

**DURHAM – CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)****Member Governments**

Town of Carrboro
Town of Chapel Hill
County of Chatham
City of Durham
County of Durham
Town of Hillsborough
NC Department of
Transportation
County of Orange

**November 10, 2010
9:00 AM****Committee Room
2nd Floor Durham City Hall**

- 1. Roll Call**
- 2. Adjustments to the Agenda**
- 3. Public Comments**
- 4. Directives to Staff (Attachment 4)**

ACTION ITEMS

- 5. October 13, 2010 TAC Meeting Minutes (9:00-9:05)
(Attachment 5)**

A copy of the October 13, 2010 TAC meeting minutes is enclosed as Attachment 5.

TAC Action: Approve minutes of the October 13, 2010 TAC meeting.

- 6. Durham Traffic Separation Study (9:05-9:40)
(No Attachment)**

Pat Simmons, Director, NCDOT Rail Division

The North Carolina Department of Transportation's Rail Division plans to complete a Traffic Separation Study (TSS) in Durham. This will be a comprehensive study of the North Carolina Railroad Company and Southeast High Speed Rail corridor from the Cornwallis Road at grade crossing (#734 742W, MP H 62.83) on the eastern edge of Durham to the Neal Road at-grade crossing (#735 202E, MP H 50.2) on the west side of Durham. It will include a complete engineering evaluation, as well as a thorough public involvement process with the various communities involved within the study area. The end result will be a plan to address near, mid and long-term improvements for the public at-grade crossings within the study area. This plan will improve safety along the corridor and thus be beneficial to all stakeholders involved.

TAC Action: Receive presentation from NCDOT Rail Division concerning the Traffic Separation Study (TSS).

- 7. Complete Streets – Update (9:40-10:05)
(Attachment 7)**

Joey Hopkins, Dep. Div. Engineer, NCDOT Division 5

Complete Streets is North Carolina's approach to interdependent, multi-modal transportation

networks that safely accommodate access and travel for all users. Recently, the NCDOT adopted a complete streets policy that requires NCDOT's planners and designers to consider and incorporate multimodal alternatives in the design and improvement of all appropriate transportation projects within a growth area of a town or city unless exceptional circumstances exist. The policy includes a discussion of scope and applicability, exceptions, context sensitivity guidelines and partnerships with the stakeholders.

TAC Action: Receive presentation from NCDOT concerning the Complete Streets policy.

8. STP-DA Reallocation for I-85 Project (10:05-10:15)

(Attachment 8, 8A)

Maricia Brown, LPA Staff

The municipal agreements for the I-85 widening project (I-0306DB/ I-0306C) make provisions for project enhancement features which include brick noise wall betterment costs, landscape median planters, sidewalks, pedestrian trail, and stamped and colored concrete traffic islands. When the agreements were prepared and executed in 2001 and 2003, the N. C. Department of Transportation estimated the total costs of the enhancements at \$4,098,740.00. As stated in the agreements, the costs were to be covered with a combination of STP-DA funds (\$3,267,232.00), City funds (\$795,500) and State funds (\$36,008). During project close out and final invoicing, it became apparent that the actual cost of the enhancement work was significantly different from the distribution of STP-DA funds among the different phases of the project. Therefore, the City is requesting a reallocation of the STP-DA funds among different phases of the project (there is no net change in the total STP-DA allocation to the project). Attachment 8 is a memo detailing this process and comparison tables that shows the STP-DA allocation according to the original agreement, the proposed STP-DA allocation, and the net adjustment to STP-DA funds. Attachment 8A is a resolution and summary table in support of the requested reallocation.

TCC Recommendation: Recommend that TAC adopts the resolution approving the proposed reallocation of STP-DA funds for the I-85 project.

TAC Action: Approve a resolution regarding the reallocation of STP-DA funds for the I-85 project.

9. FY 2010-2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)– Amendment #1 (10:15-10:25)

(Attachment 9, 9A)

Maricia Brown, LPA Staff

The TAC approved the 2010-2011 UPWP on May 12, 2010. The UPWP provides yearly funding allocations to support the ongoing transportation planning activities of the DCHC MPO. The UPWP must identify MPO planning tasks to be undertaken with the use of federal transportation funds, including highway and transit programs. Funds that would not be expended during the current fiscal year must be de-obligated through an amendment in order for the funds to be available for programming in subsequent fiscal years. The amendment of the UPWP is also used to include additional funding that becomes available during the UPWP approval process.

The proposed Amendment #1 is necessary in order to reflect an addition of Section 104 (f) Planning funds and an addition/reallocation of Section 5303 Metropolitan Transit Planning funds. Attachment 9 is a memo describing Amendment #1 to the 2010-2011 UPWP. Attachment 9A is a resolution and supporting tables that detail Amendment #1 to the 2010-2011 UPWP.

TCC Recommendation(s):

1. Recommend that TAC approve amendment #1 for FY11 UPWP.
2. Recommend that TAC adopts the resolution regarding Amendment #1 to the 2010-2011 UPWP.

TAC Action: Approve amendment #1 for FY11 UPWP & adopt the supporting resolution.

10. Election of MPO Officers for 2011 (10:25-10:30)

(No Attachment)

Mark Ahrendsen, TCC Chair

The election of officers for the upcoming calendar year occurs on the agenda at the last TAC meeting of every year. The TAC Chair appoints a nominating committee in November to report back to the TAC in December.

The TAC Bylaws state that officers cannot serve more than two consecutive terms. In addition, the Chair shall rotate among the jurisdictions represented in Durham County, Orange County, and Chatham County so that successive chairs come from different counties. For example, if the Chair is from the City of Durham or Durham County, the next Chair shall be from Carrboro, Chapel Hill, Hillsborough, Orange County, or Chatham County. The Vice-Chair shall be from a jurisdiction located in one of the two other counties.

Mike Woodard and Lydia Lavelle have served two consecutive terms as TAC Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, and are therefore not eligible to serve another term in their current office.

TAC Action: TAC Chair shall appoint a nominating committee.

REPORTS:

11. Report from the TAC Chair (10:30-10:35)

Mike Woodard, TAC Chair

TAC Action: Receive Report from TAC Chair

12. Report from Staff (10:35-10:40)

(Attachment 12)

Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff

TAC Action: Receive Report from Staff

**13. Report from the TCC Chair (10:40-10:45)
Mark Ahrendsen, TCC Chair**

TAC Action: Receive Report from TCC Chair

**14. NCDOT Report (10:45-10:50)
(Attachment 14)
Wally Bowman, Division 5 – NCDOT
Mike Mills, Division 7 – NCDOT**

TAC Action: Receive report of NCDOT

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

**15. Recent News Articles and Updates
(Attachment 15)**

**16. Durham Planning Commission Letter re: the Draft NC 54/I-40 Corridor Study
(Attachment 16)**

Adjourn

Next meeting: December 8, 2010

Dates of Upcoming Transportation-Related Meetings:

- 11/10/2010, 11:00 am Meeting with NCDOT regarding the Draft 2011-2020 STIP @ City of Durham
- 11/17/2010, 11:30 am The Regional Transportation Alliance State of Mobility 2010 @ Embassy Suites, Cary, NC
- 12/2/2010, 1:00 pm Regional Wayfinding Meeting @ Cary Chamber of Commerce
- 12/7/2010, 9:00 am I-40 Regional Partnership Meeting @ RTP Headquarters, 12 Davis Dr, RTP
- 12/17/2010, 10:30 am Tri-MAP Meeting @ RDU Airport Authority

TAC Directives to Staff

06/11/03 – 12/31/08 (Pending/In Progress/On Going)

01/01/09 – Present (Completed/Pending/In Progress)

Meeting Date	Directive	Status
4/12/06	Investigate use of peer review for Triangle Regional Model (TRM)	<u>In Progress:</u> TRM committee has taken up this project
4/12/06	Address cost splits for TRM tasks	<u>In Progress:</u> TRM Executive Committee has taken up this project.
8/09/06	Follow up with the BPAC and DATA Boards regarding public involvement for MPO activities.	<u>In Progress:</u>
2/14/07	Develop a long-term and short-term strategy for addressing funding needs working with other MPOs and the Metropolitan Coalition	<u>Completed:</u> Results—Mobility Fund and Congestion Relief legislation, and NCDOT SPOT program
3/12/08	Provide an update on the state's human services transportation plan	<u>Completed:</u> Plan completed and approved.
12/10/08	Develop a recommendation for the bridge replacement on State Forest Rd.	<u>In Progress:</u> NCDOT is investigating use of secondary road funds to replace bridge
1/14/09	Re-order projects and respond to the issues raised by the TAC on the draft FY 2011-2017 TIP Regional Priority List.	<u>Completed:</u> See Attachment 7 of 2/11/09 TAC Agenda.
1/14/09	Investigate the relationship between projected transit ridership and revenue	<u>Completed:</u> See Attachment 6 of 2/11/09 TAC Agenda.
2/11/09	Send a letter to the MPO's congressional delegation regarding the urbanized area's 5307 apportionment	<u>Completed:</u> See Attachment 19 of 3/11/09 TAC Agenda.
4/08/09	Send a letter to the MPO's congressional delegation and member jurisdictions regarding S1001/H881	<u>Completed:</u> See Attachment 16 of 5/13/09 TAC Agenda.
5/13/09	Send a letter to Brier Creek shopping center management requesting bus shelters.	<u>In Progress:</u> LPA, CAT, and DATA staff are discussing transit access and passenger amenities.
5/13/09	Send a letter to the Town of Cary and Chatham County regarding trailhead parking areas for the American Tobacco Trail	<u>Completed:</u> See Attachment 15 of 8/12/09 TAC Agenda.
10/14/09	Present to the Durham City Council on the status of the Durham Walks Plan	<u>Completed:</u> Occurred 2/4/2010
10/14/09	Work with NCDOT and Durham City/County Planning to ensure that developers in the Hopson Road project area make contributions to the road improvements	<u>Completed:</u> See Attachment 8 of 4/14/2010 TAC Agenda.

10/14/09	Present to the Orange County BOCC on MAB expansion	<u>Completed:</u> 11/17/2009
11/11/09	Meet with the Secretary of Transportation to discuss the East End Connector and the urban loop prioritization process	<u>Completed:</u> Meeting occurred 1/8/2010
11/11/09	Provide the TAC a summary of the Regional Transit Leadership Group meetings and status of the county transit plans.	<u>In Progress:</u> Status provided to TAC, TAC Chair and elected officials on an ongoing basis
11/11/09	Provide additional information to the TAC on the Complete Streets policy and legislation.	<u>In Progress:</u>
1/13/10	Send letter to Chatham County BOCC regarding MAB expansion	<u>Completed:</u> See Attachment 19 of 2/10/10 TAC Agenda.
1/13/10	Send letter to NCDOT describing the ranking of multi-modal projects in the DCHC MPO's FY 2012-2018 TIP Regional Priority List	<u>Completed:</u> See Attachment 28 of 3/10/10 TAC Agenda.
2/10/10	Provide a recommendation for how to proceed with programming funding for alternatives to U-3808, Elizabeth Brady Road.	<u>In Progress:</u> See 3/10/10 TAC Agenda. Study has been drafted.
3/10/10	Address the issues raised regarding the Farrington Road Corridor Study.	<u>In Progress</u>
5/12/10	Send letter to Secretary Conti regarding funding for the East End Connector.	<u>Completed:</u> See 5/12/10 TAC Agenda.
8/11/10	Follow-up with UNC-Chapel Hill during public involvement period for NC 54 Corridor Study.	<u>Completed:</u>

44 Brian Rhodes City of Durham/Transportation
45 Meg Scully Durham County
46 Christy Shumate NCTA
47 Mila Vega Orange County
48 Sam Veraldi Duke University PTS
49 Patrick Wilson NCDOT – Division 7

50
51 **Voting Member
52 *Alternate or Non-Voting Member

53
54 Mike Woodard, TAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. and the Roll Call was
55 conducted.

56 **PRELIMINARIES:**

57 **Adjustments to the Agenda**

58 Mike Woodard stated there are two items that staff has requested be added at the end of the
59 agenda. There will be a discussion regarding the NCDOT Rescission and an update on the Mobility Fund
60 that will require action.

61 Mark Ahrendsen identified the handouts that were distributed at the beginning of the meeting
62 which will be referred to during the meeting.

