

**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

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

**December 11, 2013  
9:00 a.m.**

**Committee Room  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Durham City Hall**

---

- 1. Roll Call**
- 2. Ethics Reminder**  
It is the duty of every Board member to avoid conflicts of interest. Does any Board member have any known conflict of interest with respect to any matters coming before the Board today? If so, please identify the conflict and refrain from any participation in the particular matter involved.
- 3. Adjustments to the Agenda**
- 4. Public Comments**
- 5. Directives to Staff (Attachment 5)**

**CONSENT AGENDA (9:00-9:05)**

- 6. November 13, 2013 TAC Meeting Minutes  
Attachment 6**

A copy of the November 13, 2013 TAC meeting minutes is enclosed as Attachment 6.

**TAC Action:** Approve minutes of the November 13, 2013 TAC meeting.

- 7. Resolution Endorsing Chapel Hill's Application for Pedestrian Plan Grant Funding  
Attachment 7  
Dale McKeel, LPA Staff**

The North Carolina Department of Transportation has made available funding to assist municipalities with bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts. The grants are awarded on a competitive basis. For the current grant cycle, communities interested in being considered must submit an application by December 19, 2013. The Town of Chapel Hill has prepared an application for a pedestrian planning grant. While there is no financial commitment expected from the MPO, NCDOT requires an endorsement from the MPO for all communities interested in submitting an application.

**TCC Recommendation:** That the TAC approve the resolution.

**TAC Action:** Approve the resolution.

**8. FY 2013-2014 Unified Planning Work Program – Amendment #1  
Attachment 8  
Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

The TAC approved the 2013-2014 UPWP on May 8, 2013. 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. Amendment #1 reflects a request from Chapel Hill Transit.

**TCC Recommendation:** That the TAC approve the resolution.

**TAC Action:** Approve the resolution.

**9. Resolution in Support of Federal Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Performance Measures  
Attachment 9, 9A  
Dale McKeel, LPA Staff  
Ellen Beckmann, LPA Staff**

H.R. 3494 and S. 1708 are identical bills that have been introduced in the U.S. House and Senate that would require US Department of Transportation to establish performance measures for non-motorized transportation (Attachment 9). A resolution in support of these bills is provided as Attachment 9A.

**TAC Action:** Approve the resolution.

**10. 2014 TAC and TCC Meeting Schedule  
Attachment 10  
Ellen Beckmann, LPA Staff**

The 2014 TCC and TAC meeting schedule is provided as Attachment 10.

**TAC Action:** Adopt the 2014 TCC and TAC Meeting Schedule.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**11. 2013 Coordinated Public Transportation – Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP) (9:05-9:35)  
Attachment 11, 11A, 11B  
Andy Henry, LPA Staff  
Sherry Taylor Lewis, LPA Staff  
Travis Pollack, Gannett Fleming**

The purpose of a CPT-HSTP is to improve transportation services for persons with disabilities, older adults, and low-income individuals through a better coordinated transportation system. Current federal transportation legislation, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), continues the requirement for an updated coordinated public transportation plans. The TAC received a presentation on the CPT-HSTP at their November meeting and offered several comments on the draft plan. Attachment 11 is a memorandum that addresses those TAC comments. Attachment 11A is a portion of the 2007 CPT-HSTP with the project selection process. Attachment 11B is a compilation of comments received up to the agenda publication date.

Today, the TAC is to hold a public hearing on the plan and will have the opportunity to adopt it at their January 2014 meeting. The public comment period ended yesterday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, so staff will need to hand out a copy of any comments that were received and provide a verbal summary, if necessary. A copy of the CPT-HSTP and a presentation are at the following MPO Web page:

[http://www.dchcmo.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=104&Itemid=35](http://www.dchcmo.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=104&Itemid=35)

**TAC Action:** Conduct public hearing and provide comments to staff for developing the final plan.

## **12. STP-DA and Transportation Alternatives Program (9:35-9:50)**

**Attachment 12, 12A, 12B**

**Ellen Beckmann, LPA Staff**

Attachment 12 is a memo on STP-DA and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding. The MPO currently has projects programmed with STP-DA through FY 2014 and is considering project funding in FY 2015 and 2016.

The TCC is in the process of developing recommended changes to the current policy for the distribution of STP-DA funding (Attachment 12A). A recommendation will be brought forward in January.

A list of current FY 2014 STPDA funding is included in Attachment 12B. Changes to FY 2014 funding have been requested by local governments. The estimated funding available for FY 2015 and 2016 is also shown in the attachment. The TAC will be asked to approve FY 2014, 2015, and 2016 programming in February.

**TAC Action:** Receive update.

## **13. Prioritization 3.0 (9:50-10:10)**

**Attachment 13, 13A**

**Ellen Beckmann, LPA Staff**

**Andy Henry, LPA Staff**

Attachment 13 includes a schedule and process for submitting and ranking projects for Prioritization 3.0 – the process for developing the FY 2016-2022 TIP and STIP. An update on

Prioritization 3.0 will be provided at the meeting. Attachment 13A is a compilation of project requests endorsed by local governments in the MPO.

**TAC Action:** Receive update.

**14. Election of 2014 TAC Officers (10:10-10:15)**

**No Attachment**

**Ellen Beckmann, LPA Staff**

The election of officers for the upcoming calendar year occurs on the agenda at the last TAC meeting of every year. The TAC Chair appointed a nominating committee in October 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.

Ellen Reckhow and Mark Kleinschmidt are in their first terms as TAC Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, and are therefore eligible to serve another term in their current offices.

**TAC Action:** Elect a TAC Chair and Vice-Chair for 2014.

**REPORTS:**

**15. Report from the TAC Chair**

**Ellen Reckhow, TAC Chair**

**TAC Action:** Receive Report from TAC Chair

**16. Report from the TCC Chair**

**Mark Ahrendsen, TCC Chair**

**TAC Action:** Receive Report from TCC Chair

**17. Report from Staff**

**Attachment [17](#)**

**Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

**TAC Action:** Receive report from staff.

**18. NCDOT Report**

**Attachment [18](#)**

**Wally Bowman, Division 5 – NCDOT**  
**Mike Mills, Division 7 – NCDOT**  
**Rob Stone, Division 8 - NCDOT**  
**Julie Bollinger, Transportation Planning Branch – NCDOT**  
**Kelly Becker, Traffic Operations – NCDOT**

**TAC Action:** Receive report of NCDOT

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

**19. Recent News Articles and Updates**  
**Attachment 19**

**Adjourn**

**Next meeting: January 8, 2014**

**Dates of Upcoming Transportation-Related Meetings:**

December 9, 2013 Town of Chapel Hill Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Input Session, 6-7:30 pm at Chapel Hill Public Library  
December 12, 2013 RTA State of Mobility, 11:30-1:30 at Embassy Suites, Cary

[www.dhcmpo.org](http://www.dhcmpo.org)  
[www.twitter.com/dhcmpo](http://www.twitter.com/dhcmpo)

**TAC Directives to Staff**  
 Pre-12/31/11 (Pending/In Progress/On Going)  
 01/01/12 – Present (Completed/Pending/In Progress)

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Directive</b>	<b>Status</b>
3/9/11	Improve public outreach and add links to other transportation organizations to the MPO website	<u>In Progress:</u> DCHC MPO is now on Twitter. Website consultant has been selected.
11/14/2012	Provide recommendation for remaining FY 2012 STPDA projects	<u>In Progress:</u> See 12/12/2012 TAC and 3/13/2013 TAC Agenda.
12/12/2012	Investigate ways to improve the development of socio-economic data for the 2045 MTP	<u>In Progress:</u> Staff is creating updated Community Viz model.
12/12/2012	Provide a report on how the Bennett Road and Mount Carmel Church Road intersection can be improved and funded	<u>In Progress:</u> Pending NCDOT cost estimate of preferred option.
2/13/2013	Provide a presentation on the Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan	<u>Completed:</u> Draft plan released. See 4/10/2013 TAC Agenda
2/13/2013	Provide a recommendation on how to add transit operators as voting members of the TAC	<u>In Progress:</u> This issue is included in the MPO MOU update.
2/13/2013	Send letter to incoming Board of Transportation members	<u>Completed:</u> New members sworn-in April 4. LPA staff has been in contact with new members. Assignment to DCHC MPO TAC has been made.
3/13/2013	Send a letter to Governor McCrory, Speaker Tillis, and Pro Tem Berger regarding state rail funding	<u>Completed:</u> See 4/10/2013 TAC Agenda
3/13/2013 and 4/10/2013	Send a letter to the Chatham TAC representative when Chatham County issues are on the agenda	<u>On-going:</u> LPA staff will continue to reach out to Chatham County's staff and TAC member as issues arise. LPA staff presented at Chatham BOCC on 4/15/2013.
5/8/2013	Send a letter to the legislative delegation regarding the Strategic Mobility Formula	<u>Completed:</u> See 6/12/2013 TAC Agenda.
5/8/2013 10/9/2013	Send the draft MPO Memorandum of Understanding to the member governments for review	<u>In Progress:</u> Final MOU has been sent to member governments for approval by February 2014.
10/9/2014	Send a letter to the NC Board of Transportation members regarding the Strategic Transportation Investments	<u>Completed:</u> See 11/13/2013 TAC Agenda.

All Completed Directives since 1/1/2013 are shown.



43 **Ethics Reminder**

44 Ellen Reckhow read the Ethics Reminder for TAC members and asked board members if there  
45 are any known conflicts of interest with respect of matters coming before the board and requested that  
46 if there were any identified during the meeting for them to be announced. No one identified any  
47 conflicts.

48 **Adjustments to the Agenda**

49 Mark Ahrendsen identified a few handouts that were provided for review which were the  
50 corrections to the October 9, 2013 minutes (attachment #6), Prioritization 3.0 Existing Highway Projects  
51 (attachment #10A), the 2040 MTP and CTP Draft-Roadway Project List (attachment #10B), and an  
52 informational citizen response regarding the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit project.

53 Mark also introduced Joy Liang from the Federal Highway Administration training program.

54 **Public Comments**

55 Terry Rekeweg provided a handout with a proposal for an alternate alignment for the Durham-  
56 Orange Light Rail Transit system. He believes his proposal would increase ridership for all three  
57 passenger rail systems that have been proposed in the Triangle.

58 **Directives to Staff (Attachment 5)**

59 The Directives to Staff are attached for review.

60 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

61 Ellen Reckhow asked if the board wanted to make a motion to approve item #7 and #8. A  
62 motion was made by Damon Seils to approve item #7 (FY 2012-2018 Transportation Improvement  
63 Program Amendment #13) and #8 (DCHC MPO Memorandum of Understanding) and seconded by Diane  
64 Catotti. The motion carried unanimously.

65 Ellen Reckhow acknowledged the requested changes to the October 9, 2013 meeting minutes  
66 submitted by Alice Gordon. Also the requested change on page 12, line 1 the word "stated" should be

67 changed to “stating”. A motion was made by Damon Seils to approve the October 9, 2013 minutes with  
68 the amendments and seconded by Diane Catotti. The motion carried unanimously.

69 **ACTION ITEMS:**

70 **2013 Coordinated Public Transportation – Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP)**

71 **(Attachment 9, 9A, 9B)**

72 Andrew Henry introduced Travis Pollack and Jeremy Goldstein from Gannett Fleming. Travis  
73 Pollack and Jeremy Goldstein provided a PowerPoint presentation and handouts on the purpose of the  
74 2013 CPT-HSTP plan. Travis Pollack stated the purpose of the plan is to improve the services through  
75 coordination. Gannett Fleming recommends five main areas for improvement based on a review of the  
76 demographic data, workshop and survey information, and the progress of services since 2007. These  
77 areas include education and outreach, better and safer access to fixed route services, improved  
78 coordination and cooperation among providers, leveraged alternative funding, and improved rural  
79 services and rural-urban connections. Bernadette Pelissier asked how the priorities will be determined  
80 among the goals. Travis Pollack stated that there has been some changes under the new federal law  
81 which will be provided in a memo and distributed to Sherry Taylor-Lewis for review as well as  
82 suggestions and formulas as to how other MPO’s and localities are setting priorities. Ellen Reckhow  
83 suggested focusing on where to invest transit infrastructure improvements and the alternative funding  
84 sources. Travis Pollack stated that he agreed with Ellen Reckhow’s suggestions, and pointed out that the  
85 concentration is not only on services that require some type of eligibility the goal is to make sure that all  
86 the transit services of the general public are used more effectively and efficiently while addressing the  
87 needs of the transportation disadvantaged population. Ellen Reckhow asked if Travis Pollack knew the  
88 cost for implementing these recommendations. Travis Pollack stated he did not. Mark Kleinschmidt  
89 asked if there was a mechanism for accessing what has been achieved since the 2007 plan, and if there  
90 is an assessment of what was already accomplished out of the 2007 plan? Travis Pollack stated that a

91 review of the 2007 plan was conducted to assess the details of the plan for recommendations, and what  
92 was done to identify those issues and goals. Based on the workshop and survey, we determined that  
93 some of the goals were being met and there has been a lot of improvement since 2007. However,  
94 additional improvements are needed. Jeremy Goldstein stated that the plan exists because there is  
95 federal funding earmarked for disadvantaged populations and in order to access those funds there is a  
96 need to identify things that can be done to improve transportation outcomes for those populations. The  
97 plan is to identify these general recommendations. Once this plan is approved, it allows for any  
98 recommendation or projects that one of the transit agency's wants to pursue that meets one of the five  
99 goals to be eligible for federal funding. Alice Gordon asked what is the purpose of this plan? Travis  
100 Pollack provided a review of the purpose of the plan. Ellen Reckhow stated she would like to see the  
101 plan meshed together with all of the planning efforts and requested updates regularly. Damon Seils  
102 agreed with the idea of receiving annual reports. Bernadette Pelissier stated that looking at the overall  
103 transit plan and what needs to be accomplished is important to figuring out where the federal funding  
104 can come from in context with other projects to accomplish these goals. Ellen Reckhow requested that  
105 the TCC review TAC feedback on this item and provide ideas on how this plan can be utilized. Mark  
106 Kleinschmidt requested information on how the service providers, particularly Triangle Transit, get  
107 funding for a lot of the other services. Alice Gordon asked if there was a reason to keep this plan general  
108 and suggested using a more evidence based approach going forward. Jeremy Goldstein addressed Alice  
109 Gordon's concern about keeping the plan general and stated it is general to ensure that all projects can  
110 be included.

111 Damon Seils made a motion to receive the presentation and the draft plan and release it for  
112 public comment and seconded by Mark Kleinschmidt. The motion carried unanimously.

113 Ellen Reckhow requested a follow up by January 2014.

114 **Prioritization 3.0 (Attachment 10, 10A, 10B)**

115 Ellen Beckmann provided an update and handouts on Prioritization 3.0. Steve Schewel asked if  
116 the projects that have been scratched out on the draft are counted as eliminated for the purposes of  
117 adding five projects. Ellen Beckmann responded no. Jill Stark asked what were the five projects and  
118 how do they interact with the congestion management plan? Ellen identified the projects as Jack  
119 Bennett Rd, re-pavement of Carmichael Drive in Chapel Hill, three projects in Durham were moved from  
120 the 2040 MTP to the CPT list due to fiscal constraints including the Glover Road interchange with the  
121 Durham Freeway, Briggs Avenue extension, and Old Oxford Highway widening, and Jeremiah Drive in  
122 Chatham in County. Ellen Reckhow suggested putting the columns in bold to better identify those  
123 projects. Diane Catotti asked for clarification on how to get from the local jurisdiction to the P3.0  
124 Highway Projects list. Ellen Beckmann stated that jurisdictions must submit their list of highway, bike &  
125 ped, and rail projects to the MPO by December 1<sup>st</sup>. The MPO staff believes that it make sense to submit  
126 the projects that are in the 2040 MTP that are not already in the database; however, local projects that  
127 are not in the 2040 MTP can be submitted, as well.

128 Ellen Beckmann provided information on the Bike & Pedestrian process and requested that each  
129 jurisdiction submit their top four projects, except the City of Durham and Durham County will submit  
130 their top eight projects. The TCC will then use a scoring method to select 20 projects from the list of 36  
131 projects for TAC review in January 2014. Alice Gordon requested to have the current list of 70 projects  
132 sent to the TAC for review. Ellen Beckmann agreed to send the list out to the TAC members for review.  
133 Ellen Beckmann provided information on the submission of five rail projects.

134 Ellen Beckmann stated that the TCC is also going through the process of developing a method  
135 for allocating Surface Transportation Program – Direct Attributable (STP-DA) and Transportation  
136 Alternatives Program (TAP) funding for fiscal years 2015-16. Projects submitted for P3.0 will also be  
137 considered for this type of funding. The TCC will provide a recommendation for funded projects by  
138 February of 2014. Ellen Reckhow requested larger copies of the lists so they are more readable.

139

**REPORTS:****Report from the TAC Chair**

141 Ellen Reckhow commended Carrboro for an excellent statewide bike summit. Diane Catotti,  
142 nominating committee, stated that Ellen Reckhow and Mark Kleinschmidt are eligible to serve in their  
143 current positions for one more term and that is the recommendation of the nominating committee for  
144 one more year. Ellen Reckhow stated this would be on the agenda in December.

**Report from the TCC Chair**

146 Mark Ahrendsen provided an update on the letter that was sent to the Board of Transportation  
147 (attachment #16) regarding the distribution of the local points for regional and divisions projects. The  
148 request was to support the Workgroup's recommendation to provide a heavier local input percentage  
149 for the MPO's and RPO's on regional and divisional projects. The action of the Board of Transportation  
150 was to provide equal input percentage between the Division Engineers and the MPO's and RPO's on  
151 both the regional and division project categories. There was no change in the minimum allocation across  
152 all three funding categories. There is still a four percent minimum allocation, or \$36 million statewide,  
153 for alternative transportation.

154 Mark Ahrendsen provided information about the Durham/Orange Light Rail project public  
155 meeting schedule.

**Report From Staff**

157 There were no reports from the staff.

**Report from NCDOT**

159 Joey Hopkins, NCDOT Division 5, stated that the Main Street bridge at Campus Drive is open.  
160 Joey Hopkins advised the committee about the conversation with Davis Wealth Management about the  
161 Triangle Commuter Bike Initiative and the idea to collect funds for local or state government for bike  
162 improvement along five identified connectors.

163 Pat Wilson, Division 7, informed the committee that guardrail was installed at the NC 751  
164 railroad bridge the last week of October. Ellen Reckhow thanked Pat Wilson for his responsiveness and  
165 asked if the speed limit should be reduced and a warning sign installed at the bridge approach. Pat  
166 Wilson said that he will look into it.

167 Alice Gordon asked why the Smith Level road project will take until 2015 to be completed.  
168 Damon Seils said that it just takes time.

169 Dale McKeel provided information about an additional project on the Orange County report that  
170 is being funded from the same pot of money that is being used to for Barbee Chapel Road and  
171 Stagecoach Road. The project will add two-foot paved shoulders to NC 86 between Whitfield Rd. and US  
172 70 Business.

173 Darius Sturdivant, Division 8, updated the committee on the approval of the Jack Bennett Road  
174 project and the let date of April 2014.

175 The park and ride lot on the American Tobacco Trail at New Hope Church Road is being  
176 administered by the Town of Cary. The Town of Cary has submitted the plans and specifications to the  
177 Department of Transportation for approval by the end of this month.

178 The consultant has reviewed the comments on the US 15-501 corridor study and will send out a  
179 memorandum to address the comments. There will be a stakeholders meeting in January 2014 to  
180 present the existing conditions and the build alternatives. The final technical memorandum will be  
181 completed in spring 2014 according to the schedule.

182 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

183 Ellen Reckhow stated that the board has the informational items. Ellen Reckhow informed the  
184 committee about the light rail meetings schedule.

185 Patrick McDonough provided a light rail transit update that included positive comments from  
186 the rail companies concerning passenger rail. Ellen Reckhow asked that a response to Terry Rekeweg's

187 concerns on the viability of both passenger and freight rail service on the mainline tracks be provided to  
188 the various boards that have received Mr. Rekeweg's comments.

189 **Adjournment**

190 There being no further business before the Transportation Advisory Committee, the meeting  
191 was adjourned at 11:13 a.m.

**RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL’S APPLICATION TO THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (NCDOT) FOR A PEDESTRIAN PLANNING GRANT**

**December 11, 2013**

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**, the North Carolina Department of Transportation has a matching grant program that encourages municipalities to develop comprehensive bicycle plans and pedestrian plans; and

**WHEREAS**, NCDOT has opened a call for applications for grants under the Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Chapel Hill has prepared an application for a grant to prepare a comprehensive pedestrian plan.

**BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED** that the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Advisory Committee endorses the Town of Chapel Hill’s pedestrian planning grant application provided here on this, the 11<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ellen Reckhow, TAC Chair

Durham County, North Carolina

I certify that Ellen Reckhow personally appeared before me this day acknowledging to me that she signed the forgoing document.

Date: December 11, 2013

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

**RESOLUTION**

**TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #1 TO THE FY 2013-2014 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM OF THE DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (DCHC MPO)**

**December 11, 2013**

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 2013-2014 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 2013-2014

**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 2013-2014 as described in the attached sheets.**

I, Ellen Reckhow, 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 11<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2013

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of TAC Chair  
Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization

STATE OF: North Carolina  
COUNTY OF: Durham

I, \_\_\_\_\_, a Notary Public of \_\_\_\_\_ County, North Carolina do hereby certify that Ellen Reckhow personally appeared before me on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2013, to affix her signature to the foregoing document.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public  
101 City Hall Plaza  
Durham, NC 27701

My commission expires: \_\_\_\_\_

Town of Chapel Hill Budget Table					Town of Chapel Hill Amendment #1 -Budget Table					Town of Chapel Hill Budget Table							
#REF!	Task Description	FTA Section 5309				#REF!	Task Description	Change in 5309				Task Description	FTA Section 5309				
		Local 10%	NCDOT 10%	FTA 80%	Total 100%			FTA Section 5309					Local 25%	NCDOT 25%	FTA 50%	Total 100%	
								Local	NCDOT	FTA	Total						
II-A	Surveillance of Change					II-A	Surveillance of Change					II-A	Surveillance of Change				
	1 Traffic Volume Counts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		1 Traffic Volume Counts	0	0	0	0		1 Traffic Volume Counts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	2 Vehicle Miles of Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		2 Vehicle Miles of Travel	0	0	0	0		2 Vehicle Miles of Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	3 Street System Changes	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		3 Street System Changes	0	0	0	0		3 Street System Changes	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	4 Traffic Accidents	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		4 Traffic Accidents	0	0	0	0		4 Traffic Accidents	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	5 Transit System Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		5 Transit System Data	0	0	0	0		5 Transit System Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	6 Dwelling Unit, Pop. & Emp. Change	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		6 Dwelling Unit, Pop. & Emp. Change	0	0	0	0		6 Dwelling Unit, Pop. & Emp. Change	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	7 Air Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		7 Air Travel	0	0	0	0		7 Air Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	8 Vehicle Occupancy Rates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		8 Vehicle Occupancy Rates	0	0	0	0		8 Vehicle Occupancy Rates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	9 Travel Time Studies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		9 Travel Time Studies	0	0	0	0		9 Travel Time Studies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	10 Mapping	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		10 Mapping	0	0	0	0		10 Mapping	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	11 Central Area Parking Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		11 Central Area Parking Inventory	0	0	0	0		11 Central Area Parking Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	12 Bike & Ped. Facilities Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		12 Bike & Ped. Facilities Inventory	0	0	0	0		12 Bike & Ped. Facilities Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	13 Bike & Ped. Counts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		13 Bike & Ped. Counts	0	0	0	0		13 Bike & Ped. Counts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
II-B	Long Range Transp. Plan					II-B	Long Range Transp. Plan					II-B	Long Range Transp. Plan				
	1 Collection of Base Year Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		1 Collection of Base Year Data	0	0	0	0		1 Collection of Base Year Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	2 Collection of Network Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		2 Collection of Network Data	0	0	0	0		2 Collection of Network Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	3 Travel Model Updates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		3 Travel Model Updates	0	0	0	0		3 Travel Model Updates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	4 Travel Surveys	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		4 Travel Surveys	0	0	0	0		4 Travel Surveys	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	5 Forecast of Data to Horizon year	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		5 Forecast of Data to Horizon year	0	0	0	0		5 Forecast of Data to Horizon year	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	6 Community Goals & Objectives	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		6 Community Goals & Objectives	0	0	0	0		6 Community Goals & Objectives	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	7 Forecast of Future Travel Patterns	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		7 Forecast of Future Travel Patterns	0	0	0	0		7 Forecast of Future Travel Patterns	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	8 Capacity Deficiency Analysis	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		8 Capacity Deficiency Analysis	0	0	0	0		8 Capacity Deficiency Analysis	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	9 Highway Element of the L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		9 Highway Element of the L RTP	0	0	0	0		9 Highway Element of the L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	10 Transit Element of the L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		10 Transit Element of the L RTP	0	0	0	0		10 Transit Element of the L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	11 Bicycle & Ped. Element of the L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		11 Bicycle & Ped. Element of the L RTP	0	0	0	0		11 Bicycle & Ped. Element of the L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	12 Airport/Air Travel Element of L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		12 Airport/Air Travel Element of L RTP	0	0	0	0		12 Airport/Air Travel Element of L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	13 Collector Street Element of L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		13 Collector Street Element of L RTP	0	0	0	0		13 Collector Street Element of L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	14 Rail, Water or other mode of L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		14 Rail, Water or other mode of L RTP	0	0	0	0		14 Rail, Water or other mode of L RTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	15 Freight Movement/Mobility Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		15 Freight Movement/Mobility Planning	0	0	0	0		15 Freight Movement/Mobility Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	16 Financial Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		16 Financial Planning	0	0	0	0		16 Financial Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	17 Congestion Management Strategies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		17 Congestion Management Strategies	0	0	0	0		17 Congestion Management Strategies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	18 Air Qual. Planning/Conformity Anal.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		18 Air Qual. Planning/Conformity Anal.	0	0	0	0		18 Air Qual. Planning/Conformity Anal.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
II-C	Short Range Transit Planning					II-C	Short Range Transit Planning					II-C	Short Range Transit Planning				
	1 Short Range Transit Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		1 Short Range Transit Planning	0	0	0	0		1 Short Range Transit Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
III-A	Planning Work Program					III-A	Planning Work Program					III-A	Planning Work Program				
	Planning Work Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		Planning Work Program	0	0	0	0		Planning Work Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
III-B	Transp. Improvement Plan					III-B	Transp. Improvement Plan					III-B	Transp. Improvement Plan				
	TIP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		TIP	0	0	0	0		TIP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
III-C	Cvl Rgts. Cmp./Otr .Reg. Reqs.					III-C	Cvl Rgts. Cmp./Otr .Reg. Reqs.					III-C	Cvl Rgts. Cmp./Otr .Reg. Reqs.				
	1 Title VI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		1 Title VI	0	0	0	0		1 Title VI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	2 Environmental Justice	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		2 Environmental Justice	0	0	0	0		2 Environmental Justice	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	3 Minority Business Enterprise	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		3 Minority Business Enterprise	0	0	0	0		3 Minority Business Enterprise	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	4 Planning for the Elderly & Disabled	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		4 Planning for the Elderly & Disabled	0	0	0	0		4 Planning for the Elderly & Disabled	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	5 Safety/Drug Control Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		5 Safety/Drug Control Planning	0	0	0	0		5 Safety/Drug Control Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	6 Public Involvement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		6 Public Involvement	0	0	0	0		6 Public Involvement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	7 Private Sector Participation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		7 Private Sector Participation	0	0	0	0		7 Private Sector Participation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
III-D	Incidental Png./Project Dev.					III-D	Incidental Png./Project Dev.					III-D	Incidental Png./Project Dev.				
	1 Transportation Enhancement Png.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		1 Transportation Enhancement Png.	0	0	0	0		1 Transportation Enhancement Png.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	2 Enviro. Analysis & Pre-TIP Png.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		2 Enviro. Analysis & Pre-TIP Png.	0	0	0	0		2 Enviro. Analysis & Pre-TIP Png.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	3 Special Studies	\$43,750	\$43,750	\$350,000	\$437,500		3 Special Studies	5,000	5,000	40,000	50,000		3 Special Studies	\$38,750	\$38,750	\$310,000	\$387,500
	4 Regional or Statewide Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		4 Regional or Statewide Planning	0	0	0	0		4 Regional or Statewide Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
III-E	Management & Operations					III-E	Management & Operations					III-E	Management & Operations				
	1 Management & Operations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		1 Management & Operations	(5,000)	(5,000)	(40,000)	(50,000)		1 Management & Operations	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$40,000	\$50,000
Totals		\$43,750	\$43,750	\$350,000	\$437,500	Totals		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Totals		\$43,750	\$43,750	\$350,000	\$437,500

Town of Chapel Hill Budget Table					Town of Chapel Hill Amendment #1 - Budget Table					Town of Chapel Hill Budget Table							
#REF!	Task Description	Amendment #1				#REF!	Task Description	Proposed Change in 5307				Task Description	Original Adopted (may 2013) UPWP				
		FTA Section 5307						FTA Section 5307					FTA Section 5307				
		Local 10%	NCDOT 10%	FTA 80%	Total 100%			Local 10%	NCDOT 10%	FTA 80%	Total 100%		Local 10%	NCDOT 10%	FTA 80%	Total 100%	
II-A	Surveillance of Change					II-A	Surveillance of Change					II-A	Surveillance of Change				
1	Traffic Volume Counts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1	Traffic Volume Counts	0	0	0	0	1	Traffic Volume Counts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	Vehicle Miles of Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	2	Vehicle Miles of Travel	0	0	0	0	2	Vehicle Miles of Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Street System Changes	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	3	Street System Changes	0	0	0	0	3	Street System Changes	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	Traffic Accidents	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	4	Traffic Accidents	0	0	0	0	4	Traffic Accidents	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5	Transit System Data	\$3,125	\$3,125	\$25,000	\$31,250	5	Transit System Data	0	0	0	0	5	Transit System Data	\$3,125	\$3,125	\$25,000	\$31,250
6	Dwelling Unit, Pop. & Emp. Change	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	6	Dwelling Unit, Pop. & Emp. Change	0	0	0	0	6	Dwelling Unit, Pop. & Emp. Change	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7	Air Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	7	Air Travel	0	0	0	0	7	Air Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
8	Vehicle Occupancy Rates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	8	Vehicle Occupancy Rates	0	0	0	0	8	Vehicle Occupancy Rates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
9	Travel Time Studies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	9	Travel Time Studies	0	0	0	0	9	Travel Time Studies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10	Mapping	\$2,750	\$2,750	\$22,000	\$27,500	10	Mapping	0	0	0	0	10	Mapping	\$2,750	\$2,750	\$22,000	\$27,500
11	Central Area Parking Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	11	Central Area Parking Inventory	0	0	0	0	11	Central Area Parking Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	Bike & Ped. Facilities Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	12	Bike & Ped. Facilities Inventory	0	0	0	0	12	Bike & Ped. Facilities Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	Bike & Ped. Counts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	13	Bike & Ped. Counts	0	0	0	0	13	Bike & Ped. Counts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
II-B	Long Range Transp. Plan					II-B	Long Range Transp. Plan					II-B	Long Range Transp. Plan				
1	Collection of Base Year Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1	Collection of Base Year Data	0	0	0	0	1	Collection of Base Year Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	Collection of Network Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	2	Collection of Network Data	0	0	0	0	2	Collection of Network Data	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Travel Model Updates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	3	Travel Model Updates	0	0	0	0	3	Travel Model Updates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	Travel Surveys	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	4	Travel Surveys	0	0	0	0	4	Travel Surveys	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5	Forecast of Data to Horizon year	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	5	Forecast of Data to Horizon year	0	0	0	0	5	Forecast of Data to Horizon year	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6	Community Goals & Objectives	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	6	Community Goals & Objectives	0	0	0	0	6	Community Goals & Objectives	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7	Forecast of Future Travel Patterns	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	7	Forecast of Future Travel Patterns	0	0	0	0	7	Forecast of Future Travel Patterns	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
8	Capacity Deficiency Analysis	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	8	Capacity Deficiency Analysis	0	0	0	0	8	Capacity Deficiency Analysis	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
9	Highway Element of the LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	9	Highway Element of the LRTP	0	0	0	0	9	Highway Element of the LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10	Transit Element of the LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	10	Transit Element of the LRTP	0	0	0	0	10	Transit Element of the LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
11	Bicycle & Ped. Element of the LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	11	Bicycle & Ped. Element of the LRTP	0	0	0	0	11	Bicycle & Ped. Element of the LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	Airport/Air Travel Element of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	12	Airport/Air Travel Element of LRTP	0	0	0	0	12	Airport/Air Travel Element of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	Collector Street Element of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	13	Collector Street Element of LRTP	0	0	0	0	13	Collector Street Element of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	Rail, Water or other mode of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	14	Rail, Water or other mode of LRTP	0	0	0	0	14	Rail, Water or other mode of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	Freight Movement/Mobility Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	15	Freight Movement/Mobility Planning	0	0	0	0	15	Freight Movement/Mobility Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
16	Financial Planning	\$62,225	\$62,225	\$497,800	\$622,250	16	Financial Planning	28,225	28,225	225,800	282,250	16	Financial Planning	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$272,000	\$340,000
17	Congestion Management Strategies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	17	Congestion Management Strategies	0	0	0	0	17	Congestion Management Strategies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
18	Air Qual. Planning/Conformity Anal.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	18	Air Qual. Planning/Conformity Anal.	0	0	0	0	18	Air Qual. Planning/Conformity Anal.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
II-C	Short Range Transit Planning					II-C	Short Range Transit Planning					II-C	Short Range Transit Planning				
1	Short Range Transit Planning	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$10,000	\$12,500	1	Short Range Transit Planning	0	0	0	0	1	Short Range Transit Planning	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$10,000	\$12,500
III-A	Planning Work Program					III-A	Planning Work Program					III-A	Planning Work Program				
	Planning Work Program	\$500	\$500	\$4,000	\$5,000		Planning Work Program	0	0	0	0		Planning Work Program	\$500	\$500	\$4,000	\$5,000
III-B	Transp. Improvement Plan					III-B	Transp. Improvement Plan					III-B	Transp. Improvement Plan				
	TIP	\$500	\$500	\$4,000	\$5,000		TIP	0	0	0	0		TIP	\$500	\$500	\$4,000	\$5,000
III-C	Cvl Rgts. Cmp./Otr .Reg. Reqs.					III-C	Cvl Rgts. Cmp./Otr .Reg. Reqs.					III-C	Cvl Rgts. Cmp./Otr .Reg. Reqs.				
1	Title VI	\$250	\$250	\$2,000	\$2,500	1	Title VI	(250)	(250)	(2,000)	(2,500)	1	Title VI	\$500	\$500	\$4,000	\$5,000
2	Environmental Justice	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	2	Environmental Justice	0	0	0	0	2	Environmental Justice	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Minority Business Enterprise	\$500	\$500	\$4,000	\$5,000	3	Minority Business Enterprise	0	0	0	0	3	Minority Business Enterprise	\$500	\$500	\$4,000	\$5,000
4	Planning for the Elderly & Disabled	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	4	Planning for the Elderly & Disabled	4,000	4,000	32,000	40,000	4	Planning for the Elderly & Disabled	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$8,000	\$10,000
5	Safety/Drug Control Planning	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$8,000	\$10,000	5	Safety/Drug Control Planning	(3,000)	(3,000)	(24,000)	(30,000)	5	Safety/Drug Control Planning	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$32,000	\$40,000
6	Public Involvement	\$500	\$500	\$4,000	\$5,000	6	Public Involvement	0	0	0	0	6	Public Involvement	\$500	\$500	\$4,000	\$5,000
7	Private Sector Participation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	7	Private Sector Participation	0	0	0	0	7	Private Sector Participation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
III-D	Incidental Plng./Project Dev.					III-D	Incidental Plng./Project Dev.					III-D	Incidental Plng./Project Dev.				
1	Transportation Enhancement Plng.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1	Transportation Enhancement Plng.	0	0	0	0	1	Transportation Enhancement Plng.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	Enviro. Analysis & Pre-TIP Plng.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	2	Enviro. Analysis & Pre-TIP Plng.	0	0	0	0	2	Enviro. Analysis & Pre-TIP Plng.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Special Studies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	3	Special Studies	0	0	0	0	3	Special Studies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	Regional or Statewide Planning	\$3,750	\$3,750	\$30,000	\$37,500	4	Regional or Statewide Planning	0	0	0	0	4	Regional or Statewide Planning	\$3,750	\$3,750	\$30,000	\$37,500
III-E	Management & Operations					III-E	Management & Operations					III-E	Management & Operations				
1	Management & Operations	\$14,650	\$14,650	\$117,200	\$146,500	1	Management & Operations	3,725	3,725	29,800	37,250	1	Management & Operations	\$10,925	\$10,925	\$87,400	\$109,250
Totals		\$96,000	\$96,000	\$768,000	\$960,000	Totals		\$32,700	\$32,700	\$261,600	\$327,000	Totals		\$63,300	\$63,300	\$506,400	\$633,000

**CHAPEL HILL TRANSIT  
FTA TASK NARRATIVE TABLE  
FY2013-2014 (FY14) UPWP**

1-	MPO	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)
2-	FTA Code	442400	442400	442400	442301	442302	442302	442302	442302
3-	Task Code	II-A-1	II-A-5	II-A-6	II-A-10	II-A-12	II-A-13	II-B-1	II-B-2
4-	Title of Planning Task	Traffic Volume Counts	Transit System Data	Dwelling Unit, Pop. & Emp. Change	Mapping	Bike & Ped. Facilities Inventory	Bike & Ped Counts	Collection of Base Year Data	Collection of Network Data
5-	Task Objective		Review and analyze transit system data to monitor changes in travel behavior	Compare projected 2040 population and employment with results of revised 2020 Comprehensive Plan Land Use	Participate with MPO in further development of regional GIS database; prepare mapping to support local and regional activities				
6-	Tangible Product Expected		Chapel Hill Data Book Update	Revised population and employment projections	Geo spatial database				
7-	Expected Completion Date of Product(s)	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014
8-	Previous Work		2012 Data Book Update	Development of 2035 population and employment projections	Provided support for development of geo spatial database architecture				
9-	Prior FTA Funds		\$60,000	\$3,000	\$40,000				
10-	Relationship To Other Activities		Supports implementation of LRTP	Support development of LRTP	Supports development of LRTP and related MPO activities				
11-	Agency Responsible for Task Completion	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill
12-	HPR - Highway - NCDOT 20%								
13-	HPR - Highway - FHWA 80%								
14-	Section 104 (f) PL Local 20%	\$600	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$600	\$751	\$2,000		
15-	Section 104 (f) PL FHWA 80%	\$2,400	\$200	\$400	\$3,300	\$2,400	\$3,003	\$8,000	
16-	Section 5303 Local 10%		\$200	\$400	\$3,300				\$500
17-	Section 5303 NCDOT 10%		\$200	\$400	\$3,300				\$500
18-	Section 5303 FTA 80%		\$1,600	\$3,200	\$26,400				\$4,000
19-	Section 5307 Transit - Local 10%		\$3,125		\$2,750				
20-	Section 5307 Transit - NCDOT 10%		\$3,125		\$2,750				
21-	Section 5307 Transit - FTA 80%		\$25,000		\$22,000				
22-	Section 5309 Transit - Local 10%								
23-	Section 5309 Transit - NCDOT 10%								
24-	Section 5309 Transit - FTA 80%								
		\$3,000	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$33,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000
	Amendment #1 Nov 13, 2013	\$0	\$31,250	\$0	\$27,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**CHAPEL HILL TRANSIT  
FTA TASK NARRATIVE TABLE  
FY2013-2014 (FY14) UPWP**

