

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
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC)**

**December 18, 2013
9:00 a.m.**

**Committee Room
2nd Floor Durham City Hall**

- 1. Roll Call**
- 2. Adjustments to the Agenda**
- 3. Public Comments**

CONSENT AGENDA

- 4. Approval of November 20, 2013 TCC Meeting Minutes Attachment 4**

A copy of the November 20, 2013 minutes is enclosed as Attachment 4.

TCC Action: Approve minutes of the November 20, 2013 TCC meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

- 5. 2013 Coordinated Public Transportation – Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP)
Attachment 5, 5A, 5B
Andy Henry, LPA Staff
Sherry Taylor Lewis, LPA Staff**

The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the CPT-HSTP and released it for public comment at their November meeting. The TAC requested that the TCC review past MPO policies and provide specific guidance on implementation of the plan, mechanisms to continue coordination, and the collection of performance measures/evidence-based data for grant projects. The TAC conducted a public hearing at their December meeting.

Attachment 5 is a memorandum that addresses the TAC comments. Attachment 5A is a portion of the 2007 CPT-HSTP with the project selection process. Attachment 5B is a compilation of comments received. The public comment period ended December 10th. A copy of the draft plan can be found at the following MPO Web page:

http://www.dchcmo.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=104&Itemid=35

TCC Action: Recommend a final Coordinated Public Transportation – Human Service Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP) to the TAC.

6. Prioritization 3.0 – Approval of Submission of Projects**Attachment 6, 6A, 6B****Ellen Beckmann, LPA Staff****Dale McKeel, LPA Staff****Andy Henry, LPA Staff**

A TCC Subcommittee met on December 5, 2013 to discuss Prioritization 3.0. Attachment 6 is a memo describing Prioritization 3.0. Attachment 6A displays the subcommittee's recommendation for projects to be submitted for Prioritization 3.0. The bicycle and pedestrian list displays the scores developed for the projects submitted by the local governments. Attachment 6B is a table of highway projects in the 2040 MTP as compared to the Prioritization 3.0 submittal recommendation.

TCC Action: Recommend that the TAC approve the list of highway, bicycle and pedestrian, and rail projects for submission to Prioritization 3.0.

7. STP-DA and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) – Policy Update**Attachment 7, 7A, 7B, 7C****Ellen Beckmann, LPA Staff****Dale McKeel, LPA Staff**

A TCC Subcommittee met on November 6, 2013 to discuss the STP-DA and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). A Call for Projects will be held to program STP-DA and TAP funding in FY 2015 and 2016. Attachment 7 is a memo describing the proposed Call for Projects.

A list of FY 2014 STPDA funding is included in Attachment 7A. Local governments were asked to provide an update on the schedules for obligating these funds and any requests for re-programming. The TAC will be asked to approve these changes in February. Attachment 7A also includes the estimated amount available for the Call for Projects.

The TCC Subcommittee discussed revisions to the policy for the distribution of STP-DA funding. Attachment 7B displays the LPA staff's proposed incorporation of the discussion of the subcommittee.

Attachment 7C is a memo from NCDOT describing their proposed policy for TAP funding.

TCC Recommendation: Recommend that the TAC approve MPO Policy #3: Policy Framework for DCHC MPO Federal Funds.

REPORTS FROM STAFF:**8. Reports from Staff****Attachment 8****Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

TCC Action: Receive report from staff

9. Report from the Chair

No attachment

Mark Ahrendsen, TCC Chair

TCC Action: Receive report from TCC Chair

10. NCDOT Report

Attachment 10

Wally Bowman (Joey Hopkins), Division 5 – NCDOT

Mike Mills (Pat Wilson), Division 7 – NCDOT

Rob Stone (Darius Sturdivant), Division 8 – NCDOT

Julie Bollinger, Transportation Planning Branch – NCDOT

Kelly Becker, Traffic Operations – NCDOT

TCC Action: Receive report from NCDOT

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

11. 2014 TAC/TCC Meeting Schedule

Attachment 11

Adjourn

Next meeting: January 22, 2014

42

PRELIMINARIES:**Ethics Reminder**

44 In accordance with the State Governmental Ethics Act, it is the duty of every Board member
45 to avoid conflicts of interest. Does any Board member have any known conflict of interest with
46 respect to any matters coming before the Board today? If so, please identify the conflict and refrain
47 from any participation in the particular matter involved. There were none.

Public Comments

49 There were no comments from the public.

CONSENT AGENDA:**Approval of October 23, 2013 TCC Meeting Minutes**

52 Ellen Beckmann pointed out changes to the minutes regarding voting members. Ellen
53 Beckmann stated that the following voting members were listed as non-voting members: Ellen
54 Beckmann, Tasha Johnson, Hillary Pace, and Liz Rooks.

55 Bret Martin pointed out that the spelling of his name needed to be corrected throughout the
56 minutes. He will provide other changes to staff. Page 3 Line 77 "5703" should read "5307", and page
57 3, line 79 the word "populations" should be added after low income.

58 Ed Lewis requested to be acknowledged as an attendee for the October 23rd TCC meeting.

59 Joey Hopkins asked for a motion to remove the meeting minutes from the consent agenda,
60 and John Hodges-Copple seconded it. A motion was made by Felix Nwoko to approve the consent
61 agenda, and seconded by Meg Scully. A motion was made by Felix Nwoko to approve the minutes as
62 amended, and seconded by Tom Altieri. All three motions passed unanimously.

63 Mark Ahrendsen suggested that members email requested changes to the minutes Ellen
64 Beckmann in advance of the TCC meeting.

65

ACTION ITEMS:

66 **2013 Coordinated Public Transportation – Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT – HSTP)**

67 **(Attachments 8)**

68 Andrew Henry provided an update on the Coordinated Public Transportation – Human
69 Services Transportation Plan (CPT – HSTP) along with an attachment. Andrew Henry stated the TAC
70 had questions about the plan providing guidance to the transit systems, implementation,
71 quantitative data, and how the data would be used to show that the plan is meeting the goals. The
72 TCC also suggested there be an annual review of the goals in the CPT-HSTP plan. Andrew Henry
73 referred to the memorandum handout and explained that the memorandum helps to answer some
74 of the TAC’s questions.

75 Meg Scully suggested including the explanation provided by Jeremy Goldstein from Gannett
76 Fleming that the plan be general, not too specific.

77 Felix Nwoko suggested adding the criteria from the old plan to the new plan and
78 recommending it to the TAC. Andrew Hendry stated that he would review the recommended
79 changes prior to open public hearing at the TAC meeting. There was no action.

80 **Federal Functional Classification Review (Attachment 9, 9A)**

81 Ellen Beckmann introduced Joy Liang from the Federal Highway Association. Joy Liang
82 provided information about the NCDOT request to have all MPOs consider adjustments to the federal
83 functional classification system. She noted that all roadways on the National Highway System (NHS)
84 are eligible for federal funding, but that not all principal arterials are necessarily on the NHS.

85 John Hodges-Copple mentioned a list that included the East-End Connector and asked about
86 implying functional class to roads that are not yet constructed. Ellen Beckmann stated that a request
87 can be made for it to be classified if it is going to be constructed within four years. John Hodges-
88 Copple asked if this is something that can be modified overtime. Felix Nwoko stated that the MPO’s

89 TAC can request changes on an as-needed basis. John Hodges-Copple asked who is the ultimate
90 decision-maker? Felix Nwoko stated it is FHWA.

