

1 **DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

3 **October 23, 2019**

4
5 **MINUTES OF MEETING**

6
7 The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Committee
8 met on October 23, 2019, at 9:00 a.m. in the City Council Committee Room, located on the
9 second floor of Durham City Hall. The following people were in attendance:

10		
11	Nish Trivedi (Chair)	Orange County Planning
12	Ellen Beckmann (Vice Chair)	City of Durham
13	Kayla Seibel (Member)	City of Durham Planning
14	Evan Tenenbaum (Member)	City of Durham Transportation
15	Tasha Johnson (Member)	City of Durham Public Works
16	Jomar Pastorelle (Member)	Chapel Hill Planning
17	Zach Hallock (Member)	Carrboro Planning
18	Tina Moon (Member)	Carrboro Planning
19	Margaret Hauth (Member)	Hillsborough
20	Chance Mullis (Member)	Chatham County Planning
21	Scott Whiteman (Member)	Durham County Planning
22	Brooke Ganser (Member)	Durham County Planning
23	Tom Altieri (Member)	Orange County Planning
24	John Hodges-Copple (Member)	Triangle J Council of Governments
25	Julie Bogle (Member)	NCDOT Transportation Planning Division
26	John Grant (Member)	NCDOT Traffic Operations
27	Patrick McDonough (Member)	GoTriangle
28	Kurt Stolka (Member)	University of North Carolina
29	Joe Geigle (Member)	FHWA
30	Matt Cecil (Alternate)	Chapel Hill Planning/Engineering
31	Brian Taylor (Alternate)	City of Durham Transportation
32	David Keilson (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 5
33	Richard Hancock (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 5
34	Bryan Kluchar (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 8
35		
36	Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO
37	Aaron Cain	DCHC MPO
38	Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
39	Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
40	Robert Jahn	DCHC MPO
41		
42	Andrea Eilers	TJCOG
43	Shuchi Gupta	TJCOG
44	Kim Johnson	GoTriangle
45	Tamara Njegovan	NCDOT, Division 7
46	Stephen Robinson	NCDOT, Division 7

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74

Quorum Count: 23 of 31 Voting Members

Chair Nish Trivedi called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A roll call was performed. The Voting Members and Alternate Voting Members of the DCHC MPO Technical Committee (TC) were identified and are indicated above. Chair Nish Trivedi reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet.

PRELIMINARIES:

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

There were no adjustments to the Agenda.

3. Public Comments

There were no members of the public signed up to speak during the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA:

4. Approval of September 25, 2019, Meeting Minutes

5. 2020 MPO Board and Technical Committee Meeting Schedule

Aaron Cain, LPA Staff

Aaron Cain noted that the date of the DCHC MPO Board meeting for January may be moved from January 8 to January 15.

Scott Whiteman made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Margaret Hauth seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS:

6. Mobility and Safety Operations and Funding

John Grant, NCDOT Regional Traffic Engineer

John Grant stated that he is the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Regional Traffic Engineer for Divisions 5 and 8, and that Brian Thomas is the Regional Traffic Engineer for Division 7 and 9. John Grant stated that there are several roles that the Regional Traffic Engineer has, including:

75 field investigations, countermeasures, funding, ordinances, systemic projects, and Transportation
76 Improvement Program (TIP) projects. John Grant stated that there are three main funding sources:
77 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), which has a \$1M budget cap; SPOT Safety, which has a
78 \$400,000 budget cap; and SPOT Mobility, which has a \$750,000 budget cap. There was discussion that
79 funding can be added from an outside source to a project exceeding the budget cap. John Grant
80 continued that funding from SPOT Mobility and SPOT Safety can be combined to fund a single project.
81 John Grant added that projects are chosen based on a cost benefit analysis and then compared to other
82 projects across the state. John Grant stated that a Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) is used in the cost
83 benefit analysis for SPOT Safety projects.

84 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann and John Grant discussed that, for example, safety improvement
85 projects can add facilities, such as sidewalks, but will increase the budget, which may then lower the
86 score and ranking in the cost benefit analysis. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann and John Grant discussed that
87 bike/ped programs using HSIP funds are sourced from 10 years' worth of data and other projects can be
88 sourced from five years' worth of data. Aaron Cain and John Grant discussed that the process for
89 submitting SPOT Mobility projects would be through the municipality's transportation department to
90 the NCDOT Regional Division Traffic Engineer. John Grant explained that SPOT Mobility projects are
91 more competitive when they can demonstrate that travel time savings at a particular location by adding
92 capacity.