1-	MPO	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)
2-	FTA Code	442302	442302	442302	442302	442302	442100	442500	442700
3-	Task Code	II-B-3	II-B-5	II-B-16	II-B-17	II-C-1	III-A-1	III-B-1	III-C-1
4-	Title of Planning Task	Travel Model Updates	Forecast of Data to Horizon Year	Financial Planning	Congestion Management Strategies	Short Range Transit Planning	Planning Work Program	Transportation Improvement Program	Title VI
5-	Task Objective	Monitor the use of the TRM in the development of Triangle LPA.		Prepare Financial Plan for 2040 LRTP. Development of a strategic plan, and financial plan identifying sustainable funding sources for services established in the strategic plan.	Coordinate with Triangle Regional TDM program to implement regionwide TDM program.	Develop elements of Chapel Hill Transit Short Range Transit Plan.	To prepare the Chapel Hill element of the FY2014 UPWP	To monitor the adopted TIP and prepare information for amendments to TIP.	To prepare the FY2013 Title VI program/plan
6-	Tangible Product Expected	Modification		2040 Financial Plan	Development of TDM program for incorporation into 2040 LRTP	Refinements to the previously completed comprehensive route analysis.	FY2014 PWP	Updated TIP	Updated Title VI program
7-	Expected Completion Date of Product(s)	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	On-going	10/15/2013
8-	Previous Work	Participation in refinements to TRM.		2035 Financial Plan and CHT's Financial Sustainability Plan	TDM element of 2035 LRTP.	Development of comprehensive route analysis.	Development and management of FY12 & FY13 UPWP	Adjustments to existing TIP; Development of new TIP	Monitoring of the Title VI program
9-	Prior FTA Funds	\$3,000		\$28,000	\$10,000	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$18,000	\$1,250
10-	Relationship To Other Activities	Support development of LRTP		Supports development of the 2040 LRTP	Supports development of the 2040 LRTP	Supports implementation of the MPO LRTP	Supports implementation of annual work program	Supports implementation of adopted LRTP	State/Federal Civil rights requirements
11-	Agency Responsible for Task Completion	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill
12-	HPR - Highway - NCDOT 20%								
13-	HPR - Highway - FHWA 80%								
14-	Section 104 (f) PL Local 20%		\$600	\$400	\$600		\$400	\$400	
15-	Section 104 (f) PL FHWA 80%		\$2,400	\$1,600	\$2,400		\$1,600	\$1,600	
16-	Section 5303 Local 10%	\$350	\$1,000	\$200	\$300	\$1,000		\$200	
17-	Section 5303 NCDOT 10%	\$349	\$1,000	\$200	\$300	\$1,000		\$200	
18-	Section 5303 FTA 80%	\$2,797	\$8,000	\$1,600	\$2,400	\$8,000		\$1,600	
19-	Section 5307 Transit - Local 10%			\$62,225		\$1,250	\$500	\$500	\$250
20-	Section 5307 Transit - NCDOT 10%			\$62,225		\$1,250	\$500	\$500	\$250
21-	Section 5307 Transit - FTA 80%			\$497,800		\$10,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$2,000
22-	Section 5309 Transit - Local 10%								
23-	Section 5309 Transit - NCDOT 10%								
24-	Section 5309 Transit - FTA 80%								
		\$3,496	\$10,000	\$2,000	\$3,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$2,000	\$0
	Amendment #1 Nov 13, 2013	\$0	\$0	\$622,250	\$0	\$12,500	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$2,500

**CHAPEL HILL TRANSIT  
FTA TASK NARRATIVE TABLE  
FY2013-2014 (FY14) UPWP**

1-	MPO	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	DCHC-MPO (Chapel Hill Transit)	
2-	FTA Code	442700	442400	442400	442100	442700	442200	442100	
3-	Task Code	III-C-3	III-C-4	III-C-5	III-C-6	III-D-3	III-D-4	III-E	
4-	Title of Planning Task	Minority Business Enterprise	Planning for the Elderly and Disabled	Safety/Drug Control Planning	Public Involvement	Special Studies	Regional or Statewide Planning	Management and Operations	TOTALS
5-	Task Objective	To assess compliance with minority business enterprise regulations	To assess impact of transit service on elderly and handicapped populations	To implement and monitor federal safety and drug control planning	To establish public outreach efforts to engage public involvement.	To prepare special studies to support ongoing transit operations. To prepare an Alternatives Analysis for CHT.	To support regional and statewide planning projects	To support various transit planning activities	
6-	Tangible Product Expected	Annual assessment	Annual assessment	Annual Assessments	Annual transit forums	Transit oriented development land use guidelines	Chapel Hill long range transit plan	Ongoing transit activities and reporting requirements.	
7-	Expected Completion Date of Product(s)	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	6/30/2014	
8-	Previous Work	Annual assessment	Ongoing monitoring	Ongoing monitoring	Annual transit forums	Chapel Hill Long Range Transit Plan		Management of transit planning activities	
9-	Prior FTA Funds	\$1,000	\$31,250	\$20,000	\$10,000		\$18,250	\$156,000	
10-	Relationship To Other Activities	State/Federal MBE requirements	This project supports the development of the 2035 Regional Plan		This project supports the developmnet of the 2035 Regional plan		Supports the implementation of the 2035 Regional Plan and the Chapel Hill Long Range Transit Plan.	Supports all other transit planning activities MPO-wide.	
11-	Agency Responsible for Task Completion	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	Town of Chapel Hill	
12-	HPR - Highway - NCDOT 20%								
13-	HPR - Highway - FHWA 80%								
14-	Section 104 (f) PL Local 20%						\$3,000	\$4,000	\$17,351
15-	Section 104 (f) PL FHWA 80%						\$12,000	\$16,000	\$69,403
16-	Section 5303 Local 10%						\$2,600	\$3,470	\$13,520
17-	Section 5303 NCDOT 10%						\$2,600	\$3,470	\$13,519
18-	Section 5303 FTA 80%						\$20,800	\$27,760	\$108,157
19-	Section 5307 Transit - Local 10%	\$500	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$500		\$3,750	\$14,650	\$96,000
20-	Section 5307 Transit - NCDOT 10%	\$500	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$500		\$3,750	\$14,650	\$96,000
21-	Section 5307 Transit - FTA 80%	\$4,000	\$40,000	\$8,000	\$4,000		\$30,000	\$117,200	\$768,000
22-	Section 5309 Transit - Local 10%						\$43,750		\$43,750
23-	Section 5309 Transit - NCDOT 10%						\$43,750		\$43,750
24-	Section 5309 Transit - FTA 80%						\$350,000		\$350,000
		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,000	\$34,700	
	Amendment #1 Nov 13, 2013	\$5,000	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$437,500	\$37,500	\$146,500	\$1,619,450
							STP-DA not shown on this table		75,000.00
									\$1,694,450

**RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT H.R. 3494 AND S. 1708 TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**December 11, 2013**

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**, between 2008 and 2011, overall traffic deaths in the United States decreased by over 15 percent; however, during that same period, pedestrian and bicycle fatalities increased from 12 percent to 16 percent of all traffic deaths; and

**WHEREAS**, less than 0.5 percent of federal Highway Safety Funds are spent on bicycle and pedestrian safety; and

**WHEREAS**, in 2012 Congress mandated that the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) set performance goals, including safety goals. In response to this mandate, however, the USDOT has not set safety goal for non-motorized transportation.

**WHEREAS**, H.R. 3494 and S. 1708 would require the USDOT to set a non-motorized safety performance measure; and

**WHEREAS**, having a national performance measure would require states to also set targets for reducing bicycle and pedestrian fatalities and injuries;

**BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED** that the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Advisory Committee supports the approval of H.R. 3494 and S. 1708 provided here on this, the 11<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ellen Reckhow, TAC Chair

Durham County, North Carolina

I certify that Ellen Reckhow personally appeared before me this day acknowledging to me that she signed the forgoing document.

Date: December 11, 2013

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

**DCHC MPO Meeting Dates 2014**  
Durham City Hall, Committee Room

MPO Board  
2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of the month, 9 am

Technical Committee  
4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday of the month, 9 am

January 8  
February 12  
March 12  
April 9  
May 14  
June 11, 7 pm\*  
Late June or July meeting TBD  
August 13  
September 10  
October 8  
November 12  
December 10

January 22  
February 26  
March 26  
April 23  
May 28  
June 25  
July 23  
August 27  
September 24  
October 22  
November 19\*\*  
December 17\*\*

**Tentative Joint TAC Meeting Dates (locations and times TBD)**

April 30  
October 29

\*Evening meeting to accommodate a public hearing on the FY 2016-2022 TIP  
Prioritization of Projects.

\*\* One week earlier than usual (3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of the month) to avoid conflict with a  
holiday

TAC meetings are occasionally moved to 7 pm to accommodate public hearings.  
Appropriate notice will be provided for schedule changes.

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)  
DCHC MPO

**From:** DCHC MPO Lead Planning Agency

**Date:** December 11, 2013

**Subject:** **2013 Coordinated Public Transportation- Human Services Transportation Plan Update**

---

**Background**

In 2007, the DCHC MPO adopted a Coordinated Public Transportation-Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP) to fulfill requirements of SAFETEA-LU, federal transportation law. The 2013 CPT-HSTP Update draft was developed by the Gannett Fleming consulting firm to identify human service transportation needs and prioritize them. The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the draft 2013 CPT-HSTP Update and received a presentation from Gannett Fleming at their November meeting. They also released the draft plan for public comment and provided a few key comments, including those listed directly below. The remainder of this document describes how these comments will be addressed.

- How is the CPT-HSTP implemented?
- Are performance measures collected and analyzed?
- What is the project selection process?
- Is there a mechanism for continued coordination after the plan is approved?

**Public Hearing**

The public, human services providers, and transit agencies have had the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft CPT-HSTP during the public comment period, which ran from November 13<sup>th</sup> through December 10<sup>th</sup>. Interested parties can also offer comments directly to the TAC during the public hearing today.

**Implementation of the CPT-HSTP**

In accordance with the Federal Transit Administration regulations, a Program Management Plan (PMP) will be developed to document and describe the processes used to solicit, select, award, and administer the section 5307 and 5310 grants. The PMP serves as a guide for the project selection and monitoring process. The PMP is developed separately from the CPT-HSTP, which

serves as the policy document for coordinated human services transit within the MPO boundary.

A Program Management Plan was previously developed to manage the JARC and New Freedom grants. After the CPT-HSTP Update is adopted, a new PMP will be developed to serve as the overarching implementation plan (including policies, project selection, and procedures). A project selection process similar to that within the 2007 CPT-HSTP will be developed and included. See Attachment ?A for a copy of the project selection process from the 2007 plan.

### **Performance Measures and Data Collection**

The DCHC MPO requests that each grantee propose a set of performance measures and provide that performance data to the MPO on an annual basis. The collection of performance measures, which is required under the new MAP-21 regulations, allows the MPO to measure the implementation and effectiveness of the projects. In addition, grantees are also required to provide a quarterly project status update.

The MPO does not require grantees to provide a standard set of performance data because grant project goals, transit service type and target group can vary greatly. For example, comparing the trips per hour between a bus pass program for an employment program and demand-responsive service for a wheel-chair dependent client does not indicate how well either program is meeting its goal. As a result, the MPO monitors the individual performance measures that have been worked out through the grant process.

## IX. Project Selection Process

The federal transportation law, SAFETEA-LU, requires that projects receiving funding under the Job Access/Reverse Commute program or the New Freedom program must be "derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit - human services transportation plan." Rather than developing specific strategies, services, or projects for funding, this plan identifies seven top priority needs to be addressed. This allows the flexibility of applicants to propose strategies for addressing these needs, and puts the MPO in the position of evaluating competing proposals, as required under the federal guidance.

The Project Selection process should be conducted annually, as long as JARC and New Freedom grant funds are available. The solicitation of projects should be announced as early in each calendar year as is feasible, to provide applicants with ample time to develop complete proposals. During this first year, the solicitation announcement would follow the Transportation Advisory Committee's approval of this document. In subsequent years, the solicitation announcement should occur earlier.

All applicants should be required to submit a completed application (see attachment K) in April. This would allow enough time for the application evaluation and approval process to be completed by the June meeting of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). Applications should be reviewed and scored by the Transit/TDM Subcommittee of the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC). This subcommittee would make funding recommendations to the TCC, who in turn would make final recommendations to the TAC. The criteria recommended for use in evaluation of competing applications are listed in the box at right.

The intent is that the selected projects each year will enable all the stakeholders to cooperatively move toward a coordinated transportation system. This will better serve the needs of all our customers, but particularly those who have traditionally been transportation-disadvantaged.

### **All applications must meet the following:**

1. The proposed project must be a non-duplicative service or program.
2. Eligible matching funds must be identified and available.
3. The proposed project must be a new or expanded service or program.
4. The primary focus of the proposed service or program must serve the target populations (i.e., persons with low-income for the JARC funds, or persons with disabilities or elders for the New Freedom funds).
5. The project must benefit the Durham - Chapel Hill - Carrboro urbanized area.

### **Eligible applications will then be evaluated on the following criteria:**

1. *Project Need/Goals & Objectives (30%)*
  - Fit with high-priority needs identified in the Coordinated Plan
2. *Quality of the implementation plan (20%)*
3. *Project Budget (15%)*
  - Efficiency (estimated cost per new customer)
  - Financial sustainability beyond grant period
4. *Partnerships and Outreach (20%)*
  - Effectiveness of proposed partnerships
  - Strength of stakeholder support
  - Quality of marketing/outreach plan
  - Geographic range of project benefits
5. *Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators (10%)*
  - Quality of the evaluation plan
6. *Innovation (5%)*
  - Applicability of innovative ideas elsewhere in region

## 2013 CPT-HSTP Update

### *Compilation Public Comments*

---

This document compiles all of the comments that the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) has received during the public input process for the 2013 Coordinated Public Transportation-Human Services Transportation Plan Update (CPT-HSTP). All comments received prior to the agenda publication date (12/4/13) are included. Any comments received after the publication date will be provided via hardcopy at the Transportation Advisory Committee meeting on December 11, 2013.

---

From: Darrell Solomon, Durham Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
To: Lewis, Sherry  
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2013 9:47 AM  
Subject: RE: Request for Comments on the Coordinated Public Transportation Plan

Hi Sherry

Hope your week is off to a great start.

After reviewing the plan, most of my thoughts were addressed during the Sept 2013 workshops involving participant agencies that most closely serve the targeted populations.

With the targeted populations in mind, my only ideas would be to further build upon what was mentioned in the report by:

1. Ensuring that all stops have a shelter or at least a pad so that people are not exposed to the elements or waiting in high grass/mud.
2. Including within any video that is produced to be put on the web how a person in a wheelchair/scooter is accommodated on the bus so that first time riders can be prepared. Also, including how to make a request for the bus to stop (including what to do if the pull cord doesn't work and indicating that sometimes the sound on the request for stop messaging is not audible but the driver is still aware of the stop request).

The report seems thorough and seems to include ideas from a lot of agencies that serve these populations.

Darrell Solomon

---

From: Bret Martin, Transportation Planner, Orange county Planning Dept.  
 To: Taylor-Lewis, Sherry  
 Sent: Monday, November 25, 2013 9:07 AM  
 Subject: RE: Orange County Staff Comments – Draft DCHC MPO Coordinated Public Transportation – Human Service Transportation Plan Update

Sherry,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft DCHC MPO Coordinated Public Transportation-Human Service Transportation Plan Update. Attached are Orange County planning staff's comments on this draft. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any further clarification regarding these comments.

Thanks,  
**Bret "Bee" Martin, AICP**

*Text from Attachment:*

Date: November 25, 2013  
 To: Sherry Taylor Lewis, Grant Administration and Fiscal Program Management Intern, DCHC MPO  
 From: Bret Martin, AICP, Transportation Planner, Orange County  
 Subject: DCHC MPO Coordinated Public Transportation-Human Service Transportation Plan Update Comments

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft DCHC MPO Coordinated Public Transportation Plan Update dated October 2013. Following are Orange County planning staff's comments on this draft:

- 1) Page 12, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line: Insert "during peak periods" after "100 buses."
- 2) Page 13, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, last line: Insert "that" before "would have been eligible..."
- 3) Page 14, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: The City of Durham is the designated recipient of Section 5307/5340 funds for the Durham Urbanized Area (UZA) but not for the entire MPO planning area since part of the Burlington UZA is located within the DCHC MPO planning area. This section should note this intricacy. For the Burlington UZA, which is partially within the DCHC MPO planning area, the State is the designated recipient since the Burlington UZA is not a transportation management area (TMA). Because Section 5307 funding for the portion of the Burlington UZA in the DCHC MPO planning area should come from the FTA Section 5307/5340 apportionment to the Burlington UZA, this should be noted in this section.
- 4) Page 15, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: It should further be noted in this section that, under the MPO's existing funding sub-allocation arrangement, the funding that was allocated for the Section 5316- JARC program under SAFETEA-LU that is now wrapped into the Section 5307 apportionment to the DCHC MPO for the Durham UZA is automatically apportioned to the direct recipients, and for the MPO to ensure implementation of eligible JARC projects, it will need to have more involvement in this funding configuration than just simply sub-allocating it to the direct recipients to determine how it is spent. Because there is no Federal requirement for Section 5307 funds to be expended on JARC-

eligible projects under MAP-21, there is no mechanism in place at the MPO level to ensure such projects get implemented to execute relevant recommendations in this plan.

- 5) Page 16, last paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line: Replace “rural areas, defined as areas with fewer than 50,000 residents” with “nonurbanized areas, defined as those areas located outside Census-designated urbanized areas, which have a minimum of 50,000 residents.”
- 6) Page 19, Orange Public Transportation section: OPT is a division of the Orange County Planning and Inspections Department and not the Department of Aging. The Orange County Transportation Advisory Board’s official name as a County advisory body is the Orange Unified Transportation Board (OUTBoard). The plan should note here that future bus service expansions are planned for implementation within the next 5 years and beyond as part of the Orange County Bus and Rail Investment Plan. Additionally, Al Terry is no longer the contact for Orange Public Transportation. The contact should be changed to Craig Benedict, Director, Orange County Planning and Inspections Department.

Should you have any questions or need any further clarification on these comments, please do not hesitate to contact me via email at [brmartin@orangecountync.gov](mailto:brmartin@orangecountync.gov) or by phone at (919) 245-2582.

---

From: Taylor-Lewis, Sherry  
 Sent: Monday, November 25, 2013 1:52 PM  
 To: Bret A. Martin  
 Subject: RE: Orange County Staff Comments - Draft DCHC MPO Coordinated Public Transportation-Human Service Transportation Plan Update

Bret,

Thanks for submitting comments on behalf of Orange County.

As for comment #4, Gannett Fleming Consultants and the MPO realize the need for a mechanism to oversee the selection/execution of JARC eligible projects with the transit providers. Grant administration and management details will be outlined in the program management plan (PMP) that will be developed separately after the CPT is approved (covering 5307 and 5310).

Best,  
**Sherry Taylor Lewis**

---

From: Bret Martin, Transportation Planner, Orange county Planning Dept.  
 To: Taylor-Lewis, Sherry  
 Cc: Tom Altieri  
 Sent: Monday, November 25, 2013 3:35 PM  
 Subject: RE: Orange County Staff Comments – Draft DCHC MPO Coordinated Public Transportation – Human Service Transportation Plan Update

Sherry,

Thank you for following up on this. The program management plan (PMP) does appear to be a more appropriate tool for the MPO to determine how the JARC funding that used to be separately allocated under Section 5316 will be allocated now that it is wrapped under Section 5307. The heart of that comment gets at the existing automatic sub-allocation of Section 5307 funding to the three existing direct recipients from which there is no specific set-aside of funding to implement JARC-eligible projects for FY 2013 and moving forward. Because a portion of the Section 5307 apportionment to the designated recipient for the Durham UZA is based on low-income population to account for the Section 5316 program being folded under Section 5307, the sub-allocation formula will need to be revisited to account for this change. We have already gone through one year (FY 2013) during which no portion of the Section 5307 funding has been set aside for these specific types of projects when a portion of that funding is intended to implement JARC-eligible projects. If the PMP development process is the appropriate time to interject and discuss that comment, I will wait to do so when that time comes. Thanks again for your work on this.

Thanks,

**Bret "Bee" Martin, AICP**

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Transportation Advisory Committee  
DCHC MPO

**From:** DCHC MPO Lead Planning Agency

**Date:** December 11, 2013

**Subject:** **STP-DA and Transportation Alternatives**

---

**Background**

Surface Transportation Program – Direct Attributable (STP-DA) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds are directly allocated to the DCHC MPO annually based on the population of the urbanized area. The DCHC MPO receives approximately \$4.3 million annually in STP-DA and \$351,000 annually in TAP.

STP-DA can be used for many different planning, highway, transit, or bicycle/pedestrian projects. The MPO has a policy not to use STP-DA for highway projects. In 2008, the DCHC MPO held a Call for Projects for STP-DA for FY 2009-2015. A distribution policy was developed and followed at that time for the distribution of funding among project types and recipients (Attachment 12A). The programming approved in 2008 has been modified and adjusted many times over the past five years. Projects inevitably fall behind schedule, new priorities arise, estimated project costs change, etc. Currently, the MPO does not have any projects programmed with STP-DA beyond FY 2014 in the TIP.

TAP is a new funding source included in the MAP-21 federal transportation legislation. Transportation Management Areas, such as the DCHC MPO, receive a direct allocation of TAP annually based on the population of the urbanized area. NCDOT also receives TAP funding. Federal legislation requires that TAP projects be selected through a competitive process, and State DOTs are not eligible recipients of TAP funding. TAP can only be used for “transportation alternatives” including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, trails, scenic areas, community improvement activities, environmental mitigation, and safe routes to school programs. The DCHC MPO needs to develop a policy for programming its TAP funding. NCDOT plans to program the majority of its TAP funding through the Prioritization 3.0 process.