91 Andrew Henry asked if there was a way to show the changes on a single map instead of the
92 user have to go between two similar maps. Ellen Beckmann stated she would request to have that
93 change made.

94 David Bonk asked about the schedule or deadline for approving this item. Ellen Beckmann
95 stated that the changes will be sent to NCDOT prior to coming back to the TCC and going before the
96 TAC for approval. The deadline to send the changes to the NCDOT is December 2, 2013.

97 David Bonk suggested that the TCC conditionally approve the map pending further
98 comments from individual members between now and December 1, 2013. Ellen Beckman requested
99 that members have comments to the MPO staff by Tuesday November 26, 2013. Joey Hopkins
100 requested to add a list of changes. Ellen Beckmann stated that there is a list but it is difficult to
101 understand because it uses state route numbers, but she will modify the list to make it useful. John
102 Hodges-Copple requested a list for the travel demand model team and use in air quality conformity.

103 David Bonk made a motion to forward the revised functional classification to NCDOT subject
104 to comments that may be received from members by November 26, 2013, and Brett Martin
105 seconded the motion. It is understood that the NCDOT will return the functional classification to the
106 MPO for final review and approval in a few months.

107 **STP-DA and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) (Attachments 10, 10A, 10B)**

108 Ellen Beckmann provided an introduction on the November 6, 2013 TCC subcommittee
109 meeting on STP-DA and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) along with attachments.

110 Ellen Beckmann stated that the next call for projects will be held to program STP-DA and TAP
111 funding for FY 2015 and 2016. The first step in programing is to determine how much unobligated
112 and programmed money is available. Ellen Beckmann referred to the table on attachment 10A to

113 assist with an explanation of funding. She suggested that the MPO that over obligating this funding
114 to use it on a more timely basis. The CAMPO does a 30% over obligating of STP-DA, and the NCDOT
115 says that front loading or going into the red is acceptable.

116 David Bonk asked if there has been any STP-DA fund set aside for the right-a-way
117 construction for the Chapel Hill side. Ellen Beckmann stated not for the fiscal year 2014, and there is
118 nothing programed past fiscal year 2014. The additional funds were shifted over to the Durham
119 phase of the project. If the Chapel Hill phase of the project is ready for construction in FY 2015-16, it
120 will be considered in the next call for projects for those programing years. Felix Nwoko asked if there
121 were any project coming up in Chapel Hill for FY 2013-14. David Bonk stated that at the minimum
122 they would proceed with the construction of a sidewalk on the south side of the road consistent with
123 the overall design.

124 Felix Nwoko stated that once STP-DA funds are flexed to FTA 5307, those funds are no longer
125 available for non-5307 projects. Ellen Beckmann stated that the subcommittee proposed to make
126 adjustments to FY 2014 projects to reflect what will actually get done in 2014, which will involve a TIP
127 amendment, and look at the policy for distributing funds and make suggestions if needed. Mark
128 Ahrendsen asked about the timeline on the decision making process for the allocation of available
129 funds. Ellen Beckmann stated that ideally the TAC approves the changes and TIP Amendment by
130 December, and then the sub-committee meets in December to discuss the policy. A
131 recommendation should go before the TCC in December and to the TAC in January 2014. Then there
132 will be a review the projects and program specific projects at the January TCC meeting, and the
133 projects will be approved at the February TAC meeting. The intention is to get projects programmed
134 in early spring so they can be included in the local budget process.

135 Dale McKeel stated that on the attachment 10A table on the last row of projects the project
136 ID number was incorrect. It is listed as NCDOT TIP "EB-4708" and should be "EB-4707". Dale McKeel

137 suggested getting reports from the TCC members who have funding through STP-DA and CMAQ on
138 the status of their projects. Mark Ahrendsen stated that it was a good suggestion and should be a
139 recommendation taken up by the subcommittee.

140 Felix Nwoko made a motion to recommend the STP-DA and TIP Amendment subject to
141 further input from Chapel Hill on clarification of their three projects on attachment 10A, including
142 Estes Park, Tanyard Branch and variable messaging signs.

143 John Hodges-Copple asked if there is a time frame to DATA to use the funds once the funds
144 are flexed? Ellen Beckmann responded yes. There is a two-year time limit. John Hodge-Copple
145 stated that it would be helpful to have a timeline for specific steps available for review and
146 communicated to ensure that funds are not lost. Mark Ahrendsen added that this would be a good
147 tool for funds that are flexed.

148 The motion was adjusted to recommend approval of the STP-DA and TIP Amendments, with
149 the three Chapel Hill projects, two Durham project changes, and the accountability of flexed funding
150 by listing the listing the TEAM deadline. David Bonk seconded this motion.

151 **Prioritization 3.0 (Attachment 11)**

152 Ellen Beckmann provided an introduction and update on the November 6, 2013 TCC
153 subcommittee meeting on Prioritization 3.0 along with attachments.

154 Ellen Beckmann stated that Transit Operators must submit projects by November 29, 2013.
155 These projects do not come through the MPO. The Deadline for the MPO submission of Highway,
156 Rail, and Bike/Ped projects is February 2014. The MPO can submit up to 14 new highway projects and
157 up to five additional projects for each current highway project that is deleted, up to 20 bike/ped
158 projects, and up to 5 rail projects.

159 John Hodges-Copple commented on Rail division submission of projects. David Bonk asked
160 that local jurisdictions submit supporting data in addition to submitting bike/ped projects. Ellen

161 Beckmann responded yes and that additional information from planner would be needed to
162 appropriately rank the projects.

163 Patrick McDonough stated that they will not submit either the Durham-Wake corridor or the
164 Wake County corridor to the SPOT process due to the locally matched resource requirements and the
165 lack of an LPA.

166 John Hodges-Copple asked if MPOs are allowed to submit projects or it is only transit agency
167 providers. Ellen Beckmann stated she was not sure if MPOs were allowed. Patrick McDonough stated
168 that Transit Operators are submitting multiple applications for each bus shelter to be scored.

169 Andrew Henry commented about legislation stating that the MPO is scoring projects and
170 awarding points. Felix Nwoko stated that this is one of the questions that the MPO is waiting for an
171 answer for clarification.

172 Patrick McDonough commented on the onerous requirement that individual bus shelters be
173 submitted one-by-one, and asked that the MPO request that the NCDOT improve this process.

174 Bret Martin stated that to his understanding as it relates to the MPO submitting transit is
175 that a project must be submitted through Partner Connect by November 29, 2013. Part of the
176 process for Partners Connect is attaching supporting documentation to show the need. Bret Martin
177 stated that this is only for state matched money, and as he was told to plan with the assumption that
178 it will not be available; but also plan to provide a 20% local match. Felix Nwoko confirmed Bret
179 Martins statement.

180 Jeff Brubaker asked if would make sense to do a catch all shelter projects through STP-DA,
181 and use SPOT to get replacement buses?

182 Patrick McDonough stated that it is possible; however he is still trying to figure out the
183 funding with the current variables. He is not sure about the SPOT process.

184 Ellen Beckmann reiterated that the MPO and NCDOT division each have 2,500 points and
185 15% of the score at the division level. Quantitative is only 50% so local points will be important.