93 John Grant demonstrated how each of the funding programs work at three different locations.
94 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann and John Grant discussed the Complete Streets policy. Aaron Cain and John
95 Grant discussed that the SPOT Mobility program is new, but it is not replacing the High Impact-Low Cost
96 program. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann stated that the City of Durham Department of Transportation
97 meets on a monthly basis, and assistance from the Regional Traffic Engineering Department would be
98 beneficial.

99 **7. Goals for the Update of the Triangle Region TDM Plan**
100 **Shuchi Gupta, Triangle J Council of Governments**
101 **Andrea Eilers, Triangle J Council of Governments**
102 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff**

103 Andrea Eilers stated that she is the Energy and Environment Program Manager for Triangle J
104 Council of Governments (TJCOG) and that she helps oversee the Triangle Transportation Demand
105 Management (TDM) Program. Andrea Eilers states that the TDM program aims to reduce reliance on
106 Single Occupancy Vehicles by promoting ride sharing, public transit, biking, telework, etc. Andrea Eilers
107 stated that funding is provided by DCHC MPO, Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO),
108 and NCDOT. Andrea Eilers stated that funding is then administered by TJCOG using a competitive grant
109 program to regional and local service providers. Andrea Eilers stated that the past TDM goals have
110 included reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), reduce congestion, improve environmental quality,
111 improve public safety, and reduce road construction.

112 Andrea Eilers stated that the five goals for the Updated Triangle Region TDM Plan are: refine and
113 enhance the program evaluation methods; align funding cycles with performance; expand program
114 marketing and outreach; increase innovation; and integrate with local and regional planning efforts. Vice
115 Chair Ellen Beckmann asked about how year-to-year VMT reductions are calculated. Andrea Eilers stated
116 that the calculation was developed by a consultant using data, estimates, and yearly employer surveys.
117 There was discussion about organizations that can apply for funding. Andrea Eilers stated that there is not
118 specific organizational requirements to receive TDM funding, but there is a 50% cost sharing requirement
119 for service providers. Patrick McDonough and Andrea Eilers discussed that advocacy organizations can
120 create partnerships in order to fulfill the funding match requirement.

121 Andrea Eilers stated that TJCOG will present the updated Triangle Regional TDM plan to technical
122 committees and executive boards of DCHC MPO and CAMPO. Andrea Eilers stated that a 30-day public
123 comment period will follow, and then the TDM Plan will be scheduled for approval from the MPOs by
124 February 10, 2020.

125 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann recommended that the MPO Board release the Triangle Region TDM
126 Plan goals for public comment. Jomar Pastorelle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

127 **8. 2020 Safety Performance Measures**
128 **Andy Henry, LPA Staff**

129 Andy Henry stated that MPOs must adopt targets for their 2020 Safety Performance Measures per
130 federal statute. Andy Henry added that MPOs may either adopt the targets developed by the state, or they
131 may develop their own. Andy Henry continued that MPO staff recommends adopting the NCDOT targets
132 because the targets are ambitious, and using the NCDOT targets allows the MPO to use the NCDOT data.
133 Andy Henry stated that a resolution adopted by the MPO Board indicating the targets for 2020 must be
134 adopted by February 27, 2020. Andy Henry added that these targets would also be incorporated into the
135 2045 MTP.

136 Andy Henry stated that the five safety targets are; total fatalities, fatality rate, total serious
137 injuries, serious injury rate, and non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries. Andy Henry reviewed some
138 of the rates of the safety targets. Patrick McDonough asked how the City of Durham's Vision Zero policy is
139 understood in light of the 50% reductions for the safety targets. Andy Henry and Patrick McDonough
140 discussed that the NCDOT targets are means of reduction on the road to eventually zero fatalities. Vice
141 Chair Ellen Beckmann noted that safety requirements are becoming more stringent, but NCDOT has not
142 allocated funding to meet their goals. Andy Henry and Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann discussed that there
143 could be consequences for the state if certain goals are not met, but there are not any consequences for
144 the MPO. Joe Geiger stated that the state has used 100% of HSIP funding in previous years instead of
145 flexing that funding to other sources, therefore they are meeting federal requirements. Vice Chair Ellen
146 Beckmann and Joe Geiger discussed using 100% of its TAP funds to meet non-motorized safety
147 requirements. Andy Henry stated that in 2014 the goal was to reduce safety numbers by 50% by the year
148 2030, and that yearly the percentage is adjusted should they not meet the current year target.