The MPO requested that all of its member jurisdictions review the STP-DA projects currently programmed in FY 2014 to assess if the funding will be obligated in FY 2014. Jurisdictions were asked to submit any requested changes to FY 2014 projects. Any funding not expected to be obligated in FY 2014 would be subject to the FY 2015-2016 Call for Projects process.

Attachment 12B is a set of tables displaying the current FY 2014 STP-DA programming, the requested changes to FY 2014 programming, and the expected funding for the FY 2015-2016 Call for Projects.

As shown, the MPO has approximately \$13 million of STP-DA programmed for FY 2014. This is equivalent to approximately three years of the MPO's annual allocation. Due to a variety of reasons, many of these projects have been delayed by several years. Reasons for delays include the time consuming federal approval process, insufficient local staff available to manage projects, lack of local matching funds, changes to project scopes, etc. While the MPO's STP-DA policy includes a one-year grace period for the obligation of funding, the MPO has been very lenient on this and has tried to work with its member governments to maintain funding for projects that are local priorities and are making progress. Simultaneously, over the past several years, the MPO has approved several new projects and requests to cover cost over-runs. Lack of STP-DA funding has not been a hindrance to getting projects completed.

The MPO wants to work with our member governments to get more of our STP-DA obligated so the funding is safe from potential federal rescissions and so that the funding can be put to use to improve bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities in the MPO. The table displays a revised program of projects that local governments believe can be completed in FY 2014. Carrboro, Chapel Hill, and Durham have all pledged to obligate \$13 million of STP-DA funding in FY 2014. Several projects are expected to proceed as currently programmed, a few projects are expected to proceed to the next phase of project development but won't be constructed in FY 2014, a few projects are being canceled and the funding reallocated to different projects, and some bicycle and pedestrian funding will be reallocated to needed replacement transit vehicles.

This table is shared with the TAC for information only at this time. Formal approval of the FY 2014 programming in a TIP amendment will be requested in a few months simultaneous with the approval of the FY 2015 and 2016 funding.

### **FY 2015 and 2016 Call for Projects**

The TCC is developing a process and recommendation for programming STP-DA and TAP funding in FY 2015 and 2016. Due to the difficulties in managing a seven-year program of projects, the TCC recommends that the MPO only look at a two year period. The MPO will be programming our current unobligated balance of STP-DA that is not expected to be obligated in FY 2014, \$1,019,690; plus our expected FY 2015 and 2016 STP-DA, \$4,367,271 annually; plus our FY 2013 and 2014 TAP, \$351,000 annually; plus our expected FY 2015 and 2016 TAP, \$351,000 annually. The total is \$11,158,231. The TCC is currently considering over-programming by 30 percent to help ensure that project delays don't continue to add to our high unobligated balance. Over-programming would result in approximately \$14,505,701 available for projects in FY 2015 and 2016.

The TCC is currently reviewing the STP-DA policy and plans to bring forward recommended changes in January. A policy for selecting TAP projects will be included in this policy. Once a policy is approved, the

TCC will bring forward a recommended programming of projects in February. The MPO's goal is to approve programming in early spring 2014 so that local governments can include the local match for FY 2015 projects in their FY 2015 budgets.

**Schedule**

December 11, 2013	TAC receives update
January 8, 2013	TAC approves revised STP-DA and TAP policy
February 12, 2013	TAC approves STP-DA and TAP programming for FY 2014, 2015, and 2016

**TAC Action:** Receive information.

## **POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR DCHC-MPO'S FEDERAL FUNDS**

Under the federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC-MPO) is responsible for programming and maintaining the seven-year Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), coordinating updates of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and selecting projects to receive funds from three federal funding programs:

- Surface Transportation Program – Direct Apportionment (STP-DA)
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

Under SAFETEA-LU, DCHC-MPO is required to document the process used for programming these funds. The “Policy Framework for the DCHC-MPO’s Federal Funds” provides policy direction and guidelines for the recommendation and selection of projects to receive DCHC-MPO funds. In addition to more general policy direction, this Policy Framework contains specific information for DCHC-MPO’s project selection process for programming DCHC-MPO funds, as part of the development of the TIP. This policy focuses and provides guidance for programming DCHC-MPO funds and support implementation and tracking of projects established in the MPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan, the 2035 *LRTP*, adopted on May 13, 2009.

### **Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)**

The TIP contains the transportation project list developed and approved through the MPO’s decision-making process. The TIP is focused on the development and implementation of projects that are part of or directly support key local and state transportation policies and plans, including designated projects in the 2035 *LRTP*. Under federal law, the TIP must be a four-year program of projects that is updated at least every 2 years. At a minimum, federal and state legislation requires a Metropolitan TIP to contain all of the transportation projects requesting federal transportation funding under Titles 23 CFR (Highways) and 49 CFR (Transit) in the United States Code, as well as all the non-federally funded, significant projects. The 2012–2018 TIP will therefore include:

- Projects using federal funds managed by DCHC-MPO (STP-DA, CMAQ, and FTA).
- Projects using federal and state funds managed by NCDOT.
- Projects of significance, regardless of funding source, required to be included in the air quality analysis and conformity determination of the TIP.

- Projects carried forward from the previous TIP funding, with funds not yet obligated.

As part of the development of the TIP, DCHC is responsible for reviewing all projects submitted for programming. DCHC has primary responsibility for selecting projects to receive DCHC-managed federal funds from the STP-DA, CMAQ, and FTA federal funding programs.. The process is summarized in the subsequent sections of this policy.

## **DCHC-MPO Funds - Eligibility Requirements**

As previously stated, DCHC is responsible for selecting projects to receive STP-DA, CMAQ, and FTA funds. Each federal funding program has specific eligibility requirements, as follows:

- STP-DA funds are the most flexible of DCHC funds and can be used for a variety of transportation projects, transit projects, and planning activities.
- CMAQ funds are available for specific categories of transportation projects and programs that improve air quality by increasing the efficiency of existing transportation facilities or reducing travel demand on those facilities. General purpose roadway projects are not eligible.
- FTA funds may be used *only* for transit related projects serving the DCHC's federal urbanized areas.

## **DCHC-MPO Funds - STP-DA Funding Proposal**

In 2008 the MPO adopted the following three step process for establishing an annual STP-DA funding proposal. The Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) recommends to the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) approval of the distribution of funds to projects via this process.

### **Step 1 – Distribution guidance**

The MPO funds identified are distributed through a partially competitive and non-competitive process. This process is based on the requirements of current transportation legislation, with additional guidance provided by the *2035 LRTP*, the MPO's long-range metropolitan transportation plan and other local comprehensive plans.

The process begins with the calculation of our "expected" annual STP-DA funds available. It is calculated by combining our annual allocation over the 7 year period with any prior year uncommitted balance. The total "expected" STP-DA funds available is initially reduced by the following items:

1. *Annual Reserve (15%)*- distributed to participating members on a competitive basis
2. *Staff and Routine Planning needs* - funding level varies depending on LPA needs
3. *Extra Planning needs* - funding level varies depending on LPA needs

After those items have been accounted for, the "remainder" of STP-DA funds is allocated to 3 sub-categories as follows:

1. 25% to *Transit* (non-competitive split: 50% Chapel Hill Transit, 50% Durham Area Transit Authority)
2. 25% to *Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian* (competitive – for projects of regional scale and importance)

3. 50% to *Local Discretionary* (distributed to participating members on a non-competitive basis)

**Step 2 – Distribution of STP-DA within the each distribution category**

*Annual Reserve (Small Projects)* – This category is intended to be used for short-term immediate needs and small projects. No guidelines have been proposed for distribution by jurisdiction so that the MPO has flexibility in responding to immediate needs that may vary significantly from year to year.

*Staff and Routine Planning* – This category is for LPA staff and routine planning activities either performed by the LPA or by other agencies (TJ COG or the Model Service Bureau) on behalf of the LPA. There is no need for guidelines for the distribution of funding within this category because all funding is for MPO-wide activities – no funding is allocated to individual jurisdictions.

*Extra Planning* – This category is for special emphasis projects either performed by the LPA or member jurisdictions. This category is for larger, more expensive planning projects that will enhance transportation planning in the MPO but are not required. No guidelines have been proposed for distribution by jurisdiction. All of the projects that have been approved are for MPO-wide activities.

*Transit* - The TAC approved an even distribution of STP-DA funds within the transit category between Chapel Hill Transit and DATA

*Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian* – There is no distribution formula for funding within this category. Projects in this category will span across multiple jurisdictions or otherwise provide regional benefits through increased connectivity.

*Local Discretionary* – For the local discretionary category, the TAC approved a guaranteed \$500,000 minimum for each municipality over the 7-year TIP and then distribution of the remainder proportionate to municipal population

**Step 3 – Allocate STP-DA funds to specific projects within each category**

All funding of specific projects within each category must be presented to the TAC for approval. There is no sub-allocation of funding directly to member governments.

These first 3 categories are approved annually with the UPWP process:

*Annual Reserve (Small Projects)* – Each member agency will submit new or continued projects annually for this category.

*Staff and Routine Planning* – The LPA Staff will submit estimated staffing and routine planning activities annually for this category.

*Extra Planning* – The LPA Staff will submit new or continued projects for this category.

These next 3 categories are typically approved bi-annually with the MTIP process; yet amendments can be made in the interim as needed:

*Transit* – Transit agencies will submit projects for the TCC to develop a recommendation for the transit category.

*Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian* – LPA staff and each member agency will submit new or continued projects for this category. LPA formally identified regional connections as part of the 2035 LRTP.

*Local Discretionary* – LPA staff and each member agency will submit new or continued projects for this category. The TAC will approve with the added expectation that offers municipalities flexibility in funding projects that reflect their own priorities.

### **DCHC-MPO Funds – STP-DA Project Approval Process**

DCHC has an established process for recommending and selecting projects to receive DCHC funds. STP-DA funds are distributed based on the aforementioned funding proposal methodology and the following funding policy that was adopted by TAC in 2003:

***“Funding priority will be given to projects in the adopted DCHC Long Range Transportation Plan in the following categories and not for roadway projects:***

***----Public Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities, Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management / Intelligent transportation Systems, Scenic and Environment enhancements, Planning Studies that support the implementation or development of the adopted and future versions of DCHC's Long Range Transportation Plan, & Air Quality Programs***

***When projects are being considered, equity and funding in jurisdictions over time will be considered.”***

Projects that are submitted for funding requests will be given priority separately according to the seven project groups and the following guiding principles:

1. Annual Reserve (Small projects), includes:
  - a. LPA and local government planning activities under \$200,000 (federal)
  - b. Bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects under \$200,000 (federal)
  - c. Cost over-runs and additions to existing projects
  - d. These are projects that require less advance planning and can be completed quickly.
  
2. LPA staff requests and LPA and local government routine planning activities, includes:
  - a. New and existing LPA staff positions
  - b. Activities that are required to be completed such as air quality planning, congestion mitigation plan, modeling, etc.

3. LPA and local government extra planning activities, include:
  - a. LPA and local government planning activities over \$200,000 (federal)
  - b. Optional activities such as special emphasis projects
4. Transit projects over \$200,000 (federal)
5. Regional bicycle and pedestrian projects
  - a. Projects of regional scale and importance that span or connect multiple jurisdictions.
6. Local Discretionary –This is the most flexible category. Projects can include:
  - a. Large bicycle and pedestrian projects
  - b. Scenic and environmental enhancements to highway TIP projects
  - c. Transit projects
  - d. Planning projects
7. Travel demand management - Funding for the TDM will be shared equally by CAMPO. The MPO's share of TDM for FY 2009 and future years will be provided using CMAQ funds. TDM offers very high air quality benefits and competes very favorably for CMAQ funding. Future CMAQ funds have been approved for FY 2013 through 2015 for TDM.

### **DCHC-MPO Funds – CMAQ Funding**

Federal CMAQ funds are apportioned annually to each State according to the severity of its criteria air problems. The CMAQ program is funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); therefore CMAQ projects must follow Federal laws and regulations. Since transportation and environmental program priorities fluctuate, a limited portion of CMAQ apportionment can be transferred to other Federal-aid highway programs such as:

- Surface Transportation Program (STP)
- National Highway System (NHS)
- Highway Bridge Program (HBP)
- Interstate Maintenance (IM)
- Recreational Trails Program (RTP)
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

The transfer of funds has specific monetary provisions and will differ each year. It is also a requirement that any transfer of such funds must still be obligated in nonattainment and maintenance areas. The MPO plans to explore the option of transferring funds.

The CMAQ program is based on a competitive process for which proposals for candidate transportation projects are submitted to North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). MPO's and RPO's responsible for transportation planning in air quality non-attainment & maintenance areas are encouraged to work cooperatively with their member jurisdictions to develop & submit project proposals. There is currently a minimum project threshold of \$100,000.

Transit project(s) selected as part of the CMAQ competitive process are flexed to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and retain the funding laws and regulation under the CMAQ program. FTA is ultimately responsible for the administration of flexed CMAQ funds.

## **Project Tracking System**

DCHC would like to implement a Project Tracking System to monitor the progress of DCHC's STP-DA, CMAQ, and FTA funds. The following is a proposed tracking system. The project tracking policies contained within this document apply to the following federal funds for which the DCHC has primary responsibility for project selection through the current congressional appropriations bill:

- Surface Transportation Program Direct Attributable (STP-DA),
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), and
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) – Section 5307

The purpose of the project tracking system is to ensure the timely use of all MPO managed federal funds (referred to as "MPO funds"). Four (4) important goals of the system are to:

- Implement approved qualified/quantifiable projects
- Identify the reasons and accountability for, and possible solutions to, project delays
- Ensure a consistent process is followed for any distribution of MPO funds
- Ensure minimal impact to DCHC's UZA in the event of future rescissions

Each project sponsor will be responsible for identifying the appropriate estimated obligation date for each phase of their project receiving MPO funds and update as necessary via the project tracking database. A one-year grace period beyond the estimated obligation date is established for each project. The estimated obligation date identified by each project sponsor, once funds are programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), is used to monitor the progress of the funds and the projects.

This project tracking system will monitor *the obligation* of STP-DA and CMAQ funds, as well as the timely realignment of these funds when necessary. A decision on the need to develop policies and procedures for monitoring the expenditures of STP-DA will be instituted at a future date. LPA staff is currently working to develop a CMAQ project evaluation analysis policy. This policy will monitor CMAQ projects to evaluate whether or not they have met their intended objectives and will also be used in decisions for future CMAQ funding. This policy will be instituted begin with the FY2011 UPWP reporting cycle.

## **Policies - Obligations & Monitoring**

### *A. Obligation Monitoring of STP-DA and CMAQ Funds*

Each phase of a project with STP-DA and/or CMAQ funds is allowed a one-year grace period beyond the allocation year. If project funds remain un-obligated by the end of this grace period, funds are at risk of being removed from the project. The MPO staff will provide regular reports to both the TCC and the TAC of those projects with STP-DA and/or CMAQ funds that are approaching this milestone. These reports

will include information on the age of the funds, the phases programmed, and the length of time passed beyond the estimated obligation date (i.e., months “past due”).

LPA staff will notify the project sponsor when any STP-DA or CMAQ funds are six months past the estimated obligation date (before the one-year grace period expires). The project sponsor will be required to prepare a narrative outlining the reasons for the delay in preparation for presentation to the TCC. The LPA staff, along with the TCC’s input will determine whether or not an obligation date extension is warranted.

1. The length of any obligation date extension will be determined on a case-by-case basis and may be allowed for any date within the 7-year time span of the current TIP. The TCC will then make a recommendation to the TAC.
2. If the LPA staff and subsequent TCC determination is that an obligation date extension is not warranted, the recommendation to the Committee will be to remove the funds in question from the project. Project sponsors will be provided the opportunity to present their case to the Committee if they choose to appeal the recommendation. The LPA Staff will be regularly notified well in advance of all delayed projects with “at risk” funds via the reports mentioned above, and will be taking action on all subsequent activities. Any redistribution of these funds will follow the policies contained in Section E of this document.
3. LPA staff will obtain a monthly report from NCDOT that will be used to develop a report to reconcile project obligations. This will provide a “real-time” status of project obligations.

#### *B. Expenditure Monitoring of STP-DA and CMAQ Funds*

A decision on the need to develop policies and procedures for monitoring the expenditures of STP-DA will be instituted at a future date. LPA staff is currently working to develop a CMAQ project evaluation analysis policy. This policy will monitor CMAQ projects to evaluate whether or not they have met their intended objectives and will also be used in decisions for future CMAQ funding.

#### *C. Obligation and Expenditure Monitoring of FTA Funds*

These funds include STP-DA and CMAQ funds flexed from FHWA. The TAC will approve the flexed amount each year at the first meeting for the federal fiscal year. (Typically October TAC meeting) Once the TAC has approved the flexed amount, the request is made through NCDOT-PTD to transfer (flex) these funds, making them available through the FTA grant application process.

1. Each transit agency receiving funding will submit an application to FTA via the Transportation Electronic Award Management (TEAM) system within 45 days of TAC’s authorization. The application is used to obligate Section 5307 funding for approved project (s) (*The application will be assigned a 10-digit application number beginning with NC-90-XXXX-XX*)
  - a. Any time there is an application amendment; updated copies must be sent to DCHC.
2. Each transit agency must forward a copy of the approved application and certificate of award/grant agreement to DCHC within 30 days of receipt of FTA documents.

3. The mandatory reports and applicable due dates are as follows:

*1st Quarter* - due Feb. 15th;  
*2nd Quarter* - due May 15th;  
*3rd Quarter* - due Aug. 15th;  
*4th Quarter* - due Nov. 15th

- a. **Narrative reports** - Each transit agency must forward a copy of their quarterly narrative reports to DCHC according to the deadlines dictated above. *(The standard FTA narrative report includes complete project information, the Federal Financial Report (SF-425) and a Milestone/Project Progress report.*
- b. **UPWP Detail Composite Report** - Each transit agency/participating member government must complete the detailed composite expense report in the standard UPWP task format according to the deadlines dictated above.
- c. **Project Funds/Status** - Each transit agency will forward a “print-screen” copy of the Project Funds/Status – Project funding tab only to DCHC according to the deadlines dictated above. *(This report will give details on obligations, disbursements, de-obligation & refunds over the life of the project.)*

*D. Scope Changes to Projects Awarded STP-DA, CMAQ and/or FTA Funds*

Requests for a change in scope for a project that received DCHC funds must be submitted to the TCC for evaluation. All projects awarded CMAQ funds were selected via a competitive process based upon the expectation that the project as described in the grant application would be delivered in the time frame specified. During the selection process of CMAQ projects, each project went through an extensive sub-committee review and quality analysis. As a result, proposed scope changes may have consequences that require careful review and evaluation by LPA staff before they can be recommended for approval.

If a change is requested such that the MPO funds will implement some reduced scope of the existing project, the project sponsor will be asked to provide information on their intent to complete the full project and the request will be sent to the TAC for approval. An existing project’s scope may not be modified so substantially as to effectively constitute a new project. This will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, but a change in location or outcome may be considered a new project (e.g., changing the scope from a high occupancy vehicle lane to a general purpose lane). A key factor will be how the project was described and evaluated during the competitive process – any scope changes will then be reviewed to determine if the project is essentially meeting the spirit of the original evaluation.

*E. Distribution of New and “Returned” STP-DA, CMAQ and FTA Funds*

New and “Returned” funds are defined as follows:

1. **New funds** are defined as additional funds to the MPO/UZA from the reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU or other sources.
2. **Returned funds** may originate from several sources: un-committed funds remaining from each project category, unused funds from completed projects, unused funds remaining from cancelled

projects, or funds “returned” from projects due to a variety of reasons (such as an indefinite delay to a project, a change in priorities, or the receipt of other funding sources).

The TCC and TAC will approve the following:

- A MPO wide STP-DA contingency lists of prioritized projects. In the event that additional funds become available through the reauthorization of the federal transportation act, the project tracking system, or any other sources, these contingency lists will become effective. The contingency projects must also be already included in the current TIP, and will remain in effect (unfunded) until the next project selection process, to be considered for more distributed MPO funds. The contingency lists should encompass projects through-out the MPO.
- A MPO wide CMAQ contingency list will be retained based on originally submitted proposals that met the program requirements during the current competitive selection process, but were otherwise unable to be funded due to funding availability.

The FTA funds distributed noncompetitively will not be affected by this policy, yet transit projects may be highly considered as contingency projects due to the increased ability to obligate these funds/projects.

