

BGMPO Draft MTP Edits and Comments June 15, 2020			
Commenting Agency	Change Requested	Edit Made	Response from Study Team if Changes Not Made
VHB Study Team- needed revisions		Added routine funding items-maintenance, HSIP safety, urban and rural transit formula funding	
NCDOT TPB	Provided recommended Performance Measures section	Recommended Performance Measures Targets section incorporated	
BGMPO staff	Include Triad ITS Plan - Burlington Recommendations (currently in draft)	Incorporated	
BGMPO staff	Re-format tables throughout the document for more consistent format	Incorporated/tables reformatted	
BGMPO staff	Update cover page	Updated	
BGMPO staff	Include Acknowledgements page	Included	
BGMPO staff	Include appendix with meetings timeline	Incorporated	
BGMPO staff	Include a list of acronyms at the end	Incorporated	
BGMPO staff	Incorporate a table of population and employment projections	Incorporated	
BGMPO staff	Update/include description of the 3C planning process and STI Prioritization process	Incorporated	
BGMPO staff	Include air quality conformity process description	Incorporated	
Orange County	P. ii update language to state "The final plan was adopted June 2020 following public review and hearing"	Incorporated	

Orange County	Suggested language revisions to reflect that stakeholders and Steering Committee are separate, and that public involvement process was more extensive; suggested revision to highlight TCC as part of the MPO structure	Updated description	
Orange County	Suggested update to MTP / CTP process description; clarify that CTP will incorporate both funded and unfunded MTP projects (Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) reflects the overall transportation vision and needs of the region for an indefinite period of time. Therefore, it has no horizon and is fiscal unconstrained.)	Updated description	
Orange County	P. 5 Utilize existing transportation capacity through...--add tables with additional data-AADT, LOS, VHT, missing matrices (data) from the PTRM	Will include an appendix with Travel Demand Model outputs	
Orange County	Pp 29-37, request for more explanation re: how were projects selected	Updated project selection explanation	
Orange County	P. 49 NC 54 Express bus Route—add some context about post NC 54 widening		NC 54 Express Bus route is in unfunded category of transit improvements- future implementation details to be worked out in further planning
Orange County	P. 54-55 suggestion to clarify that CTP is the controlling document for NCDOT Complete Streets policy application – projects in the MTP must also	Description updated, Complete Streets Cost share table included	

	be in the CTP; make sure cost-share table is included		
Orange County	P.69 Missing US 70 significance as freight corridor, add reference to US 70 as a strategic freight corridor (SFC) --several corridors in Orange Co are identified as Strategic Freight Corridors (SFC); PART working on a freight plan	Added language re: US 70 as a strategic freight corridor; PART freight model component discussion added	
Orange County	P. 82 Missing reference to SPOT Safety, SPOT Mobility, FHWA Highway Safety Improvement Program—add reference to NCDOT’s SPOT Safety, Mobility and HSIP, along with other safety improvement opportunities	Added description of potential funding sources to Safety section; routine HSIP funding line item added to the funding table	
Orange County	P. 102 Comment re: Buckhorn Road project preliminary cost, Division Needs vs. Statewide Mobility tier in STI prioritization		Keeping cost estimates as is-planning level cost estimates; SPOT detailed cost estimates not available for all projects, Buckhorn Road estimates discussed with Division staff; keeping in Statewide Mobility due to interchange improvements;
Orange County	PP. 96-103—MTP projects and SPOT 6.0 projects do not match, only 7 SPOT 6.0 projects included in the MTP but the cost is quite different—update MTP cost to match SPOT 6 or vice versa—		MTP cost estimates are preliminary / planning-level estimates; SPOT 6 cost estimates were not available for all projects; not all SPOT 6 projects submitted for scoring are expected to have

			local points assigned or be funded in the next STIP or even in the next two cycles; if a SPOT project is funded and is not already in the MTP the MTP could be amended in the future
ACTA	Request to include ACTA ridership table	Included	
ACTA	Page 48 – (Mebane Circulator – Implement New Route) - include ACTA as a potential transit service provider in your comments.	Made the edit to reference ACTA as a potential agency to operate.	
PART	The Regional ITS Plan is not mentioned and should be incorporated. This resource will only serve beneficial if funding is sought in the future for projects included in the ITS plan.	Included a reference to ITS plan/included top projects in funded/unfunded project lists	
PART	There is little to no mention of Travel Demand Management as a mobility tool. This is a mobility option that should flourish in an urbanized area with the growth and cross jurisdiction travel that exist in your area. The PART program and details can be provided or linked from our website.	Adding a section on Travel Demand Management	
PART	Multiple comments regarding vision, goals and objectives; Comment regarding table on Page 8 (Table 2)- recommendation to add to the text or chart the total number of full and partial supported planning factors	For Page 8 Table 2—Federal planning factors-table updated	For goals and objectives-it is too late in the process to modify the project selection approach

