRT study is uncertain</li> <li>2. Our demographic update did not include projected transit ridership demand over the course of the plan; we will note this for the subsequent update.</li> <li>3. Performance Measures section updated with data and discussion.</li> <li>4.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. TAM data and discussion added to final plan.</li> <li>b. PTASP data and discussion added to final plan.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>  | Addressed in Plan?        | Yes | pp.5-18 - 5-20<br>p.5-28<br>pp.5-33 - 5-51 |

|           |  |  |     |  |
|-----------|--|--|-----|--|
| 5.2 From: | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1   | RE: Ch. 5, p.7 'Tourism is placing increasingly more traffic demands on the system today |     |  |
| Comment:  | Data source?   |  |     |  |
| Response: | This language is anecdotal, which is why there isn't a data source. The MIC continues to accommodate traffic from all sources, and for the economic vitality of the region, we would also like to accommodate tourist traffic, both physical and economical. | Addressed in Plan?   | n/a |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                  |   |   |     |        |  |
|------------------|---|---|-----|--------|--|
| <b>5.3 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.7 'Re-thinking one-way streets'    |     |        |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | This is quite lengthy for a sidebar. Maybe it needs to be just incorporated into the main text?   |   |     |        |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | The discussion was incorporated into text.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                       | Yes | p.5-7  |  |
| <b>5.4 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.9, Design Elements                 |     |        |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Add boulevards/distance from traffic  |   |     |        |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Addressed in the "Opportunities" section  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                       | Yes | p.5-9  |  |
| <b>5.5 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.13, 'Duluth International Airport' |     |        |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | I believe the current list is Delta, United, and Sun Country. American is no longer at DLH, as of 2020.   |   |     |        |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Corrected list of commercial airlines in sidebar.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                       | Yes | p.5-21 |  |
| <b>5.6 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.14, 'Freight Rail'                 |     |        |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | This is an outdated threshold. See <a href="https://www.dot.state.mn.us/ofrw/railroad/systems.html">https://www.dot.state.mn.us/ofrw/railroad/systems.html</a>          |   |     |        |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Reference deleted.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                       | n/a |        |  |
| <b>5.7 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.15, 'Major Network Gaps'           |     |        |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Would be helpful to have a map to show these as not all are obvious as to where the gap is. An alignment wouldn't need to be shown, just the two relevant segment ends. |   |     |        |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | The referenced map is under development, and will be included in following plans by the MIC (Bike Plan update)  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                       | n/a |        |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                  |   |                                   |                           |     |   |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----|---|
| <b>5.8 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p. 16, Figures 5.2-5.4 |                           |     |   |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | <p>The figures are not showing pavement condition, rather are the targets/outcomes that we are measured against. If these target figures are kept, this needs to be explained in the text.</p> <p>5.3: Non-Interstate NHS Pavement; NHS should be added so it doesn't read as all other pavements that aren't interstate.</p> <p>5.4: MnDOT has much more current data, if requested. MnDOT administers the bridge inspection program for all owners, so we have that data available on all (not just MnDOT structures).</p> <p>5.4: Missing the data source(s): I know that MnDOT, SLC, and Duluth did provide this data [pavement condition data] and is listed in a different chapter. I think it is preferable to include what you do have, instead of not including due to not having all jurisdictions/agencies' data. This was also one of the formal comments provided on the 2045 plan</p> |                                   |                           |     |   |
| <b>Response:</b> | Figures updated in accordance with comments.  |                                   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.5-9<br>p.5-35<br>p.5-36<br>p.5-37<br>p.5-38 |

|                  |   |                                      |                           |     |      |
|------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>5.9 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.17, Harbor/Port sidebar |                           |     |      |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Bullet points under "infrastructure" should maybe go under the previous header? |                                      |                           |     |      |
| <b>Response:</b> | Header was changed  |                                      | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | 5-23 |

|                   |  |                 |                           |     |      |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>5.10 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1                               | RE: Ch. 5, p.17 |                           |     |      |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Tall Ships Festival has not recently been hosted in Duluth |                 |                           |     |      |
| <b>Response:</b>  | This reference has been removed from the document          |                 | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | 5-23 |

|                   |   |                 |                           |     |      |
|-------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>5.11 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.22 |                           |     |      |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | If a map is going to be in a different chapter, I would think you'd want to consider a duplication here or explain what the map includes. |                 |                           |     |      |
| <b>Response:</b>  | The Duluth-Superior Functional Classification map is included in final plan   |                 | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | 5-26 |