186 Bret Martin stated that there must be a federal source to compete for a state match. If STP-
187 DA is made available to use for bus shelters this is the federal source, and the process for competing
188 for the state match is still necessary.

189 Dale McKeel stated that the City of Raleigh is proposing a resolution to their City Council
190 requiring the SPOT 3.0 process. They are requesting the Safe Routes to School funding not be a part
191 of this process and the decisions about funding be made by the MPOs rather than through SPOT.
192 Dale McKeel requested to review the resolution at the December 5, 2013 subcommittee meeting.

193 Mark Ahrendsen stated that the recommended action is to direct the subcommittee
194 to meet to develop a recommended list of bicycle and pedestrian, highway, and rail project
195 submittals.

196 Ellen Beckmann reminded everyone to send the resolutions or approved list of projects to
197 her.

198 **REPORTS FROM STAFF:**

199 **Reports from Staff**

200 Felix Nwoko referred everyone to attachment #12.

201 Dale McKeel mentioned that it has been 6 years since the 7 year TDM plan was adopted and
202 there is a retreat scheduled for Friday, November 22, 2013 with the Oversight Committee to discuss
203 updates to the plan.

204 John Hodges-Copple mentioned the Golden Modes Award were held last week in Cary which
205 is TDM recognition and Secretary Tata was in attendance.

206 **Report from the Chair**

207 There was nothing to report from the Chair.

208 **NCDOT Reports (Attachment 12)**

209 Ed Lewis, Division 7, stated the 751 guard rail project was completed. A job order was put in
210 to get addition advance signage. Ed Lewis stated that the speed adjustment request looks promising
211 and Patrick Wilson will provide and update on this next month. The advance warning sign on 751
212 should be up prior to the Thanksgiving holiday.

213 Julie Bollinger stated that the Orange County comprehensive report was finalized.

214 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

215

216

217 **Adjournment**

218 There being no further business before the Technical Coordinating Committee, the meeting was

219 adjourned at 10:33 a.m.

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 13th through December 10th. 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, 3rd paragraph, 3rd line: Insert "during peak periods" after "100 buses."
- 2) Page 13, 1st paragraph, last line: Insert "that" before "would have been eligible..."
- 3) Page 14, 2nd 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, 1st 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, 2nd 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 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: Technical Coordinating Committee
DCHC MPO

From: DCHC MPO Lead Planning Agency

Date: December 18, 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. 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 18 additional projects that have been requested from our member governments in their local lists. The TCC Subcommittee recommends that these 18 projects be recommended to the TAC. The Subcommittee also recommends that four projects be removed from the database as indicated in the table.

Another attachment displays a comparison between these recommended projects and the 2040 MTP project list. Most new requests are also in the 2040 MTP. Two new requests are variations of projects in the 2040 MTP. Four 2040 MTP projects were not requested to be submitted by any local government.

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 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 Subcommittee developed a scoring methodology to compare these projects, and LPA staff applied this methodology to develop a recommended list of 20 projects in the MPO. The scoring methodology is similar to the methodology that NCDOT will be using for SPOT 3.0.

The scoring methodology consisted of the following:

- Safety
 - 20% Crash data available (GIS file for crashes from 2008-2012) – number of crashes
Application: 4 points per crash; maximum 20 points
 - 20% Posted speed limit
Application: 40 to 50 mph = 20 points; 30 to 39 mph = 10points; 25 mph = 5 points
- Access to destinations – from local planners
 - 10% number of destinations
Application: 1 point for “major” destinations; maximum 7 points; ½ point for “secondary” destinations; maximum 3 points.
 - 10% within 1 mile of K-8 school, provides access to network – using spatial 1 mile buffer
Application: Within 1 mile = 10 points; otherwise, 0 points.
- Demand/Density –TAZ population (10%) and employment (10%) density available (from TRM)
Application: Points derived by dividing the density by 100, then multiplying by 0.3; maximum 10 points.
- Constructability – request ROW availability (10%) and design status (10%) from local planners
Application: Points derived by dividing the percentages by 10.

In general, data was collected within ½ mile of pedestrian projects and 1.5 miles of bike/trail projects.

There was a great deal of variability in the number of major and secondary destination centers submitted by staff from the various jurisdictions. LPA staff used the data as submitted in ranking the projects. It does not appear that this had a major influence on the final project rankings. However, LPA staff plan to discuss this with staff at NCDOT and suggest that additional guidance be provided on the definitions of major and secondary centers for submissions to SPOT, to ensure more uniform application of this criteria across the state.

NC Highway Divisions are also allowed to submit new bicycle and pedestrian projects. Projects that do not make the MPO's list of 20 could be requested to be submitted by the applicable Highway Division.

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. NCDOT has also issued a memo describing its process for selecting projects for its Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding. TAP funding is expected to be programmed through the Prioritization 3.0 process.

A total of 32 bicycle and pedestrian projects were submitted by local jurisdictions. Two projects submitted separately by Durham and Chapel Hill were contiguous and combined into one project. Attachment 6B includes the rankings of the 32 submitted projects. In order that there is at least one project submitted from each MPO jurisdiction, LPA staff recommends that project numbers 19 and 20 be replaced by project numbers 21 and 22 in the TCC's recommendation.

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. The Rail Division hopes to share the list of pre-populated projects as soon as possible, but it is not currently available. The Rail Division has said that only freight rail projects will be pre-populated.

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

The grade separation projects may end up being pre-populated in the database as they have freight rail benefits. In addition, the MPO may want to consider adding some additional passenger rail projects that

the Rail Division will not be including in its list. Many freight rail projects have benefits for passenger rail and vice versa. It is not clear how the Rail Division will make this determination.

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.

TCC Action: Recommend that the TAC approve the list of highway, bicycle and pedestrian, and rail projects for submission to Prioritization 3.0.

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	Orange County; Hillsborough	
H090006-B	7	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	I-0305B	I-85		East of SR 1709	Durham County Line	Add Additional Lanes	Orange County; Hillsborough	
H090010-A	10	Statewide Mobility	1 - Widen Existing Roadway	I-3306A	I-40		I-85	US 15/501	Add Additional Lanes	Orange County	
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	P2.0 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.		Widening is not in the 2040 MTP; Much of project is in TARPO; Chatham County has requested that it be ranked.
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	Orange County	
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.		
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	

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
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 .	Orange County	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.	Orange County; Hillsborough	I-40 to US 70 Business.
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.		REMOVE - Not in 2040 MTP; Hillsborough staff have confirmed that this is not a desired project.
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; Orange County	

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
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	REMOVE - 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.	Orange County; Hillsborough	
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	REMOVE - Project is funded through Division.
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.		