63 **Public Comments**

64 There were no public comments.

65 **Directives to Staff (Attachment 4)**

66 The Directives to Staff are attached for review.

67 **ACTION ITEMS:**

68 **September 8, 2010 TAC Meeting Minutes (Attachment 5)**

69 Alice Gordon stated lines 89-90 should read as follows; “Alice Gordon asked if we are looking at
70 both light rail transit and commuter rail transit studies west of Durham in Orange County and Durham
71 County”; line 96 should read as follows; “Alice Gordon asked why not analyze UNC-Duke instead of
72 UNC-Gateway”; line 139-141 should read as follows; “Alice Gordon stated that she will ask the same

73 questions later in the process and wants them to be answered at that time. Otherwise, she cannot
74 support the list of study corridors proposed today for analysis.”

75 Lydia Lavelle stated line 195 should read as follows; “understanding of the wording in the report
76 regarding the status of the project.”

77 A motion was made by Ellen Reckhow and seconded by Diane Catotti to approve the September
78 8, 2010 TAC Meeting Minutes with the amendments noted above. The motion carried unanimously.

79 **NC Turnpike Authority Update (Attachment 6)**

80 Christy Shumate with the North Carolina Turnpike Authority provided an update on the portions
81 of the Triangle Expressway that are under construction and then Roy Bruce with H.W. Lochner provided
82 an update on the next phase of the project they are calling the Southeast Extension which will be the
83 continuation of I-540 around Raleigh.

84 Christy Shumate stated the portions that are under construction right now are the Triangle
85 Parkway and Western Wake Freeway, which are about 35% complete. The Triangle Parkway is on
86 schedule to open at the end of next year and the Western Wake section of I-540 is scheduled to open at
87 the end of 2012. They are going to begin preliminary paving this week. About 90% of the right-of-way is
88 complete.

89 Sally Kost asked when McCummon Parkway is scheduled to re-open. Ms. Shumate stated she
90 doesn't know but she will find out. There is a website site www.westernwakeinfo.com and they are
91 keeping the website updated with road closures and traffic detours.

92 Roy Bruce with H.W. Lochner provided a Power Point presentation on the Triangle Expressway
93 Southeast Extension.

94 Ellen Reckhow stated she thought there was already an alignment chosen. Mr. Bruce stated yes
95 there is an alignment that has been preserved for the last fifteen years. However, the NEPA law
96 requires that we look at all reasonable and feasible corridors within the study area. The environmental

97 study process is scheduled to be done in 2013. Ellen Reckhow asked if H.W. Lochner as a private
98 consultant can expedite things and Mr. Bruce stated they follow the same federal laws that everyone
99 else follows.

100 Sally Kost asked what is being done about the prices of the toll and Ms. Shumate stated the toll
101 rates have not been formally set yet; but it is expected in the next few months. Ms. Shumate stated
102 they expect it to be \$.15 cents per mile. The rate will be set by NCDOT and the NC Turnpike Authority
103 boards within the next couple of months. The fare technology allows for use without correct change.
104 There will be a certain amount of time allotted to pay the tolls. We have to have the enforcement
105 legislation to get the bond money to build the project.

106 Ms. Shumate stated they have hired a Marketing Manager which is working on the educational
107 piece of the toll road. Lydia Lavelle stated we need to make sure rental car companies are involved. Ms.
108 Shumate stated there is the potential of time of day variability in the future.

109 Ellen Reckhow asked the schedule for opening the segment under construction. Ms. Shumate
110 state the first section will be the Triangle Parkway which is the extension NC147 from I-40 to I-540 will
111 open at the end of 2011. The next section which is the remainder of I-540 to NC55 in Holly Springs is on
112 schedule to open in 2012. Ellen Reckhow suggested involving the local elected officials in the
113 information meetings.

114 **Triangle Regional Transit Program – Transitional Analysis (Attachment 7)**

115 Greg Northcutt provided a Power Point on the Triangle Regional Transit Program – Transitional
116 Analysis.

117 Mr. Northcutt stated a question was raised asking why not use US15-501 down all the way to
118 UNC into Chapel Hill. They felt not only was it outside the corridor; but it didn't warrant the same level
119 of study that an alternative analysis on NC54 in the original alignment that would get you to
120 Meadowmont for example. Ed Harrison stated it is important corridor in Chapel Hill. Mr. Northcutt

121 stated it is important. However, they didn't feel like it fell into the highest priority corridor. Patrick
122 McDonough provided an update on the US 15-501 corridor and what is going on in the corridor,
123 especially with bus.

124 Lydia Lavelle asked if she can find the appendix on-line for the Town of Carrboro. Bill Martin
125 stated the Town of Carrboro, the Town of Hillsborough, and discussion going east of Raleigh toward
126 Knightdale/Zebulon. There is an appendix specifically for these.

127 Alice Gordon asked how many Locally Preferred Alternatives (LPAs) there will be and Greg
128 Northcutt stated there will be (3) three. The third LPA will be the Wake/Durham commuter rail.

129 Alice Gordon asked about submitting the projects for federal funding in August 2011 which is
130 before the referendum. We are submitting the projects before we know the outcome of the
131 referendum because we want to catch the funding cycle from the federal government. They probably
132 aren't going to act on it immediately because they know we don't have a local funding source in place.
133 Without a funding source, the state may not roll in and the feds definitely won't because they are
134 looking for local participation. We are hoping they will rate the project on its merits and as soon as we
135 know the outcome of the referendum we will forward it to the FTA and perhaps catch the funding cycle.
136 You can submit a New Starts project to the FTA anytime of the year. The advantage of going forward is
137 we are in the queue and if the timing is right and we can get a referendum that is positive we need to
138 roll it into the FTA's consideration. It is going to be a tight timeframe.

139 Bill Martin stated the commuter rail corridor extends from west Durham to the Wake County-
140 Johnston County line and it is a subset. You can start with commuter rail in the next five years or start
141 with light rail. It is unlikely that twenty-nine miles of commuter rail will be funded by FTA.

142 Alice Gordon asked why it is considerably less expensive for commuter rail than light rail. Mr.
143 Northcutt stated commuter rail is less expensive because of the assumption that it uses existing tracks.

144 Alice Gordon stated she doesn't understand what type of information you are going to get when
145 you study the UNC hospitals to Alston Avenue. Mr. Northcutt stated it will be an exact alignment and
146 then a detailed analysis will be run.

147 Bill Bell asked what the best case is if the referendum passes and Mr. Northcutt stated more
148 information beyond the next phase will be needed to make a decision on the commuter rail.

149 Bill Martin stated the New Starts program is not a one shot opportunity. We will be submitting
150 New Starts criteria for each of the projects next fall in November. It puts you in the process and there
151 are steps to be followed. Bill Bell asked how much financial information is going to be available by the
152 time of the referendum. The revenue streams will be determined later.

153 Mark Ahrendsen stated the financial plan is a condition of House Bill 148. The MPOs, TTA, and
154 BOCC must approve it.

155 Ellen Reckhow asked if they are going to be assessing the loss of ridership because of people
156 having to make a mode change. Mr. Martin stated we will show the connection between light rail and
157 commuter rail with the timing and phasing. Ms. Reckhow stated the interface is critical and she wanted
158 to know if it will be evaluated and Mr. Martin stated yes it will be evaluated. Ms. Reckhow asked if they
159 will be evaluating the ridership loss due to the lack of connection and Mr. Martin stated yes it will be
160 evaluated. Mr. Martin stated everyone needs to remember these will be two different markets.

161 Ellen Reckhow stated the key figure is riders per mile and cost per rider. How many riders do
162 you lose? Patrick McDonough stated light rail and commuter rail are two different markets.
163 Durham/Raleigh might be faster using commuter rail than using light rail given fewer stations and higher
164 speeds. Ellen Reckhow stated we need to lay out the assumptions in the presentation, eg, cost per
165 mile.

166 A motion was made by Diane Catotti and seconded by Lydia Lavelle to receive the Transitional
167 Analysis presentation, and support the Transitional Analysis conclusions to advance the UNC-Chapel Hill

168 hospitals to Alston Avenue in Durham, and northwest Cary to the Northeast Regional Center in Raleigh
169 corridors for more detailed Alternatives Analysis, and conduct a special Alternatives Analysis of
170 commuter rail service in the corridor between Durham and Raleigh. The motion carried unanimously.

171 Alice Gordon stated she has concerns which were expressed at the last meeting. Ms. Gordon is
172 going to move forward and support despite her concerns. However, these concerns need to be
173 acknowledged.

174 **Draft 2011-2020 STIP (Attachments 8, 8A, and 8B)**

175 Andy Henry provided an update on the Draft 2011-2020 STIP, along with the attachments. Mr.
176 Henry stated attachment 8A and 8B are mostly the MPOs priority list.

177 Sally Kost stated #12 on Attachment 8A was a high priority project and it was the number one
178 priority in Regional Mobility for Division 8. Ellen Reckhow concurs with Ms. Kost. Ms. Kost suggested
179 changing the language beginning with the second sentence to read as follows: "The study is not
180 included as part of the MPO's 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (2035 LRTP)" and delete the balance
181 of the language.

182 Chuck Watts, Jr. reminded everyone that the Mobility Funding is currently not funded at this
183 time even though there are mobility funded projects.

184 Alice Gordon suggested removing "cannot move forward until the I-85 widening is complete"
185 from Attachment 8B, #6 (a).

186 There was discussion of changing the time of the meetings and providing lunch. Andy Henry will
187 send out a revised schedule for the division meetings.

188 **FFY 2010 JARC and New Freedom Program Appropriation (Attachments 9, 9A, and 9B)**

189 Maricia Brown provided an introduction for the FFY 2010 JARC and New Freedom Program
190 Appropriation, along with the attachments.

191 Lydia Lavelle asked the difference between Attachment 9B, Rogers Road Community and NS
192 Route Expansion (service to Rogers Rd). Brian Litchfield stated that Rogers Road Community should be
193 Rogers Road Community NS&G Night Service and NS Route Expansion (service to Rogers Rd) should be
194 HS Route Expansion. Maricia Brown will make sure it gets corrected.

195 Maricia Brown stated that on Attachment 9 – 2010 Call for Projects – Updated Schedule – May
196 11, 2011 should be changed to reflect TAC action on TCC recommendations including the STIP
197 amendment.

198 A motion was made by Lydia Lavelle and seconded by Diane Catotti to approve the 2010 JARC
199 and New Freedom Call-for-Projects schedule with the changes noted above. The motion carried
200 unanimously.

201 **MTIP Amendment #17 (Attachment 10)**

202 Andy Henry provided an introduction for the MTIP Amendment #17, along with the attachment.

203 A motion was made by Eric Hallman and seconded by Diane Catotti to amend the FY2009-2015
204 MTIP to include the three new projects. The motion carried unanimously.

205 **2010 Rescission (Attached)**

206 Dale McKeel provided an introduction for the 2010 Rescission. The staff recommends adding
207 this to the one-on-one meetings for discussion.

208 **Mobility Fund (Attached)**

209 Dale McKeel provided an introduction for the Mobility Fund and attachment. NCDOT has
210 requested comments by October 29, 2010. The recommendation is to authorize the Chair and Vice-
211 Chair to work with the LPA staff and TCC on a response which is needed prior to the next TAC meeting.

212 A motion was made by Diane Catotti and seconded by Ellen Reckhow to empower the Chair and
213 Vice-Chair to work with the LPA staff and TCC to prepare a response. The motion carried unanimously.

214 **REPORTS:**

215 **Report from the TAC Chair**

216 Mike Woodard stated there will be no federal highway reauthorization soon. Thanks to
217 everyone that attended the Joint TAC meeting and thanks to staff for the preparation.

218 **Report from Staff (Attachment 12)**

219 The Report from Staff is attached for review.

220 **Report from the TCC Chair**

221 Mark Ahrendsen stated there will be Alston Avenue citizen workshop on October 19, 2010 from
222 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Holton Resource Center. Staff will provide an update to City Council at the
223 Work Session on October 21, 2010 and at the Board of County Commissions Work Session on November
224 1, 2010 on the Regional and Local Transit Program. There will be a Joint MPO legislative committee
225 meeting on October 22, 2010 with the Chair and Vice-Chairs of the DCHC and CAMPO.

226 **NCDOT Report (Attachment 14)**

227 Joey Hopkins, NCDOT Division 5 Engineer provided an update on US 15-501; a punch list should
228 be completed in about a month. The State Forest Road Bridge washed out and the Durham Board of
229 County Commissioners (BOCC) made it very clear they wanted it replaced. NCDOT will be using
230 secondary road construction funding. The replacement bridge will be very similar to the previous
231 bridge.

232 Patrick Wilson, NCDOT Division 7 Engineer stated there is a project in Chapel Hill on US 15-501
233 near Old Mason Farm Road where NCDOT crews will be closing a right lane – southbound towards
234 Pittsboro beginning on Monday until October 23, 2010 from the hours of 9 a.m. until 3 p.m. daily. Mr.
235 Wilson also provided an update on the South Columbia Street project which was completed over the
236 weekend. However, there is still a punch list.