|                   |  |  |                           |     |        |
|-------------------|--|--|---------------------------|-----|--------|
| <b>5.12 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1             | RE: Ch.5, p.30, 'Performance Measures' |                           |     |        |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Should "FAST Act" be updated to IIA/BIL? |  |                           |     |        |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Updated this reference                   |  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.5-30 |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                   |   |  |     |                    |  |
|-------------------|---|--|-----|--------------------|--|
| <b>5.13 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p. 29, 'Progress in meeting PM2/Infrastructure Targets'     |     |                    |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | As commented previously, current bridge data can be requested and added here.   |  |     |                    |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Updated this section  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.5-35<br>p.5-36   |  |
| <b>5.14 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p. 29, 'Progress in meeting PM2/Infrastructure Targets'     |     |                    |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | 'The following projects in the MN portion of the MIC area have contributed to accomplishing the performance measure targets above' -- incomplete  |  |     |                    |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Updated this section  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.5-39             |  |
| <b>5.15 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.34, 'System performance report summary'                   |     |                    |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | I will let the other reviewers provide more specific feedback but I expect that more condition and performance data is expected for the system performance report   |  |     |                    |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | This was addressed in the jurisdictional consultation – System Performance is part of our larger effort to include "Performance-Based Planning" into our processes for planning at the MIC, and will be incorporated in future iterations of this plan, and others. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.5-48 –<br>p.5-51 |  |
| <b>5.16 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p. 34, 'Intersections'                                      |     |                    |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | There is more than one roundabout now...  |  |     |                    |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Updated this section  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.5-49             |  |
| <b>5.17 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.36 'Blatnik Bridge'                                       |     |                    |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | This can be updated to reflect the new project.   |  |     |                    |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | This has been updated on various pages throughout the plan.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.5-50             |  |
| <b>5.18 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, WisDOT Central Office   | RE: Ch. 5, p.27 'Progress in Meeting Minnesota PM 1 / Safety Targets'' |     |                    |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Recommend a more robust approach to PM1 performance measure reporting, including specific statements regarding the MIC's current progress toward meeting all PM1 goals.   |  |     |                    |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Beefed up this section in accordance with recommendation – and the importance of this Performance Measure.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.5-33<br>p.5-34   |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                   |  |  |     |                 |
|-------------------|--|--|-----|-----------------|
| <b>5.19 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, WisDOT Central Office  | RE: Ch. 5, p.34, 'System performance report summary' |     |                 |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Recommend inclusion of system performance report that states progress made toward goals established or stated in prior MTPs  |  |     |                 |
| <b>Response:</b>  | This was addressed in the jurisdictional consultation – System Performance is part of our larger effort to include “Performance-Based Planning” into our processes for planning at the MIC, and will be incorporated in future iterations of this plan, and others.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                            | Yes | p.5-48 – p.5-51 |
| <b>5.20 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, St. Louis County   | RE: Ch. 5, p.15, 'Rail Transportation'               |     |                 |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | The County is applying for a rail crossing project on Midway road through the federal Railroad Crossing Elimination (RCE) Grant Program – and that it would make sense to reference this program in the MTP as a way for area jurisdictions to improve roadway safety, decrease delays and make it easier to get around railroad tracks by adding grade separations, closing at-grade crossings, and improving existing at-grade crossings where train tracks and roads intersect. |  |     |                 |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Comments have been added to the Rail Transportation section of the document.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                            | Yes | p.5-22          |
| <b>5.21 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, FHWA-MN  | RE: Ch. 5, p.12 'DTA Annual Ridership'               |     |                 |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Compare ridership pre-covid, during covid and post covid   |  |     |                 |
| <b>Response:</b>  | DTA Ridership and STRIDE Ridership over the last decade is shown on Fig 5.1  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                            | Yes | p.5-19          |
| <b>5.22 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1   | RE: Ch. 5, p.10                                      |     |                 |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Spell out acronyms   |  |     |                 |
| <b>Response:</b>  | This is addressed across the document.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                            | Yes | Multiple pages  |
| <b>5.23 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1   | RE: Ch. 5, p.11 'Transit Options'                    |     |                 |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Might be helpful to note that Jefferson Lines is primarily intercity bus service and to explain the types of transit service Arrowhead Transit provides.   |  |     |                 |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Descriptions have been updated.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                            | Yes | p.5-18          |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                   |   |  |     |                |  |
|-------------------|---|--|-----|----------------|--|
| <b>5.24 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.16 'Pavement Condition'             |     |                |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | <p>Shouldn't this section be moved to the Performance Measures section?</p> <p>Recommend showing the pavement condition data that is available, even if it's not available across all roadway authorities. This will help paint a picture of the conditions to compare to the targets.</p> <p>Use the most recent data (2023)</p> <p>These are showing targets not existing conditions.</p> <p>Include the most recent pavement data (2023)</p> |  |     |                |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Figures updated in accordance with comments.  | Addressed in Plan?                               | Yes | p.5-9          |  |
| <b>5.25 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.19 'Functional Classification'      |     |                |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | <p>Might be helpful to add reference to 2023 FHWA Functional Classification guidelines:<br/> <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/statewide/related/hwy-functional-classification-2023.pdf">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/statewide/related/hwy-functional-classification-2023.pdf</a></p>  |  |     |                |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Addressed in this section.  | Addressed in Plan?                               | Yes | p.5-26         |  |
| <b>5.26 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.24 'Performance Measures'           |     |                |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | <p>Update to IJJA<br/> <a href="https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/chapter-I/subchapter-E/part-450/subpart-C/section-450.324">https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/chapter-I/subchapter-E/part-450/subpart-C/section-450.324</a><br/> <a href="https://www.congress.gov/117/plaws/publ58/PLAW-117publ58.pdf">https://www.congress.gov/117/plaws/publ58/PLAW-117publ58.pdf</a></p>   |  |     |                |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Addressed throughout document.  | Addressed in Plan?                               | Yes | Multiple pages |  |
| <b>5.27 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.25 'Performance Measures'           |     |                |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Also needs to include PTASP (Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan) targets and discussion.  |  |     |                |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | This information added to final document.   | Addressed in Plan?                               | Yes | p.5-47         |  |
| <b>5.28 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1  | RE: Ch. 5, p.27 'PM 1 Safety- Minnesota Targets' |     |                |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | These are 2018-2022 actuals?  |  |     |                |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Updated to reflect 2024 targets; 2018-2022 targets are included as baseline data.   | Addressed in Plan?                               | Yes | p.5-33         |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                   |  |   |     |                                      |
|-------------------|--|---|-----|--------------------------------------|
| <b>5.29 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1   | RE: Ch. 5, pp.29, 31 'PM 2&3 baseline data'         |     |                                      |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | 2021 data (or actuals)?  |   |     |                                      |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Updated to reflect 2023-2025 targets; 2021 targets are included as baseline data.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                           | Yes | p.5-35                               |
| <b>5.30 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1   | RE: Ch. 5, p.29 'Progress in Meeting Minnesota PM2' |     |                                      |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | <p>Data is available through 2023, but for this it seems you could use 2021 data to match the baseline at least instead of 2018.</p> <p>This should be square feet of bridge deck area. We simplify the title of the measure because it is so cumbersome. Please use the data from the bridge condition spreadsheet.</p> <p>When you use square foot of deck area, Duluth's numbers will not meet the statewide targets, but you aren't expected to since you're not setting your own targets.</p> <p>Probably best to use updated data. Also your pavement condition is just contributing to statewide since you didn't set your own targets.</p> |   |     |                                      |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Updated with data as recommended.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                           | Yes | p.5-35<br>p.5-36<br>p.5-37<br>p.5-38 |
| <b>5.31 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT District 1   | RE: Ch. 5, p.34 'System Performance Report Summary' |     |                                      |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | <p>This section should include some more detail on progress since the 2045 MTP. In the performance measures section, there is 2018-2022 baseline data and 2024 targets, but in order to measure progress, it would be helpful to show a comparison of the 2019 baseline data to show how conditions have changed since the last MTP.</p> <p>See 23 CFR 450.324(f)(4)<a href="https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450/section-450.324#p-450.324(f)(4)">https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450/section-450.324#p-450.324(f)(4)</a></p>  |   |     |                                      |
| <b>Response:</b>  | This was addressed in the jurisdictional consultation – System Performance is part of our larger effort to include “Performance-Based Planning” into our processes for planning at the MIC, and will be incorporated in future iterations of this plan, and others.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                           | Yes | p.5-48 – p.5-51                      |
| <b>5.32 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, DTA  | RE: Ch. 5, p.18 'Active Transportation - Transit'   |     |                                      |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Provided additional information about the 'Better Bus Blueprint service improvements and route restructuring.  |   |     |                                      |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Edits incorporated into Transit section.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                           | Yes | p.5-18 – p.5-20                      |
| <b>5.33 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, DTA  | RE: Ch. 5, p.18 'Active Transportation - Transit'   |     |                                      |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Provided additional information about the 'Better Bus Blueprint service improvements and route restructuring.  |   |     |                                      |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Edits incorporated into Transit section.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                           | Yes | p.5-18 – p.5-20                      |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