PART	Suggestion to establish a new Objective-establish a task force to define transit needs within the MPO area and a sustainable, phased funding plan to support the need; Metric: Received taskforce recommendation by June 2021 and implement funding scheme beginning July 2022.	Added to transit recommendations chapter	
PART	Comment re: LEHD Commuting pattern graphic	Using updated graphic from Commuter Bus study	
PART	Page 38 First sentence ...(PART) provides regional public transportation service through Alamance County and coordinates planning efforts among the BGMPO planning area and other MPOs in the <u>Piedmont Triad</u> ; Last bullet point should read... Regional Travel Demand Management program including ridesharing and vanpooling	Updated the description	
PART	Page 42 First bullet point under Park and Ride Lots..."This location provides connections between the Triangle and the Triad." This could be said of all the Park and Ride Lots. But perhaps fits best under the Mebane P&R because that is the transfer location with GO Triangle.	Updated description to refer to Mebane Park & Ride lot	
PART	Page 44 request to update PART ridership chart	Updated chart	
PART	Page 53 As mentioned previously - funding is the principle obstacle to enhancing public transportation within the MPO region. Technical expertise is abundant in the		Not sure how to reflect this in a list of recommendations in a simple way. Numerous steps are

	<p>region. A feasibility study will not address advocacy and political will. The first two bullets are similar in nature. Public support for additional funding is paramount. Instead of a feasibility study would a comprehensive survey entitled “ I would ride public transportation if...’ serve the community better.</p>		<p>required to move towards identifying new transit funding sources.</p>
PART	<p>Page 69 Freight- an MPO region data snapshot is suggested (The NCDOT Office of Freight and Logistics) The Tour-based Freight Model needs to be mentioned and how it can improve freight planning and project evaluation in the future.</p>	<p>The Tour-based freight model reference incorporated; added reference to the recommendation for a future freight plan for the region</p>	<p>MPO region freight snapshot not included at this time</p>
PART	<p>Rail vs BRT-A BRT express dedicated to Gibsonville, Graham and Mebane would be easier to implement</p>	<p>Adding reference re: additional recommendations based on NCDOT Statewide Commuter Bus Study Draft Recommendations to the Transit Recommendations section.</p>	
PART	<p>Safety- There is no mention of public transportations safety benefits.</p>	<p>Added reference to public transportation safety benefits</p>	
DCHC	<p><u>W. Ten Road</u> – The DCHC MPO intends to add a corresponding widening of W. Ten Road as a three-lane cross-section in Amendment #2 to the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)</p>		<p>W. Ten Road widening projects considered for BGMPO MTP are only included in the unfunded list for CTP plan update consideration. Hwy-102 project is</p>

	<p>based on the Efland-Buckhorn-Mebane Access Management Plan. This widening is not in our MPO’s fiscally-constrained 2045 MTP. Note that this project is shown in the BG MPO 2045 MTP map but staff was not able to find it in the project tables.</p>		<p>mostly inside of BGMPO boundary and we will carry forward for consideration as part of CTP update. Hwy-138 project, Buckhorn Rd to Mt. Willing Road is of BGMPO boundary and we will remove it from the BGMPO plan/to be carried forward as part of future DCHC CTP amendment as referenced in your email.</p>
DCHC	<p><u>Commuter Rail Transit</u> – The DCHC MPO recommends that the BGMPO add commuter rail transit to the North Carolina Railroad mainline. The DCHC MPO’s 2045 MTP and CTP show commuter rail transit extends west of Hillsborough to the MPO planning boundary. A corresponding extension in the BG MPO area would help ensure that the travel demand modeling and long-range planning resources are available to evaluate the feasibility of this project in the future.</p>	<p>Link for Hillsborough-Mebane commuter train added to the unfunded projects and map of bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects. The commuter rail project was already referenced in the text earlier. However-see comment from the City of Mebane below</p>	<p>Conflicting comments from DCHC and the City of Mebane re: remove or leave Commuter Rail line on the unfunded transit projects map/list</p>
DCHC	<p><u>Lebanon Road Intersection Improvements</u> – The DCHC MPO does not have a corresponding improvement project for this roadway improvement in its long-range</p>	<p>We will update project description to stop at N. Frazier Rd to be consistent with</p>	