---

Adopted by TAC *June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2010.*

**Currently Programmed STPDA Funding in FY 2014**

Jurisdiction	TIP No	T-2	Project Description	Federal Funding	Amount Obligated	Project Phase	Federal Fiscal Year		Status
							Org. Year (May 2008)	Ext. Year	
Carrboro	U-4726	DF	Bicycle Loop Detectors	\$ 30,000	\$ 6,000	Construction	2011	2014	Scheduled to be bid March 2014
Carrboro	EL-4828		Morgan Creek Greenway –Carrboro	\$ 396,636	\$ -	Construction	2007	2014	Scheduled to be bid July 2014.
Carrboro	U-4726	DE	Bolin Creek Greenway - Carrboro (Homestead to Chapel Hill HS Greenway)	\$ 723,184	\$ -	Construction	2008	2014	Scheduled to be bid summer 2014.
Carrboro	U-4726	DD	Rogers Road- Sidewalk (Homestead to Meadow Run)	\$ 363,960	\$ -	Construction	2010	2014	Scheduled to be bid April 2014.
Carrboro	U-4726	Dx	South Greensboro St. - Sidewalk	\$ 46,640	\$ -	Construction	2012	2014	Cancel.
Carrboro	EL-4828	Dx	Bel-Arbor Plantation Acres Multi-use Path	\$ 67,000	\$ -	Construction	2013	2014	Cancel.
Chapel Hill	U-4726	Ix	NC-86/Other Locations of Pedestrian Safety Improvements	\$ 150,000	\$ -	Construction	2009	2014	Cancel.
Chapel Hill	U-4726	Ix	CH- Chapel Hill Sidewalks	\$ 320,000	\$ -	Construction	2007	2014	Cancel.
Durham	SR-5001	C	Fayetteville Road (Cornwallis to Nelson bicycle lanes and sidewalks)	\$ 200,800	\$ -	Construction	2009	2014	Scheduled to bid in March 2014.
Durham	U-4726	HL	Barbee Road (Orindo to Pearsontown Elementary) Sidewalk	\$ 15,680	\$ -	Construction	2009	2014	Scheduled to bid in April 2014
Durham	C-4928		Morreene Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 1,269,045	\$ -	Construction	2010	2014	Planning underway. Funding design in FY 14.
Durham	U-4724		Cornwallis Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 1,846,245	\$ -	Construction	2010	2014	Planning underway. Funding design in FY 14.
Durham	U-4726	HK	Hillandale Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 1,077,433	\$ -	Construction	2011	2014	Planning underway. Funding design in FY 14.
Durham	U-4726	HO	Carpenter Fletcher Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 984,819	\$ -	Construction	2010	2014	Planning underway. Funding design in FY 14.
Durham	U-4726	Hx	Avondale Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 412,000	\$ -	Construction	2011	2014	Scheduled to bid in October 2014
Durham	U-4726	HK	Holloway Street Sidewalks	\$ 125,685	\$ -	Construction	2006	2014	Cancel.
NCDOT	EB-4707	B	Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road (Durham)	\$ 2,412,000	\$ 1,320,000	Right-of-Way	2009	2012	
NCDOT	EB-4708	B	Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road (Durham)	\$ 3,947,035	\$ -	Construction	2010	2014	
				\$ 14,388,162	\$ 1,326,000				

**Recommended STPDA Funding in FY 2014**

Carrboro	U-4726	DF	Bicycle Loop Detectors	\$ 30,000	\$ 6,000	Construction	2011	2014	No change.
Carrboro	EL-4828		Morgan Creek Greenway –Carrboro	\$ 396,636	\$ -	Construction	2007	2014	No change.
Carrboro	U-4726	DE	Bolin Creek Greenway - Carrboro (Homestead to Chapel Hill HS Greenway)	\$ 723,184	\$ -	Construction	2008	2014	No change.
Carrboro	U-4726	DD	Rogers Road- Sidewalk (Homestead to Meadow Run)	\$ 477,600	\$ -	Construction	2010	2014	Increased STPDA. Reallocated from two canceled projects.
Chapel Hill	U-4726	Ix	Tanyard Branch Greenway	\$ 100,000	\$ -	Design	new	2014	Add STPDA funding. Reallocate funding from other projects.
Chapel Hill	U-4726	Ix	Estes Drive Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 176,000	\$ -	Design	new	2014	Add STPDA funding. Reallocate funding from other projects.
Chapel Hill	?		Variable Message Signs	\$ 194,000		Construction	new	2014	Add STPDA funding. Reallocate funding from other projects.
Durham	SR-5001	C	Fayetteville Road (Cornwallis to Nelson bicycle lanes and sidewalks)	\$ 200,800	\$ -	Construction	2009	2014	No change.
Durham	U-4726	HL	Barbee Road (Orindo to Pearsontown Elementary) Sidewalk	\$ 15,680	\$ -	Construction	2009	2014	No change.
Durham	C-4928		Morreene Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 425,000	\$ -	Design	2010	2014	Changed to design phase and decreased funding
Durham	U-4724		Cornwallis Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 275,000	\$ -	Design	2010	2014	Changed to design phase and decreased funding
Durham	U-4726	HK	Hillandale Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 455,000	\$ -	Design	2011	2014	Changed to design phase and decreased funding
Durham	U-4726	HO	Carpenter Fletcher Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 422,000	\$ -	Design	2010	2014	Changed to design phase and decreased funding
Durham	U-4726	Hx	Avondale Road Bike/Ped Facilities	\$ 412,000	\$ -	Construction	2011	2014	Although past the FY 14 deadline, recommend keeping funding in FY 14 in order to ensure project can proceed as quickly as possible.
Durham	U-71		East End Connector Enhancements	\$ 237,590	\$ -	Construction		2014	Add STPDA funding. Reallocate funding from other projects.
DATA	TA-4923		9 Replacement Buses	\$ 3,218,400		Capital		2014	Add STPDA funding. Reallocate funding from other projects.
DATA	TA-5019	A	7 Replacement Vans	\$ 266,000		Capital		2014	Add STPDA funding. Reallocate funding from other projects.
NCDOT	EB-4707	B	Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road (Durham)	\$ 2,412,000	\$ 1,320,000	Right-of-Way	2009	2014	
NCDOT	EB-4708	B	Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road (Durham)	\$ 3,947,035	\$ -	Construction	2010	2014	
				\$ 14,383,925	\$ 1,326,000				

**Estimated Funding for FY 15-16 Programming**

Current unobligated balance	\$	14,077,615
FY 14 expected obligations	\$	13,057,925
<hr/>		
Carry-over to FY 15-16 Call for Projects	\$	1,019,690
FY 15 Estimated STPDA	\$	4,367,271
FY 16 Estimated STPDA	\$	4,367,271
<hr/>		
Total for FY 15-16 Call for Projects - STPDA	\$	9,754,231
FY 13 TAP	\$	351,000
FY 14 TAP	\$	351,000
FY 15 Estimated TAP	\$	351,000
FY 16 Estimated TAP	\$	351,000
<hr/>		
Total for FY 15-16 Call for Projects - TAP	\$	1,404,000
Grand Total for Call for Projects	\$	11,158,231
Grand Total if Over-Program 30%	\$	14,505,701

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Transportation Advisory Committee  
DCHC MPO

**From:** DCHC MPO Lead Planning Agency

**Date:** December 11, 2013

**Subject:** **FY 2016-2022 TIP – Prioritization 3.0**

---

**Background**

Prioritization 3.0 is NCDOT's third iteration of using a quantitative prioritization process for development of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). In 2013, the General Assembly codified the prioritization process and set many parameters on the use and distribution of transportation funding in legislation titled Strategic Transportation Investments (H817).

The Strategic Transportation Investments legislation organized transportation funding into three categories: Statewide Mobility, Regional Impact, and Division Needs. Statewide Mobility includes highway projects mostly on Interstates and the National Highway System (e.g. I-40, US 15/501, NC 147), commercial service airports (e.g. RDU), and major freight rail corridors (e.g. the NC Railroad). Regional Impact includes Statewide Mobility projects and adds highway projects on other NC and US routes (e.g. NC 54, US 501), public bus and rail transit that crosses county lines (e.g. Durham-Orange light rail, Triangle Transit bus). Division Needs includes Statewide Mobility, Regional Impact, and adds other state roads (e.g. Fayetteville Road), federally funded municipal roads (e.g. portions of Martin Luther King Jr. Parkway), other public transit (e.g. DATA, CHT), and bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Forty percent of the funding is allocated to the Statewide Mobility category for competition statewide based fully on a quantitative analysis. Thirty percent of the funding is allocated to the Regional Impact category for competition within two paired Divisions (5&6, 7&9, 8&10) and is distributed by population of the paired Divisions. Regional Impact projects compete based on a quantitative analysis and local input from MPOs, Rural Planning Organizations, and NCDOT Highway Division Engineers. Thirty percent of the funding is allocated to the Division Needs category for competition within a Division and is distributed equally to each Division. Division Needs projects compete based on a quantitative analysis and local input from MPOs, Rural Planning Organizations, and NCDOT Highway Division Engineers.

Prioritization 3.0 will result in a draft STIP which will be released by NCDOT by December 1, 2014. The MPO will also release a draft TIP at that time and seek public input. A final STIP and TIP are expected to be approved by July 1, 2015 by the NC Board of Transportation and the MPO. The STIP and TIP will include funding for federal fiscal years 2016 through 2022.

## Schedule

Steps for submission of projects:

- October 23, 2013: Deadline to modify an existing highway project  
*LPA staff coordinated with Division staff to make a few technical modifications to projects in the DCHC MPO*
- November 29, 2013: Transit project submission deadline for Prioritization 3.0.  
*DATA, CHT, and Triangle Transit submitted projects*
- December 1, 2013: Local governments submit lists of highway, rail, bicycle/pedestrian projects to the MPO for submission.  
*Lists have been received from each member jurisdiction.*
- December 18, 2013: DCHC MPO TCC recommends highway, rail, bicycle/pedestrian projects to submit for Prioritization 3.0.
- January 8, 2014: DCHC MPO TAC votes on highway, rail, bicycle/pedestrian projects to submit for Prioritization 3.0.
- February 17, 2014: Highway, rail, bicycle/pedestrian submission deadline for Prioritization 3.0.

Future steps for developing local input points:

- January –April 2014: MPO develops and approves a local ranking methodology
- March 26, 2014 TCC makes recommendation on local ranking methodology
- April 9, 2014 TAC approves local ranking methodology
- April 30, 2014 NCDOT releases quantitative scores
- May 1, 2014 NCDOT deadline for approval of local ranking methodology
- May 1-May 13, 2014 LPA applies local ranking methodology
- May 14, 2014 TAC releases proposed public input points for public comment
- Two options:
- June 11, 2014 TAC holds public hearing on public input points **\*evening meeting\***
- June 25, 2014 TCC makes recommendation on local input points
- Late June or early July TAC approves local input points **\*requires extra TAC meeting\***
- July 31, 2014 MPO submits local input points
- Or
- May 28, 2014 TCC makes recommendation on local input points
- June 11, 2014 TAC holds public hearing on public input points and approves local input points **\*evening meeting\***
- July 31, 2014 MPO submits local input points

## Highway

All highway projects previously submitted for earlier Prioritization processes remain in the project database for scoring. The DCHC MPO can submit up to 14 new highway projects. If the DCHC MPO removes up to five existing highway projects, the MPO can submit up to five additional new projects. MPO staff believes that there are at least five projects within the MPO that can be removed due to

obsolescence or lack of priority so the MPO will likely be submitting a total of 19 new highway projects for Prioritization 3.0. The deletion of projects requires agreement by the MPO and the Division.

The attached table shows the projects in the Prioritization 2.0 database, plus 17 additional projects that have been requested from our member governments in their local lists. Five projects were requested to be removed from the database by local governments. Requests for project deletions and additions will be considered by the TCC and a recommendation to the TAC will be developed. The TAC will approve these projects in January.

Previously submitted modernization projects that were primarily bicycle and pedestrian projects have been removed from the highway project list. The MPO could submit these modernization projects as bicycle and pedestrian projects for Prioritization 3.0.

### **Bicycle/Pedestrian**

NCDOT has set a limitation of 20 bicycle and pedestrian projects that each MPO can submit for Prioritization 3.0. The draft list of bicycle/pedestrian projects released by the TAC in October included more than 70 project requests. In order to begin the process of narrowing down the MPO's bicycle and pedestrian submission list to 20, the MPO requested that each local government provide a list of their top priorities by December 1, 2013. The TCC has set a limit of eight projects per jurisdiction in Durham County and four projects per jurisdiction in Orange and Chatham counties. The submitted projects are shown on the attached list. The TCC is developing a process to compare these projects and develop a recommended list of 20 projects in the MPO. A recommendation will be brought to the TAC in January.

The Strategic Transportation Investments legislation prohibits the State from using State funds on bicycle and pedestrian projects. As a result, projects funded through Prioritization 3.0 will require a 20 percent local match by the local jurisdiction. These projects will also be required to be managed by the local jurisdiction.

NCDOT has also requested that MPOs include bicycle and pedestrian projects that are eligible for federal Safe Routes to School funding. Safe Routes to School funding is only eligible to be used on projects within two miles of a K-8 school.

### **Transit**

Only expansion projects (e.g. expansion vehicles, new park-and-ride lots, etc.) are subject to the Prioritization 3.0 process. NCDOT has not set any limitation on the number of transit projects that the MPO can submit. Transit operators were responsible for submitting their projects into the Prioritization process by November 29, 2013. The submitted projects are shown on the attached list. NCDOT is not requiring MPO approval of projects that transit operators submit. The MPO will be responsible for assigning local input points to these projects in the spring.

### **Rail**

NCDOT has set a limitation of five rail projects that each MPO can submit. However, there will be many rail projects already in the database that were submitted by railroads through the NCDOT Rail Division. Three rail projects have been requested by MPO member jurisdictions:

- Hillsborough train station
- Grade separation of NCRR and Blackwell and Mangum streets in Durham
- Grade separation of NCRR and Ellis Road (west, near Angier) in Durham

**TAC Action:** Receive information.

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H090006-A	6	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	I-0305A	I-85		SR 1006 Near Hillsborough	East of SR 1709	Add Additional Lanes		
H090006-B	7	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	I-0305B	I-85		East of SR 1709	Durham County Line	Add Additional Lanes		
H090010-A	10	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	I-3306A	I-40		I-85	US 15/501	Add Additional Lanes		
H090366	366	Statewide Mobility	2 - Upgrade Arterial to Freeway/Expressway	U-2807	US 15/501		I-40	US 15/501	I-40 to US 15/501 Bypass in Durham. Major Corridor Upgrade.	Durham, Durham County	
H110997	997	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	FS-1205C	NC 147	Durham Freeway	I-40	East End Connector	Widen Roadway to 6 Lanes and Rehabilitate Pavement	Durham, Durham County	
H111013	1013	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	FS-1205A	I-40		NC 147	Wade Avenue	Construct Managed Lanes	Durham, Durham County	

SPOTID	P.2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H111014	1014	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	FS-1305A	I-540		I-40	US 64 Bypass	Convert Freeway to tolled Facility and Widen to 8 Lanes	Durham, Durham County	
H111097	1097	Statewide Mobility	16 - Modernize Roadway		NC 147		East End Connector	US 15/501	Modernization, Pavement Rehabilitation, Interchange Consolidation/Upgrades, and Lighting (pending lighting study recommendations)	Durham, Durham County	
H111131	1131	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		I-40		NC 147	US 15/501	Construct 1 Managed Lane Per Direction (Additional 16Ft of Pavement - 12Ft Lanes + 4Ft Pavement For Separation with General Purpose Lanes)	Durham, Durham County	
H111143-A	1143	Statewide Mobility	4 - Upgrade Arterial to Superstreet	U-5304A	US 15/501	Fordham Boulevard	SR 1742 (Ephesus Church Road)	NC 86 (Columbia Street)	Capacity improvements and possible interchange at Manning Drive, with Sidewalks, Wide-Outside Lanes, and Transit Accommodations.	Chapel Hill	Different description: Capacity improvements with sidewalks, bicycle, and transit accommodations
H111143-B	1144	Statewide Mobility	4 - Upgrade Arterial to Superstreet	U-5304B	US 15/501	Fordham Boulevard	East Lakeview Drive	Sage Road	Upgrade Road to "Superstreet"	Chapel Hill	Different description: Capacity improvements with sidewalks, bicycle and transit accommodations

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H111143-C	937	Statewide Mobility	10 - Improve Intersection	U-5304C	US 15/501		SR 1742 (Ephesus Church Road)		Intersection Improvements	Chapel Hill	
H128086	8086	Statewide Mobility	7 - Upgrade At-grade Intersection to Interchange or Grade Separation		US 70		Miami Boulevard		Upgrade Existing at-Grade intersection to interchange	Durham, Durham County	
H129603-A	9603	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	I-4743A	I-85/US 15		US 70	SR 1675 (Glenn School Road)	Add Additional Lanes	Durham, Durham County	
H129603-B	9604	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	I-4743B	I-85/US 15		SR 1675 (Glenn School Road)	SR 1632 (Red Mill Road)	Add Additional Lanes	Durham, Durham County	
H129638-A	9638	Statewide Mobility	6 - Widen Existing Roadway and Construct Part on New Location	U-4720A	US 70		Lynn Road	Miami Blvd	Upgrade Roadway to Freeway	Durham, Durham County	
H129638-B	9639	Statewide Mobility	6 - Widen Existing Roadway and Construct Part on New Location	U-4720B	US 70		Miami Blvd	Proposed Northern Durham Parkway	Upgrade Roadway to Freeway	Durham, Durham County	
H090326	326	Regional Impact	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location	U-2405		New Route - Martin Luther King, Jr. Parkway Extension	NC 55	Cornwallis Road	NC 55 to Cornwallis Road. Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Facilities.	Durham, Durham County	

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H090531-A	8067	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	U-5324A	NC 54		SR 1110 (Barbee Chapel Road)	I-40	Widen Roadway to 6 Lanes with Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Facilities (Adjacent Multiuse Path)	Durham, Durham County	
H090531-B	531	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	U-5324B	NC 54		I-40	NC 751	Widen to Multi-Lanes with Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Accommodations	Durham, Durham County	
H090531-C	532	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	U-5324C	NC 54		NC 751	SR 1118 (Fayetteville Road)	Widen to Multi-Lanes with Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Accommodations	Durham, Durham County	
H090531-D	533	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	U-5324D	NC 54		SR 1118 (Fayetteville Road)	SR 1106 (Barbee Road)	Widen to Multi-Lanes with Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Accommodations	Durham, Durham County	
H090531-E	534	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	U-5324E	NC 54		SR 1106 (Barbee Road)	NC 55	Widen to Multi-Lanes with Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Accommodations	Durham, Durham County	

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H090555-A	555	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		NC 751		US 64	O'Kelly Chapel Road	Widen to 4 Lanes with Bicycle Lanes on Existing Location.		Not in 2040 MTP
H090555-B	1018	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		NC 751		Renaissance Parkway	O'Kelly Chapel Road	Widen Roadway to Four Lanes with a Median and Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Facilities As Appropriate.	Durham, Durham County	
H090558	558	Regional Impact	8 - Improve Interchange		I-85/US 70 Connector		US 70		Reconstruct interchange to Allow For Full Movements		
H090652	652	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		NC 751	Hope Valley Road	South Roxboro Road	NC 54	NC 751 (S. Roxboro Rd. to NC 54) Widen to 4-Lane, Bike Lanes, and Sidewalks.	Durham, Durham County	
H090961	961	Regional Impact	16 - Modernize Roadway		NC 86		US 70A	I-40	Construct Wide Outside Lanes.		