### Chapter 6

|                  |  |  |     |       |  |
|------------------|--|--|-----|-------|--|
| <b>6.1 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.3  |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Recent history of large federal discretionary grants?  |  |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | This is not just referring to the recent large grant for Blatnik or any other specific recent grant, but a more general statement of striving to be fiscally sustainable.                      | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | n/a |       |  |
| <b>6.2 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.4 Projects Addressing Known Issue Areas                    |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | I think in addition to improving to good condition, it is worth mentioning maintaining to keep good condition. When thinking of asset management, preventive maintenance is a key component.   |  |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Made revision to include “maintain”.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.6-4 |  |
| <b>6.3 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.5 Figure 6.1   |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Is this based on # of projects or cost? This would be good to clarify.   |  |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | T Figure explained on page 6-4 and says “distribution of listed projects”.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.6-5 |  |
| <b>6.4 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.7  |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Partial sentence.  |  |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Corrected.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.6-7 |  |
| <b>6.5 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.8  |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Is this in the right location? Doesn't flow quite right. Also, City of Duluth received a RAISE grant for the Lakewalk.   |  |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Comment 6.4 may explain the issue with this section.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | Yes | p.6-7 |  |
| <b>6.6 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.8, Table 6.1   |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | This data should also be in Chapter 5.<br>Did the City of Duluth not provide data on “Fair”? If that is the case, it should be noted specifically.   |  |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | We disagree this data needs to be provided in Chapter 5 as well.<br>City of Duluth provided us with all condition data. According to the City, they do not have any roads in “Fair” condition. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | n/a |       |  |
| <b>6.7 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.10, ‘Planning Perspective (Blatnik Bridge Reconstruction)’ |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | This is kind of an odd comparison - what's the message this is trying to convey?   |  |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | It is simply a long-range planning perspective to consider, regarding all options, along with the magnitude of need and cost.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>  | n/a |       |  |

**Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses**

|                  |   |                           |     |              |
|------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|--------------|
| <b>6.8</b>       | <b>From:</b> Reviewer 1, WisDOT Central Office  | RE: Ch. 6, p.11           |     |              |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | <p>“For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO(s), public transportation operator(s), and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under § 450.314(a). All necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan shall be identified.” <a href="https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(11)(ii)">https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(11)(ii)</a></p> <p>a. I am not sure I am understanding the table shown on 6-11. I see a column listed as “Revenues” but I believe the dollar amounts under that column actually reflect average expenditures? I am struggling to find where all necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan are identified.</p> <p>Suggestion for clarity:<br/> <i>“The financial plan shall include recommendations on any additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the metropolitan transportation plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. The financial plan may include an assessment of the appropriateness of innovative finance techniques (for example, tolling, pricing, bonding, public private partnerships, or other strategies) as revenue sources for projects in the plan.”</i> <a href="https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(11)(iii)">https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/part-450#p-450.324(f)(11)(iii)</a></p> <p>b. I see on 6-11 that a dire picture is painted for the financial future of the DTA, and that there are possible route changes or tax/fare increases. Has there been any analysis as to the appropriateness of each strategy? Or analysis to ensure these are viable options? Seeing as this is the long range plan, and the financial future of DTA is looking precarious, it might be worthwhile to include some more detail on how funding will be maintained through new revenue or if the most viable strategy is to reduce costs in proportion to lack of revenue growth.</p> |                           |     |              |
| <b>Response:</b> | <p>a. This was discussed and clarified during the formal consultation on 8/8/2024. Final plan includes revised financial analysis, including justification for projected revenues, on pages.</p> <p>b. Same as above; more detail about strategies to maintain transit funding over the 25-year planning horizon are recommended to be included in the next MTP update.</p>   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.6-8 – 6-15 |
| <b>6.9</b>       | <b>From:</b> Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.12, Table 6.2 |     |              |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Is this an annual average or five years cumulative?   |                           |     |              |
| <b>Response:</b> | The table (Figure 6.5) headings have been revised to provide better clarity.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.6-12       |
| <b>6.10</b>      | <b>From:</b> Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.15, Table 6.4 |     |              |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Where are the numbered notes? If not going to number the text below, remove this column.  |                           |     |              |
| <b>Response:</b> | Correction made to table and added to document. Column was removed The new table includes the financial correction based on comments 6.11 and 6.12.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.6-15       |

**Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses**

|            |  |   |     |  |
|------------|--|---|-----|--|
| 6.11 From: | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.17-18 Short Term Projects (2024-2028) |     |  |
| Comment:   | <p>a. These lists are not very readable - they need to be replaced with clearer tables.</p> <p>b. Three projects are missing from the short-term list as they are newer projects in the TIP:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6937-104 fy25 State Highway 2 in Duluth lighting &amp; bridge deck repair on the Bong Bridge. \$1.7M</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6925-148 fy28 On London Rd in Duluth, from 26 Ave E. to just north of. 60th Ave. E. Landscaping., 300K</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">8821-385 fy 2025 Districtwide install Electronic Charging Stations and Infrastructure along I-35 corridor near Duluth and Proctor \$843K</p> <p>c. This project is now in 2029 and 2033, so should be on the mid-term project list.</p> <p>d. This project has moved to the CHIP, so should be on the mid-term project list and includes the bridge work. \$7M</p> |   |     |  |
| Response:  | <p>a. Tables with better resolution will be added for final draft.</p> <p>b. Added Bong Bridge project and NEVI EV Charging Station projects. London Rd project not added as it is part of the overall London Rd project (this is not a TIP project list). Primary project MN-01-06 is shown in project list; any additional related projects are covered under the primary project.</p> <p>c. Project not moved (this is not a TIP project list) and it is a movement from Short to Mid Term.</p> <p>d. Project not moved or cost increased --need more information or clarification as to why the project went from a \$350,000 landscaping project to a \$7M bridge/landscaping project.</p>  | Addressed in Plan?                                | Yes | <p>p.6-5</p> <p>p.6-15</p> <p>p.6-17</p> <p>p.6-18</p> <p>p.6-19</p> <p>p.6-49</p> <p>Project maps will be updated in final plan</p> |
| 6.12 From: | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p. 18 Mid-term Projects                 |     |  |
| Comment:   | <p>Missing projects:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6926-56: Resurface NB Hwy 61 from CR 33 (McQuade Rd) to CR 42 (Homestead Rd) and SB Hwy 61 from CR 33 (McQuade Rd) to Knife River, FY29, \$8.5M.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6980-63: Reconstruct Interstate 535 between Twin Ports Interchange and Garfield Interchange in Duluth, FY30, \$5.3M</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6982-1124044: Replace 40th Ave W bridge over Interstate 35 in Duluth. FY31, \$5.1 M</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6932-1112303: Resurface bridges on Hwy 2, Hwy 33, and Hwy 194 in Saginaw area, FY33, \$3.9 M</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6916-116: Resurface NB Hwy 53 from CR 13 to 1.6 miles north of Hwy 33, FY24, \$24M.</p>  |   |     |  |
| Response:  | <p>Hwy 61 project not added as it is part of the overall Hwy 61 project listed in Long Range (this is not a TIP project list). Primary project MN-01-41 is shown in project list; any additional related projects are covered under this project.</p> <p>Added I-535 Project</p> <p>Added 40th Ave W Project</p> <p>Added Hwy 2/33/194 Project</p> <p>Hwy 53 project not added as it is part of the overall Hwy 53 project listed in Long Range (this is not a TIP project list). Primary project MN-01-39 is shown in project list; any additional related projects are covered under this project.</p>   | Addressed in Plan?                                | Yes | <p>p.6-5</p> <p>p.6-15</p> <p>p.6-17</p> <p>p.6-18</p> <p>p.6-19</p> <p>p.6-49</p> <p>p.6-51</p>                                     |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                   |  |   |     |             |  |
|-------------------|--|---|-----|-------------|--|
| <b>6.13 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p. 44, Fiscal Summary point 2 |     |             |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | I think you could note that most don't even do 10 years, at least in the past. Is there a way to reword this sentence to help with that understanding?   |   |     |             |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Revised the sentence to capture the suggestion.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>               | Yes | p.6-44      |  |
| <b>6.14 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.45                          |     |             |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Rewrite point 3 as:<br><i>Initial environmental review and alternative selection for the Blatnik Bridge reconstruction project in the MIC area has been completed. Preliminary planning, fieldwork and design are being conducted, and construction is anticipated to begin in 2026. This is a joint project between MnDOT and WisDOT and will address aging infrastructure, improve safety and better accommodate oversize and overweight loads. Majority of the \$1.9 billion estimated cost has been funded through a federal INFRA grant under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law.</i>  |   |     |             |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Replaced existing text with suggested text.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>               | Yes | p.6-45      |  |
| <b>6.15 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.46                          |     |             |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | This should be adjusted so the sentence isn't cut off by the maps, pushing the second half to several pages away.  |   |     |             |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Formatting has been addressed  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>               | Yes | p.6-46      |  |
| <b>6.16 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.6, p.55-56                       |     |             |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | <p>Rewrite 'Twin Ports Interchange' section as: <i>This project was delayed one year but is nearing completion. Once completed, this project will provide safer conditions for motorists, improve access to the Port of Duluth-Superior, reduce neighborhood impacts due to freight traffic, and improve movement of over-sized, overweight loads (OSOW) through the MIC area. An elevated highway system will remain in the Lincoln Park neighborhood, and it has been designed to provide usable spaces under the highway to reduce negative impacts associated with the project.</i></p> <p>Rewrite 'Blatnik Bridge' section as: <i>Blatnik Bridge is a key transportation corridor in the MIC area that links the cities of Duluth and Superior across the St Louis River. It provides connection for locals, as well as regional and national commerce and tourism. It is the I-535 and US Highway 53 routes across the river. Following thorough assessment of the condition of the Blatnik Bridge, it has been determined the bridge will be completely reconstructed on the same alignment, although the approach/exit in Superior will be a new configuration. The new bridge will include a pedestrian and bike facility. Significant federal and state funding has been earmarked, and a federal Finding of No Significant Impact has been determined. Construction of the Blatnik Bridge is anticipated to begin in 2026, and the bridge will be closed for 4-5 years. Motorists will have to use alternative routes, primarily the Bong Bridge. Modeling and planning have been ongoing to determine appropriate route options and needed mitigation to improve safety for all users and maintain efficient traffic movement. Preliminary planning and design, as well as numerous stakeholder group discussions are ongoing.</i></p> <p>Rewrite 'London Road' section as: <i>London Road is a significant corridor within the City of Duluth. This approximate 3.5-mile portion of London Road serves as Highway 61 through the east side of Duluth, connecting I-35 with the expressway to Two Harbors and the North Shore. London Road is to be resurfaced with the addition of numerous safety and connectivity improvements including two roundabouts and multiple left turn lanes. The corridor runs through a busy neighborhood and will include marked pedestrian crossings with refuge islands and bike lanes.</i></p> |   |     |             |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Replaced existing text with suggested text.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>               | Yes | p.6-55-6.56 |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                   |   |   |     |               |  |
|-------------------|---|---|-----|---------------|--|
| <b>6.17 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.6, p. 59, Bong Bridge section                            |     |               |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | This should be removed. The redecking is on the long-term project list and a replacement would not be until 40-50 years after that redeck, well beyond the planning horizon of this plan.   |   |     |               |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Revised to capture reviewer’s point and timeline, but kept as a “For Study” item.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                       | Yes | p.6-59        |  |
| <b>6.18 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.6, p. 57, For Study Projects                             |     |               |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | (a) As above, I’d like to see “Significant Unfunded Projects” and “For Study Projects” separated into two sections<br>(b) Can we include the projects as noted in Ch. 5 in the latter section of Ch. 6?   |   |     |               |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Projects are separated into “Unfunded” and “For Study” subsections.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                       | Yes | p.6-54 – 6.59 |  |
| <b>6.19 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, WisDOT Central Office   | RE: Ch.6, p.51 Natural Resources and Environmental Consultation |     |               |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Recommend including a list of stakeholders contacted regarding environmental impact mitigation, including federal, state, and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies.  |   |     |               |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | The list of stakeholders invited are listed in the adjacent sidebar.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                       | Yes | p.6-51        |  |
| <b>6.20 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, WisDOT Central Office   | RE: Ch.6, p.52 Natural Resources and Environmental Consultation |     |               |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Discussion of Responses Received -- Recommend a statement of comparison between MTP and state conservation plans and inventories of natural and historic resources.   |   |     |               |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | This was discussed and clarified during the formal consultation on 8/8/2024. The suggested inventories are not available from the agencies contacted. No revision is needed.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                       | n/a |               |  |
| <b>6.21 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, FHWA-MN   | RE: Ch.6, p.3 Transportation Projects Overview                  |     |               |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | The MTP can include a set of assumptions as a “placeholder” for the proposed project or use a no-build scenario until a final alternative is identified and amended into the plan.  |   |     |               |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Noted. No change required.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                       | n/a |               |  |
| <b>6.22 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, FHWA-MN   | RE: Ch.6, p.18 MnDOT Mid-term Projects                          |     |               |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Why isn’t the Blatnik Bridge mentioned here as well?  |   |     |               |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Blatnik Bridge project was not added to the Mid-term list, as any work after the start of the project is considered part of the overall Blatnik Bridge (this is not a TIP project list).<br>Both MnDOT and WisDOT only showed the project in the Short Term since funding will be allocated in 2026 (Short-Term). Primary project MN-01-28/WI-01-23 is shown in project list; any additional related projects are covered under this project unless noted otherwise.<br>Follow-up with reviewer during formal consultation on 8/8/2024 clarified we do not need to make any change with this. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                       | n/a |               |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                   |  |   |     |  |
|-------------------|--|---|-----|--|
| <b>6.23 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, FHWA-MN  | RE: Ch.6, p.22 St. Louis County Short-term Project List |     |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | <p>MN02-46 Project type is not Bike or Ped Improvement – complete streets or safety, unless it specifically addresses a trail or multi-use path.</p> <p>MN-02-9/60 Project type is not intersection control or roundabout – safety</p> <p>Put a project description under the title in the table. What is this in reference to? Location? Final Change, Add title to all pages?</p>          |   |     |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | <p>Project MN-02-46 is a new sidewalk being constructed from Menard Dr. To CSAH 91. This would be considered Bike and Ped Improvement. Can add text saying “New Sidewalk from” to the description. Addressed in final draft.</p> <p>Follow-up with reviewer during formal consultation on 8/8/2024 about projects MN-02-9 and -60 clarified we do not need to make any change with this.</p> | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                               | n/a |  |