149 Tom Altieri recommended that the MPO Board adopt the resolution endorsing the state's safety
150 performance measure targets. Evan Tenenbaum seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

151 **9. 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan -- Amendment #2 (MTP)**

152 **Andy Henry, LPA Staff**

153 Andy Henry stated that the MPO Board released Amendment #2 to the 2045 Metropolitan
154 Transportation Plan (MTP) in September and conducted a public hearing in October. Andy Henry stated
155 that there are two changes to the proposed amendment since the October MPO Board meeting. Andy
156 Henry stated that the first change is due to an MPO Board Member requesting that the description for
157 high capacity transit service in central Durham in Chapter 7 of the 2045 MTP report mention North
158 Carolina Central University (NCCU). Andy Henry stated that the second change involved the
159 performance measures table in Chapter 4, which has new targets for the safety performance measures
160 and is related to the safety measures item on this same agenda.

161 Andy Henry that there was a public comment that requested that language be changed from
162 "suitable" to "required" in reference to shared use paths along four-lane, high volume corridors. Andy
163 Henry also stated that a public comment requested that language be added to shared use paths to
164 include "other protected facilities." There was discussion about the proposed changes. It was decided
165 that "suitable" will remain in order to keep options more flexible and that "other protected bicycle and
166 pedestrian facilities" will be added to language involving shared use paths.

167 Margaret Hauth recommended that the MPO Board adopt Amendment #2 to the 2045
168 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) by resolution. Scott Whiteman seconded the motion. The
169 motion passed unanimously.

170 **10. NC 54 West Corridor Study - Phase Two**

171 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff**

172 Aaron Cain stated that, in 2018, the original NC 54 West Corridor Study was presented to the
173 MPO Board, who requested that the NC 54 West Corridor Study include additional elements. Aaron Cain

174 stated that the Phase Two of the NC 54 West Corridor Study is now included to the original report as an
175 addendum, and is currently open for public comment. Aaron Cain and Tina Moon discussed that the
176 Carrboro Board of Alderman voiced opposition to the study, but did not reject it, however, final wording
177 of their resolution is forthcoming. Aaron Cain added that the NC 54 West Corridor Study will be
178 presented to the Chapel Hill Town Council on October 30, the Orange County Board of Commissioners
179 on November 7, and to the MPO Board for a public hearing on November 13.

180 Zach Hallock discussed safety and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) within the study.
181 Zach Hallock also stated that neither Carrboro nor Chapel Hill has areas of land that could be used for
182 parking, should NC 54 be widened. Chair Nish Trivedi compared the similarities between the NC 98
183 Corridor study, which was between Wake Forest and Durham, and NC 54, including aspects of length
184 and inter-MPO boundaries. Chair Nish Trivedi continued that there were more public meetings for the
185 NC 54 study than that for the NC 98 study.

186 There was discussion about street widening in an urbanized area. Tina Moon stated that
187 widening NC 54 is in opposition to Carrboro's land use planning due to part of the corridor being located
188 in a watershed area. Tina Moon stated that right-of-way development could result in residents losing
189 property. There was discussion about the development of bike/ped facilities. Aaron Cain stated that
190 Hannah Cockburn can answer further Complete Streets Policy questions at the MPO Board Meeting on
191 November 13. Tina Moon requested that intersection improvement projects be implemented to
192 alleviate safety concerns before widening projects are decided. Tina Moon also stated that the number
193 of through traffic vehicles was not as high as originally projected.

194 Chair Nish Trivedi stated that the Carrboro portion of the NC 54 Corridor Study accounts for
195 8.75% of the original corridor study. Chair Nish Trivedi discussed that the larger percentage of accidents
196 occur in Orange County outside of Carrboro. Chair Nish Trivedi and Zach Hallock discussed development
197 at the Old Fayetteville Road and NC 54 intersection. Chair Nish Trivedi stated that there are capacity

198 improvement projects for Carrboro currently in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
199 Tina Moon stated that the original intent of the NC 54 West Corridor study was multimodal
200 transportation, including a shared use path.

201 Tom Altieri stated that NC 54 widening is reflected in the Orange County Comprehensive
202 Transportation Plan (CTP) that was approved by Orange County's Board of County Commissioners. Tom
203 Altieri continued that this project is therefore not inconsistent with the Orange County's land use plan.
204 Tom Altieri and Aaron Cain discussed that NC 54 widening is not currently listed in the Strategic Planning
205 Office of Transportation (SPOT) 6 project list, and it is not currently in the Metropolitan Transportation
206 Plan (MTP). Tom Altieri and Aaron Cain discussed that a project submitted for SPOT would first have to
207 be in the MTP. Andy Henry added that the NC 54 West Corridor Study would not automatically be put in
208 the MTP if it was received, it must be adopted first. Chair Nish Trivedi stated that the BGMPO Board will
209 attend the MPO Board meeting on November 13. Zach Hallock stated that NC 54 is at capacity for three
210 hours during the day.