237 Alice Gordon wants information on the Twin Creek Greenway project. Karen Lincoln stated it
238 looks like Orange County is going to have to get a supplemental agreement because of delays with
239 NCDOT. Patrick Wilson will get back to Karen Lincoln and Alice Gordon with an update.

240 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

241 **Recent News Articles and Updates (Attachment 15)**

242 The recent news articles and updates are attached for review.

243 **Triangle Transit Appointment letter to the DCHC MPO (Attachment 16)**

244 The Triangle Transit appointment letter to the DCHC MPO is attached for review.

245 **Adjournment**

246 There being no further business before the Transportation Advisory Committee, the meeting
247 was adjourned at 11:56 a.m.

NCDOT July 2009 Board of Transportation Agenda
Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation
Complete Streets Policy

Board approval is requested for adoption of the Complete Streets Policy.

A. Definition

Complete Streets is North Carolina's approach to interdependent, multi-modal transportation networks that safely accommodate access and travel for all users.

B. Policy Statement

Transportation, quality of life, and economic development are all undeniably connected through well-planned, well-designed, and context sensitive transportation solutions. To NCDOT, the designations "well-planned", "well-designed" and "context-sensitive" imply that transportation is an integral part of a comprehensive network that safely supports the needs of the communities and the traveling public that are served.

The North Carolina Department of Transportation, in its role as stewards over the transportation infrastructure, is committed to:

- providing an efficient multi-modal transportation network in North Carolina such that the access, mobility, and safety needs of motorists, transit users, bicyclists, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities are safely accommodated;
- caring for the built and natural environments by promoting sustainable development practices that minimize impacts on natural resources, historic, businesses, residents, scenic and other community values, while also recognizing that transportation improvements have significant potential to contribute to local, regional, and statewide quality of life and economic development objectives;
- working in partnership with local government agencies, interest groups, and the public to plan, fund, design, construct, and manage complete street networks that sustain mobility while accommodating walking, biking, and transit opportunities safely.

This policy requires that NCDOT's planners and designers will consider and incorporate multimodal alternatives in the design and improvement of all appropriate transportation projects within a growth area of a town or city unless exceptional circumstances exist. Routine maintenance projects maybe excluded from this requirement; if an appropriate source of funding is not available.

C. Purpose

This policy sets forth the protocol for the development of transportation networks that encourage non-vehicular travel without compromising the safety, efficiency, or function of the facility. The purpose of this policy is to guide existing decision-making and design processes to ensure that all users are routinely considered during the planning, design, construction, funding and operation of North Carolina's transportation network.

D. Scope and Applicability

This policy generally applies to facilities that exist in urban or suburban areas, however it does not necessarily exclude rural setting; and is viewed as a network that functions in an interdependent manner.

There are many factors that must be considered when defining the facility and the degree to which this policy applies, e.g., number of lanes, design speeds, intersection spacing, medians, curb parking, etc. Therefore, the applicability of this policy, as stated, should be construed as neither comprehensive nor conclusive. Each facility must be evaluated for proper applicability.

Notwithstanding the exceptions stated herein, all transportation facilities within a growth area of a town or city funded by or through NCDOT, and planned, designed, or constructed on state maintained facilities, must adhere to this policy.

E. Approach

It is the Department's commitment to collaborate with cities, towns, and communities to ensure pedestrian, bicycle, and transit options are included as an integral part of their total transportation vision. As a partner in the development and realization of their visions, the Department desires to assist localities, through the facilitation of long-range planning, to optimize connectivity, network interdependence, context sensitive options, and multimodal alternatives.

F. Related Policies

This policy builds on current practices and encourages creativity for considering and providing multi-modal options within transportation projects, while achieving safety and efficiency.

Specific procedural guidance includes:

- Bicycle Policy (adopted April 4, 1991)
- Highway Landscape Planting Policy (dated 6/10/88)
- Board of Transportation Resolution: Bicycling & Walking in North Carolina, A Critical Part of the Transportation System (adopted September 8, 2000)
- Guidelines for Planting within Highway Right-of-Way
- Bridge Policy (March 2000)
- Pedestrian Policy Guidelines –Sidewalk Location (Memo from Larry Goode, February 15, 1995)
- Pedestrian Policy Guidelines (effective October 1, 2000 w/Memo from Len Hill, September 28, 2000)
- NCDOT Context Sensitive Solutions Goals and Working Guidelines (created 9-23-02; updated 9-8-03)

G. Exceptions to Policy

It is the Department's expectation that suitable multimodal alternatives will be incorporated in all appropriate new and improved infrastructure projects. However, exceptions to this policy will be considered where exceptional circumstances that prohibit adherence to this policy exist. Such exceptions include, but are not limited to:

- facilities that prohibit specific users by law from using them,
- areas in which the population and employment densities or level of transit service around the facility does not justify the incorporation of multimodal alternatives,

It is the Department's expectation that suitable multimodal alternatives will be incorporated as appropriate in all new and improved infrastructure projects within a growth area of a town or city.

As exceptions to policy requests are unique in nature, each will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Each exception must be approved by the Chief Deputy Secretary.

Routine maintenance projects maybe excluded from this requirement; if an appropriate source of funding is not available.

H. Planning and Design Guidelines

The Department recognizes that a well-planned and designed transportation system that is responsive to its context and meets the needs of its users is the result of thoughtful planning. The Department further recognizes the need to provide planners, designers and decision-makers with a framework for evaluating and incorporating various design elements into the planning, design, and construction phases of its transportation projects. To this end, a multi-disciplined team of stakeholders, including transportation professionals, interest groups, and others, as appropriate, will be assembled and charged with developing comprehensive planning and design guidelines to support this policy.

These guidelines will describe the project development process and incorporate transparency and accountability where it does not currently exist; describe how (from a planning and design perspective) pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, and motor vehicles will share roads safely; and provide special design elements and traffic management strategies to address unique circumstances.

An expected delivery date for planning and design guidelines will be set upon adoption of this policy.

I. Policy Distribution

It is the responsibility of all employees to comply with Departmental policies. Therefore, every business unit and appropriate private service provider will be required to maintain a complete set of these policies. The Department shall periodically update departmental guidance to ensure that an accurate and up-to-date information is maintained and housed in a policy management system.

J. Declaration of Policy

J. Douglas Galyon, Chairman
Board of Transportation

Date

Eugene A. Conti, Secretary

Date

July 9, 2009

MEMORANDUM

**TO: Transportation Advisory Committee
DCHC MPO**

FROM: DCHC MPO Lead Planning Agency

DATE: November 10, 2010

SUBJECT: STP-DA Reallocation for I-85 Project

The municipal agreements for the I-85 widening project (I-0306DB/ I-0306C) make provisions for project enhancement features which include brick noise wall betterment costs, landscape median planters, sidewalks, pedestrian trail, and stamped and colored concrete traffic islands. When the agreements were prepared and executed in 2001 and 2003, the N. C. Department of Transportation estimated the total costs of the enhancements at \$4,098,740.00. As stated in the agreements, the costs were to be covered with a combination of STP-DA funds (\$3,267,232.00), City funds (\$795,500) and State funds (\$36,008).

The tables below reflect the funding allocations specified in the I-0306DB Municipal Agreement, the I-0306C Municipal Agreement, and the I-306C Supplemental Agreement. The final cost of the I-306C median planter was \$538,654.79 below estimate, leaving an unused STP-DA allocation of \$430,923.83 (80%). The I-306DB Duke Park Pedestrian Trail cost \$1,389.21 below estimate, leaving an unused STP-DA allocation balance of \$1,111.37 (80%). This leaves a total unused STP-DA balance of \$432,035.20 not applied to the project element overruns totaling \$617,085.60 since the agreements make no allowances to do so.

Reallocating the unused STP-DA balance within the project will substantially reduce the City's financial obligation, fully deplete the project's allocated STP-DA funds and require no additional State funds. Recognizing the invoices are prepared in accordance with the terms of the respective agreements, we request supplemental agreements which

adjust the cost allocations to match actual costs as reflected in the attached tables. We believe doing so reflects the original intent and purpose of the STP-DA allocations.

Summary

	Municipal Agreement Allocation	Proposed Allocation (reflecting actual cost)	Percent	Change
<i>Grant Totals</i>				
STP-DA Funds	3,267,232.00	3,267,232.00	78.2%	-
City Share	795,500.00	872,541.60	20.9%	77,041.60
State Share	36,008.00	36,008.00	0.9%	-
<i>Grand Totals</i>	4,098,740.00	4,175,781.60	100.0%	77,041.60

I-306C

Project Element	Municipal Agreement Allocation	Proposed Allocation (reflecting actual cost)	Percent	Change
<i>Median Planter</i>				
STP-DA Funds	1,122,563.20	691,639.37	80.0%	(430,923.83)
City Share	280,640.80	172,909.84	20.0%	(107,730.96)
Total	1,403,204.00	864,549.21	100.0%	(538,654.79)
<i>Brick Noise Wall</i>				
STP-DA Funds	447,723.20	516,964.62	80.0%	69,241.42
City Share	111,930.80	129,241.15	20.0%	17,310.35
Total	559,654.00	646,205.77	100.0%	86,551.77
<i>Sidewalk</i>				
STP-DA Funds	75,073.60	97,699.98	80.0%	22,626.38
City Share	18,768.40	24,425.00	20.0%	5,656.60
Total	93,842.00	122,124.98	100.0%	28,282.98
<i>Totals</i>				
STP-DA Funds	1,645,360.00	1,306,303.97	80.0%	(339,056.03)
City Share	411,340.00	326,575.99	20.0%	(84,764.01)
State Share	-	-	0%	-
Total	2,056,700.00	1,632,879.96	100.0%	(423,820.04)

I-306C Supplemental

Project Element	Municipal Agreement Allocation	Proposed Allocation (reflecting actual cost)	Percent	Change
<i>Stamped and Colored Concrete Islands</i>				
STP-DA Funds	60,000.00	149,898.27	80.0%	89,898.27
City Share	29,700.00	37,474.57	20.0%	7,774.57
Total	89,700.00	187,372.84	100.0%	97,672.84

<i>Totals</i>				
STP-DA Funds	60,000.00	149,898.27	80.0%	89,898.27
City Share	29,700.00	37,474.57	20.0%	7,774.57
State Share	-	-	0%	-
Total	89,700.00	187,372.84	100.0%	97,672.84

I-306DB

Project Element	Municipal Agreement Allocation	Proposed Allocation (reflecting actual cost)	Percent	Change
<i>Median Planter</i>				
STP-DA Funds	478,080.00	720,031.45	80.0%	241,951.45
City Share	119,520.00	180,007.86	20.0%	60,487.86
Total	597,600.00	900,039.31	100.0%	302,439.31
<i>Brick Noise Wall</i>				
STP-DA Funds	921,562.00	929,879.68	75.0%	8,317.68
City Share	230,390.00	310,786.65	25.0%	80,396.65
Total	1,151,952.00	1,240,666.33	100.0%	88,714.33
<i>Sidewalk</i>				
STP-DA Funds	144,030.00	144,030.00	74.4%	-
City Share	-	13,424.37	6.9%	13,424.37
State Share	36,008.00	36,008.00	18.6%	-
Total	180,038.00	193,462.37	100.0%	13,424.37
<i>Duke Park Pedestrian Trail</i>				
STP-DA Funds	18,200.00	17,088.63	80.0%	(1,111.37)
City Share	4,550.00	4,272.16	20.0%	(277.84)
Total	22,750.00	21,360.79	100.0%	(1,389.21)
<i>Totals</i>				
STP-DA Funds	1,561,872.00	1,811,029.76	76.9%	249,157.76
City Share	354,460.00	508,491.04	21.6%	154,031.04
State Share	36,008.00	36,008.00	1.5%	-
Total	1,952,340.00	2,355,528.80	100.0%	403,188.80

**RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE REALLOCATION OF
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM – DIRECT ATTRIBUTABLE (STP-DA)
FUNDS BETWEEN THE THREE PHASES THE I-85 PROJECT
FOR THE DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO URBAN AREA**

November 10, 2010

A motion was made by TAC Member _____ and seconded by TAC Member _____ for the adoption of the following resolution, and upon being put to a vote, was duly adopted.

WHEREAS, Surface Transportation Program – Direct Attributable (STPDA) funds are provided to the DCHC MPO for transportation projects and planning activities; and

WHEREAS, the DCHC MPO approved FFY 2001 and FFY 2003 STP-DA funds for I-306 (I-85) Project to be managed and completed by NCDOT; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is in agreement with the reallocation of STP-DA funds between the phases of the I-85 project; and

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Advisory Committee hereby grants permission for the NC DOT to reallocate the Surface Transportation Program Direct Attributable (STPDA) funds for the I-85 projects between the three different phases of the project as summarized on the attached table, provided here on this, the 10th day of November, 2010

J. Michael Woodard, TAC Chair

Durham County, North Carolina

I certify that J. Michael Woodard personally appeared before me this day acknowledging to me that he signed the forgoing document.