### Chapter 7

|                  |  |   |     |       |
|------------------|--|---|-----|-------|
| <b>7.1 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.7, p.2 Right-of-way Reallocation |     |       |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | I'd add that often these projects do require a larger upfront investment to reconstruct the roadway, to right size it. |   |     |       |
| <b>Response:</b> | Revision made  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>               | Yes | p.7-2 |

|                  |  |                           |     |       |
|------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|-------|
| <b>7.2 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.7, p.3             |     |       |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | <p>Definitions and clarification needed:</p> <p>‘Dynamic Adaptation, Smart Growth Infrastructure’ -- definitions? Not commonly known concepts, especially smart growth. If used, should be defined. If not specifically needed, remove.</p> <p>‘Data and Data Management’ – does this refer to data access? data availability?</p> <p>Internet of Things (IoT) – definition? Not a commonly known concept. If not specifically needed, remove.</p> |                           |     |       |
| <b>Response:</b> | Added these definitions in the adjacent side bar.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.7-3 |

|                  |   |                           |     |       |
|------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|-------|
| <b>7.3 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.7, p.4             |     |       |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | <p>Definitions and clarification needed:</p> <p>‘Improved Transparency’ -- What kind of transparency? When and/or where locations are cleared?</p> <p>‘Telematic Technology’ -- Not a commonly known concept. If not specifically needed, remove.</p> |                           |     |       |
| <b>Response:</b> | Added these definitions in the adjacent side bar.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.7-4 |

|                  |   |                           |     |       |
|------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|-------|
| <b>7.4 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.7, p.5             |     |       |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Source for statement ‘12% of new passenger cars’? Source or evidence for statement ‘However, our region is at the forefront of innovation, leveraging technology and AI’? |                           |     |       |
| <b>Response:</b> | Added sources in the adjacent side bar.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | p.7-5 |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                  |  |   |     |       |  |
|------------------|--|---|-----|-------|--|
| <b>7.5 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.7, p.5 'Automated Shuttle Bus Pilot Project' |     |       |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | This project is done but there is also the goMARTI project in our region (Grand Rapids), which just received additional funding to continue. <a href="https://www.gomarti.com/">https://www.gomarti.com/</a> |   |     |       |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Made revisions to cover this.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                           | Yes | p.7-5 |  |

|                  |   |   |     |  |  |
|------------------|---|---|-----|--|--|
| <b>7.6 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.7, p.6 'Applicability to the MIC Area' |     |  |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | What mechanism would the MIC use to apply these concepts?           |   |     |  |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | While an understandable point, it is not necessary to include this. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                     | n/a |  |  |

|                  |  |                               |     |  |  |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| <b>7.7 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.7, p. 9 'Microtransit' |     |  |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Missing Applicability to the MIC area section                              |                               |     |  |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | N/A – there was not meant to be an "Applicability to MIC Area" subsection. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>     | n/a |  |  |

|                  |  |                           |     |      |  |
|------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|------|--|
| <b>7.8 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.7, p.11            |     |      |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Clarification needed: '5,480 ZEBs' – nationwide?                     |                           |     |      |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Revised to add "nationwide". Added sources in the adjacent side bar. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | 7-11 |  |