211 Scott Whiteman stated that adopting or rejecting the study by TC members outside of the
212 impacted jurisdictions when they are not in agreement would not be advantageous to the TC as a whole.
213 Aaron Cain presented the TC bylaws for voting on a motion for clarification. There was discussion on the
214 advances and disadvantages of consensus voting. Aaron Cain stated that there is no requirement for
215 consensus. Meg Scully added that a vote to adopt this study would mean that jurisdictions outside of
216 impacted area would need to choose sides because the Carrboro and Orange County are not in
217 agreement. John Hodges-Copple suggested to receive the report without adoption, review appropriate
218 safety and intersection improvement projects, and to encourage impacted jurisdictions to negotiate the
219 best result for both parties. John Hodges-Copple stated that parking and land use policies would need to
220 be reviewed during this process.

221 Margaret Hauth made a motion to (1) receive the NC 54 West Corridor Study – Phase Two
222 report, (2) review safety improvement projects along the 54 west corridor, and (3) facilitate discussions
223 between the Town of Carrboro and Orange County in order to negotiate a resolution. The motion
224 passed unanimously.

225 **11. FY2020-2029 Transportation Improvement Program**
226 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff.**

227 Aaron Cain stated that MPO staff is currently working on the formatting of the FY 2020-2029
228 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), including some minor edits and inserting project sheets.
229 Aaron Cain stated that, following the 21-day public comment period, the TIP is scheduled to be voted on
230 to be released by the MPO Board on November 13, which will then vote on adoption on December 11 to
231 meet its concurrence deadline from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

232 Scott Whiteman recommended that the MPO Board release the TIP for a 21-day public
233 comment period. Chance Mullis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

234 **12. Questions Regarding NCDOT's Complete Streets Policy and Implementation Guide**
235 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff**

236 Aaron Cain stated that the NCDOT has released its new Complete Streets Policy and
237 Implementation Guide, and Hannah Cockburn will present at the November 13 MPO Board. Aaron Cain
238 stated that further questions regarding the Complete Streets Policy should be sent to Dale McKeel.

239 **REPORTS:**

240 **13. Reports from the LPA Staff**
241 **Felix Nwoko, Andy Henry, LPA Staff**

242 Meg Scully stated that there will be a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) meeting in the MPO
243 offices following the TC meeting. Andy Henry stated that the 15-501 project steering committee will meet
244 on November 18. Andy Henry continued that the 15-501 corridor study recommendations will come to the
245 TC in February. Aaron Cain stated that the Joint DCHC MPO and CAMPO meeting is tentatively scheduled
246 for January 29, 2020.

247

248 **14. Report from the DCHC MPO TC Chair**

249 Nish Trivedi, DCHC MPO TC Chair

250 Chair Nish Trivedi stated that there is no further report.

251 **15. NCDOT Reports**

252 Richard Hancock, Division 5, stated that there is no additional report.

253 Stephen Robinson, Division 7, stated that the roundabout at Mt Carmel Church Road and Bennett
254 Road (U-5854) is approximately 75% complete. Stephen Robinson stated that construction is ongoing for
255 the roundabout at Greensboro Street and Estes Drive (U-5846), and work is being done on utilities at the
256 location. Stephen Robinson stated that the improvements at W Franklin Street and Merritt Mill Road (U-
257 5847) are being finalized.

258 Stephen Robinson stated that the I-40 widening from I-85 to the Durham County line (I-3306) has
259 been divided into two projects; I-40 from I-85 to NC 86 and NC 86 to the Durham county line. There was
260 discussion that the portion from NC 86 to the Durham County line will start first. Stephen Robinson
261 discussed that there is a third portion of the project that will include the interchange at NC 86, which is
262 scheduled to let at the same time as the first part of the I-40 widening.

263 Bryan Kluchar, Division 8, stated that there was no additional report.

264 Julie Bogle, Transportation Planning Division, stated that there are stakeholder meetings for the
265 NC Moves 2050 Plan in Kinston on October 29, Hickory on November 4, and Raleigh on November 5. Julie
266 Bogle stated that there is a public survey on NCMoves.gov through February 14, 2020.

267 John Grant, Traffic Operations, stated that there is no additional report.

268 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

269 Information Items were included in the Agenda packet.

270 **ADJOURNMENT:**

271 There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Technical Committee, the meeting was
272 adjourned at 11:22 a.m.