



**Date:** March 2, 2021

**To:** Anne Phillips, Principal Planner, DCHC MPO  
**From:** Evan Tenenbaum, Transportation Planner, City of Durham Transportation  
**Subject:** City of Durham 2021 CMAQ Application Submissions

To Ms. Philips,

The City of Durham has concerns about the CMAQ funding recommendations that were presented at the February 24<sup>th</sup> MPO Technical Committee meeting. The January 26<sup>th</sup> memo outlining the call for projects, indicated that geographic equity and emissions savings were being utilized as part of the selection process. The recommendations in the February 19<sup>th</sup> memo do not appear to align with this previously stated selected criteria. More specifically, if the funding had simply been selected with 25% assigned to regional partners (TJCOG and/or GoTriangle) and the remaining 75% split among member jurisdiction population to establish geographic equity, the City estimates the “population share” for each jurisdiction would have been the following:

Jurisdiction	Population (Google or MPO Report)	% of MPO Population	"Population Share"
Durham	269,702	63%	\$1,036,671
Chapel Hill	60,998	14%	\$230,371
Carrboro	20,337	5%	\$82,275
Unassigned Jurisdictions	77,656	18%	\$296,192
Regional Agencies - TJCOG, GoTriangle (25% assigned)	428,693	N/A	\$548,502
		<b>Total Funding Available</b>	<b>\$2,194,011</b>

While we understand that population alone was not the sole criteria that was to be used, the secondary criteria cited in the January 26<sup>th</sup> memo was emissions savings. Unfortunately, the February 19<sup>th</sup> recommendations once again do not appear to have utilized this criteria as multiple projects with lower emission benefits were chosen above higher scoring projects.

The City of Durham submitted 3 projects (Bike Facilities II, Neighborhood Bike Routes II and III, and Wayfinding II) for a total of \$2,036,000 of federal funding at 80-20, knowing all three projects would not be selected. In the February 19 memo, the MPO selected only two corridors of Bike Facilities II at a *cap* of \$422,524 (well below the \$1,036,671 geographic equity target). Based on the emissions information

provided in the February 19 memo, the three Durham projects are ranked second through fourth among all projects submitted, behind the TJCOG TDM program funding, and ahead of *all* other projects. Additionally, the City of Durham project was the only one required to contribute a larger portion of local money (calculated at 63-37) to have their project as part of the selection. The only options offered by the MPO to keep the project at 80-20 was to either reduce the scope of the project further (down to one corridor only), or to instead select a lower cost Durham project that is ranked lower in priority for the City (Neighborhood Bike Routes) for *less* amount of CMAQ money, with the remainder being thrown back into the regional pool.

While we recognize the value that all of the proposed projects will provide to the region, the City does not understand why lower emission reduction projects were fully funded in other jurisdictions above and beyond the geographic equity targets. In particular, the Chapel Hill's Estes Drive Bike and Ped project and the GoTriangle Bus Shelters project were selected to be fully funded at 80-20, despite ranking lower than all three Durham projects. Additionally, these projects may have alternate options for funding such as utilizing STGDBA (Estes Drive) and Orange County Transit Plan (GoTriangle Bus Shelters) to complete funding gaps that would be left with partial funding or no funding from this call for projects. Bike Facilities II, despite being ranked lower than the other two Durham projects, still ranked higher than the remaining selected projects, but is only selected to receive federal funding at 63-37, for only *part* of the initial request.

Because the rankings of projects weren't specifically called out in the February 19 memo, the City of Durham would like to propose an alternative for projects selected for CMAQ funding.

	CMAQ	Additional STBG-DA/other local source needed
TJCOG TDM Program/DCHC area	\$ 571,487	-
City of Durham Bike Facilities II*	\$ 852,000	-
Town of Chapel Hill Estes Drive Bike-Ped Improvement	\$ 770,524	\$ 29,476
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,194,011.00</b>	

The City of Durham's initial request of four Bike Facilities corridors (Club, Morgan, Foster, Chapel Hill), was initially modified to just two (Club and Foster), but under this alternative, expand to three to also include Chapel Hill Street. Durham will likely be seeking funding for the Morgan corridor using only local funds. The total for the three corridors would be \$1,065,000, and at 80% would mean \$852,000 from CMAQ. The difference from the selection in the February 19 memo comes from eliminating the GoTriangle Bus Shelters project, and the Town of Chapel Hill finding \$29,476 from other sources of local or federal funding to complete their project. Alternatively, to keep Chapel Hill's project fully funded, the City of Durham also proposes this selection:

	CMAQ	Additional STBGDA/other local source needed
TJCOG TDM Program/DCHC area	\$ 571,487	-
City of Durham Bike Facilities II*	\$ 822,524	\$ 29,476
Town of Chapel Hill Estes Dr Bike-Ped Improvement	\$ 800,000	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,194,011.00</b>	

This alternative, while still eliminating the GoTriangle Bus Shelters project, allows Chapel Hill's Estes Drive project to be fully funded at 80-20 without seeking additional federal funding. This would allow the remaining CMAQ money to be capped, for the City of Durham to receive \$822,524 to fund Bike Facilities for three corridors (Club, Foster, Chapel Hill). Compared to the \$852,000 in the first alternative, the City would have to contribute an additional local match of \$29,476, meaning the project would be at a 77-23 split, rather than 80-20.

Please consider these alternatives when discussing this item at the March DCHC MPO Board meeting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Evan Tenenbaum", written over a light gray grid background.

Evan Tenenbaum, Transportation Planner

Cc: Sean C. Egan, Director, Transportation  
Bill Judge, Assistant Director, Transportation