|                  |  |                                      |     |  |  |
|------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| <b>7.9 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.7, p. 2 'Redesign of WIS 175' |     |  |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Great examples! FYI, I think WisDOT is the project lead for these studies (but I know they're partnering with the City of Milwaukee & Milwaukee County). |                                      |     |  |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Nothing to add or edit   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>            | n/a |  |  |

|                   |  |  |     |  |  |
|-------------------|--|--|-----|--|--|
| <b>7.10 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.7, p. 5 'Autonomous & Connected Vehicles' |     |  |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Also autonomous snow plows!<br><a href="https://www.mprnews.org/story/2024/01/19/robot-snowplow-competition-a-glimpse-of-the-future">https://www.mprnews.org/story/2024/01/19/robot-snowplow-competition-a-glimpse-of-the-future</a> |  |     |  |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Autonomous snowplows is covered by AV and CV.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                        | n/a |  |  |

|                   |  |  |     |     |  |
|-------------------|--|--|-----|-----|--|
| <b>7.11 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.7, p. 9 'Demand Response Transit' |     |     |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Doesn't Arrowhead Transit also provide DR service?   |  |     |     |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Revised to make the point that even with this DR transit option, a service gap remains; we heard in stakeholder group meetings that improvements are needed to the DTA's STRIDE service. | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                | Yes | 7-9 |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                   |  |   |     |      |  |
|-------------------|--|---|-----|------|--|
| <b>7.12 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.7, p. 12 – ‘ZEV Applicability to the MIC Area’ |     |      |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Add references to these plans. Also might be helpful to note the NEVI program is installing charging stations in the MIC area. |   |     |      |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Added sources in the adjacent side bar. Made revision to cover the NEVI program comment.                                       | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                             | Yes | 7-12 |  |

### Chapter 8

|                  |  |                                  |     |     |  |
|------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----|-----|--|
| <b>8.1 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.8, p.8 ‘Federal Guidance’ |     |     |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | ‘Transportation Legislation’ needs to be updated with current federal transportation bill/law, IIJA/BIL? |                                  |     |     |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Updated references on this page (and throughout document)  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>        | Yes | 8-8 |  |

|                  |  |   |     |      |  |
|------------------|--|---|-----|------|--|
| <b>8.2 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.8, p. 18 ‘MIC Plans and Studies’ |     |      |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Missing Central Entrance plan and I-35 Corridor Study            |   |     |      |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Updated references to the MIC’s most recent planning initiatives | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>               | Yes | 8-18 |  |

|                  |   |  |     |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|-----|--|--|
| <b>8.3 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, FHWA-MN   | RE: Ch.8, p.8 ‘The MIC’s Planning Process’ |     |  |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | I don't think there is a set update frequency in regulations. But, make sure to promote frequent review and update to make sure it includes and references any changes to public participation requirements set through Federal guidance, Executive Orders, and new strategies like virtual engagement. |  |     |  |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | In accordance with federal guidance, updates to the MIC’s Title VI, and Limited English Proficiency plans are underway and will be presented to the MIC Board for adoption by the end of 2024 and the MIC’s Public Involvement Plan will be updated in early 2025.                                      | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                  | n/a |  |  |

|                  |  |                                     |     |     |  |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|--|
| <b>8.4 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.8, p. 2 ‘23 U.S. Code § 134’ |     |     |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Link to a different source (uscode.house.gov) for Metropolitan Planning Requirements |                                     |     |     |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Updated link per recommendation  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>           | Yes | 8-2 |  |

|                  |  |                           |     |      |  |
|------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|------|--|
| <b>8.5 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT D1                                     | RE: Ch.8, p.10            |     |      |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Add section on Title VI and Limited English Proficiency. |                           |     |      |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Updated section and links per recommendation             | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | 8-10 |  |

|                  |  |                           |     |              |  |
|------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|--------------|--|
| <b>8.6 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.8, pp.12-14        |     |              |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Note pending updates to state bike, freight. rail, transit, SHIP, asset management, and safety plans |                           |     |              |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Updated those sections and links to related plans.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | 8-12, 13, 14 |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

|                  |  |                           |     |      |  |
|------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|------|--|
| <b>8.7 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.8, p.15            |     |      |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | <p>Other plans to consider adding:</p> <p>Resilience Improvement Plan 2024: <a href="https://dot.state.mn.us/sustainability/resilience.html">https://dot.state.mn.us/sustainability/resilience.html</a></p> <p>Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Plan 2023: <a href="https://talk.dot.state.mn.us/ev-infrastructure-plan">https://talk.dot.state.mn.us/ev-infrastructure-plan</a></p> <p>CAV Strategic Plan 2019: <a href="https://dot.mn.gov/automated/destinationcav/strategicplan.html">https://dot.mn.gov/automated/destinationcav/strategicplan.html</a></p> <p>Carbon Reduction Strategy: <a href="https://edocs-public.dot.state.mn.us/edocs_public/DMResultSet/download?docId=36928262">https://edocs-public.dot.state.mn.us/edocs_public/DMResultSet/download?docId=36928262</a></p> <p>Statewide Corridor Planning Initiative: <a href="https://www.dot.state.mn.us/planning/program/corridor-planning.html">https://www.dot.state.mn.us/planning/program/corridor-planning.html</a></p> |                           |     |      |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Updated references on this page (and throughout document)  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b> | Yes | 8-15 |  |