	<p>plans. MPO staff is not aware of any congestion, safety, or other transportation challenges along the segment of this roadway that is in the DCHC MPO. Note that the pop-up data on the BG MPO project map and the corresponding highway project table states that the extent of the project goes to Efland-Cedar Grove Road. However, the interactive BG MPO map appears to correctly show that the project terminates at the MPO border.</p>	BGMPO boundary.	
City of Mebane	<p>Please delete Figure 39 on page 51. While the CRT line between Mebane and RTP was an exciting concept, it is unsupported by cost-benefit analysis. The City would also appreciate discussion of how this result has yielded to further discussion about how to enhance bus ridership from Mebane, including investments in Bus Rapid Transit, which needs a separate feasibility analysis, but this is not necessary;</p>		<p>Conflicting comments from DCHC and the City of Mebane re: remove or leave Commuter Rail line on the unfunded transit projects map/list</p>
Mebane	<p>Subchapter 4.3 “Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation” does not appear to include any of the data or recommendations of the City of Mebane’s adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan (BPTP). The City provided VHB with the GIS shapefiles from its BPTP on July 24, 2019, yet they are not represented on any of the</p>		<p>The MTP plan included only a small subset of bicycle and pedestrian projects as fiscally constrained/funded bicycle and pedestrian projects. Draft “Universe of Projects” for consideration was</p>

	<p>maps in this subchapter. These projects are represented in Figure 63 (page 104) but nowhere in Subchapter 4.3, including within the textual discussion of projects.</p>		<p>reviewed with the MPO committees in the fall. Recommendations from bicycle and pedestrian plans reflected in the PBIN mapping will be carried forward as part of CTP plan update—those GIS files will be turned over to BGMPO staff.</p>
Mebane	<p>Question about Figure 11 on page 15 (“Water and Sewer Service Areas”) only features the City of Mebane’s Future Service Area -omitting the City’s current service areas. GIS files with this information should have already been provided to VHB by the City; In all maps, the Mebane City Limits reflect the boundaries around July 2019. The City’s corporate limits have changed significantly since then, especially in Orange County, where >100 acres were annexed into the City for an economic development project. The analyses in the MTP are based upon the earlier City limits but the displayed limits are already outdated. What is the appropriate presentation of the City of Mebane for this document – at the beginning of the planning process or at the date of adoption?</p>		<p>VHB Study team tried to use the best data available at the time that the maps were created. The municipal boundaries were downloaded from NCDOT at the start of the study in the spring of 2019. It is not likely to have a bearing on final recommended project list at this point. We could provide an updated map as an appendix if desired.</p>
Mebane	<p>On page 17, please add the South Mebane Residential Historic District;</p>	Incorporated	

Mebane	The Transit subchapter is deficient in its discussion of transit reducing vehicle miles traveled and transitioning to alternative fuels for their vehicles, making it one of the more effective tools for reducing carbon emissions in the region. Orange County, which is part of the BGMPO, is non-compliant for Clean Air Act air quality standards and enhancing its transit network as a strategy to reduce fossil fuel emissions. This discussion is valuable to the MTP's Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4, and Objectives 1A, 1B, 2B, 2D, 2E, 4A, and 5C;	Added discussion of air quality benefits of transit	
Mebane	On page 67, discussion of what is appropriate Complete Streets compliance for roads with posted limits above 55 MPH is requested;	Added	
Mebane	On page 72, eliminate the asterisked comment for the Buckhorn Road Crossing, reflecting recent NCDOT actions to separate the rail and road projects for SPOT 6.0 submissions;	Removed asterisk	
Mebane	On page 74, delete Figure 50, as the design is no longer reflective of the designs proposed by NCDOT, nor discussions among NCDOT, Orange County, and the City of Mebane;	Removed Figure 50 Fifth Street Crossing	
Mebane	On page 101, please expand upon the "Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects" listed under the 2045 Horizon STIP Projects; and		The detailed list included in bicycle and pedestrian section

Mebane	For Figure 64 – 66, please revise the color scheme so the different projects are clearer – the blues and greens are difficult to distinguish from each other on a 8.5"x11" page (all modes, funded and unfunded improvements)	Updated	
Mebane	On page 33, please make the legend for Figure 23 legible; On page 34, please provide a legend for Figure 24 ("Map of Division 7 Posted Bridges")	Updated	