Date: November 10, 2010

Frederick Brian Rhodes, Notary Public
My commission expires: May 10, 2015

Proposed STP-DA Allocations

Project	Agreement STP-DA Allocation	Proposed STP-DA Allocation	STP-DA Adjustment	% Change
I-306C	1,645,360.00	1,306,303.97	(339,056.03)	-20.6%
I-306C Supplemental	60,000.00	149,898.27	89,898.27	149.8%
I-306DB	1,561,872.00	1,811,029.76	249,157.76	16.0%
Total	3,267,232.00	3,267,232.00	0.00	0.0%

MEMORANDUM

TO: Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)
DCHC MPO

FROM: DCHC MPO Lead Planning Agency

DATE: November 10, 2010

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Amendment #1.

The TAC approved the 2010-2011 UPWP on May 12, 2010. The UPWP provides yearly funding allocations to support the ongoing transportation planning activities of the DCHC MPO. The UPWP must identify MPO planning tasks to be undertaken with the use of federal transportation funds, including highway and transit programs. Funds that would not be expended during the current fiscal year must be de-obligated through an amendment in order for the funds to be available for programming in subsequent fiscal years. The amendment of the UPWP is also used to include additional funding that was available during the UPWP approval process.

Accordingly, the proposed amendment reflects an addition of Section 104 (f) Planning funds and an addition/reallocation of Section 5303 Metropolitan Transit Planning funds. Attachment 9A is the schedules that support changes. The PL, STP-DA, & Section 5307 funds approved by TAC on May 12, 2010, included the following:

- PL - \$1,600,145 (Federal portion)
- STP-DA - \$354,044 (Federal portion)
- Section 5307 Planning - \$1,519,525 (Federal & State portion)

The table reflects amended amounts by fund as follows:

- PL – addition of \$61,543 (Federal portion)
- STP-DA – reallocation of funds by task (\$0 change)(Federal portion)
- Section 5307 Planning - addition of \$87,015 (Federal & State portion)

Attachment 9A is a resolution regarding Amendment #1 to the 2010-2011 UPWP

RESOLUTION

TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #1 TO THE FY 2010-2011 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM OF THE DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (DCHC MPO)

November 10, 2010

A motion was made by TAC Member _____ and seconded by TAC Member _____ for the adoption of the following resolution, and upon being put to a vote was duly adopted.

WHEREAS, A comprehensive and continuing transportation planning program must be carried out cooperatively in order to ensure that funds for transportation planning projects are effectively allocated to the DCHC MPO; and

WHEREAS, The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO requests an amendment to the 2010-2011 UPWP as outlined on the attached tables; and

WHEREAS, Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee agree that the Unified Planning Work Program amendment effectively advances transportation planning for 2010-2011.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Transportation Advisory Committee hereby endorses Amendment #1 of the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Urban Area Unified Planning Work Program for the FY 2010-2011 as described in the attached sheets.

I, J. Michael Woodard, Transportation Advisory Committee Chair, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from the minutes of a meeting of the Durham-Chapel Hill- Carrboro Urban Area Transportation Advisory Committee, duly held on the 10th day of November, 2010.

J. Michael Woodard, TAC Chair

Durham County, North Carolina

I certify that J. Michael Woodard personally appeared before me this day acknowledging to me that he signed the forgoing document.

Date: November 10, 2010

Frederick Brian Rhodes, Notary Public
My commission expires: May 10, 2015

MEMORANDUM

To: Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)
DCHC MPO

From: DCHC MPO Lead Planning Agency

Date: November 10, 2010

Subject: **Lead Planning Agency (LPA) Staff Report**

This memorandum provides a summary status of tasks for projects in the FY 2010-2011 Unified Planning Work Program.

- Indicates that task is ongoing and not complete.
- ✓ Indicates that task is complete.

2010-2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Projects

Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)

- Draft CTP – December 2010/January 2011 – Depends on NCDOT Schedule
- Public Input
- Recommended CTP
- Adopted CTP
- Technical report and implementation

NC 54/I-40 Corridor/Sub-Area Study

- ✓ Staff study initiation meeting
- ✓ Draft scope of services
- ✓ Agency review of scope and time
- ✓ Request for Proposal notice – October 2008
- ✓ Proposal due January 2009
- ✓ Consultant selected
- ✓ Contract negotiation underway
- ✓ Council contract approval May 18, 2009
- ✓ Notice to Proceed – June 2009
- ✓ Kickoff Meeting – July 2009
- ✓ Public Outreach Plan – August 2009
- ✓ Prepare Corridor / Subarea Community Profile – Dec 2009
 - ✓ Public Workshop #1 – Fall 2009
- ✓ Development and Evaluation of Scenarios – Apr 2010
 - ✓ Public Workshop #2 – Feb 25, 2010
- ✓ Transportation/Land Use Master Plan – June 2010
 - ✓ Public Workshop #3 – May 11, 2010

- ✓ Documentation and Final Presentation – June 2010
- Local agency review - ongoing
- Study completion – March 2011

Commercial Vehicle/Freight Survey (TRM Service Bureau Project)

- ✓ Project near completion
- Final Report/Draft Dataset – December 2010

GIS/Data Integration and Automation

- ✓ Phase I completed. Internal review and implementation in progress
- ✓ Phase 2 to commence in January 2011

Land-use Model Development

- ✓ Multi-year project in progress
- ✓ Phase 1 completed
- ✓ Sensitivity analysis and testing in progress
- Phase 2- Parcel level model for DCHC – To commence in January 2011
 - Initial database – TBD
 - Initial model estimation – TBD
 - Initial calibration – TBD

Non-Motorized Model Development

- ✓ Phase 1 completed.
- ✓ Phase 2 completed
- Sensitivity analysis and testing in progress

MPO Parking Survey and Study (postponed)

- Parking model specification
- Regional Coordination and planning
- Draft scope of services
- Request for Proposal notice
- Consultant selection
- Council contract approval
- Project commences

MPO Community Viz. Scenarios Planning and Visualization

- Project kick- off in November 2010

Contract Number: C201487	Route: US-15
Physical Division: 5	County: Durham
Administrative Division: 5	TIP Number: B-3450, U-4009, U-4012
Length: 1.769 miles	Federal Aid Number: BRSTP-1116(6)
Resident Engineer: Chad D. Hinnant	RE Phone Number: (919)220-4680
Location Description: BRIDGES OVER SANDY CRK & TRIBUTARY & APPROACHES ON SR-1116, SR-1126 NEAR US-15/501 & SR-1116, US-15/501 AT MT MORIAH RD.	
Type of Work: GRADING, DRAINAGE, PAVING, SIGNALS, AND STRUCTURES.	
Contractor Name: DLB, INC DBA DLB INC (OF VA)	
Contract Amount: \$18,810,912.36	Cost Overrun/Underrun: 5.3%
Availability Date: 10/1/2007	Letting Date: 8/21/2007
Completion Date: 8/1/2010	Work Began: 10/1/2007
Revised Completion Date: 8/3/2010	Estimated Completion: 10/15/2010
Last Estimate Thru: 9/22/2010	Scheduled Progress: 100%
Last Estimate Paid: 10/4/2010	Actual Progress: 90.67%

Contract Number: C201994	Route: NC-147
Physical Division: 5	County: Durham
Administrative Division: 15	TIP Number: U-4763B
Length: 4.2 miles	Federal Aid Number: TIFIA-540(2)
Resident Engineer: D. Brian Harrington, PE	RE Phone Number: (919)836-4873
Location Description: TRIANGLE PARKWAY FROM NC-540 IN WAKE CO TO I-40 IN DURHAM CO	
Type of Work: GRADING, DRAINAGE, PAVING, SIGNALS, TOLL FACILITIES & STRS.	
Contractor Name: S. T. WOOTEN CORPORATION	
Contract Amount: \$137,446,000.00	Cost Overrun/Underrun:
Availability Date: 9/19/2008	Letting Date: 8/5/2008
Completion Date: 7/1/2011	Work Began: 8/3/2009
Revised Completion Date:	Estimated Completion:
Last Estimate Thru:	Scheduled Progress:
Last Estimate Paid:	Actual Progress:

Contract Number: C202064	Route: SR-2028
Physical Division: 5	County: Durham
Administrative Division: 5	TIP Number: U-3309A
Length: 1.165 miles	Federal Aid Number: STP-2028(4)
Resident Engineer: Cadmus Capehart, PE	RE Phone Number: (919)840-0914
Location Description: SR-2028 (TW ALEXANDER DR) FROM CORNWALLIS RD TO EAST OF NC-147 IN DURHAM.	
Type of Work: WIDENING, GRADING, DRAINAGE, PAVING & SIGNALS.	
Contractor Name: THOMPSON CONTRACTING GRADING PAVING & UTILITIES INC	
Contract Amount: \$6,502,648.68	Cost Overrun/Underrun: 2.12%
Availability Date: 2/1/2010	Letting Date: 12/15/2009
Completion Date: 8/15/2011	Work Began: 2/8/2010
Revised Completion Date:	Estimated Completion: 8/15/2011
Last Estimate Thru: 9/22/2010	Scheduled Progress: 25%
Last Estimate Paid: 9/28/2010	Actual Progress: 33.32%

Contract Number: C202277	Route: I-40
Physical Division: 5	County: Durham
Administrative Division: 5	TIP Number: R-2000AF, R-5164B
Length: 3.56 miles	Federal Aid Number: STM-540(15)
Resident Engineer: Jeffrey D. Allen, PE	RE Phone Number: (919)733-9499
Location Description: NORTHERN WAKE FREEWAY INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS AT I-540 AND I-40, AND I-40 FROM NC-147 TO EAST OF I-540.	
Type of Work: WIDENING, GRADING, DRAINAGE, MILLING, PAVING, & STRUCTURE .	
Contractor Name: FSC II LLC DBA FRED SMITH COMPANY	
Contract Amount: \$7,577,355.48	Cost Overrun/Underrun: 0.93%
Availability Date: 3/1/2010	Letting Date: 1/19/2010
Completion Date: 12/31/2010	Work Began: 4/1/2010
Revised Completion Date: 1/9/2011	Estimated Completion: 12/31/2010
Last Estimate Thru: 10/21/2010	Scheduled Progress: 82.4%
Last Estimate Paid: 10/26/2010	Actual Progress: 76.64%

Contract Number: C202340	Route: SR-1321
Physical Division: 5	County: Durham
Administrative Division: 5	TIP Number: U-3804
Length: 1.07 miles	Federal Aid Number: STM-0505(50)
Resident Engineer: Chad D. Hinnant	RE Phone Number: (919)220-4680