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H111011	1011	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		NC 751		NC 54	Renaissance Parkway	Widen Roadway to Four Lanes with a Median with Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Facilities As Appropriate.	Durham, Durham County	
H111036	1036	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		NC 86		US 70 Bypass	North of NC 57	Widen Roadway to Four Lanes with a Median and Improve intersections at US 70 Bypass and NC 57 .		Not in 2040 MTP
H128065	8065	Regional Impact	10 - Improve Intersection		NC 751	Hope Valley Road	SR 1183 (University Drive)		Construct Roundabout	Durham, Durham County	
H129645	9645	Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	U-4722	US 501	Roxboro Road	US 501 Bypass (Duke Street)	SR 1640 (Goodwin Road)	Widen to Six Lanes	Durham, Durham County	
H129685	9685	Regional Impact	10 - Improve Intersection	U-5516	US 501	Roxboro Road	SR 1448 (Latta Road) / SR 1639 (Infinity Road)		Add lanes through intersection	Durham, Durham County	
H090200	200	Division Needs	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	R-2825	SR 1009	South Churton Street	I-40	Eno River	I-40 to Eno River. Widen to Multi-Lanes with Landscaped Median, Bicycle Lanes, and Sidewalks, Widen Bridge No. 240 Over Southern Railroad.		
H090239	239	Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location	R-3438		New Route - Hillsborough Western Bypass	US 70	NC 57	US 70 to NC 57. Two Lanes on New Location.		Not in 2040 MTP

SPOTID	P.2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H090365	365	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway	U-2805	SR 1777	Homestead Road	SR 1009 (Old NC 86)	NC 86	SR 1009 (Old NC 86) to NC 86. Widen to include Bicycle Lanes, Sidewalks, Transit Accommodations, and Safety Improvements (Design May Vary Along Length).	Chapel Hill; Carrboro	
H090372-B	372	Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location	U-2831B		New Route - Briggs Avenue Extension	Riddle Road	SR 1951 (So-Hi Drive)	Riddle Road to SR 1951 (So-Hi Drive). Two Lanes on Multi-Lane Right of Way.	Durham, Durham County	Request removal. Not in 2040 MTP.
H090408	408	Division Needs	10 - Improve Intersection	U-3436	SR 1148, SR 1192	Eno Mountain Road, Mayo Street	SR 1006 (Orange Grove Road)		SR 1148 (Eno Mountain Road) and SR 1192 (Mayo Street) at SR 1006 (Orange Grove Road). Realign intersection and Make Safety Improvements. include Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalks.		
H090487-D	487	Division Needs	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	U-4716D	SR 1978	Hopson Street	SR 1999 (Davis Drive)	NC 54 (Miami Blvd)	Widen to Multi-Lanes	Durham, Durham County	
H090631	631	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway		SR 1734	Erwin Road	US 15/501	NC 751	US 15/501 to NC 751, Bike Lanes, Sidewalks, and Safety Improvements (Design May Vary Along Length).	Chapel Hill, Durham, Durham County	
H090632	632	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway		SR 1717	Jack Bennett Road	US 15/501	SR 1721 (Lystra Rd)	Jack Bennett Rd (SR 1717) (US 15/501 to Lystra Rd (SR 1721) Safety Improvements.	Chatham County	Request removal. Project is funded.

SPOTID	P.2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H090637	637	Division Needs	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		SR 1118	Fayetteville Road	Woodcroft Pkwy	SR 1171 (Riddle Road)	SR 1118 (Fayetteville Road) (Woodcroft Pkwy to Riddle Road (SR 1171)) Widen to 4-Lane Divided, Bikelanes and Sidewalks.	Durham, Durham County	
H090641	641	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway		SR 1780	Estes Drive	NC 86	Caswell Road	Estes Drive (NC 86 to Caswell Road) Widen Existing Roadway to include Two 12-Foot Travel Lanes, Four-Foot Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalks.		
H090647	647	Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location		SR 1006	New Route - Orange Grove Road	SR 1006 (Orange Grove Road)	US 70A	Orange Grove Road Extension (Orange Grove Road to US 70) with Sidewalks and Bicycle Lanes		
H090649	649	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway		SR 1762	Jeremiah Drive	SR 1721 (Lystra Road)	End of Road	Elevate Road For Flood Control.	Chatham County	Request removal.
H090651	651	Division Needs	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		SR 1004	Old Oxford Highway	US 501 Business (Roxboro Road)	Hamlin Road	Old Oxford Highway (Roxboro Road to Hamlin Road) Expand Capacity, Bike Lanes, and Sidewalks.	Durham, Durham County	Request removal. Not in 2040 MTP.
H090653	653	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway		SR 1721	Lystra Road	US 15/501	SR 1008 (Farrington Point Road)	Safety Improvements and 4' Bicycle Lanes.	Chatham County	
H090654	654	Division Needs	10 - Improve Intersection		SR 1010	Franklin Street/East Main Street	Merritt Mill Road (SR 1771)/Brewer Lane		Franklin Street/Merritt Mill Road/Brewer Ln/E Main Street intersection Improvements.	Chapel Hill; Carrboro	

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H090655	655	Division Needs	10 - Improve Intersection		SR 1780	Estes Drive	SR 1772 (Greensboro Street)		SR 1780 (Estes Drive)/SR 1772 (Greensboro Street) Construct Roundabout.	Carrboro	
H090826	826	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway		SR 1843	Seawell School Road	SR 1780 (Estes)	SR 1777 (Homestead)	Seawell School Road (Homestead to Estes) Bicycle Lanes, Sidewalks, Transit Accommodations, and intersection Safety Improvements (Design May Vary Along Length)	Chapel Hill	
H090859	859	Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location			New Route - T.W. Alexander Drive Extension	ACC Boulevard	Leesville Road	Extension of Tw Alexander Drive (4 Lanes New Location)	Durham, Durham County	
H090953	953	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway		SR 1009	Old NC 86	I-40	SR 1727 (Eubanks Road)	Widen Outside Lanes.		
H111005	1005	Division Needs	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		SR 1940	Glover Road	NC 147	SR 1926 (Angier Avenue)	Convert Existing Grade Separation at NC 147 to An interchange and Widen Roadway to Four Lanes with a Median and Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Facilities Asappropriate.	Durham, Durham County	Request removal. Not in 2040 MTP.
H111033	1033	Division Needs	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		SR 1118	Fayetteville Road	Renaissance Parkway	NC 751	Widen Roadway to Four Lanes with a Median and Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Facilities As Appropriate.	Durham, Durham County	

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H111034	1034	Division Needs	6 - Widen Existing Roadway and Construct Part on New Location		SR 1146	Roxboro Street	SR 1158 (Cornwallis Rd)	Martin Luther King, Jr. Parkway	Widen Existing Roadway to Multi-Lanes and Construct on New Location Multi-Lane Roadway with Bicycle, Pedestrian	Durham, Durham County	
H111056	1056	Division Needs	10 - Improve Intersection		SR 1771		SR 1008 (Mount Carmel Church Road)	1913 (Bennett Road)	Construct Roundabout and Related Safety Improvements at the Existing intersection of Mount Carmel Church Road and Bennett Road.	Chapel Hill	
H111096	1096	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway		SR 1727	Eubanks Road	SR 1729 (Rogers Road)	NC 86	Construct Bicycle Lanes, Sidewalks, Safety and intersection Improvements.		
H111162	1162	Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway		SR 1005	Old Greensboro Road	SR 2057 (Sturbridge Lane)	Alamance County Line	Add 4-Foot Paved Shoulders		
H129640-B	9641	Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location	U-4721B		New Route - Northern Durham Parkway	US 70	NC 98	Construct Multi-Lanes on New Location	Durham, Durham County	
H129640-C	9642	Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location	U-4721C		New Route - Northern Durham Parkway	NC 98	I-85	Construct Multi-Lanes on New Location	Durham, Durham County	

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
H129640-D	9643	Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location	U-4721D		New Route - Northern Durham Parkway	I-85	SR 1004 (Old Oxford Road)	Construct Multi-Lanes on New Location	Durham, Durham County	
H129640-E	9644	Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location	U-4721E		New Route - Northern Durham Parkway	SR 1004 (Old Oxford Road)	US 501 (Roxboro Road)	Construct Two Lanes, Part on New Location	Durham, Durham County	
new		Statewide Mobility	8 - Improve Interchange		US 15/501	Fordham Boulevard	NC 54	Raleigh Road	Interchange Improvements	Chapel Hill	2030 in 2040 MTP
new		Statewide Mobility	8 - Improve Interchange		US 15/501	Fordham Boulevard	NC 54	NC 86	Interchange improvements	Chapel Hill	Not in 2040 MTP
new		Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location			Elliot Road	US 15/501	Ephesus Church Road	Construct Extension of Existing Roadway on New Location	Chapel Hill	2020 in 2040 MTP
New		Statewide Mobility	8 - Improve Interchange		I-40	I-40/NC 54 (interchange)	I-40	NC 54	Upgrade interchange	Durham, Durham County	2030 in 2040 MTP
New		Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		US 15/501	US 15-501 Bypass	Pickett Rd	Cameron Blvd	Widen to six lanes	Durham, Durham County	2040 in 2040 MTP
New		Regional Impact	7 - Upgrade At-grade Intersection to Interchange or Grade Separation		NC 54	NC 54/Farrington Rd (grade separation)	Farrington Rd	NC 54	Grade separation	Durham, Durham County	2030 in 2040 MTP
New		Regional Impact	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		NC 98	NC 98 (Holloway St)	Oak Grove/Nichols Farm	Wake County Line	Widen to four lanes	Durham, Durham County	2040 in 2040 MTP
New		Division Needs	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		SR 1158	Cornwallis Rd	NC 55	Alexander Dr	Widen to four lanes	Durham, Durham County	2030 in 2040 MTP
New		Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location			Farrington Rd (realignment)	NC 54	Wendell Rd	New alignment	Durham, Durham County	2030 in 2040 MTP
New		Division Needs	16 - Modernize Roadway			Garrett Rd	NC 751	Old Durham Rd	Add turn lanes, bicycle lanes, sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	2030 in 2040 MTP
New		Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location			Woodcroft Pkwy Ext	Garrett Rd	Hope Valley Rd	New alignment	Durham, Durham County	2030 in 2040 MTP

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
New		Division Needs	1 - Widen Existing Roadway		SR 1118	Fayetteville Rd	Renaissance Pkwy	NC 751	Widen to four lanes	Durham, Durham County	2040 in 2040 MTP
New		Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location			Globe Rd Ext (Brier Creek Parkway)	Miami Blvd	Wake County Line	New alignment	Durham, Durham County	2040 in 2040 MTP
New		Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location			Leesville Rd Ext	Northern Durham Parkway	US 70/Page Rd Ext	New alignment	Durham, Durham County	2040 in 2040 MTP
New		Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location			Olive Branch Rd Ext	NC 98	Wake County Line	New alignment	Durham, Durham County	2040 in 2040 MTP
New		Division Needs	1 - Widen Existing Roadway			SW Durham Dr	Witherspoon Rd	Old Chapel Hill Rd	Widen to four lanes	Durham, Durham County	2040 in 2040 MTP
New		Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location			SW Durham Dr	I-40	NC 54	New alignment	Durham, Durham County	2040 in 2040 MTP

<b>Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects on Local Priority Lists - MPO can submit up to 20 Projects - NOT IN PRIORITY ORDER</b>		
	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Submitted by</b>
1	Estes Dr. (Greensboro St. to Carrboro Town Limits) – bicycle lanes, sidewalk (south side), and transit accommodations.	Carrboro
2	Morgan Creek Phase II (from the end of Phase I to Carrboro Town line) - multi-use path from University Lake to the western terminus of the first phase of the greenway and a multi-use path spur to BPW Club Rd.	Carrboro
3	NC 54 from James St. to Anderson Park – sidepath on the north side of the road to accommodate two-direction bicycle transportation.	Carrboro
4	SR 1919 (S Greensboro St) (Old Pittsboro Rd to NC 54) sidewalk on the west side	Carrboro
5	Campus to Campus Connector (Merritt Mill Rd to Carolina North Campus) – multi-facility signed route (on-road and trail) providing bicycle and pedestrian connectivity.	Chapel Hill
6	Finley Golf Course Rd (US 15-501/NC 54 to NC 54) - sidepath on one side or bicycle lanes	Chapel Hill
7	US 15-501 (Fordham Blvd) (Cleland Dr to Willow Dr) - improve existing off-road path and construct new section of sidepath	Chapel Hill
8	Farrington Point Rd / Old Farrington / Farrington Mill Rd (Durham County Line to Lystra Rd) - bicycle lanes	Chatham County
9	Mann's Chapel Rd (US 15-501 to Poythress Rd) - bicycle lanes	Chatham County
10	Mt. Carmel Church Rd (Orange County Line to Old Farrington Point Road) - bicycle lanes	Chatham County
11	O'Kelley Chapel Road (NC 751 to Wake County Line/Yates Store Rd) - sidepath between Wake County Line and American Tobacco Trail; bicycle lanes between American Tobacco Trail and NC 751	Chatham County
12	Bryant Bridge Trail (NC 55 to Kelly Bryant Bridge) – shared Use Path	Durham, Durham County
13	Cook Road (Fayetteville Rd. near Hillside High to Martin Luther King, Jr. Parkway) – Construct bicycle lanes and sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
14	Erwin Rd (NC 751 to County Line) - bicycle lanes or shoulders	Durham, Durham County
15	Geer Street (Midland Terrace to Glen School Rd) - bicycle lanes and sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
16	Guess Road (Hillcrest to Carver) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
17	Hardee Street (Holloway St. to Cheek Rd.) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
18	Horton Road (Hillandale Rd. to Roxboro Rd.) – Sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
19	LaSalle Street (Kangaroo to Sprunt) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
20	NC 54 (NC 55 to RTP) – sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
21	NC 55 (Riddle Road to Cecil Street) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
22	NC 98 (Holloway St) (SR 1838 (Junction Rd) to Chandler Rd) sidewalks.	Durham, Durham County
23	Pickett Road (Garrett Rd to Academy) - sidewalks and bicycle lanes	Durham, Durham County
24	Raynor Street (Miami Blvd to Hardee St.) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
25	SR 1800 (Cheek Rd) (SR 1670 (E Geer St) to Hardee St) - sidewalks.	Durham, Durham County
26	US 501 Bypass (Duke Street) (Murray Ave. to Roxboro Rd.) – sidewalks	Durham, Durham County
27	Pope Road / Ephesus Church Road (Old Durham-Chapel Hill Rd to Legion Road) - sidewalks and bicycle lanes	Durham, Durham County, Chapel Hill
28	Neighborhood sidewalk and trail connections to Cameron Park Elementary School from Cameron Street and St. Mary's Road.	Hillsborough
29	Orange Grove Road/I-40 Pedestrian Bridge and Supporting Sidewalk Improvements	Hillsborough, Orange County
30	Orange High School Road/Harold Latta Road Sidewalk Improvements	Orange County
31	Trail Connection from English Hill Lane to Buttonwood Drive	Orange County
32	Trail Connection from Patriots Pointe to Timbers Drive	Orange County

**Submitted List of Transit Projects for Prioritization 3.0.**

<b>Project Category</b>	<b>Transit Partners and Providers</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Year</b>
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit	2014+
Division Needs	DATA	Duke Regional Hospital Park and Ride	2016
Division Needs	DATA	South Square Park and Ride	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Southpoint Park and Ride	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Woodcroft Park and Ride	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Rougemont Park and Ride	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Northern Durham Park and Ride	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Village Neighborhood Transit Center	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Mebane-Hillsborough-Durham Expansion Buses (2)	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Bus Shelter Northgate	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Rougemont Expansion Buses (2)	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Holloway Transit Corridor Improvements	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	BOSS 147 (40 to Trent)	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Fay Street Office Building Improvements	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Bus Wash Upgrade	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Durham Station Pedestrian Safety Improvements	2016
Division Needs	CHT	Peak Hour Frequency Increase (5 40' buses; 2 articulated buses)	2016
Division Needs	CHT	1 Bus Shelter	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Southern Durham Neighborhood Transit Center	2017
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	DRX Expansion Buses (2)	2017
Division Needs	DATA	Fayetteville 1 Transit Corridor Improvements	2017
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Patterson Place Neighborhood Transit Center	2017
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Patterson Place Park and Ride	2017
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Regional Transit Center Ticket Building	2017
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Westgate at Target Shelter	2017
Division Needs	CHT	Service Improvements on US 15/501 Corridor (4 40' buses)	2017
Division Needs	DATA	Route 4 Expansion Buses (2)	2018
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Route 700 Expansion Buses (3)	2018
Division Needs	DATA	Fayetteville 2 Transit Corridor Improvements	2018
Division Needs	CHT	NC 54 Improvements (4 40' buses)	2018
Division Needs	DATA	Northern Durham Neighborhood Transit Center	2019
Division Needs	DATA	Roxboro Transit Corridor Improvements	2019
Division Needs	CHT	Pittsboro-Chapel Hill Express (1 40' buses)	2019
Division Needs	CHT	1 Bus Shelter	2019
Division Needs	CHT	MLK Enhanced Transit Service (4 articulated buses)	2020

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)  
DCHC MPO

**From:** DCHC MPO Lead Planning Agency

**Date:** December 11, 2013

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

---

This memorandum provides a summary status of tasks for projects in the FY 2013-2014 Unified Planning Work Program.

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

### ***FY 2013-2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Projects***

#### **Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)**

- ✓ Draft CTP Vision - December 2012
- ✓ CTP Deficiency Analysis & Needs Assessment – December 2013
- CTP Purpose Statement – February 2014
- Alternative Analysis – April 2014
- Draft CTP Maps /Draft CTP - June 2014
- MPO Adopt CTP – September 2014
- NCDOT BOT – December 2014
- Final CTP documentation and distribution – February 2015

#### **MPO Community Viz. Scenarios Planning and Visualization -2.0**

- ✓ Funding for local Community Viz 2.0 preparatory work – July 2013
- Geo-spatial database development for Community Viz 2.0 – February 2014
- Implementation in ArcGIS online – February- March 2014
- Field verification & Validation of data – February – June 2014
- Model/Scenario Building – FY 2015

#### **Update of the MPO Public Involvement Policy (PIP)**

- ✓ Reconcile MPO Public Involvement Policy with MAP-21 – December 2013
- Update of the MPO Public Involvement to reflect Map 21 and new MOU – April 2014
- Public Comment period of the Draft MAP -21 compliant PIP – May 2014
- TAC adopted of the Map-21 compliant PIP – June 2014

#### **MPO Title VI/Environmental Justice (EJ)/Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan**

- Desk Audit of MPO Title VI/LEP – October 2013
- Response to Title Audit – February 2014
- Implementation of the MPO Title VI and LEP – on going
- Monitoring of Title VI and LEP – On going

**SE Data Update – Employment /Housing/Population Verification**

- ✓ Setup of INFO-USA and Wood & Pole Employment Data - July/August 2013
- ✓ Geo-spatial development of INFOUSA employment data - December 2013
- 2013 Base Year Employment Verification – January /February 2014
- Update of Certificate of Occupancy from 2010-2013 – December 2013
- Establishment of 2013 Base Year Dwelling Unit data by TAZ – January 2014
- Development of Draft 2013 Base Year Employment & Dwelling Unit by TAZ – January/February 2014
- Employment/Dwelling Unit/Population data tabulation – December 2013
- Development of County control Totals – February 2014
- Local Review/Concurrence and Endorsement of Control Totals – March/April 2014
- SE Data Forecasts – 2014

**Base Year Data Collection (Traffic/Travel Time/Crash/Transit)**

- ✓ Fall data collection (Volume/Trucks/ Travel Time/Speed) –September to December 2013
- ✓ Fall Transit data collection - Augusta - December 2013
- Monitoring of Title VI and LEP – On going

**GIS Online/Data Management**

**MPO Congestion Management Process CMP**

**MPO Website Update**

**Triangle Regional Model Update**

**Map-21 Performance Measurement**

<b>Contract Number:</b> C202436	<b>Route:</b> US-70, SR-1322
<b>Physical Division:</b> 5	<b>County:</b> Durham
<b>Administrative Division:</b> 5	<b>TIP Number:</b> B-3638, R-5164F
<b>Length:</b> 1.233 miles	<b>Federal Aid Number:</b> BRSTP-70B(2)
<b>Resident Engineer:</b> Mark W. Luther, PE	<b>RE Phone Number:</b> (919)220-4680
<b>Location Description:</b> BRIDGE OVER CAMPUS DR AND APPROACHES ON US-70 BUS AND US-70 BUS (MAIN ST) FROM NINTH ST TO BUCHANAN ST.	
<b>Type of Work:</b> GRADING, DRAINAGE, PAVING, SIGNALS AND STRUCTURE.	
<b>Contractor Name:</b> DEVERE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC	
<b>Contract Amount:</b> \$1,969,734.20	<b>Cost Overrun/Underrun:</b> -2.98%
<b>Availability Date:</b> 7/30/2012	<b>Letting Date:</b> 6/19/2012
<b>Completion Date:</b> 3/18/2014	<b>Work Began:</b> 9/17/2012
<b>Revised Completion Date:</b> 3/25/2014	<b>Estimated Completion:</b> 3/18/2014
<b>Last Estimate Thru:</b> 10/31/2013	<b>Scheduled Progress:</b> 100%
<b>Last Estimate Paid:</b> 11/5/2013	<b>Actual Progress:</b> 99.8%