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
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	Orange County; Hillsborough	
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	REMOVE - Not a TIP-level project.
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	Durham and Durham County requested removal. NCDOT Division 5 requested it be scored. 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	
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	

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
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	Durham and Durham County requested removal. Not in 2040 MTP. Keep in database for now as we do not need to replace this project with another.
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	
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	

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
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.	Orange County	Bike lanes from Old NC 86 to NC 86;
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	
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 -1		Statewide Mobility	8 - Improve Interchange		US 15/501	Fordham Boulevard	NC 54	Raleigh Road	Interchange Improvements	Chapel Hill	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 - 2		Statewide Mobility	8 - Improve Interchange		US 15/501	Fordham Boulevard	NC 54	NC 86	Interchange improvements. Increase capacity on northbound to eastbound movement.	Chapel Hill	Included in 2040 MTP as a TSM project. No horizon year. Or as part of Fordham Boulevard widening project.
New - 3		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 - 4		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 - 5		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 - 6		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 - 7		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 - 8		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 - 9		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 - 10		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 - 11		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
New - 12		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 - 13		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 - 14		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 - 15		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 - 16		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

SPOTID	P2.0 SPOTID	Project Category	Specific Improvement Type	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	Local Priority List	Note
New - 17		Division Needs	5 - Construct Roadway on New Location			SW Durham Dr	I-40	NC 54	New alignment	Durham, Durham County	2040 in 2040 MTP
New - 18		Regional Impact	13 - Citywide Signal System		Multiple	Multiple			City of Durham Signal System Upgrade (inc. central servers, signal controller upgrades for FYA and transit priority, CCTV network, fiber optic communications network, etc.)	Late staff request	Included in 2040 MTP as a TSM project. No horizon year.

Submitted List of Transit Projects for Prioritization 3.0.

Project Category	Transit Partners and Providers	Description	Year
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit	2014+
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
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Mebane-Hillsborough-Durham Expansion Buses (2)	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Rougemont Expansion Buses (2)	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	BOSS 147 (40 to Trent)	2016
Division Needs	CHT	Peak Hour Frequency Increase (5 40' buses; 2 articulated buses)	2016
Division Needs	CHT	1 Bus Shelter	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Duke Regional Hospital Park and Ride	2016
Division Needs	DATA	South Square Park and Ride	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Village Neighborhood Transit Center	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Bus Shelter Northgate	2016
Division Needs	DATA	Holloway Transit Corridor Improvements	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	OPT	Mebane-Hillsborough-Durham Express/Local Route (1 25' cutaway bus)	2016
Division Needs	OPT	Hillsborough Circulator Headway Reduction (1 25' cutaway bus)	2016
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Southern Durham Neighborhood Transit Center	2017
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	DRX Expansion Buses (2)	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	Fayetteville 1 Transit Corridor Improvements	2017
Division Needs	OPT	Hillsborough Circulator Service Continuation and Expansion (1 25' cutaw	2017
Regional Impact	Triangle Transit	Route 700 Expansion Buses (3)	2018
Division Needs	CHT	NC 54 Improvements (4 40' buses)	2018
Division Needs	DATA	Route 4 Expansion Buses (2)	2018
Division Needs	DATA	Fayetteville 2 Transit Corridor Improvements	2018
Division Needs	CHT	Pittsboro-Chapel Hill Express (1 40' buses)	2019
Division Needs	CHT	1 Bus Shelter	2019
Division Needs	DATA	Northern Durham Neighborhood Transit Center	2019
Division Needs	DATA	Roxboro Transit Corridor Improvements	2019
Division Needs	CHT	MLK Enhanced Transit Service (4 articulated buses)	2020

2040 MTP
Roadway Project List Compared to Prioritization 3.0

Project ID	Road Name	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Distance (miles)	Proposed Improvement	AQ Year	TIP No.	SPOT 2.0 ID or TIP?
										Recommended for submission by local government
										Variation of project recommended for submission by local government
										Not recommended for submission by any local government
2020 MTP										
30*	Hillandale Rd.	I-85	Carver	2	4	0.7	Widening	2012	U-3804	TIP
59	Miami Blvd.	Methodist Dr.	Angier Ave	2	5	0.72	Widening	2012	U-4011	TIP
9	Carver St Ext	Armfield St	Old Oxford Rd	0	4	1.00	New Location	2014	none	CIP
15	East End Connector (EEC)	NC 147	US 70 E: NC 98	0	4	3.20	New Location	2017	U-0071	TIP
221	S Elliot Rd Ext	Fordham Blvd	Ephesus Church Rd	0	2	0.25	New Location	2020	none	Assumed to be Local/Private funded in MTP. However, it was recommended for submission by MPO - Chapel Hill
43	I-40	US 15-501	NC 86	4	6	4.10	Widening	2019	I-3306	10
44	I-40	NC 86	I-85	4	6	7.32	Widening	2019	I-3306	10
70.4	I-40/ NC 54 ramp	Farrington Rd.	I-40	0	1	0.20	New Location	2014	U-5517	TIP
223	Legion Rd Ext	Legion Rd	Fordham Blvd	0	2	0.10	New Location	2020	none	Local/Private
75.1	NC 55 (Alston Ave)	NC 147	Main St	2	4	0.42	Widening	2017	U-3308	TIP
75.2	NC 55 (Alston Ave)	Main St	NC 98	2	2	0.58	Modernization	2017	U-3308	TIP
220	Purefoy Rd Ext	Sandberg Ln	Weaver Dairy Rd	0	2	0.60	New Location	2020	none	Local/Private
92.1	Roxboro/Latta/Infinity (intersection)	Latta Rd.	Infinity Rd.	4	6	0.50	Intersection	2014	U-5516	9685
97	Smith Level Rd	Rock Haven Rd	NC 54 bypass	2	3	0.60	Widening	2014	U-2803	TIP
98*	South Columbia St	NC 54	Manning Dr	2	2	0.70	Modernization	2013	U-624	TIP
1	T W Alexander Dr	Cornwallis Rd	NC 147	2	4	1.00	Widening	2012	U-3309	TIP
119	Weaver Dairy Rd	NC 86	Erwin Rd	2	3	2.80	Widening	2013	U-3306	TIP
Total Costs for 2012 to 2020										
* Some costs for #30 and #90 were budgeted before the plan fiscal years.										
2030 MTP										
40	Carolina North network	Carolina North Campus		0	2	0.82	New Location	2030	none	Local/Private
232	Corcoran St. (grade separation)	N.C. Railroad tracks		3	3	0.10	Grade Separation	2030	none	None - Potential Rail Project Submittal
12	Cornwallis Rd	NC 55	Alexander Dr	2	4	1.07	Widening	2030	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
17	Estes Dr	NC 86	Seawell School Rd	2	2	0.71	Modernization	2030	none	375; MPO current list; NCDOT suggests delete
17.1	Estes Dr	Seawell School Rd	Greensboro Rd	2	2	0.93	Modernization	2030	none	375; MPO current list; NCDOT suggests delete
241	Estes Dr	MLK Blvd	E Franklin Street	2	2	1.36	Modernization	2030	none	641; SPOT 2.0 modernization; NCDOT does not suggest delete; Not in current MPO list
200	Eubanks Rd	Old NC 86	Millhouse Rd.	2	2	2.64	Modernization	2030	none	951; MPO current list; NCDOT suggests delete
222	Eubanks Rd	Millhouse Rd	NC 86	2	4	0.80	Widening	2030	none	Widening not requested. Modernization from Rogers to NC 86 is project #1096.
201	Farrington Rd (realignment)	NC 54	Wendell Rd	0	2	0.85	New Location	2030	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
23	Fayetteville Rd	Woodcroft Pkwy	Cornwallis Rd	2	4	2.31	Widening	2030	none	637
73	Fordham Blvd (bypass)	NC 54	US 15-501	4	6	2.12	Widening	2030	U-5304	1143 - Interchange at NC 86 recommended for submission as separate project - Chapel Hill
240	Fordham Blvd (superstreet)	NC 54	Franklin Street	4	4	2.08	Superstreet	2030	U-5304	1143
204	Fordham Blvd/NC 54 (interchange)	US 15-501	NC 54	4	4	0.30	Interchange	2030	U-5304	Recommended for submission by MPO - Chapel Hill
24.11	Garrett Rd	NC 751	Old Durham Rd	2	2	2.10	Modernization	2030	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
35	Homestead Rd	High School Rd	NC 86	2	2	1.70	Modernization	2030	none	365; MPO current list; NCDOT does not suggest delete
36	Homestead Rd	Old NC 86	High School Rd	2	2	1.47	Modernization	2030	none	365; MPO current list; NCDOT does not suggest delete
202	Hopson Rd	Davis Dr	NC 54	2	4	0.67	Widening	2030	U-4716D	487
203	I-40/NC 54 (interchange)	I-40	NC 54	6	7	0.35	Interchange	2030	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
45	I-40 Managed Lanes	Wake County Line	NC 147	0	2	3.85	Widening	2030	FS-1205A	1013
900	I-40/Mattress Factory Rd (interchange)	(Outside MPO)	(For modeling only)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Interchange	2030	none	None - Not in MPO
48	I-85	Orange Grove Rd	Lawrence Rd	4	6	2.70	Widening	2030	I-305	6
49	I-85	US 70	Red Mill Rd	4	6	3.50	Widening	2030	I-4743	9603 and 9604
50.11	Jack Bennet Rd/Lystra Rd	US 15-501 South	Farrington Mill/Point R	2	2	2.77	Modernization	2030	none	632