<p>Location Description: SR-1321 (HILLANDALE RD) FROM I-85 TO NORTH OF SR-1407 (CARVER AVE). Type of Work: GRADING, DRAINAGE, PAVING, AND SIGNAL. Contractor Name: REA CONTRACTING A DIVISION OF THE LANE CONSTRUCTION CORPORAT Contract Amount: \$4,222,625.78 Cost Overrun/Underrun: Availability Date: 8/30/2010 Letting Date: 7/20/2010 Completion Date: 6/15/2012 Work Began: Revised Completion Date: Estimated Completion: Last Estimate Thru: Scheduled Progress: Last Estimate Paid: Actual Progress:</p>	
<p>Contract Number: C202408 Route: US-501 Physical Division: 5 County: Durham Administrative Division: 5 TIP Number: Length: 18.15 miles Federal Aid Number: Resident Engineer: Chad D. Hinnant RE Phone Number: (919)220-4680 Location Description: US-501 BUS FROM SOUTH OF SR-1669 (CLUB BLVD) TO SR-1443 (HORTON RD) AND 8 SECTIONS OF SECONDARY ROADS. Type of Work: MILLING, RESURFACING & SHOULDER RECONSTRUCTION. Contractor Name: FSC II LLC DBA FRED SMITH COMPANY Contract Amount: \$2,694,654.51 Cost Overrun/Underrun: 17.44% Availability Date: 10/5/2009 Letting Date: 8/18/2009 Completion Date: 6/11/2010 Work Began: 4/5/2010 Revised Completion Date: Estimated Completion: 10/15/2010 Last Estimate Thru: 9/15/2010 Scheduled Progress: 100% Last Estimate Paid: 9/28/2010 Actual Progress: 99.92%</p>	
<p>Contract Number: C202493 Route: I-85 Physical Division: 5 County: Durham Administrative Division: 5 TIP Number: R-5164A Length: 9.6 miles Federal Aid Number: STM-085-4(114)171 Resident Engineer: Cadmus Capehart, PE RE Phone Number: (919)840-0914 Location Description: 1 SECTION OF I-85, 1 SECTION OF US-15/501, AND 1 SECTION OF NC-147. Type of Work: MILLING, RESURFACING & MILLED RUMBLE STRIPS. Contractor Name: REA CONTRACTING A DIVISION OF THE LANE CONSTRUCTION CORPORAT Contract Amount: \$6,088,736.11 Cost Overrun/Underrun: -4.94% Availability Date: 3/15/2010 Letting Date: 1/19/2010 Completion Date: 12/16/2010 Work Began: 8/4/2010 Revised Completion Date: Estimated Completion: 12/16/2010 Last Estimate Thru: 10/7/2010 Scheduled Progress: 59% Last Estimate Paid: 10/13/2010 Actual Progress: 53.28%</p>	
<p>Contract Number: C202496 Route: US-15501 Physical Division: 5 County: Durham Administrative Division: 5 TIP Number: R-5164C Length: 2.9 miles Federal Aid Number: STM-0015(30) Resident Engineer: Chad D. Hinnant RE Phone Number: (919)220-4680 Location Description: 3 SECTIONS OF US-15/501 BUS AND 3 SECTIONS OF SECONDARY ROADS. Type of Work: MILLING & RESURFACING. Contractor Name: REA CONTRACTING A DIVISION OF THE LANE CONSTRUCTION CORPORAT Contract Amount: \$861,556.72 Cost Overrun/Underrun: 9.64% Availability Date: 5/19/2010 Letting Date: 1/19/2010 Completion Date: 9/15/2010 Work Began: 5/19/2010 Revised Completion Date: Estimated Completion: 11/7/2010 Last Estimate Thru: 10/7/2010 Scheduled Progress: 100% Last Estimate Paid: 10/19/2010 Actual Progress: 82.34%</p>	
<p>Contract Number: C202538 Route: NC-55, NC-751, SR-1118 SR-1357, SR-1404, SR-1615 SR-1641, SR-1646, SR-1656 SR-1670, SR-1671, SR-1901 SR-1954, SR-1955, SR-1981 US-70 Physical Division: 5 County: Durham Administrative Division: 5 TIP Number: Length: 22.96 miles Federal Aid Number: Resident Engineer: Cadmus Capehart, PE RE Phone Number: (919)840-0914 Location Description: 1 SECTION OF US-70, 1 SECTION OF NC-55, 1 SECTION OF NC-751 & 13 SECTIONS OF SECONDARY ROADS. Type of Work: MILLING, RESURFACING & SHOULDER RECONSTRUCTION.</p>	

<p>Contractor Name: TRIANGLE GRADING & PAVING, INC Contract Amount: \$4,474,348.51 Availability Date: 3/15/2010 Completion Date: 12/16/2010 Revised Completion Date: Last Estimate Thru: 10/22/2010 Last Estimate Paid: 10/28/2010</p>	<p>Cost Overrun/Underrun: 1.21% Letting Date: 1/19/2010 Work Began: 4/5/2010 Estimated Completion: 12/16/2010 Scheduled Progress: 76% Actual Progress: 62.06%</p>
<p>Contract Number: C202610 Physical Division: 5 Administrative Division: 5 Length: 6.8 miles Resident Engineer: Cadmus Capehart, PE Location Description: NC-147 FROM NORTH OF SR-1322 (BROAD ST) TO NORTH OF SR-2028 (TW ALEXANDER BLVD). Type of Work: DIAMOND GRINDING, CONC PVT SLAB REMOVAL & SHOULDER RECONST. Contractor Name: FSC II LLC DBA FRED SMITH COMPANY Contract Amount: \$4,274,880.20 Availability Date: 3/15/2011 Completion Date: 11/1/2011 Revised Completion Date: Last Estimate Thru: Last Estimate Paid:</p>	<p>Route: NC-147 County: Durham TIP Number: R-5164D Federal Aid Number: STM-0147(3) RE Phone Number: (919)840-0914 Cost Overrun/Underrun: Letting Date: 9/21/2010 Work Began: Estimated Completion: Scheduled Progress: Actual Progress:</p>
<p>Contract Number: C202613 Physical Division: 5 Administrative Division: 5 Length: 7.59 miles Resident Engineer: Chad D. Hinnant Location Description: 1 SECTION OF US-70 BUS, 13 SECTIONS OF US-15/501 BUS, 1 SECTION OF NC-751 AND 4 SECTIONS OF SECONDARY ROADS. Type of Work: MILLING, RESURFACING & SHOULDER RECONSTRUCTION. Contractor Name: FSC II LLC DBA FRED SMITH COMPANY Contract Amount: \$1,844,694.96 Availability Date: 3/15/2011 Completion Date: 9/2/2011 Revised Completion Date: Last Estimate Thru: Last Estimate Paid:</p>	<p>Route: - County: Durham TIP Number: R-5164E Federal Aid Number: STM-0070(140) RE Phone Number: (919)220-4680 Cost Overrun/Underrun: Letting Date: 9/21/2010 Work Began: Estimated Completion: Scheduled Progress: Actual Progress:</p>
<p>Contract Number: DO00031 Physical Division: 5 Administrative Division: 5 Length: 0 miles Resident Engineer: Chad D. Hinnant Location Description: BRIDGES #160, 163, 144, 138, AND 140 ON NC-147. Type of Work: BRIDGE PAINTING. Contractor Name: SAFFO CONTRACTORS INC Contract Amount: \$782,555.00 Availability Date: 5/3/2010 Completion Date: 9/14/2010 Revised Completion Date: Last Estimate Thru: 9/22/2010 Last Estimate Paid: 9/24/2010</p>	<p>Route: NC-147 County: Durham TIP Number: B-4700AD Federal Aid Number: BRNHS-000S(370) RE Phone Number: (919)220-4680 Cost Overrun/Underrun: -2.29% Letting Date: 3/18/2010 Work Began: 6/15/2010 Estimated Completion: 10/15/2010 Scheduled Progress: 100% Actual Progress: 100%</p>
<p>Contract Number: DO00050 Physical Division: 5 Administrative Division: 5 Length: 0 miles Resident Engineer: Chad D. Hinnant Location Description: BRIDGES #71 ON US-15/501, 191, 192, 177, 180, 173, 175, 164, & 166 ON NC-147. Type of Work: BRIDGE PAINTING. Contractor Name: SAFFO CONTRACTORS INC Contract Amount: \$792,555.00 Availability Date: 5/3/2010 Completion Date: 9/14/2010 Revised Completion Date: Last Estimate Thru: 9/22/2010</p>	<p>Route: NC-147 County: Durham TIP Number: B-4700AC Federal Aid Number: BRNHS-000S(370) RE Phone Number: (919)220-4680 Cost Overrun/Underrun: -0.76% Letting Date: 3/18/2010 Work Began: 8/5/2010 Estimated Completion: 10/15/2010 Scheduled Progress: 70%</p>

Last Estimate Paid: 9/24/2010		Actual Progress: 90.78%	
Contract Number: DO00069	Route: NC-147	Physical Division: 5	County: Durham
Administrative Division: 5	TIP Number: BK-5102G	Length: 0 miles	Federal Aid Number: BRNHS-0147(4)
Resident Engineer: Cadmus Capehart, PE	RE Phone Number: (919)840-0914	Location Description: BRIDGES #12, 71, 137, 154, 156, AND 169 ON NC-147.	
Type of Work: BRIDGE PAINTING.		Contractor Name: S & D INDUSTRIAL PAINTING, INC.	
Contract Amount: \$922,562.15	Cost Overrun/Underrun:	Availability Date:	Letting Date: 8/19/2010
Completion Date:	Work Began:	Revised Completion Date:	Estimated Completion:
Last Estimate Thru:	Scheduled Progress:	Last Estimate Paid:	Actual Progress:
Contract Number: DO00070		Route: NC-147	
Physical Division: 5		County: Durham	
Administrative Division: 5		TIP Number: BK-5102E	
Length: 0 miles		Federal Aid Number: BRZ-1940(2)	
Resident Engineer: Cadmus Capehart, PE		RE Phone Number: (919)840-0914	
Location Description: BRIDGES #194 ON SR-1940, #202 ON SR-2080, #206 ON SR-1121, AND #212 ON NC-147.			
Type of Work: BRIDGE PAINTING.			
Contractor Name: ASTRON GENERAL CONTRACTING COMPANY INC			
Contract Amount: \$1,079,557.80		Cost Overrun/Underrun:	
Availability Date:		Letting Date: 8/19/2010	
Completion Date:		Work Began:	
Revised Completion Date:		Estimated Completion:	
Last Estimate Thru:		Scheduled Progress:	
Last Estimate Paid:		Actual Progress:	
Contract Number: DO00076		Route: -	
Physical Division: 5		County: Durham	
Administrative Division: 5		TIP Number: BK-5102F	
Length: 0 miles		Federal Aid Number: BRSTP-1959(5)	
Resident Engineer: Jeffrey D. Allen, PE		RE Phone Number: (919)733-9499	
Location Description: BRIDGES #228 ON SR-1959, #224 ON SR-1999, AND #100 ON SR-2028.			
Type of Work: BRIDGE PAINTING.			
Contractor Name: SAFFO CONTRACTORS INC			
Contract Amount: \$1,138,000.00		Cost Overrun/Underrun:	
Availability Date:		Letting Date: 9/2/2010	
Completion Date:		Work Began:	
Revised Completion Date:		Estimated Completion:	
Last Estimate Thru:		Scheduled Progress:	
Last Estimate Paid:		Actual Progress:	

**ACTIVE NCDOT PROJECTS LOCATED IN ORANGE COUNTY - DCHC MPO
ARRA**

County	WBS #	Route	Location Description	Amount	Status
Orange	EL-4601	Morgan Creek Greenway	Construct Greenway	\$940,000	ARRA- Sullivan Eastern =16.5% compl.; ARRA funds added(\$47,488)- Suppl. Agree. rec'd. from Town 11/1/10; latest inv. for reimbursement approved 10/14/10
Orange	EL-5103	Carrboro	Construct bus shelters at 4 locations	\$48,296	ARRA- WC Construction =100% compl.; M.A. compl. 7/14/10-revised to 9/14/10; latest invoice for reimbursement approved 11/1/10
Orange	ER-5100 GE	US 15-501@ SR 1734 (Erwin Rd./Europa Dr.)	Plantings	\$65,000	ARRA -Plymouth Nursery and Landscaping =planting compl.; warranty period underway
Orange	R-5178A	NC 57	Widen for two foot paved shoulders and resurface from NC 86 to SR 1544 (Pearson Road)	\$1.0 million	ARRA-Riley Paving, Inc.; work began 6/2/10; 94.89% compl.
Orange	R-5178B	NC 86 (S. Columbia St.) from SR 1010 (Franklin St.) to Cameron Ave.	Mill, resurface, and replace curb and gutter	\$200,000.00	ARRA-Eastern Services, LLC dba Raleigh Paving=71.8% compl.
Orange	TA-5117		Two 28' light transit vehicles w/ wheelchair lift	\$183,200.00	ARRA-funds flexed to FTA; Buses have been received by Chapel Hill Transit, lease has been signed and buses delivered to Orange Public Transportation
Orange	U-3100B	SR 1107 (Old Fayetteville Rd.) from NC 54 to SR 1106 (Stroud Lane)	Safety Improvements (Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Accommodations)	\$1.8 million	ARRA-Atwell Const. Co., Inc., Greenville, NC= 87.11% compl.
Orange	U-3306 34913.3.ST1 STM-1733 (16)	SR 1733 (Weaver Dairy Rd.) from NC 86 to Old Sterling Road	Grading, drainage, paving, signals, curb and gutter, retaining wall	\$13.4 million	Yates Construction Co., Inc. began const. 9/7/10= 3.67% complete