|                  |   |   |     |        |  |
|------------------|---|---|-----|--------|--|
| <b>8.8 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, WisDOT Central Office   | RE: Ch.8, p16 'Wisconsin Strategic Highway Safety Plan' |     |        |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Recommend explicit integration into the MTP of the goals and objectives contained within the Wisconsin Strategic Highway Safety Plan and also on page 8-16 of the draft MTP Sustainable Choices 2050. |   |     |        |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Referenced the goals of the WI Strategic Highway Safety Plan and its relationship to the MIC's upcoming Safety Action Plan.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                               | Yes | p.8-17 |  |

|                  |   |  |     |      |  |
|------------------|---|--|-----|------|--|
| <b>8.9 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT Central Office  | RE: Ch.8, p.15 'Carbon Reduction Strategy' |     |      |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | The Carbon Reduction Strategy is linked, but the text below it discusses the Resilience Improvement Plan. I'm guessing this is just a mistake and content should be updated to summarize the CRS. |  |     |      |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Description corrected.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                  | Yes | 8-15 |  |

## Chapter 9

|                  |   |  |     |     |  |
|------------------|---|--|-----|-----|--|
| <b>9.1 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT D1                    | RE: Ch.9, p.2 'The MIC's Planning Process' |     |     |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Links need updating                     |  |     |     |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Revised this section with updated links | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                  | Yes | 9-2 |  |

|                  |  |   |     |     |  |
|------------------|--|---|-----|-----|--|
| <b>9.2 From:</b> | Reviewer 2, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.9, p.7 'Targeted Stakeholder Focus Groups' |     |     |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | Suggest rewording to demonstrate that MIC enlisted a consulting firm's assistance. Currently reads as though MIC was secondary in this work. |   |     |     |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Revised for clarification  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                         | Yes | 9-7 |  |

|                  |  |   |     |                  |  |
|------------------|--|---|-----|------------------|--|
| <b>9.3 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1   | RE: Ch.9, p.5 'Sustainable Choices 2050 web page' |     |                  |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>  | This webpage has resources and links from the last plan update, not the current one. |   |     |                  |  |
| <b>Response:</b> | Fixed website issue (defaulted to 2045 LRTP page, not the 2050 MTP page)             | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                         | n/a | Web page updated |  |

## Comments Received on the Draft 2050 MTP and MIC Responses

### Chapter 10

|                   |   |  |     |                             |  |
|-------------------|---|--|-----|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>10.1 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.10, p.2 '2. Improve Safety'                             |     |                             |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Condense down - stick to the action item not making the case for it in this chapter. Completion and implementation of these plans (transportation safety plan and SS4A project) should be a priority action item.   |  |     |                             |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | As discussed during the formal consultation on 8/8/2024, the point of adding a relatively brief contextual summary was to allow this chapter to be a quick read (not requiring people to read the full plan to understand the Action Steps.<br><br>But the reviewer's point is noted. Section 2 was revised to note material that was "Summary Context" and to highlight actions within bullets under "Action Steps."<br><br>In addition, "Safety and Security" was prioritized as the first goal in Chapter 2, 'Vision, Goals and Objectives.'   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                      | Yes | p.10-2<br>p. 10-3<br>p. 2-3 |  |
| <b>10.2 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.10, p.3 '3. Prioritize an Integrated Multimodal System' |     |                             |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Again, condense down to just the action item. Too much reiteration from the multimodal chapter and not focused on the action item, which would be to prioritize vulnerable road users (bikes/peds).<br><br>Action item should include implementation of existing plans and updating plans when needed.  |  |     |                             |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | As discussed during the formal consultation on 8/8/2024, the point of adding a relatively brief contextual summary was to allow this chapter to be a quick read (not requiring people to read the full plan to understand the Action Steps.<br><br>But the reviewer's point is noted. Section 3 was revised to note material that was "Summary Context" and to highlight actions within bullets under "Action Steps."<br><br>In addition, improving safety for vulnerable users is described as a priority in Objective 1-3 under the Safety and Security Goal 1, in Chapter 2, 'Vision, Goals and Objectives.' | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                      | Yes | p.10-3<br>p. 10-4<br>p. 2-4 |  |
| <b>10.3 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.10, p.4 'Strive For An Equitable & Accessible System'   |     |                             |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Clarify what this means -- example action items could be: to prioritize equity and accessibility when updating MIC plans; ensuring accessibility of MIC meetings, resources, etc.; measuring Justice40 or other ways to evaluate impact of infrastructure projects.   |  |     |                             |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Revised section 5 to address the comment and to put into the "Summary Context" and highlighted "Action Steps" bullets format.   | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                      | Yes | p.10-5                      |  |
| <b>10.4 From:</b> | Reviewer 1, MnDOT D1  | RE: Ch.10, p.6 'Section 8'                                     |     |                             |  |
| <b>Comment:</b>   | Revise end of first sentence to "...disrupted during the estimated 4 to 5-years closure of the Blatnik bridge during reconstruction".   |  |     |                             |  |
| <b>Response:</b>  | Revision was made.  | <b>Addressed in Plan?</b>                                      | n/a | p.10-6                      |  |