2040 MTP
Roadway Project List Compared to Prioritization 3.0

Project ID	Road Name	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Distance (miles)	Proposed Improvement	AQ Year	TIP No.	SPOT 2.0 ID or TIP?
51	Lake Hogan Farms Rd	Eubanks Rd	Legends Way	0	2	0.68	New Location	2030	none	Local/Private
231	N Mangum St. (grade separation)	N.C. Railroad tracks		3	3	0.10	Grade Separation	2030	none	None - Potential Rail Project Submittal
69.1	NC 54	I-40 Interchange	NC 751	2	4	1.24	Widening	2030	U-5324B	531
69.2	NC 54	NC 751	Fayetteville	2	4	1.72	Widening	2030	U-5324C	532
69.3	NC 54	Fayetteville	Barbee	2	4	1.04	Widening	2030	U-5324D	533
69.4	NC 54	Barbee	NC 55	2	4	1.25	Widening	2030	U-5324E	534
70	NC 54 (widening; superstreet)	I-40	Barbee Chapel Rd	4	6	1.66	Widening	2030	U-5324A	8067
70.1	NC 54 (superstreet) (west)	Meadowmont Dr	Barbee Chapel Rd	6	6	0.20	Superstreet	2030	none	Not requested.
70.2	NC 54/Farrington Rd (grade separation)	Farrington Rd	NC 54	0	6	0.10	Grade Separation	2030	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
75.3+	NC 55 (Alston Ave)	Main St	NC 98	2	4	0.58	Widening	2030	U-3308	None - Restriping Only, TIP not necessary
77.1	NC 751	S Roxboro St	NC 54	2	4	0.70	Widening	2030	none	652
89.3	Orange Grove Connector	Orange Grove Rd	US 70	0	2	0.40	New Location	2030	none	647
92	Roxboro Rd (501 N)	Duke St	Goodwin Rd	4	6	3.75	Widening	2030	U-4722	9645
94	Roxboro St	Cornwallis Rd	MLK Pkwy	0	4	1.10	New Location	2030	none	Local/Private
106	SW Durham Dr	15-501	Mt Moriah Rd	0	2	0.35	New Location	2030	none	Local/Private
116	US 70 (freeway conversion)	Lynn Rd (Durham)	Aviation Pkwy Ext (W)	4	6	4.11	Freeway	2030	U-4720	9638 and 9639
116.1	US 70/Miami Blvd (interchange)	US 70	Miami Blvd.	4	6	0.30	Interchange	2030	U-4720	8086
123.11	Woodcroft Pkwy Ext	Garrett Rd	Hope Valley Rd	0	2	0.27	New Location	2030	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
	Total Costs for 2021 to 2030									
+Costs for #75.3 were budgeted in 2020 horizon										
2040 MTP										
22.1	Fayetteville Rd	Renaissance Pkwy	NC 751	2	4	1.90	Widening	2040	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
26.11	Globe Rd Ext (Brier Creek Pkwy)	Miami Blvd	Wake County Line	0	2	2.18	New Location	2040	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
45.2	I-40 Managed Lanes	NC 147	US 15-501	0	2	8.55	Widening	2040	FS-1205A	1131
48.1	I-85	Lawrence Rd	the Durham Co line	4	6	4.80	Widening	2040	I-305	7
206	I-85/US 70 Connector (add access)	I-85	US 70	4	4	0.41	Add Access	2040	none	558
53	Leesville Rd Ext	Northern Parkway	US 70/Page Rd Ext	0	4	0.81	New Location	2040	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
242	Mt Carmel Ch Rd	US 15-501	Old Lystra Rd	2	2	0.67	Modernization	2040	none	952; MPO current list; NCDOT suggest delete
64.13	NC 147 (general purpose widening)	East End Conn	I-40	4	6	2.63	Widening	2040	FS-1205C	997
70.3	NC 54 (superstreet) (west)	Burning Tree	Meadowmont Dr	6	6	0.55	Superstreet	2040	none	Not requested.
77.2	NC 751	NC 54	Renaissance Pkwy	2	4	1.23	Widening	2040	none	1011
77.3	NC 751	Renaissance Pkwy	O'Kelly Chapel Rd	2	4	2.68	Widening	2040	none	1018 (modification to limits requested)
81.1	NC 98 (Holloway St)	Oak Grove/Nichols	Wake County Line	2	4	5.94	Widening	2040	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
83	Northern Durham Pkwy	US 70 E	I 85 N	0	4	6.40	New Location	2040	U-4721B&C	9641 and 9642
84	Northern Durham Pkwy	I 85 North	Old Oxford Hwy	0	4	2.40	New Location	2040	U-4721D	9643
85	Northern Durham Pkwy	Old Oxford Hwy	Roxboro Rd	2	2	5.38	Modernization	2040	U-4721E	9644
243	Old Lystra Rd	Mt Carmel Ch Rd	Sun Forest Way	2	2	2.51	Modernization	2040	none	Not requested.
86	Old NC 86	I-40	Lafayette Dr	2	4	0.80	Widening	2040	none	200
87	Old NC 86	Lafayette Dr	US 70 Business	2	4	1.70	Widening	2040	none	200
89	Olive Branch Rd Ext	NC 98	Wake County Line	0	2	2.22	New Location	2040	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
106.1	SW Durham Dr	US 15-501	Mt Moriah Rd	2	4	0.35	Widening	2040	none	None - widening of road that does not yet exist
104	SW Durham Dr	Witherspoon Rd	Old Chapel Hill Rd	2	4	0.62	Widening	2040	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
230	SW Durham Dr	I-40	NC 54	0	2	2.02	New Location	2040	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
113	US 15-501 (Freeway conversion)	US 15-501 Bypass	I-40	6	6	2.39	Freeway	2040	U-2807	366
114	US 15-501 Bypass	Pickett Rd	Cameron Blvd	4	6	1.98	Widening	2040	none	Recommended for submission by MPO - Durham, Durham County
	Total Costs for 2031 to 2040									