**ACTIVE NCDOT PROJECTS LOCATED IN ORANGE COUNTY - DCHC MPO
ARRA**

Orange	U-4704	Chapel Hill-Carrboro	Computerized Traffic Signal System	\$5.175 million	ARRA-Brooks Berry Haynie & Assoc., Inc.; Mableton, Ga. = 14.8% compl. - additional contractor forces have been employed after meeting with NCDOT
Orange	U-4726 DA	Carrboro	Construct sidewalk on Ashe St. from W. Main St. to Shelton St.	\$284,176.00	ARRA- Centurion Construction Co.=100% compl. ; M.A. compl. 7/2/10- rev. to 9/2/10; latest inv. for reimbursement approved 11/1/10
Orange	U-4726 DB	Carrboro	Construct sidewalk on Bim St. from SR 1005 (Jones Ferry Rd.) to Fidelity St.	Combined w/ U-4726 DA	ARRA-Centurion Construction Co; =100% compl.; M.A. compl. 7/2/10- rev. to 9/2/10; latest inv. for reimbursement approved 11/1/10
Orange	U-4726 GA	Twin Creeks Park Greenway	Linear park: 10' multi-use asphalt trail including bridge over Jones Creek	\$429,457.00	ARRA- McQueen Construction = 51% compl. ; M.A. compl. 1/16/11; inv. reimbursed; Suppl. Const. Agree. for bridge approved; Suppl. Agreement to extend compl. date to 6/30/11 executed by County & sent to Raleigh 10/29/10
Orange	U-4726 IA	Chapel Hill	ADA ramps at selected locations	\$53,924.00	ARRA- Econ International =100% compl.; M.A. compl. 7/16/10- rev. to 8/31/10; inv. reimbursement pending receipt
Orange	U-4726 IB	Chapel Hill	Raised crosswalks/traffic calming	\$65,189.00	ARRA -Turner Asphalt =100% compl.; M.A. compl. 7/16/10- rev. to 8/31/10; inv. reimbursement pending receipt

**ACTIVE NCDOT PROJECTS LOCATED IN ORANGE COUNTY - DCHC MPO
ARRA**

Orange	U-4726 IC	Chapel Hill	Pedestrian safety improvements (refuge islands @ 7 locations)	\$370,014.80	ARRA-Econ International=100% compl.-M.A. compl. 7/16/10-rev. to 8/31/10; inv. reimbursement pending receipt
Orange	U-4726 IE	Chapel Hill	Sidewalk construction on US 15-501/NC54 from SR 1902 (Manning Dr.) to Old Mason Farm Rd.	\$142,613.00	ARRA- Holmes Contracting=100% compl. - Supplemental construction agreement to be paid by Town; Final insp. held 4/30/10; Final 5/27/10; M.A. compl. 7/16/10-rev. to 8/31/10; inv. reimbursement pending receipt
Orange	U-4726 JA	Hillsborough	Construct sidewalks	\$1,034,110.00	ARRA, STP-DA, & Contingency - S.T. Wooten Corp.=36.54% compl.; Inv. #2 app. for reimbursement; M.A. compl. 7/24/11-rev. to 9/17/11
NCDOT PROJECTS CURRENTLY IN 12 MONTH LETTING LIST					
County	TIP #	Route	Location Description	TIP Est.	Est. Let Date
			NONE		

ACTIVE NCDOT PROJECTS LOCATED IN ORANGE COUNTY - DCHC MPO

County	WBS #	Route	Location Description	Amount	Status
Orange	36945	SR 1010 (Franklin St.) @ Mallette St.	Upgrade traffic signal and install pedestrian signal heads REVISION: Install mast arm	\$110,000.00	Advertisement for Let 11/4/10
Orange	41593	Union Street	Construct 750 feet of sidewalk and a crosswalk to connect Hillsborough Elementary School to SR 1156 (Nash St.)	\$32,000 (Statewide Contingency)	See U-4726 JA
Orange	42501	US 15/501/NC54 (Fordham Blvd.) at SR 1900 (Old Mason Farm Rd.)	Construct bus pulloffs on both sides	\$140,000	Design by District- F.A. const. to begin after U-4726 IE and M.A. w/ UNC/Town for crosswalks, WCR, & ped heads-FA const. -est. completion 11/1/10
Orange	42502	SR 1010 (Franklin St.) between Hillsborough St. and Plant Rd.	Replace deteriorated curb and gutter at several locations on both sides	\$30,000	Municipal Agreement sent to Town for execution 3/9/10-resent 9/30/10; Const. FY '10-'11
Orange	43030	SR 1843 (Seawell School Rd.)	Safety improvements near railroad crossing #736157R (signing, tree removal, grading for visibility, paved shoulders, wedging, short overlay & snow-plowable pavement markers)	\$45,000	F.A. construction to be co-ordinated w/ 2011 resurfacing; est. compl. 5/30/11
Orange	43114	SR 1005 (Jones Ferry Road) at SR 1937 (Old Fayetteville Road)	Install a pedestrian countdown signal and crosswalk	\$20,000	Project to be installed by Traffic Services
Orange	7CR.10681.16 7CR.20681.16	NC 54 from 560' west of Greenwood Dr. to County line and 11 sections of secondary roads	Milling, resurfacing and shoulder reconstruction	\$3.028 million	S.T. Wooten Corp. = 90.81% compl.
Orange	B-4216	SR 1002 (St. Mary's Road)	Replacement of Bridge # 66 over Stroud's Creek	\$800,000	Dane Const. Inc.= 88% compl.; Ingle & Son Landscaping, Inc.= P.O. pending
Orange	I-4716	I-40	Grind and reseal joints on I-40 from I-85 to Durham Co. ((Patching spalls, Diamond grinding and slab repair added)	\$7.4 million	Safety Grooving & Grinding, L.P., Napolean, Ohio - =82.63% compl.; grinding compl.- joint sealing underway

ACTIVE NCDOT PROJECTS LOCATED IN ORANGE COUNTY - DCHC MPO

Orange	I-5142	I-85/I-40	Mill, resurface and install pavement markers and rumble strips from west of SR 1114(Buckhorn Road) to the I-85/I-40 interchange	\$8.60 million	C.C. Mangum Co., LLC=12% compl.; pre-con 6/7/10; will begin work 8/9/10 and compl. all WB lanes by Dec.-EB lanes will be compl. by 7/15/11
Orange	42170 SS-4907 T 42204.2 42204.1	SR 1710 (Old NC 10) @ NC 86	Construct a right turn lane on SR 1710 and install a traffic signal	\$215,000	Low Bid 10/20/10=Barrett, Irvin & Jordan, Contractors, Inc.(DG00048) Avail. 4/15/11 for compl. by 9/1/11
Orange	42171 SS-4907 U 42205.2 42205.1	SR 1710 (Old NC 10) @ SR 1713 (Mt. Herman Church Road)	Improve sight distance on SR 1710 by lowering the crest vertical curve on the westbound approach to the intersection	\$300,000	Final plans complete; utility relocation and right of way acquisition pending; est. Let date = 6/21/11
Orange	42423.3 42423.1 SS -4907V	SR 1005 (Old Greensboro Rd.) @ SR 1951 (White Cross Rd.)	Realign intersection	\$165,000	Survey compl.& Design pending; est. Let =12/20/11; flasher has been installed by separate project
Orange	SR-5000S 40922.1.18 PE	Carrboro Elementary School	Safe Routes to Schools- Education, encouragement, evaluation, and neighborhood outreach	\$12,865	Agreement with Town
Orange	SS-4907AC 43040.1.1 PE 07-10-727	SR 1734 (Erwin Rd.) and SR 1791 (Mt. Moriah Rd.) near Chapel Hill	Installation of a left turn lane on Erwin Rd. and a traffic signal	\$10,000	Survey pending
NCDOT PROJECTS CURRENTLY IN 12 MONTH LETTING LIST					
County	TIP #	Route	Location Description	TIP Est.	Est. Let Date
Durham/ Orange	EB-4707	DURHAM/ CHAPEL HILL (SR 1838/SR 2220) FROM SR 1116 (GARRETT ROAD) IN DURHAM COUNTY TO US 15-501 IN ORANGE COUNTY	Bicycle improvements(Bikeway and signals)	\$3.75 million	April 19, 2011

ACTIVE NCDOT PROJECTS LOCATED IN ORANGE COUNTY - DCHC MPO

Orange	U-0624	NC 86 (S. Columbia St.)	Corridor upgrade including Bicycle lanes from SR 1906 (Purefoy Rd.) to SR 1902 (Manning Dr.)	\$4.30 million	Nov. 16, 2011

**TARPO TCC/TAC Meeting
Division 8 Project Report**

COUNTY	WBS #	ROUTE	DESCRIPTION	TOTAL FUNDING ALLOCATION	CONTRACT BID AMOUNT	STATUS
Chatham	41700 SF-4908I	NC 751	Install protected permitted traffic signal and left turn lane at intersection of NC 751 and SR 1731 (O'Kelly Church Road)	PE: \$10,000 ROW: \$58,214.50 Const: \$523,000.00	\$301,260.69	S.T. Wooten Corp began work on 3/16/10 and is currently at 99.6% complete; Scheduled completion date is 4/30/10; Revised completion date is 9/12/2010. Complete, accepted 8/25/10; Economic Stimulus Project
Chatham	8CR.20191.12	6 sections of secondary roads	Contract resurfacing	\$2,600,000.00	\$2,155,954.37	Riley Paving, Inc. began work on 6/28/10; Currently at 100% complete; Scheduled completion is 8/13/10; Completed 9/22/10
Chatham	42221 R-5181	NC 87 from south of SR 1516 to north of SR 1516	Construct elliptical roundabout near CCCC in Pittsboro	\$399,750.00	\$584,478.20	Sanford Contractors, Inc began work on 4/19/10; Currently at 99.8% complete; Scheduled completion date is 8/13/10; Economic Stimulus Project; Complete, accepted 8/14/10
Chatham	36268 U-4726FA & 45067 ER-5100HA	US 15-501 from Cole Park Plaza to Orange County	Install pedestrian facilities (sidewalk) & Streetscaping/Landscaping	U-4726FA PE: \$22,000.00 Const: \$198,000.00 ER-5100HA PE: \$2,525.00 Const: \$22,730.00	\$144,614.00	Chatham County Municipal Agreement; Letting scheduled for 12/3/09; Awarded to White Oak Construction Corp; Availability Date is 1/5/10; Scheduled completion is 6/15/10; Economic Stimulus Project; Complete, accepted 4/30/10
Chatham	41848.3 SS-4908K	US 64 and SR 2229 (Treatment Plant Road)/SR 1363 (Pearlman Teague Road)	Island construction and improvements to accommodate U-turns	PE: \$28,708.28 ROW: \$11,000.00 CONST: \$346,600.00	\$237,788.60	Let on 5/27/10; Awarded to S.T. Wooten Corp.; Availability date is 6/28/10; Scheduled completion date is October 29, 2010
Chatham	33710.3.1 4459	NC 42	Structure replacement of #56 over Buckhorn Creek and approaches	PE: \$76,000.00 ROW: \$55,000.00 CONST: \$1,600,000.00	\$1,307,174.12	APAC-Thompson Arthur began work on 8/5/10; Currently at 5.7% complete; Scheduled completion date is 12/31/11.
Chatham	8CR.10191.14 & 42934	US 1 from the Lee Co. line to Wake County and 3 sect of Secondary Roads	Contract Resurfacing	8CR.10191.14 - \$2,900,000 42934 - \$510,000.00	\$2,919,609.44	Let on 9/7/10; Awarded to S T Wooten Corp; Scheduled completion is 6/3/2011
Chatham	45127.3.1 C-5116	NC 87	Curb & gutter and sidewalk installation in Town of Pittsboro	PE: \$21,521 CONST: \$210,479	\$146,120.00	Cruz Brothers Concrete, Inc.began work on 10/14/10; Scheduled completion date is 12/17/11.

Where Are the 'Recovery Summer' Stimulus Projects? (The New Republic)

Where Are the 'Recovery Summer' Stimulus Projects? (The New Republic)

Washington Post reported on a recent White House analysis of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. That assessment found "strikingly few claims of fraud or abuse," according to the article. Well, good!

We've complained before that ARRA's welcome emphasis on transparency tilts too much toward curbing this kind of waste and too little on establishing a clear, sensible focus on measuring outcomes, irrespective of the multiplier effects of speedy spending Jon Cohn points out. (Though, ironically, the report does not yet appear to be available on Recovery.gov.) But thanks to the ongoing oversight by the House's Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, we are provided with clear and rich information on those projects in the committee's jurisdiction along with a locational identifier for each. This data is reported by the states individually but kudos to the staff and committee leadership for pulling this together and making it available.

So what does it tell us? Our analysis shows that, just looking at the transportation agencies, 43 percent of all the projects and 67 percent of the spending occurs within the 100 largest metro areas, the geographic building blocks of America's economy and society. While this may seem low given that these places are home to two-thirds of our population and generate 75 percent of our gross domestic product, it's actually an increase from earlier this year when those figures were 41 and 59 percent, respectively.

A deeper look into the individual modal administrations (e.g., highways, transit, rail) tell a very different story, though not an unexpected one. The spending on transit projects, for example, is highly concentrated (86 percent) in the major metros while highway dollars (51 percent) are less so. Again, not too surprising given what we know about where transit is located, and how we've allocated roadway dollars in the past. But aviation is interesting: more than half the funding goes outside of the major metros despite the fact that 99 percent of all U.S. air passengers arrive or depart from one of the 100 largest metropolitan areas.