<b>Contract Number:</b> C202507	<b>Route:</b> I-540
<b>Physical Division:</b> 5	<b>County:</b> Durham
<b>Administrative Division:</b> 15	<b>TIP Number:</b> R-2635, U-4763B
<b>Length:</b> 18.8 miles	<b>Federal Aid Number:</b> TIFIA-540(2)
<b>Resident Engineer:</b> George C. Gibson, PE	<b>RE Phone Number:</b> (919)836-4873
<b>Location Description:</b> NC-540 FROM NC-55 NEAR APEX TO NC-54 NEAR RTP AND NC-147 FROM I-40 TO NC-540.	
<b>Type of Work:</b> DESIGN-BUILD LANDSCAPING.	
<b>Contractor Name:</b> SOUTHERN GARDEN, INC.	
<b>Contract Amount:</b> \$4,800,000.00	<b>Cost Overrun/Underrun:</b>
<b>Availability Date:</b> 8/15/2011	<b>Letting Date:</b> 4/21/2011
<b>Completion Date:</b> 7/1/2015	<b>Work Began:</b> 8/15/2011
<b>Revised Completion Date:</b>	<b>Estimated Completion:</b>
<b>Last Estimate Thru:</b>	<b>Scheduled Progress:</b>
<b>Last Estimate Paid:</b>	<b>Actual Progress:</b>

<b>Contract Number:</b> C202875	<b>Route:</b> I-540
<b>Physical Division:</b> 5	<b>County:</b> Durham
<b>Administrative Division:</b> 5	<b>TIP Number:</b> I-5307, I-5310
<b>Length:</b> 17.133 miles	<b>Federal Aid Number:</b> IM-0540(23)
<b>Resident Engineer:</b> Michelle H. Gaddy, PE	<b>RE Phone Number:</b> (919)840-0914
<b>Location Description:</b> I-540 FROM I-40 OVERPASS TO TRIANGLE TOWN BLVD, AND TRIANGLE TOWN BLVD FROM I-540 TO NEW ASPHALT PAVEMENT JOINT.	
<b>Type of Work:</b> MILLING, RESURFACING, SHOULDER RECONST, AND STR REHAB.	
<b>Contractor Name:</b> FSC II LLC DBA FRED SMITH COMPANY	
<b>Contract Amount:</b> \$8,384,157.45	<b>Cost Overrun/Underrun:</b> -3.82%
<b>Availability Date:</b> 2/27/2012	<b>Letting Date:</b> 1/17/2012
<b>Completion Date:</b> 11/15/2012	<b>Work Began:</b> 2/27/2012
<b>Revised Completion Date:</b> 4/4/2013	<b>Estimated Completion:</b> 6/30/2013
<b>Last Estimate Thru:</b> 6/22/2013	<b>Scheduled Progress:</b> 100%
<b>Last Estimate Paid:</b> 6/27/2013	<b>Actual Progress:</b> 98.14%

<b>Contract Number:</b> C202995	<b>Route:</b> NC-56, NC-96, US-15 US-158, SR-1103, SR-1127 SR-1135, SR-1192, SR-1671 SR-1675
<b>Physical Division:</b> 5	<b>County:</b> Durham
<b>Administrative Division:</b> 5	<b>TIP Number:</b>
<b>Length:</b> 0 miles	<b>Federal Aid Number:</b>
<b>Resident Engineer:</b> Mark W. Luther, PE	<b>RE Phone Number:</b> (919)220-4680
<b>Location Description:</b> BRG# 195 SR-1675, 16 US-15, 35 US-158, 43 SR-1103, 44 NC-96, 45 NC-56, 50 SR-1127, 54 SR-1135, 57 SR-1192 & 193 SR-1671.	
<b>Type of Work:</b> BRIDGE PRESERVATION	
<b>Contractor Name:</b> NHM CONSTRUCTORS, LLC	
<b>Contract Amount:</b> \$3,034,500.45	<b>Cost Overrun/Underrun:</b> 3.47%
<b>Availability Date:</b> 10/1/2012	<b>Letting Date:</b> 4/17/2012
<b>Completion Date:</b> 7/21/2013	<b>Work Began:</b> 10/1/2012
<b>Revised Completion Date:</b>	<b>Estimated Completion:</b> 9/30/2013
<b>Last Estimate Thru:</b> 8/15/2013	<b>Scheduled Progress:</b> 98%
<b>Last Estimate Paid:</b> 8/21/2013	<b>Actual Progress:</b> 96.62%

<b>Contract Number:</b> C203128	<b>Route:</b> SR-1978
<b>Physical Division:</b> 5	<b>County:</b> Durham

<b>Administrative Division:</b> 5	<b>TIP Number:</b> U-4716, U-4716A, U-4716B U-4716C
<b>Length:</b> 4.203 miles	<b>Federal Aid Number:</b> FRA-FR-HSR-0006-10-01-00
<b>Resident Engineer:</b> Michelle H. Gaddy, PE	<b>RE Phone Number:</b> (919)840-0914
<b>Location Description:</b> CLEGG PASSING SIDING & HOPSON RD GRADE SEPARATION AND CLOSING OF AT-GRADE RR CROSSINGS.	
<b>Type of Work:</b> GRADING, DRAINAGE, PAVING, STRUCTURE & TRACKBED.	
<b>Contractor Name:</b> FSC II LLC DBA FRED SMITH COMPANY	
<b>Contract Amount:</b> \$10,900,447.15	<b>Cost Overrun/Underrun:</b> 12.87%
<b>Availability Date:</b> 12/31/2012	<b>Letting Date:</b> 11/20/2012
<b>Completion Date:</b> 12/28/2015	<b>Work Began:</b> 1/30/2013
<b>Revised Completion Date:</b>	<b>Estimated Completion:</b> 12/28/2015
<b>Last Estimate Thru:</b> 11/7/2013	<b>Scheduled Progress:</b> 68%
<b>Last Estimate Paid:</b> 11/18/2013	<b>Actual Progress:</b> 48.63%

<b>Contract Number:</b> C203220	<b>Route:</b> NC-54, US-70, SR-1002 SR-1101, SR-1445, SR-1451 SR-1453, SR-1628, SR-1670 SR-1940, SR-1954, SR-2028
<b>Physical Division:</b> 5	<b>County:</b> Durham
<b>Administrative Division:</b> 5	<b>TIP Number:</b>
<b>Length:</b> 21.88 miles	<b>Federal Aid Number:</b>
<b>Resident Engineer:</b> Michelle H. Gaddy, PE	<b>RE Phone Number:</b> (919)840-0914
<b>Location Description:</b> US-70 FROM SR-1815 TO SR-1959, NC-54 FROM I-40 TO ORANGE COUNTY LINE AND 11 SECTIONS OF SECONDARY ROADS.	
<b>Type of Work:</b> MILLING, RESURFACING, AND SHOULDER RECONSTRUCTION.	
<b>Contractor Name:</b> CAROLINA SUNROCK LLC	
<b>Contract Amount:</b> \$4,789,367.50	<b>Cost Overrun/Underrun:</b> 4.51%
<b>Availability Date:</b> 3/18/2013	<b>Letting Date:</b> 12/18/2012
<b>Completion Date:</b> 10/18/2013	<b>Work Began:</b> 7/12/2013
<b>Revised Completion Date:</b>	<b>Estimated Completion:</b> 11/8/2013
<b>Last Estimate Thru:</b> 10/31/2013	<b>Scheduled Progress:</b> 100%
<b>Last Estimate Paid:</b> 11/6/2013	<b>Actual Progress:</b> 89.44%

<b>Contract Number:</b> C203273	<b>Route:</b>
<b>Physical Division:</b> 5	<b>County:</b> Durham
<b>Administrative Division:</b> 5	<b>TIP Number:</b>
<b>Length:</b> 1.189 miles	<b>Federal Aid Number:</b>
<b>Resident Engineer:</b> E. Boyd Tharrington, PE	<b>RE Phone Number:</b> (919)562-7000
<b>Location Description:</b> REPLACEMENT OF 4 BRIDGES IN DURHAM CO, 3 BRIDGES IN GRANVILLE CO AND 1 BRIDGE IN VANCE CO.	
<b>Type of Work:</b> DESIGN BUILD.	
<b>Contractor Name:</b> FSC II LLC DBA FRED SMITH COMPANY	
<b>Contract Amount:</b> \$8,800,000.00	<b>Cost Overrun/Underrun:</b> 0%
<b>Availability Date:</b> 4/29/2013	<b>Letting Date:</b> 3/19/2013
<b>Completion Date:</b> 9/30/2016	<b>Work Began:</b> 4/29/2013
<b>Revised Completion Date:</b>	<b>Estimated Completion:</b> 9/30/2016
<b>Last Estimate Thru:</b> 10/31/2013	<b>Scheduled Progress:</b> 5.63%
<b>Last Estimate Paid:</b> 11/1/2013	<b>Actual Progress:</b> 5.63%

<b>Contract Number:</b> DE00073	<b>Route:</b> I-40
<b>Physical Division:</b> 5	<b>County:</b> Durham
<b>Administrative Division:</b> 5	<b>TIP Number:</b> R-4049E
<b>Length:</b> 0 miles	<b>Federal Aid Number:</b> STP-000S(197)
<b>Resident Engineer:</b> David B. Moore	<b>RE Phone Number:</b> (919)250-4202
<b>Location Description:</b> I-40, I-440 AND US 1 IN WAKE AND DURHAM COUNTIES	
<b>Type of Work:</b> CCTV METAL POLE INSTALLATIONS	
<b>Contractor Name:</b> ALS OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC.	
<b>Contract Amount:</b> \$149,646.48	<b>Cost Overrun/Underrun:</b>
<b>Availability Date:</b> 9/16/2013	<b>Letting Date:</b> 8/28/2013
<b>Completion Date:</b> 3/14/2014	<b>Work Began:</b> 9/23/2013
<b>Revised Completion Date:</b>	<b>Estimated Completion:</b>
<b>Last Estimate Thru:</b>	<b>Scheduled Progress:</b>
<b>Last Estimate Paid:</b>	<b>Actual Progress:</b>

<u>Let (B)</u>	<u>TIP Sub No.</u>	<u>Div</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Let Type</u>	<u>Description</u>
09/13	U-4726HL	5	DURHAM	NON - DOT LET (Local)	DURHAM - SIDEWALK ON BARBEE STREET BETWEEN THE EXISTING SIDEWALK AT PEARSONTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND ORINDO DRIVE; ANDSIDEWALK IN FORMER FAYETTEVILLE STREET RIGHT OF WAY TO CONNECT THE DURHAM AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (DATA) ADMINISTRATIVEOFFICES WITH GEER STREET
04/14	U-0071	5	DURHAM	Raleigh Letting (LET)	DURHAM - EAST END CONNECTOR FROM NC 147 (BUCK DEAN FREEWAY)TO NORTH OF NC 98
06/14	W-5205N	5	DURHAM	Division POC Let (DPOC)	US 15/501 (UNIVERSITY DRIVE) AT SUMMIT STREET/FORESTWOOD DRIVE
09/14	C-4928	5	DURHAM	NON - DOT LET (Congestion Mitigation)	DURHAM - MORREENE ROAD FROM NEAL ROAD TO ERWIN ROAD
09/14	C-5178	5	DURHAM	NON - DOT LET (Congestion Mitigation)	DURHAM - CAMPUS WALK AVENUE, MORREENE ROAD TO LASALLE STREET AND LASALLE STREET, KANGAROO DRIVE TO ERWIN ROAD CONSTRUCTSIDEWALKS
09/14	EB-4707A	5	DURHAM	Division Design Raleigh Let (DDRL)	DURHAM/CHAPEL HILL FROM US 15/501 IN ORANGE COUNTY TO SR 1113 (POPE ROAD) IN DURHAM COUNTY BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN AND TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS
09/14	EB-4707B	5	DURHAM	Division Design Raleigh Let (DDRL)	DURHAM/CHAPEL HILL - SR 2220 (OLD DURHAM CHAPEL HILL ROAD) FROM SR 1113 (POPE ROAD) TO SR 1116 (GARRETT ROAD)
09/14	U-4724	5	DURHAM	NON - DOT LET (Bicycle and Pedestrian)	DURHAM - CORNWALLIS RD FROM SOUTH ROXBORO RD TO UNIVERSITY DR
01/15	EB-5514	5	DURHAM	NON - DOT LET (Bicycle and Pedestrian)	NC 751 /SR 1183-2220/ NON-SYSTEM (UNIVERSITY DRIVE) FROM SR1116 (GARRETT ROAD) TO SR 1158 (CORNWALLIS ROAD)
04/15	U-3308	5	DURHAM	Raleigh Letting (LET)	DURHAM - NC 55 (ALSTON AVENUE) FROM NC 147 (I. L. "BUCK" DEAN FREEWAY) TO US 70 BUSINESS - NC 98 (HOLLOWAY STREET)
06/15	U-5517	5	DURHAM	Raleigh Letting (LET)	NC 54 FROM SR 1110 (FARRINGTON ROAD) TO I-40 EASTBOUND ENTRANCE RAMP IN DURHAM
09/15	C-5182	5	DURHAM	NON - DOT LET (Congestion Mitigation)	DURHAM - HOPE VALLEY ROAD CONSTRUCT SIDEWALKS AND BIKE LANES BETWEEN MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BOULEVARD PARKWAY AND US 15-501 BUSINESS
09/15	C-5183A	5	DURHAM	NON - DOT LET (Congestion Mitigation)	DURHAM - CONSTRUCT SIDEWALKS
09/15	C-5183B	5	DURHAM	NON - DOT LET (Congestion Mitigation)	DURHAM - CONSTRUCT SIDEWALKS
11/15	U-5516	5	DURHAM	Raleigh Letting (LET)	FROM US 501 (ROXBORO ROAD) TO SR 1448 (LATTA ROAD) / SR 1639 (INFINITY ROAD) IN DURHAM
08/16	I-5331	5	DURHAM	Division POC Let (DPOC)	INTERSTATE PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE (IPPM) I-85 FROM NORTH OF MP 183 TO THE GRANVILLE COUNTY LINE
03/17	I-5334	5	DURHAM	Division Design Raleigh Let (DDRL)	I-85 FROM SOUTH OF US 15-501 TO NORTH OF US 70
06/17	B-4943	5	DURHAM	Raleigh Letting (LET)	RELPACE BRIDGE 20 OVER DIAL CREEK ON SR 1616
05/14	Small Constr.	5	DURHAM	Division POC Let (DPOC)	Barbee Rd at Herndon Rd - RBT
10/14	SS-4905BI	5	DURHAM	Division POC Let (DPOC)	SR 1004 (Old Oxford Road) at SR 1648 (Danube Lane)
11/14	SS-4905BM	5	DURHAM	Division POC Let (DPOC)	Carver St. (SR 1407) at Broad St./Kenan Rd. - Mini-Roundabout
07/14	EB-4411D	5	DURHAM	Division POC Let (DPOC)	Paved Shoulders on Barbee Chapel Rd, Farrington Rd, & Stagecoach Rd w/ left-turn lane at Farrington Mill Rd.
	SS 4906BP 43696.1.1 43696.3.1	5	DURHAM	Division annual needs contract	Upgrade SR 1327 (Gregson St) at Club Blvd replace existing ped heads, add flashing yellow arrows, remove concrete island in NW quadrant, cut back islands on north and west legs

<u>Let (B)</u>	<u>TIP Sub No.</u>	<u>Div</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Let Type</u>	<u>Description</u>
	SS 4905BR 43781.1.1 43781.3.1	5	DURHAM	Division annual needs contract	Upgrade NC 55 (Alston Ave) at NC 147 NB Off Ramp/Gann St with flashing yellow arrows for NBLT onto Gann St and SBLT from NC 55 onto NC 147 SB on ramp
	SS 4905BI 43567.1.1 43567.3.1	5	DURHAM	Division annual needs contract	Install traffic signal and construct left turn lanes on SR 1004 (Old Oxford Rd)
	SS 4905BT 43783.1.1 43783.3.1	5	DURHAM	Division annual needs contract	Upgrade traffic signal to flashing yellow arrow on EB Club Blvd and install pedestrian accommodations on all legs of the intersection

**NCDOT DIV 7 ACTIVE PROJECTS LOCATED IN DCHCMPO**

TAC 12/11/2013 Attachment 18

TIP/WBS #	Description	Let Date	Completion Date	Contractor	Status	Cost	Comments
ER-2971G 3607.3.09	Widen roadway, install curb and gutter and construct sidewalk along SR 1750 (Estes Drive) between Burlage Circle and SR 1010 (Franklin Street) in <b>Chapel Hill</b> .	5/2/13	8/15/13		100% Complete. Final review pending.	\$200,000	Small Construction/ Division Enhancement; MA w/TOCH, LGA
I-5312	Mill & Resurface I-85 from east of I-40 to the Durham County Line.	10/15/2013	9/1/2014	Carolina Sunrock	Begin construction Spring 2014	\$4,300,000	TIP
U-0624 C203175 34762.3.4	Widening , Grading, Drainage, Paving & Signals on NC 86 (S. Columbia St.) From SR -1906 (Purefoy Rd) to SR 1902 (Manning Dr) in <b>Chapel Hill</b> .	10/16/2012	12/28/2014	Triangle Grading and Paving	67%Complete 50% Schedule	\$4,565,147	TIP
U-2803 C203028 34860.3.1	Widening of SR 1919 (Smith Level Road) from Rock Haven Road to Bridge # 88 over Morgan Creek in <b>Carrboro</b> .	12/18/2012	5/14/2015	Yates Construction	33% Complete 50% Schedule	\$4,946,197	TIP
U-3306 C202266 34913.3.ST1	Grading, Drainage, Paving, Signals, Curb, and Gutter and Retaining Walls on SR 1733 (Weaver Dairy Road) From NC 86 to Old Sterling Road in <b>Chapel Hill</b> .	7/20/2010	Anticipated 5/1/14 due to extra work, Partial acceptance pending.	Yates Construction	100% Complete 100% Schedule	\$9,584,886	ARRA / TIP
W-5318 C203193	Geometric Improvement, Paved Shoulders, Resurfacing and Rumble Strips on NC 86 from NC 57 to Caswell Co. line.	2/19/2013	12/15//13	Carolina Sunrock	76% Complete 100% Schedule	\$4,750,000	High Hazard Safety
43745	Installation of a traffic signal on SR 1750 (Estes Drive) at Library Drive (non system) in <b>Chapel Hill</b> .		4/1/13	Awaiting ped head installation by Town	NCDOT forces - 100% Complete	\$75,000	Small Construction Funds
SS-4907AW 43295.3.1	Installing guardrail on NC 751 at Bridge 16, 0.2 miles south of US 70, east of Hillsborough.		11/15/2013		Work complete pending RTE inspection	\$60,000	State Spot Safety
W-5207E 45337.1.5	Installation of a roundabout on SR 1734 (Erwin Rd.) and SR 1791 (Mt. Moriah Rd.) near <b>Chapel Hill</b>	10/17/2013	2/5/2015	Triangle Grading & Paving	Contract awarded	\$640,000	High Hazard Safety
TIP/WBS #	Description	Let Date	Completion Date		Status	Cost	Comments
ER-2971G 3607.3.13	Construct sidewalks on SR 1900 (Mason Farm Road) from US 15/501 (Fordham Blvd.) to Highland Woods Road in <b>Chapel Hill</b> .	TBD	Spring 2014		Town acquiring R/W - Easement from UNC	\$30,000	Division Enhancement; MA w/TOCH, LGA

W-5207E 45337.1.5	Installation of a roundabout on SR 1734 (Erwin Rd.) and SR 1791 (Mt. Moriah Rd.) near <b>Chapel Hill</b>	10/17/2013	2/5/2015	Triangle Grading & Paving	TAC 12/11/2013 Attachment 18 Contract awarded	\$640,000	High Hazard Safety
W-5207I 45337.1.9	Funds for preliminary engineering on SR 1005 (Jones Ferry Road) and Davie Street) in <b>Carrboro</b>	Spring 2014	TBD		Meet with city/utilities and others 11/8/13. Sidewalk issue at Kangaroo.	\$50,000	High Hazard Safety
SS -4907V 42423.3 42423.1	Realign intersection of SR 1005 (Old Greensboro Rd.) @ SR 1951 (White Cross Rd.)	6/15/2014	TBD		Alternate Design in progress	\$198,000	Spot Safety- State
EB-4411E 36333.3.FD5	Install 2 ft. paved shoulders (including resurfacing) along both sides of NC 86 between Whitfield Rd. and US 70 Business in Orange County	12/1/2013	TBD		Funding Transfer pending	\$500,000	Bike/Ped enhancement