Ranking of Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Submitted for SPOT 3.0

	Project Description	Submitted by	Div	# Crashes	Pts.	Posted Speed	Pts.	# Major Ctrs	Pts.	# 2ndary Ctrs	Pts.	K-8 School?	Pts.	Pop. Density	Pts.	Emp. Density	Pts.	R/W	Pts.	Design	Pts.	Total
1	Morgan Creek Trail Phase II - multi-use path from University Lake to the western terminus of Phase I and a multi-use path spur to BPW Club Rd.	Carrboro	7	7	20	45	20	14	7	100	3	Yes	10	2253	7.6	1553	4.7	95%	9.5	25%	2.5	84.3
2	US 501 Bypass (Duke Street) (Murray Ave. to Roxboro Rd.) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	5	20	40	20	3	3	10	3	Yes	10	2661	8	2091	6.2	95%	9.5	0%	0	79.7
3	US 15-501 (Fordham Blvd) (Cleland Dr to Willow Dr) - improve existing off-road path and construct new section of sidepath	Chapel Hill	7	3	12	45	20	20	7	25	3	Yes	10	2354	7.1	1991	6	95%	9.5	0%	0	74.6
4	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	7	4	16	35	10	20	7	20	3	Yes	10	3309	9.9	3034	9.1	95%	9.5	0%	0	74.5
5	NC 54 from James St. to Anderson Park - sidepath on the north side of the road to accommodate two-direction bicycle transportation.	Carrboro	7	4	16	45	20	9	7	100	3	Yes	10	1723	5.2	467	1.4	93%	9.3	5%	0.5	72.4
6	Estes Dr. (Greensboro St. to Carrboro Town Limits) - bicycle lanes, sidewalk (south side), and transit accommodations.	Carrboro	7	4	16	35	10	13	7	100	3	Yes	10	3396	10	2634	7.9	80%	8	0%	0	71.9
7	Bryant Bridge Trail (NC 55 to Kelly Bryant Bridge) - shared use path	Durham, Durham County	5	11	20	35	10	7	7	16	3	Yes	10	2966	8.9	1995	6	65%	6.5	0%	0	71.4
8	NC 54 (NC 55 to RTP) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	5	20	35	10	4	4	6	3	Yes	10	565	1.7	3179	9.5	95%	9.5	0%	0	67.7
9	Raynor Street (Miami Blvd to Hardee St.) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	5	20	35	10	1	1	6	3	Yes	10	3812	10	1077	3.2	95%	9.5	0%	0	66.7
10	NC 55 (Riddle Road to Cecil Street) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	1	4	45	20	3	3	6	3	Yes	10	3122	9.4	1762	5.3	100%	10	0%	0	64.7
11	Finley Golf Course Rd (US 15-501/NC 54 to NC 54) - sidepath on one side or bicycle lanes	Chapel Hill	7	0	0	45	20	20	7	20	3	Yes	10	1876	5.6	3102	9.3	95%	9.5	0%	0	64.4
12	Cook Road (Fayetteville Rd. near Hillside High to Martin Luther King, Jr. Parkway) - Construct bicycle lanes and sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	6	20	35	10	3	3	15	3	Yes	10	2541	7.6	456	1.4	90%	9	0%	0	64
13	Horton Road (Hillandale Rd. to Roxboro Rd.) - bike lanes and sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	9	20	35	10	3	3	6	3	Yes	10	1872	5.6	837	2.5	90%	9	0%	0	63.1
14	NC 98 (Holloway St) (SR 1838 (Junction Rd) to Chandler Rd) sidewalks.	Durham, Durham County	5	6	20	35	10	1	1	6	3	Yes	10	2539	7.6	430	1.3	90%	9	0%	0	61.9
15	Guess Road (Hillcrest to Carver) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	4	16	35	10	2	2	6	3	Yes	10	2467	7.4	1455	4.4	90%	9	0%	0	61.8
16	LaSalle Street (Kangaroo to Sprunt) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	4	16	35	10	4	4	6	3	No	0	2219	6.7	4507	10	95%	9.5	0%	0	59.2
17	Erwin Rd (NC 751 to County Line) - bicycle lanes or shoulders	Durham, Durham County	5	1	4	45	20	3	3	6	3	Yes	10	1167	3.5	1815	5.4	90%	9	0%	0	57.9
18	SR 1919 (S Greensboro St) (Old Pittsboro Rd to NC 54) sidewalk on the west side	Carrboro	7	1	4	35	10	8	7	40	3	Yes	10	5179	10	2819	8.5	48%	4.8	0%	0	57.3
19	Pope Road / Ephesus Church Road (Old Durham-Chapel Hill Rd to Legion Road) - sidewalks and bicycle lanes	Durham, Durham Co., Chapel Hill	5, 7	2	8	35	10	11	7	20	3	Yes	10	1789	5.4	1107	3.3	90%	9	0%	0	55.7
20	SR 1800 (Cheek Rd) (SR 1670 (E Geer St) to Hardee St) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	2	8	35	10	0	0	6	3	Yes	10	2903	8.7	1263	3.8	90%	9	0%	0	52.5
21	Orange Grove Road/I-40 Pedestrian Bridge and Supporting Sidewalk Improvements	Hillsborough, Orange County	7	1	4	45	20	1	1	5	2.5	Yes	10	1211	3.6	104	0.3	70%	7	0%	0	48.4
22	Farrington Point Rd / Old Farrington / Farrington Mill Rd (Durham County Line to Lystra Rd) - bicycle lanes	Chatham County	8	0	0	50	20	5	5	3	3	Yes	10	304	0.9	58	0.2	85%	8.5	0%	0	47.6
23	Geer Street (Midland Terrace to Glen School Rd) - bicycle lanes and sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	2	8	35	10	1	1	10	3	Yes	10	1248	3.8	425	1.3	90%	9	0%	0	46.1

Ranking of Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Submitted for SPOT 3.0