Also notable are the transportation recovery funds allocated through competitive processes, rather than formula block grants. For example, the so-called TIGER funds we've written about before closely track the economic concentration of the 100 largest metropolitan areas. The railroad money (aka the High Speed Rail grants) also veers heavily towards the largest metros though that may necessarily change somewhat as work connecting these places gets started (e.g., new signals, track sidings).

At least for the transportation projects, these data are starting to show the spatial difference between legacy programs and delivery mechanisms and the new fangled emphasis on empirics when it comes to choosing projects. So this emphasis on metropolitan areas is not a parochial grab for money. It's about strategically investing where the economy is so American emerges from the rubble of the recession stronger than ever. That's one of ARRA's key lessons.

Robert Puentes
Senior Fellow, Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program

Perdue plans government consolidation

Perdue plans government consolidation (WRAL.com) Reporter: Bruce Mildwurf Posted: Thursday, Oct. 07, 2010

Facing a projected \$3 billion budget deficit next year, Gov. Beverly Perdue said Tuesday that plans are in the works to consolidate state agencies and sell government assets to save money.

Perdue has pushed for more government efficiency since taking office last year, appointing a special task force to search for ways to cut spending and improve operations. She said Tuesday that she would unveil some of her plans after the November election.

"It was a deliberate choice on my part. I've been very quiet about it. We've been talking, thinking, working," she said.

The governor declined to go into specifics, saying she doesn't want to politicize any proposals before the election. Still, she said the overall goal is to transform state government.

“We’re moving in the direction of consolidating some of the functions of state government and the elimination of others,” she said.

Some of the ideas will need legislative approval, and Perdue said she would hold town meetings across the state to explain her plan and the reasoning behind it.

“I’ve had a team talking to me every morning. We’ve had great conversations. We’ve laughed and we’ve cried about some of the things that could be done,” she said.

The potential job losses through consolidation of state agencies remains unclear. The focus will be on protecting core services – education, economic development and public safety – but everything will be evaluated, including the future of the state’s Alcoholic Beverage Control system.

“I’ve had an outside evaluator who is almost done with the estimate of the value to sell or consolidate or change the system that exists,” Perdue said.

The initiative is separate from Perdue’s recent directive that state agencies propose how to cut up to 15 percent of their budgets in the coming year.

Soaring Hoover Dam bypass bridge finally complete

By Oskar Garcia, Associated Press Writer

LAS VEGAS — A soaring bypass bridge high above the Colorado River near Hoover Dam is set to open after nearly eight years and \$240 million worth of work.

The 1,900-foot engineering wonder perched 890 feet above the water is expected to drastically cut travel time along the main route between Las Vegas and Phoenix, as motorists will no longer have to make their way across the dam and its security checkpoints at a snail’s pace.

Federal Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, Arizona Gov. Jan Brewer and U.S. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid of Nevada were among federal and state officials expected for a Thursday morning dedication at the span linking the Silver and Grand Canyon states.

The bridge, which officially opens next week, is named for former Nevada Gov. Mike O’Callaghan and Pat Tillman, the former NFL player who quit the Arizona Cardinals to join the Army Rangers and died in Afghanistan under friendly fire. Family members of O’Callaghan and Tillman are expected at the bridge’s dedication.

Cars previously were routed more than 6 miles across Hoover Dam to cross the border between Arizona and Nevada, and checkpoints added after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, often caused miles-long backups of traffic. Federal officials also heavily restricted the types of vehicles and cargo that could cross the dam, sending semis and other large vehicles some 23 miles through the resort town of Laughlin.

The new bridge allows travelers to bypass the dam much more quickly and with no checkpoints.

Those going to the dam will no longer be able to pass over it to cross the border by car, though it will remain open as a tourist attraction.

Visitors to the dam often can't help but turn and gawk at the bridge, which federal officials say is the second-tallest bridge in the United States. The tallest is Royal Gorge Bridge in Colorado.

It's the longest bridge built with concrete arches in the western hemisphere, according to the Transportation Department. The arches measure 1,060 feet.

Officials say the bridge contains some 16 million pounds of steel, 30 cubic yards of concrete and 2 million feet of cable — enough to stretch well past Phoenix from Las Vegas.

DOT will replace bridge near Rougemont

County fund will be used for replacement of Flat River crossing

By Ray Gronberg The Herald-Sun 10.14.10 - 11:28 pm

DURHAM -- In response to prodding from County Commissioners, the N.C. Department of Transportation has agreed to replace a washed-out bridge over the Flat River near Rougemont.

Deputy Division 5 Engineer Joey Hopkins told elected officials this week that the department would start planning the replacement, although engineers believe it will take more than the \$250,000 they first estimated to equip State Forest Road with a new river crossing.

Hopkins said the DOT had been "hedging on not replacing it" but came around after County Commissioners signaled they'd agree to have the agency tap into a pot of money reserved for repairs to secondary roads.

The money from that account -- whose use is largely up to the county -- would do away with the need for the department to obtain cash for the project from its own bridge-replacement fund.

State legislators recently gave DOT more flexibility in how to deploy secondary road money, Hopkins said. And given that County Commissioners are adamant about the bridge replacement, the department was willing to go along.

He acknowledged that the move was unusual. DOT and counties generally work together to update secondary-road repair priorities every four years.

Outside of that cycle, "very infrequently, almost never will a county ask us to pave something out of priority," Hopkins told members of the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Transportation Advisory Committee on Wednesday.

The crossing site is in northern Durham County, in the midst of N.C. State University's 2,450-acre George Watts Hill Demonstration Forest.

The university's College of Natural Resources uses the tract to train students in forestry management.

The old bridge over the Flat River got washed away in early September 2008, thanks to rains from Tropical Storm Hanna.

Since then, N.C. State officials, Rougemont residents and the Bahama Volunteer Fire Department have been lobbying for a replacement.

They argue the crossing, though infrequently traveled, is a vital part of the area's otherwise-sparse road network.

Without it, advocates contend, dispatch errors could send firefighters from the Bahama department's station near the corner of Quail Roost and Bahama roads miles out of their way to get to medical and fire calls.

State Forest Road connects Moore's Mill and Wilkins roads. There are roads paralleling each side of the river as it drains into Lake Michie.

While the Bahama station can as easily send trucks up one side of the river as the other, the potential for trouble enters the picture if dispatchers aren't sure which side an emergency is on.

With no other river crossing available between Bahama and Red Mountain roads -- nearly four miles apart as the crow flies -- there's no way for a fire truck to quickly change once on its way up one side or the other, replacement advocates contend.

County Commissioners conferred with Hopkins and other DOT officials on Monday.

"We were unanimous about it," Commissioner Ellen Reckhow said, explaining the county board thought the emergency-response worries provided sufficient justification.

But Durham's delegate on the state Board of Transportation, Chuck Watts, signaled other officials Wednesday that he wasn't thrilled by the move.

Afterward, Watts said that while he'd accept the decision, given the county's role in driving the use of secondary-road funds, the overall handling of the matter didn't square with the state board's current approach.

Prodded by Gov. Beverly Perdue and state Transportation Secretary Gene Conti, DOT has been trying over the last two years to ground decisions about road work on data rather than politics.

The point is "to convert the organization from one continuously subject to political pressures," Watts said.

But on this, "I was concerned because I saw this as being more reflective of DOT's past," he said, adding that officials should be able to use response-time figures to judge the need for the new crossing.

Amtrak ridership surges in North Carolina, on Triangle route

Triangle Business Journal – by Chris Baysden

Friday, October 15, 2010, 2:44pm EDT | Modified: Friday, October 15, 2010, 3:13pm

North Carolina's [Amtrak](#) ridership grew 15 percent in fiscal year 2010 – more than double the national Amtrak ridership growth rate during the same period, according to a statement issued Friday by the [North Carolina Department of Transportation](#).

The state-owned Piedmont, which travels four times daily between Raleigh and Charlotte, had the largest percentage increase in the nation at 46 percent. One reason for this increase is that mid-day service was added in June, NCDOT said.

Piedmont revenue grew 39 percent in the past year, from \$1.12 million in fiscal year 2009 to \$1.56 million in fiscal 2010. Revenue on the Carolinian line, which also runs through the Triangle, jumped 18 percent from \$14.71 million in 2009 to \$17.33 million in 2010.

North Carolina's Amtrak ridership in the last fiscal year jumped up from 688,595 to 791,157. Ticket revenue increased more than 19 percent.

Amtrak National ridership, which includes all trains that run throughout the country, grew by 5.7 percent over 2009 from just over 27 million to 28.7 million passengers in 2010. Revenue rose nearly 9 percent in 2010.

The North Carolina Mobility Fund: A Chance to Bring North Carolina Transportation Policy into the 21st Century (SELC)

By: Thomas M. Gremillion Friday, October 15, 2010

Transportation policy has a profound impact on the economy and the environment in North Carolina. Unlike many of its neighbors, North Carolina lacks any comprehensive growth management law, and so more than any other statewide policy, transportation plans dictate how North Carolina grows. Until now, state policy has focused on highways, fueling an expensive cycle of sprawl development patterns. This pattern of growth has made North Carolinians more dependent on driving in their daily lives, and it has had significant noise, water quality, wildlife habitat, air quality, and other environment impacts across the state. Today, in most North Carolina metropolitan areas the transportation sector accounts for over half of smog emissions. And statewide, it has been estimated to contribute 29% of North Carolina's gross greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions. Such impacts are bound to grow without a significant policy change at the state level. The recent creation of the North Carolina Mobility Fund may mark the first step towards such a change.

North Carolina's policy shift would take advantage of emerging federal transportation policies. President Obama recently announced a \$50 billion transportation investment plan that will work towards the goal of providing alternatives to the automobile for travel, and other changes to reduce oil consumption, lower greenhouse gas emissions, and expand access to job opportunities and housing that's affordable. A long-term framework includes plans for a national high-speed rail system, expansion of public transportation systems, and a national infrastructure bank to fund merit-based grants, building on reforms set in place during the implementation of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Like the recent federal programs, North Carolina's new transportation legislation breaks with the past practice of formula-based spending focused on new highway construction. The 2010 Appropriations Act creates the "Mobility Fund," a revenue source for projects "of statewide and regional significance that relieve congestion and enhance mobility across all modes of transportation." N.C. Sess. Law 2010-31 § 28.7(b). It is endowed with \$173 million from fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2014, and \$58 million each fiscal year thereafter, and much of this is designated for an "initial project" that would widen Interstate 85 outside of Charlotte. But the potential of the Mobility Fund lies not so much in the projects that its initial funding allocation may finance, as in the policy reforms that it may set in place.

The Mobility Fund provides a critical follow-up to the Congestion Relief and Intermodal Transportation 21st Century Fund Bill, popularly referred to as the "Intermodal Bill." N.C. Sess. Law 2009-527 codified at N.C.G.S. § 136-251(2). The Intermodal Bill established a statewide grant program for public transportation and rail projects, but the program was never funded. Now, to comply with the law, the North Carolina Department of Transportation ("NCDOT") must create a project selection process to disburse the Mobility Fund, which gives "preferential consideration" for projects targeted by the Intermodal Bill. And because the Intermodal Bill links transportation funding eligibility to various land use and environmental criteria, it could spark a broader integration of transportation and land use policy.

Currently, North Carolina's transportation policy is dominated by the Highway Trust Fund law, which mandates the construction of ten urban beltways and dozens of major highway expansions in less developed areas. No comprehensive study has ever been completed to justify these construction plans from a traffic engineering, economic development or environmental perspective. To the contrary, the most recent studies, such as the 21st Century Transportation Committee's report to the 2009 General Assembly, point to the need for a more focused approach. For now, however, the Highway Trust Fund mandate remains in place, and its scattershot approach is magnified by the so-called "Equity Formula," which allocates transportation funding on the basis of

arbitrary administrative districts, and results in some rural areas receiving over twice the funding of major metro areas on a per capita basis.

In creating the Mobility Fund, the North Carolina General Assembly stated its support for “all modes of transportation,” N.C. Sess. Law 2010-31, § 28.7(a), and expressly exempted the Fund from the Equity Formula and programming requirements of the Highway Trust Fund. To the contrary, the law conditions NCDOT’s project selection criteria for the Mobility Fund to the requirements of the Intermodal Bill, a law premised on the finding that “congestion continues to worsen” under the Highway Trust Fund building program, that “most of North Carolina’s growth is in its urban regions,” and that the “increased use of rail for transport of freight will reduce highway congestion as well as allow economic expansion.” N.C.G.S. 136-251. The Intermodal Bill’s land use and environmental objectives could help to set in place a statewide project selection process that takes these factors into account, initiating a transformation of the state’s transportation policy.