## DIV 7 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTERED PROJECTS IN DCHCMPO

TIP/WBS #	Description	Let/Start Date	Completion Date	Status	Cost	Comments
C-5184 46234.3.1	Riverwalk Trail Phase III - Construct a paved off-road trail along Eno River connecting River Park, Gold Park and the Occoneechee Mountain State Natural Area and construct sidewalk to provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to the Greenway in <b>Hillsborough</b>	3/1/14	TBD	Design in progress, R/W authorization pending	\$610,000	CMAQ
EB-4707A (Orange) EB-4707B (Durham)	Bicycle improvements(Bikeway and signals) on Durham/ Chapel Hill (SR 1838/SR 2220)from SR 1116 (Garrett Road) in Durham County to US 15-501 in Orange County	9/30/2014 (D5DRL)	TBD	Design in progress, R/W -1/1/14	\$4,900,000	Enhancement - Bike and Ped.
EL-4828 / 40245.1.1 40245.3.1	Design & construction of multi-use pedestrian /bicycle path along Morgan Creek from Smith Level Road to the Weatherhill Pointe neighborhood & construct a multi-use pedestrian /bicycle path along Morgan Creek from Smith Level road west to the Berryhill Neighborhood in <b>Carrboro</b>	6/31/14	TBD	Design in progress	\$480,000	STP-DA; MA w/TOC
SR-5000S 40922.1.18	Education, encouragement, evaluation, and neighborhood outreach for Carrboro Elementary School			Program underway	\$12,865	Safe Routes to Schools; MA w/TOC
SR-5001AE	Construct 870 linear feet of 5' sidewalk on Elm Street from existing sidewalk near Weaver Street to Shelton Street in <b>Carrboro</b>	2/21/12	12/31/12	Construction complete; Final review complete, closeout pending	\$300,000	Safe Routes to Schools; MA w/TOC
SR-5001AR	Construct 320' of 5' sidewalk on Culbreth Road between Cobbleridge Rd. in Chapel Hill and Rossburn Rd. in <b>Chapel Hill</b>	4/12/12	9/30/13	Construction complete; Final closeout pending	\$50,000 SRTS/\$108,000 STPDA	SRTS/STP-DA; MA w/TOCH
U-4726DC 36268.3.4	Wilson Park Multi-Use Path in <b>Carrboro</b>	6/7/12	11/26/12	Construction complete; Final review complete, closeout pending	\$129,431	STP-DA; MA w/TOC
U-4726DD	Construct sidewalk on Rogers Road from Homestead Road to Meadow Run Ct. in <b>Carrboro</b>	10/31/13	4/30/14	Plans under review	\$428,960	STP-DA; MA w/TOC
U-4726DE (replaces EL- 4994)	Construct Bolin Creek Multi-use Path from Homestead Road to Chapel Hill High School in <b>Carrboro</b>	TBD	TBD	Design underway	\$590,000	STP-DA; MA w/TOC
U-4726DF	Bicycle detection at Signalized Intersections in <b>Carrboro</b>	1/1/14	TBD	Design underway	\$36,000	STP-DA; MA w/TOC
U-4726IF	Design and install stairs from the sidewalk on the north side of Franklin St. to the Bolin Creek Trail in <b>Chapel Hill</b>	TBD	TBD	Supplemental agreement to remove construction; Town to pay for construction	\$20,000 PE	STP-DA; MA w/TOCH

<b>DIV 7 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTERED PROJECTS IN DCHCMPO</b>
--

TIP/WBS #	Description	Let/Start Date	Completion Date	Status	Cost	Comments
U-4726IG	Morgan Creek Trail Phase 2 - Construct 10' wide greenway from existing Fan Branch Trail near Culbreth Rd. and US 15/501 to Phase 1 in <b>Chapel Hill</b>	9/12/12	11/1/13	Construction underway	\$1,310,000 / additional funds \$1,000,000 8/12	STP-DA; MA w/TOCH

**ACTIVE NCDOT DIVISION 8 PROJECTS IN DCHCMPO**

TAC 12/11/2013 Attachment 18

Map #	TIP/WBS #	Description	Let Date	Completion Date	Status	Cost	Contractor	Comments
	W-5208G/ 4 5338.3.7	SR-1717 (Jack Bennett Rd), Chatham Co. Realign horizontal curve	<b>April 2014</b>	Not Available	Roadway design plans complete; ROW acquisition in progress	\$803K	Not Available	After ROW is acquired, the process of moving utilites will begin.
	C-5176	American Tobacco Trail (Chatham Co.) - New Hope Church Road Trail Head Park & Ride Lot. Accomodations for 100 spaces including parking for Horse Trailers, Restroom facilities, picnic area and public art.	Fall 2013	6/30/2015	Plans and Specifications are complete and have been submitted to NCDOT	\$1.2M	Coulter, Jewell Thames P.A.	Plans and Specifications are expected to be approved by the end of November. Bidding the project for construction will begin.

**ACTIVE NCDOT DIVISION 8 PROJECTS IN DCHCMPO**

Map#	TIP/WBS #	Description	Let Date	Completion Date	Status	Cost	Comments
<b>SURFACE TREATMENT</b>							
<b>RESURFACING</b>							
24	8C.20191.20	SR 1730 Wake Rd/Grandale Dr From Durham County Line to Wake County Line (0.494 miles) - Asphalt Surface Course	7/1/13	6/30/14	Work to begin 9/3/13	\$2.9M	Patch resurfacing Chatham resurfacing package

## NC Board of Transportation won't give local elected officials more 'local' input on DOT projects

The News and Observer Road Worrier Posted by Bruce Siceloff on November 7, 2013

RALEIGH — The state Board of Transportation refused Thursday to give local elected officials a bigger share of the “local” input that will help determine where DOT dollars are spent in the future.

Board members agreed unanimously to stick with an earlier decision – criticized by local officials and by transportation leaders in the House of Representatives – to assign half of the “local” vote on transportation project priorities to DOT’s 14 division engineers.

When DOT decides under the new Strategic Mobility Formula how to distribute money for regional and local improvements, division engineers will have the same say as local metropolitan and rural planning organization boards, whose members are town and county elected officials.

Division engineers are regional administrators stationed across the state, with job descriptions that explicitly require political loyalty to the governor. Board members are the governor’s political appointees, and they work closely with their respective division engineers.

Ned Curran of Charlotte, the state board chairman, disputed the idea that local elected leaders might know more about community needs.

“I was perplexed with the notion that division engineers are not intimately familiar with conditions throughout their jurisdiction,” Curran said. He said it would be wrong to give local officials an edge over the DOT division engineers.

“Equal is equal,” Curran said. “If we leave it at 50-50, no one is advantaged. And that’s the foundation for a working, trusting relationship.”

The Strategic Mobility Formula, proposed by Gov. Pat McCrory and enacted by the legislature this year, is aimed at making smarter use of transportation dollars by blending local input with objective, “data-driven” analysis of highway, transit, rail, ferry, aviation and bicycle-pedestrian projects.

DOT’s objective analysis counts for 100 percent of the rating on major, statewide projects, 70 percent on regional projects, and 50 percent on local projects in the 14 DOT divisions. The law looks to “local” input for the remaining 30 percent of the vote on regional projects and 50 percent of the vote on local division projects.

House members of the Joint Legislative Transportation Oversight Committee complained at a recent meeting that they had not intended for DOT officials to claim any part of that local vote. Some Senate members agreed with the DOT approach.

Raleigh Mayor Nancy McFarlane, chair of the N.C. Metropolitan Mayors Coalition, and Huntersville Mayor Jill Swain, the urban group’s vice chair, urged DOT officials in an Oct. 3 letter to give more clout to the local officials in their respective areas.

“We believe this large chorus of voices should not bear equal weight to two division engineers who ultimately do not report to the people in our (regions), but to the NCDOT in Raleigh,” McFarlane and Swain wrote.

A group of local and DOT planners advising DOT administrators on the new law had recommended a small shift in the balance on division-level project decisions. Give local planning boards 30 percent of the vote and the DOT division engineers 20 percent, they said, instead of an even share of 25 percent apiece.

Curran protested that this recommendation would give local elected officials “150 percent of the weight of the division engineer.” The Board of Transportation voted unanimously to reject the proposed change.

Local planners said the proposed 30-20 split would have been in line with a previous arrangement that gave the local planning boards a bigger share of the vote on local DOT projects.

“This is a disappointing step backward,” said Tyler Meyer, Greensboro's transportation planning director.

Patrick Flanagan of New Bern, planning director for the nine-county rural Eastern Carolina Council, called the board vote a “setback” but said it probably would not make a big difference in future project decisions.

“We would have been happy to have more say, but we don't feel like we're really getting cheated on this,” Flanagan said. “If we're not on the same page with the division engineer, that doesn't do anybody any good.”

## **Wake County isn't crowded enough to support rail transit, experts say**

The News and Observer Posted by Bruce Siceloff on November 12, 2013

RALEIGH — A visiting panel of transportation experts urged Wake County leaders Tuesday to put aside the county's long-range transit plan, focus on building better bus service and postpone talk of launching commuter trains and light rail service.

Wake won't be ready for trains until it has heavier urban density, worse traffic jams and more people riding buses who could be expected to ride trains later, they said.

“You're not large, yet,” said Sam R. Staley, a Florida State University economist associated with the Los Angeles-based Reason Foundation, a libertarian think tank. “The mobility needs of most people in Wake County and most people in this region are still being served quite well by the existing transportation system.”

Staley and two other panelists were recruited by County Manager David Cooke to advise county commissioners on a trains-and-buses plan that has not been aired in public since Cooke presented it to the commissioners two years ago. The three visitors spent Tuesday morning with commissioners and the afternoon with regional planners and transit advocates.

Cal Marsella, who ran the Denver regional transit agency for 14 years, said a proposed 37-mile commuter train line from Durham to Garner probably would cost more than expected and was not likely to attract enough riders.

“I look at ridership, at cost per rider,” Marsella told commissioners. “The numbers aren't great. I'm not giving up on rail here, but I do think the cost is rather exorbitant.”

The panelists' go-slow advice vindicated Republican skeptics on the commissioners board, who have balked at following Orange and Durham counties in approving new transit plans with a half-cent sales tax to help pay for the improvements.

“What I’m hearing them say is: What you did was wise,” Commissioner Paul Coble of Raleigh said later. “Don’t rush into it just because it’s the thing to do. Understand what you’re going to do and what it’s going to cost you.”

Commissioner Joe Bryan of Knightdale, the board chairman, said he probably will call for a fresh look at the Wake transit plan, to develop new proposals that could command broad support across the county.

That might mean hiring consultants to develop a new plan, Coble said – or perhaps, as one panelist suggested, two consultants to draft competing plans that would focus on buses or on trains.

‘Things we can do’

Commissioner Betty Lou Ward of Raleigh, a transit advocate who has chafed at the board’s refusal since 2011 to discuss the Wake plan, said later that the panelists’ caution on rail transit was sobering. But she said Wake leaders must push ahead now and develop a strong transit plan.

“I do realize that we are a small metro area,” Ward said. “We may not be ready for light rail – and if not, so be it. But let’s go on and talk about buses and the things we can do to bring multimodal transportation to Wake County.”

The panelists echoed recent criticism from business community members who want Wake to try bus rapid transit – a hybrid breed of transportation that is less expensive and more flexible than rail, but faster and more enjoyable than regular buses. Some U.S. cities have begun to invest in this service, sometimes giving buses their own right of way and amenities that include train-style boarding platforms.

“Bus rapid transit, where you have dedicated facilities, can actually move as many people as a light rail line,” Staley said. “If it’s designed properly and set in the right corridors and the right places and the right stops.”

‘Incremental’

The big word of the day was “incremental.” The three panelists said they had not shared notes in advance, but they all suggested that Wake build an improved transit system one step at a time.

“Do something now and more later,” said Steve E. Polzin of the University of South Florida.

They urged regional leaders to try things they have not considered before.

Wake County could invest now in the needed right of way to widen roads for bus-rapid transit lines, with the option to convert these lanes to light rail in future years. If the state Department of Transportation adds toll-express lanes to Interstate 40 – for drivers who would pay for a faster, less-congested drive – the same lanes also could provide faster trips for bus-rapid-transit riders, they said.

The panelists said Wake County was not likely to attract the federal funding it would need for a light rail line, and it doesn’t have a dense downtown employment center that would support rush-hour commuter trains.

“It’s a mass mode,” Polzin said. “And you need mass to make it work cost-effectively.”

## **\$540M DOT project to improve NC's railway service**

WRAL.com By Brian Shrader Posted November 21, 2013

Ken Aiman takes the Amtrak Carolinian No. 80 from Cary to Wilson every week for business.

"I get my laptop out, log on to my network and keep on working while I'm on the trip," he said.

He's not alone. More people seem to be taking the train these days.

North Carolina's state-supported Piedmont and Carolinian trains, the North Carolina Department of Transportation says, continue to be among the most rapidly growing in the Amtrak system, setting new ridership and revenue records.

Last year, ridership on the Piedmont service between Raleigh and Charlotte increased 4.7 percent, and revenue increased 8.1 percent, to more than \$3.3 million.

Ridership on the Carolinian, which runs once a day between Charlotte and New York City, increased 3.6 percent, and revenue increased by 6.4 percent, to more than \$19.8 million.

It's the fourth consecutive year of positive growth for both routes.

That's why the state is investing \$540 million through the Piedmont Improvement Program to expand and improve the rail corridor between Raleigh and Charlotte for passenger and freight trains.

Plans include adding two daily trips of the Piedmont service – bringing the total to five daily trips – and building 13 bridges at many railroad crossings to keep drivers and pedestrians safer.

The plan also calls for renovating train stations in Cary, High Point and Burlington and refurbishing and adding passenger rail cars to the fleet.

It also will add 28 miles of track between Greensboro and Charlotte to help trains pass each other and stay on time and will close 23 potentially dangerous railroad crossings.

Currently, projects are underway at Hopson Road in Durham and in Salisbury. Additional projects are set to begin in 2014 and 2015, with a completion date in early 2017.

Passengers like Aiman say more service would be great – anything to avoid a road trip.

"(The train) is much more comfortable," he said.

## **State searches for Transportation Funding**

The Daily TarHeel By Kathryn Trogdon Published November 25, 2013

Due to rising fuel efficiency standards, the North Carolina and federal governments will have to find alternative revenues to fund transportation as the biggest source of revenue - the motor fuels tax - continues to decline.

In August 2012, President Barack Obama finalized the Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards (CAFE), which will require cars and light-duty trucks made by foreign and domestic car manufacturers to meet a 54.5 miles per gallon fuel efficiency by 2025.

Former U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood said in an interview earlier this month that raising the CAFE standards was one of the biggest successes in transportation in the last few years.

"The president said we need to raise that much higher to take (carbon dioxide) out of the air and to get the car manufacturers to know what the standard is," he said.

But as cars become more efficient, gas sales will decrease and less revenue will be collected from the motor fuels tax, which is the biggest source of transportation revenue on a federal and state level.

"We also know that as we raise the gasoline standards, we're going to lose revenue," LaHood said. "And Congress is going to have to address this."

LaHood said Congress could address the revenue shortfall by implementing more tolls nationwide or using a method called vehicle miles traveled, where people are charged by the number of miles they travel.

He said the gas tax ought to be raised 10 cents per gallon, since it hasn't been raised in two decades, and automatically adjusting the tax annually.

But raising the gas tax alone wouldn't be enough to make up for revenue shortfall, LaHood said, so other sources of revenue must be considered.

"Everything has to be on the table," he said.

#### **Alternative sources**

The shortfall will also affect states' transportation revenue - in North Carolina, 60 percent of the transportation budget comes from the motor fuels tax, but by 2025, the state will have lost about \$1.9 billion because of decreased fuel consumption.

Burt Tasaico, the N.C. Department of Transportation state program analysis engineer, said the NCDOT needs to look at alternate sources of revenue, including interstate tolling, raising the highway use tax or gas tax and increasing vehicle registration fees.

By 2040, interstate tolling would produce \$42 billion, a higher gas tax \$19 billion and increasing registration and driver's license fees \$6 billion.

Another option is to levy a local property tax to pay for transportation, Tasaico said.

"The problem personally that I think you run with something like that is trying to convince local governments that property taxes ought to pay for transportation," he said. "Whichever way we choose to do it, it's going to be difficult."

#### **'Choose our poison'**

N.C. Sen. Bill Rabon, R-Brunswick and a vice chairman on the Senate's transportation committee, said nothing has been done by the federal or state government to address the impending shortfall.

"The price of doing business is going to continue to rise, and the cost of the highways is going to continue to rise, and the money is going to go down," he said.

Rabon said he has been investigating transportation funding solutions for three years, but few legislators shared his concern.

He said he thinks the N.C. General Assembly will address the issue in the next two years - but he said it is not likely legislators will ever raise the gas tax.

"We're just going to have to choose our poison," he said. "If we continue as we have been, we will tie things to user fees."

The NCDOT is looking at what other states are doing to make up for the revenue shortfall. For example, Virginia is collecting additional transportation revenue through a hike in the state sales tax.

Chapel Hill Mayor Mark Kleinschmidt said he preferred alternatives similar to the vehicle miles traveled option.

"I've always been a fan and supported taxes that target the user," he said. "Those revenues are important to us for being able to maintain our roads and make sure our citizens can easily and safely move around the Triangle."

## Road Worrier: NCDOT gets tougher with TriEx deadbeats; tolls to rise

The Road Worrier By Bruce Sicheloff Posted December 2, 2013

RALEIGH — State toll collectors are about to get tough with deadbeats who don't pay their bills for trips on the 18-mile Triangle Expressway.

Starting next year, 73,000 TriEx drivers with delinquent toll bills will find collections agencies hounding them to pay up. And they will be blocked from renewing their automobile registrations with the state Division of Motor Vehicles.

The state Department of Transportation said it is taking these new steps to collect delinquent tolls from drivers who are at least three months late in paying for their TriEx trips. The delinquent bills include tolls worth more than \$815,000 – plus \$3.4 million in late fees and civil penalties.

These are folks who receive toll bills in the mail, based on photos of their license plates. DOT levies the late fees, which pile up fast at \$6 per month, and the \$25 penalties to prod drivers to pay their bills and to open N.C. QuickPass transponder accounts. Transponder users pay automatically, with tolls at a lower rate, and DOT saves the expense of billing them by mail.

Drivers began paying electronic tolls on the first section of TriEx in January 2012, and the complete expressway has been open since last December. But DOT held off using these new enforcement measures until now.

“Our whole plan was to give everyone a chance to true up, prior to taking any collection activity or registration hold activity,” said John Breedlove, operations manager for the N.C. Turnpike Authority.

TriEx traffic volume has increased steadily this year, with toll collections running ahead of projections in a traffic-and-revenue forecast that was used as the basis for financing the project.

There are no tollbooths on TriEx, no drivers pitching quarters into baskets, but most folks pay their way. By the end of September, DOT had collected more than \$13 million in tolls.

“That’s the good story,” Breedlove said. “People drive the road and pay the tolls.”

But some drivers never receive bills for their TriEx trips. DOT sends out toll bills only for cars registered in North Carolina or in other states with which North Carolina has reciprocal DMV agreements that make it easy to match license plates with owners and their addresses.

Sometimes TriEx drivers with out-of-state plates call DOT or the Road Worrier to report that they’ve never received a bill. They don’t want to be surprised with a pile of late fees.

Breedlove said there are about 30 states where drivers are not likely to receive TriEx bills now. That should change in coming months, he said, when DOT works out an arrangement with a private company to get car ownership and billing address details for those exotic license plates.

“Once we get that process in place, they will be invoiced,” Breedlove said. State law allows DOT to bill only for toll trips within the past 90 days.

Meanwhile, these far-flung drivers account for only a small portion of TriEx traffic. Some of them pay already, because they use E-ZPass transponders in 14 Northeastern states or SunPass transponders in Florida. Of DOT’s 73,000 delinquent TriEx customers, Breedlove said, only 8 percent are from outside North Carolina.

The new collection actions will be rolled out gradually in the first months of 2014. TriEx drivers who owe DOT more than \$500 are receiving letters that give them a Jan. 31 deadline to pay. After that, the collection agency takes over and DMV blocks the registration renewal.

The pay-up deadline is Feb. 28 for customers who owe between \$300 and \$499 in tolls, fees and penalties. For those who owe less than \$300, it's March 31.

Starting in April, DOT will use collection agencies and registration holds on everybody with toll bills at least 90 days overdue. For any bill unpaid after six months, the state Department of Revenue will be asked to garnish the owner's tax refunds.

No more Mr. Nice DOT.