TCC 12/18/2013 Attachment 6C

	Project Description	Submitted by	Div	# Crashes	Pts.	Posted Speed	Pts.	# Major Ctrs	Pts.	# 2ndary Ctrs	Pts.	K-8 School?	Pts.	Pop. Density	Pts.	Emp. Density	Pts.	R/W	Pts.	Design	Pts.	Total
24	Orange High School Road/Harold Latta Road Sidewalk Improvements	Orange County	7	0	0	40	20	1	1	6	3	Yes	10	712	2.1	272	0.8	85%	8.5	0%	0	45.4
25	Hardee Street (Holloway St. to Cheek Rd.) - sidewalks	Durham, Durham County	5	0	0	35	10	1	1	6	3	Yes	10	2781	8.3	1204	3.6	90%	9	0%	0	44.9
26	Mann's Chapel Rd (US 15-501 to Poythress Rd) - bicycle lanes	Chatham County	8	1	4	45	20	12	7	9	3	No	0	312	0.9	59	0.2	85%	8.5	0%	0	43.6
27	Pickett Road (Garrett Rd to Academy) - sidewalks and bicycle lanes	Durham, Durham County	5	0	0	35	10	2	2	6	3	Yes	10	2045	6.1	1098	3.3	90%	9	0%	0	43.4
28	O'Kelley Chapel Road (Wake County Line/Yates Store Rd to American Tobacco Trail) - sidepath	Chatham County	8	0	0	50	20	4	4	3	1.5	Yes	10	610	1.8	82	0.2	45%	4.5	0%	0	42
29	Mt. Carmel Church Rd (Orange County Line to Old Farrington Point Road) - bicycle lanes	Chatham County	8	0	0	45	20	5	5	3	1.5	No	0	467	1.4	96	0.3	85%	8.5	0%	0	36.7
30	Pedestrian connections to Cameron Park Elementary School from Cameron Street and St. Mary's Road.	Hillsborough	7	0	0	25	5	2	2	6	3	Yes	10	651	2	714	2.1	100%	10	0%	0	34.1
31	Trail Connection from English Hill Lane to Buttonwood Drive	Orange County	7	1	4	30	10	1	1	4	2	Yes	10	843	2.5	211	0.6	0%	0	0%	0	30.1
32	Trail Connection from Patriots Pointe to Timbers Drive	Orange County	7	0	0	30	10	1	1	5	2.5	Yes	10	1469	4.4	124	0.3	0%	0	0%	0	28.2

MEMORANDUM

To: Technical Coordinating Committee
DCHC MPO

From: DCHC MPO Lead Planning Agency

Date: December 18, 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. 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 much 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.

One attachment 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 was shared with the TAC for information only. 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 needs to develop a 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 Subcommittee 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 Subcommittee recommends 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 Subcommittee reviewed the STP-DA policy and discussed recommended changes in Attachment 7A. A policy for selecting TAP projects is included in this policy. Once a policy is approved, the TCC will

develop 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

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

TCC Action: Recommend approval of the revised Policy Framework for DCHC MPO Federal Funds.

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

POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR DCHC MPO FEDERAL FUNDS

Under federal legislation, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) is responsible for programming and maintaining the seven-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), coordinating updates of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and selecting projects to receive funds from four federal funding programs:

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

Under MAP-21, 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 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

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 *2040 MTP*. 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 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 the DCHC MPO (STP-DA, TAP, 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, TAP, 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, TAP, 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.
- TAP funds may 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.
- 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 area.

DCHC MPO Funds - STP-DA and TAP Funding Policy

The following three step process has been developed for allocating STP-DA and TAP funding.

Step 1 – Distribution guidance

The MPO funds identified are distributed through a partially competitive and partially non-competitive process. This process is based on the requirements of current transportation legislation, with additional guidance provided by the *2040 MTP*, 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 and TAP funds available. It is calculated by combining our annual allocation over the 2 year period with any prior year uncommitted balance. The funds will be increased by 30 percent in order to over-program funding which should help reduce the MPO's unobligated balance more

quickly.

The total expected STP-DA and TAP funds available is initially reduced by the following items:

1. *Special Requests* (up to 5%) - distributed to parties who do not have a specific sub-allocation of funding through the policy (e.g. county governments, Triangle Transit) as needed and approved by the TAC.
2. *Staff and Routine Planning needs* - funding level varies depending on LPA needs, subject to UPWP approval
3. *Extra Planning needs* - funding level varies depending on LPA needs, subject to UPWP approval

After those items have been accounted for, the “remainder” of STP-DA and TAP 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). All TAP funding will be programmed for projects in this category.
3. 50% to *Local Discretionary* (distributed to participating members on a non-competitive basis)

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

Special Requests – This category is intended to be used for special requests from parties who do not have a specific sub-allocation of funding through other categories (e.g. county governments, Triangle Transit). No guidelines have been proposed for distribution by jurisdiction so that the MPO has flexibility in responding to needs that may vary significantly from year to year. Up to 5% can be used for these projects. Any funding not used will be assigned to other distribution categories as required by this policy.

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. The specific funding amount will be approved through the annual UPWP.

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. The specific funding amount will be approved through the annual UPWP.

Transit – 50% of funding will be programmed for Chapel Hill Transit and 50% of funding will be programmed for DATA

Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian – There is no distribution formula for funding within this category. All TAP funds will be programmed to projects in this category. As required, a competitive process will be used to select projects.

Local Discretionary – There is a guaranteed \$70,000 minimum for each municipality per programmed year and then the remainder is distributed proportionate to the municipal populations.

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

All funding of specific projects within each category must be presented to the TAC for approval and must be included in the MPO's adopted TIP. There is no sub-allocation of funding directly to member governments.

These categories are approved annually with the UPWP process:

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.

Projects funded through the 4 other categories will approved prior to the beginning of FY 2015. Amendments can be made in the interim as needed:

Special Requests - Counties and Triangle Transit can submit their requests to the LPA. The TCC will make a recommendation and the TAC will approve the projects.

Transit – Transit agencies will submit projects to the LPA. The TCC will make a recommendation and the TAC will approve the projects.

Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian – Members will submit requests to the LPA. Projects will be evaluated based on the following screening criteria and scoring methodology. The TCC will make a recommendation and the TAC will approve the projects. The following serves to satisfy the requirement that all TAP funding be selected through a competitive process.

Screening Criteria

- Projects must anticipate a minimum of \$1,000,000 (federal) funding for construction. Design and right-of-way phases can request less than \$1,000,000 (federal) if the construction phase is expected to exceed \$1,000,000 (federal);
- Only the next imminent project phase should be requested (i.e. construction funding should only be requested once design and right-of-way is complete);
- Projects must be part of the adopted Regional Routes as listed in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan

Scoring Methodology

- 40% Project readiness – priority will be given to projects that are ready to be constructed or are ready to move to the next phase of project development:
 - 100 points - Construction funding requested - right-of-way and design complete
 - 50 points - Right-of-way funding requested – design complete
 - 25 points - Planning requested
- 30% Safety
 - Variable score from 0-100 points based on the relative number of bike/ped crashes on the facility or parallel facility.
- 15% Spans multiple jurisdictions
 - 100 points – spans more than two local jurisdictions
 - 50 points – spans more than one local jurisdiction
- 15% Density
 - Variable score from 0-100 points based on the relative population and employment density of a 0.5 mile buffer of the corridor.

Local Discretionary – Each municipality will submit new or continued projects for this category to the LPA. The TCC will make a recommendation and the TAC will approve the projects. The TAC will approve with the expectation that this category 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 Metropolitan 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 environmental enhancements;
- Planning studies that support the implementation or development of the adopted and future versions of DCHC’s Metropolitan Transportation Plan and 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 six project groups and the following guiding principles:

1. Special Requests includes:
 - a. County or Triangle Transit projects that comply with the adopted funding policy.
2. Routine Planning includes:
 - a. New and existing LPA staff positions;
 - b. Activities that are required to be completed such as air quality planning, congestion mitigation planning, modeling, etc.
3. Extra Planning includes:
 - a. LPA and local government planning activities that are optional such as special emphasis projects.
4. Transit includes:
 - a. DATA and CHT projects that comply with the adopted funding policy.
5. Regional bicycle and pedestrian projects includes:
 - a. Projects of regional scale and importance that span or connect multiple jurisdictions.
 - b. Minimum project size of \$1,000,000 (federal)

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.