Shortly after coming into office, Governor Perdue directed the Secretary of Transportation to develop a “professional approval process for highway projects,” in response to widespread perception that transportation planning decisions were politically motivated. Since then, NCDOT has developed a statewide project selection process, but it has many flaws and does little to alter the status quo. For example, the project ranking process shields high-cost new construction projects from comparisons with more modest roadway upgrades or maintenance projects, or from rail, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects. None of the criteria consider land use or environmental impacts, relying instead on engineering metrics, such as a roadway’s “Level of Service” rating, which tend to focus on short-term, often temporary, congestion relief. Discretionary rankings from local officials and NCDOT division staff control up to half of the overall rankings for some projects, yet surprisingly, only the ranking criteria for urban loop projects consider cost. The resulting transportation plans have been heavily focused on new highway construction, and exhibit few differences from past plans.

By contrast, the Mobility Fund project selection process, with its mandate to give “preferential consideration” to Intermodal Fund projects, can be expected to differ dramatically from NCDOT’s current practice. Under the Intermodal Fund Bill, a city, county or local transportation authority must demonstrate “an adequate and sustainable source of funding established for its share of project costs,” N.C.G.S. 136-252(b)(4), and its transit plan must meet various objectives. These include congestion relief, the traditional focus of North Carolina transportation policy, but also environmental factors, such as improving air quality and reducing energy consumption. They also include land use objectives, which may have the potential for the most dramatic change in state policy. Criteria based on these objectives would prompt local governments to establish affordable housing inventories, promote “mixed-use” zoning, make urban centers safe for bicycles and pedestrians, provide transit access to poorer communities, and take other planning steps in order to qualify for state funding. See N.C.G.S. 136-252(b)(2). Such an incentive structure would be in stark contrast to the current state of affairs, which primarily encourages local governments to identify locations for new highway capacity in order to receive state transportation funding.

The Intermodal Bill objectives should provide the foundation for the Department’s selection process for Mobility Fund applicants. They are broad enough to apply as criteria to all projects, and could even favor highway projects with the appropriate design and overall land use plan. Incorporating these directives into the Mobility Fund selection criteria would be consistent with the Mobility Fund law’s “preferential consideration” requirement. It would also advance other state policies, such as the Ambient Air Quality Improvement Act’s goal “to reduce the growth of vehicle miles traveled in the State by at least twenty-five percent (25%),” N.C. Sess. Law 1999-328, and NCDOT’s own mission to operate with “environmental sensitivity,” a consideration that currently does not factor into the Department’s project selection process.

The bulk of the state’s transportation budget continues to target highway construction as a means of moving people and goods across the state, without a clear policy defining statewide transportation priorities. The Mobility Fund, however, could succeed in diversifying the state’s transportation investment portfolio and bringing some coherence to statewide transportation and land use policies. On October 1, 2010, NCDOT will report to the Joint Legislative Transportation Oversight Committee (“JLTOC”) with its preliminary plan for allocating the Fund. For further information and updates on the Mobility Fund project selection process, as well as contact information for interested parties seeking to submit public comment, please see <http://www.ncdot.gov/about/finance/mobilityfund/>

Thomas Gremillion is an Associate Attorney with the Southern Environmental Law Center’s North Carolina and South Carolina Office in Chapel Hill.

High-speed rail in New England faces hurdles

By STEPHEN SINGER, Associated Press Writer Monday October 18, 2010

HARTFORD, CONN. — To passengers looking forward to riding high-speed trains in New England, planners have a message: Not so fast.

Washington is spending \$8 billion in federal stimulus [money](#) to establish high-speed rail corridors nationwide. But in populated areas of New England where city streets and railroad tracks intersect and trains must negotiate curves, hills and tunnels, travel at speeds as high as 150 mph are out of the question.

In rural New England, cattle crossings halt high-speed trains, said John Zicconi, spokesman for the Vermont Agency of Transportation.

As early as this decade, passengers will instead board trains moving at between 65 mph and 80 mph. That's slower than high-speed trains and even further short of the 220-mph bullet trains planned between Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Still, trains moving at one-third that speed should accomplish their main goal: drawing motorists from gas-guzzling, carbon-emitting cars in stop-and-go highway traffic, planners say.

"High speed is kind of a loose definition," said Robert Kulat, a spokesman at the Federal Railroad Administration. "What we're looking at is reduced travel times."

In Vermont, the issue is not speed, but extending service to more areas, Zicconi said. The state is seeking \$70 million from Washington to add passenger service from Rutland to Burlington, and state officials are feeling heat from residents in the south, he said.

"We have people screaming throughout Vermont for us to extend passenger rail so more people will use it," Zicconi said.

Increasing train speeds by just 20 mph, to 79 mph, could shave 90 minutes from the nine-hour trip between Burlington and New York City, he said.

That's good enough for Ken Mennonna. On a recent afternoon, he waited at Hartford's Union Station with his daughter, Renee, who was returning to Burlington, where she is a [freshman](#) at St. Michael's College. "It's overdue," Mennonna said. "We don't pay much attention to trains."

Intercity rail connecting cities to promote economic development is an important, though less sexy and overlooked requirement of the federal rail program that instead draws attention for its high-speed initiative.

Connecticut, Massachusetts and Vermont have received \$160 million in federal economic stimulus money for track improvements to link higher speed trains from New York City to New Haven, Conn., and north to Hartford, Conn., Springfield, Mass., Vermont and Montreal.

Connecticut is expected to receive an additional \$220 million in federal money, matched by \$260 million in state [funding](#), to upgrade train service the width of the state, from New Haven on Long Island Sound north to Springfield, Mass.

Kulat said federal legislation in 2008 defined 110 mph as high speed. Federal transportation officials look to states to reduce travel time rather than reach the 110-mph threshold, he said.

“In the future we do want them to get to that goal,” he said. “It’s not a one-size-fits-all proposition.”

Rail at 110 mph is planned for Chicago to Detroit and Chicago to Milwaukee; St. Louis to Kansas City, Mo.; Charlotte, N.C., to Washington, D.C.; New York to Buffalo, N.Y.; and Philadelphia to Harrisburg, Pa. to Pittsburgh.

A 150-mph route is planned for Portland, Ore., to Seattle, eventually extending to Eugene, Ore.

Amtrak last month unveiled a \$117 billion, 30-year vision for a high-speed rail line on the East Coast. It would reduce travel times along the congested corridor using trains traveling as fast as 220 mph.

Amtrak’s Acela trains already run as fast as 150 mph, but south of New York, Acela runs at 135 mph because of curves, tunnels and additional station stops, spokesman Steve Kulm said.

Tom Maziarz, chief of planning for the Connecticut Department of Transportation, is adamant that federal and state money will draw passengers in New England to faster, if not high-speed, trains by improving tracks and stations, reducing travel time and increasing frequency of trains.

“More people will be choosing to use the train, period,” he said.

Setting Government Straight (Gov. Perdue)

The North Carolina Mayors Coalition October 21, 2010

What is Regulatory Review?

Regulatory Review is Governor Bev Perdue’s newest initiative aimed at setting government straight. It is a new process that asks you – citizens, community groups, businesses, state employees, local governments or schools – to tell us what rules and regulations in state government don’t make sense.

The Governor has instructed all of her cabinet agencies to stop creating new rules unless they are absolutely necessary and justifiable, until a thorough review can be completed. Every suggestion you send in will be reviewed by the Office of State Budget and Management, and ideas that work will be sent to the agencies to act on. If the Governor can make the change herself, she will; if she needs legislative approval, she will ask the General Assembly to make the change next year.

Why do we need it?

Put simply – because North Carolina has thousands of rules on the books that probably have not been reviewed in a long time and may not be relevant anymore. They may be outdated, inefficient or costly. They may defy common sense. State government is long overdue for such a review.

Gov. Perdue says, "My rule is the 'plain common sense rule' – if a regulation is needed, make sure it's efficient for the user, transparent to the public and has real value for North Carolina citizens."

How can I help?

Have you had contact with a state agency and found one of its rules to be outdated, frustrating or inefficient? Did it defy common sense? If so, we want to hear from you.

"I am calling on the people of this state who come into contact with state government to talk to me," Gov. Perdue says. "Tell me what isn't working for you when you go to a state agency for a permit, or a license, or any other project that falls under state regulation."

High speed rail gets \$2.4B in fed funding

Triangle Business Journal - by Chris Baysden Thursday, October 28, 2010, 12:39pm EDT

The U.S. Department of Transportation on Thursday awarded \$2.4 billion to high speed rail projects in 23 states, including North Carolina.

A total of \$68 million will go to the Southeast Corridor, which includes 480 miles of track stretching from Washington, D.C., through North Carolina. USDOT said that North Carolina will receive \$22 million of that money to improve the rail line between Raleigh and Charlotte, including eliminating grade crossings and relocating Charlotte's rail station.

The Obama administration is a fan of high speed rail, and North Carolina has reaped considerable financial rewards for that affinity. In January 2010, USDOT awarded \$8 billion in high speed rail grants across the country through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The Southeast Corridor received \$620 million of those funds and fiscal year 2009 awards.

DATA working to avoid repeat

The Herald-Sun By Ray Gronberg 10.31.10 - 11:20 pm

Officials: Driver, supervisor error caused missed stops

DURHAM -- Driver errors and a missing supervisor contributed to two missed runs of the Bull City Connector that left a couple dozen people to wait for buses outside the Golden Belt complex following a recent Third Friday art walk.

Officials said Durham Area Transit Authority managers have come up with additional safeguards to prevent a recurrence of the problem on the system's flagship service.

"We have worked diligently to address this situation with the appropriate personnel involved and have taken corrective measures in our operations to help us avoid this situation again," system General Manager Sean Smith said in an Oct. 25 apology letter to City Council members.

The problem cropped up on Oct. 15, during evening hours when the free Golden Belt-to-Duke University shuttle is supposed to pass each stop on a 20-minute cycle.

Officials learned via a rider complaint that Golden Belt stops that should have happened at 8:19 p.m. and 8:39 p.m. that evening had been missed.

Subsequent inquiries eventually established that a driver new to his job misread his work schedule and, believing his shift had

ended, parked his bus at Durham Station downtown, city Transportation Director Mark Ahrendsen said.

His relief hadn't shown up yet, so one run was missed. The second miss happened when the relief driver mistakenly went to Duke instead of to Golden Belt, Ahrendsen said.

A supervisor who works at Durham Station who normally would have been on hand to catch the problem wasn't there, having been called into the field to check on an accident that didn't involve the connector, he said.

Transit managers have responded by counseling the drivers involved on proper procedure, and by making sure that in future a supervisor is always on hand at Durham Station, Ahrendsen said.

The recent shift in management at DATA -- Triangle Transit is in charge of the overall operation, and a private contractor, First Transit, handles day-to-day matters -- doesn't appear to have been a factor, Ahrendsen said.

The key personnel involved, from Smith on down, worked at DATA before the Oct. 1 handoff from city transportation to Triangle Transit and from MV Transportation to First Transit, he said.

First Transit and before it MV are involved because state law forces public agencies like the city and Triangle Transit to use private-sector intermediaries in dealing with unionized employees. DATA drivers and mechanics have union representation dating to when the system belonged to Duke Energy.

The problem did, however, draw notice from Bull City Connector advocates eager to see the free shuttle prove its worth. They worried such incidents would scare away passengers.

"A few more failures like that, the ridership will diminish considerably," Duke professor Doc Muhlbaier, a would-be Oct. 15 boarder at Golden Belt, said in his complaint to officials about the missed runs. "The [connector] is a good idea, but it must run as scheduled to be effective."

A Durham landscape architect who lobbied officials to launch the service, Dan Jewell, echoed the professor's point.

"We need to make everyone involved in the operation of the [connector], from the dispatchers to the drivers to the maintenance people, understand the importance of keeping things running per expectations, because the cost of failure is high," Jewell said in an e-mail to City Manager Tom Bonfield.



Durham Planning Commission

October 15, 2010

Dear Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee:

At its regular meeting on October 12, 2010, the Durham City-County Planning Commission received a presentation and took public comment on the draft NC 54/I-40 Corridor Study.

By a unanimous vote, the Commission:

1. Expresses major concerns about the recommendations in the report; and
2. Recommends that the TAC extend the public input process beyond the December 10th deadline.

Attached are written comments from individual commissioners which will give you more detail about the **Commissions'** concerns.

We appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jackie Brown".

Jackie Brown, Chair
Durham City-County Planning Commission