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 CMAQ program is based on a competitive process for which proposals for candidate transportation projects are submitted to North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). MPOs and RPOs responsible for transportation planning in air quality non-attainment & maintenance areas are encouraged to work cooperatively with their member jurisdictions to develop and 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.

Travel demand management - Funding for the TDM will be shared equally by CAMPO. The MPO's share of TDM will be provided using CMAQ funds. TDM offers very high air quality benefits and competes very favorably for CMAQ funding. CMAQ funds have been approved

for FY 2013 through 2017 for TDM.

Project Tracking System

DCHC would like to implement a Project Tracking System to monitor the progress of DCHC's STP-DA, TAP, 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),
- Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP),
- 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, TAP, 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 and TAP 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.

Policies - Obligations & Monitoring

A. Obligation Monitoring of STP-DA, TAP, and CMAQ Funds

Each phase of a project with STP-DA, TAP, 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, TAP, 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, TAP, 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, TAP, and CMAQ Funds

A decision on the need to develop policies and procedures for monitoring the expenditures of STP-DA and TAP 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, TAP, 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, TAP, 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 federal legislation 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:

- STP-DA and TAP funds will be over-programmed by 30% in anticipation that projects may fall behind schedule, be canceled or delayed, or receive other funding. These projects should already be approved by the TAC and be included in the TIP.
- Cost over-runs will be considered on a case-by-case basis by the TCC and TAC. If the MPO's unobligated balance can accommodate the request and the funding is necessary for the project to move forward, the LPA staff will recommend approval of the request.
- 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.

Proposed Changes December 18, 2013 TCC
Original Adopted by TAC on June 9, 2010.



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PAT MCCRORY
GOVERNOR

1501 MAIL SERVICE CENTER, RALEIGH, N.C. 27699-1501

ANTHONY J. TATA
SECRETARY

November 13, 2013

Memorandum To: Robert Lewis, NCDOT Chief of Staff

From: Richard Walls, NCDOT Deputy Secretary for Transit

Subject: MAP – 21 Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
Approach for NCDOT

Effective as of federal fiscal year 2013, new transportation legislation called the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) contains a new funding program called the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). The following approach describes how NCDOT will program TAP funds administered by the department effective immediately. The effort will be led by a committee of NCDOT officials chaired by Calvin Leggett with the Program Development Branch.

Several factors and alternatives were considered by NCDOT staff while developing this approach. NCDOT is not an eligible project sponsor or funding recipient but is responsible for administering the program funds not directly allocated to other organizations. Additionally, the state's Strategic Transportation Investments (STI) law requires NCDOT to include TAP-funded projects within the allocation of Division-Needs funding, and the TAP project selection process is described as a separately-designed prioritization process in STI. Furthermore, FHWA requires a competitive selection process and elements of public involvement for projects funded by TAP.

Some states have elected to program TAP funds exclusively to one or a limited number of eligible activities, such as bicycle and pedestrian projects. This approach does not provide the necessary resources or flexibility needed by the department for activities managed by the Roadside Environmental unit. Most state departments of transportation have a unit or process devoted to administering all aspects of a Transportation Alternatives Program, using that process to select projects. Because NCDOT does not have a TAP unit or process in place, other options had to be explored to ensure flexibility and program efficiency.

NCDOT has developed a robust competitive model for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Therefore, NCDOT is well-positioned to use the STI bicycle-pedestrian prioritization model to program a majority of the TAP funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects. An interdisciplinary NCDOT committee will be formed to make recommendations for the prioritization and programming of all eligible projects.

PROGRAMMING APPROACH

- Program up to 50% of total TAP funds (of those sub-allocations directed by NCDOT) for bicycle and pedestrian projects as identified through the prioritization process
- Transfer approximately 20-25% of total TAP (from the Statewide Flex TAP sub-allocation) to STP for use by the Roadside Environmental Unit each year
- Reserve 5-10% of the total TAP funds (from the Statewide Flex TAP funds directed by NCDOT) for other eligible activities. Form a committee and develop a competitive selection process with provisions for public involvement for these other eligible activities. NCDOT may transfer TAP reserve not programmed to additional bicycle and pedestrian projects or the STP program.
- Coordinate as necessary with TMA-MPOs to continue programming assigned TAP sub-allocations (20-25% of total TAP)
- Coordinate with NCDENR (responsible for 5-10% of total TAP) to align investments funded by the TAP program

cc: Nick Tennyson, NCDOT
Lauren Blackburn, NCDOT
Mike Bruff, NCDOT
Terry Gibson, NCDOT
Don Lee, NCDOT
Calvin Leggett, NCDOT
Susan Pullium, NCDOT
Jimmy Travis, NCDOT
John Sullivan, FHWA

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

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

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

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

Contract Number: C202995 **Route:** NC-56, NC-96, US-15
Physical Division: 5 **County:** Durham
Administrative Division: 5 **TIP Number:**
Length: 0 miles **Federal Aid Number:**
Resident Engineer: Mark W. Luther, PE **RE Phone Number:** (919)220-4680
Location Description: 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.
Type of Work: BRIDGE PRESERVATION
Contractor Name: NHM CONSTRUCTORS, LLC
Contract Amount: \$3,034,500.45 **Cost Overrun/Underrun:** 3.47%
Availability Date: 10/1/2012 **Letting Date:** 4/17/2012
Completion Date: 7/21/2013 **Work Began:** 10/1/2012
Revised Completion Date: **Estimated Completion:** 9/30/2013
Last Estimate Thru: 8/15/2013 **Scheduled Progress:** 98%
Last Estimate Paid: 8/21/2013 **Actual Progress:** 96.62%

Contract Number: C203128 **Route:** SR-1978
Physical Division: 5 **County:** Durham

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

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

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

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

<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 (IMPM) 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

TCC 12/18/2013 Attachment 10

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 Chapel Hill .	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 Chapel Hill .	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 Carrboro .	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 Chapel Hill .	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 Chapel Hill .		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 Chapel Hill	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 Chapel Hill .	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 Chapel Hill	10/17/2013	2/5/2015	Triangle Grading & Paving	TCC 12/18/2013 Attachment 10 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 Carrboro	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 Hillsborough	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 Carrboro	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 Carrboro	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 Chapel Hill	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 Carrboro	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 Carrboro	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 Carrboro	TBD	TBD	Design underway	\$590,000	STP-DA; MA w/TOC
U-4726DF	Bicycle detection at Signalized Intersections in Carrboro	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 Chapel Hill	TBD	TBD	Supplemental agreement to remove construction; Town to pay for construction	\$20,000 PE	STP-DA; MA w/TOCH

DIV 7 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTERED PROJECTS IN DCHCMPO
--

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 Chapel Hill	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

TCC 12/18/2013 Attachment 10

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	April 2014	Not Available	Roadway design plans complete; ROW acquisition in progress	\$803K	Not Available	After ROW is acquired, the process of moving utilities 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
SURFACE TREATMENT							
RESURFACING							
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

DCHC MPO Meeting Dates 2014
Durham City Hall, Committee Room

MPO Board
2nd Wednesday of the month, 9 am

Technical Committee
4th 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 (3rd 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.