

1 **DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BOARD**

2 **9 May 2018**

3
4 **MINUTES OF MEETING**

5
6 The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Board met on May 9,
7 2018, at 9:00 a.m. in the City Council Chambers, located on the first floor of Durham City Hall.
8 The following people were in attendance:

9		
10	Damon Seils (MPO Board Chair)	Town of Carrboro
11	Wendy Jacobs (MPO Board Vice Chair)	Durham County
12	Charlie Reece (Member)	City of Durham
13	Ellen Reckhow (Member)	GoTriangle
14	Pam Hemminger (Member)	Town of Chapel Hill
15	Nina Szlosberg-Landis (Member)	NC Board of Transportation
16	Renee Price (Member)	Orange County
17	Heidi Carter (Alternate)	Durham County
18	Jenn Weaver (Alternate)	Town of Hillsborough
19	Michael Parker (Alternate)	Town of Chapel Hill
20	Lydia Lavelle (Alternate)	Town of Carrboro
21	Mark Marcoplos (Alternate)	Orange County
22		
23	Richard Hancock	NCDOT, Division 5
24	Bryan Kluchar	NCDOT, Division 8
25	Jen Britt	NCDOT, Division 8
26	Julie Bogle	NCDOT, TPD
27	Tina Moon	Town of Carrboro
28	Zack Hallock	Town of Carrboro
29	Kayla Seibel	Town of Chapel Hill
30	Bergen Watterson	Town of Chapel Hill
31	Geoff Green	GoTriangle
32	Ellen Beckmann	City of Durham
33	Evan Tenenbaum	Durham County
34	Eddie Dancausse	Federal Highway Administration
35	John Hodges-Copple	Triangle J Council of Governments
36	Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
37	Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
38	Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
39	Aaron Cain	DCHC MPO
40	Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO
41	Mo Devlin	DCHC MPO
42	Robert Jahn	DCHC MPO
43	Nishith Trivedi	Orange County
44	Will Letchworth	WSP
45	Cy Stober	City of Mebane
46		

47 Quorum Count: 8 of 10 Voting Members

48

49 Chair Damon Seils called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. A roll call was performed. The
50 Voting Members and Alternate Voting Members of the DCHC MPO Board were identified and are
51 indicated above. Chair Damon Seils reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was being
52 circulated.

53 **PRELIMINARIES:**

54 **2. Ethics Reminder**

55 Chair Damon Seils read the Ethics Reminder and asked if there were any known conflicts of
56 interest with respect to matters coming before the MPO Board and requested that if there were any
57 identified during the meeting for them to be announced.

58 There were no known conflicts identified by the MPO Board members. Aaron Cain stated that
59 all MPO Board members completed their ethics filings.

60 **3. Adjustments to the Agenda**

61 There were no adjustments to the agenda.

62 **4. Public Comments**

63 There were no public comments.

64 **5. Directives to Staff**

65 The Directives to Staff were included in the agenda packet for review.

66 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

67 **6. Approval of April 11, 2018, Meeting Minutes**

68 Chair Damon Seils stated that he submitted last minute changes to the Meeting Minutes
69 regarding comments he made during the Chair's Report. Ellen Reckhow stated that there was a
70 grammatical error on line 268 of the Meeting Minutes.

71 Pam Hemminger made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Ellen Reckhow seconded
72 the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

73 **ACTION ITEMS:**

74 **7. Managed Motorways Presentation**

75 Will Letchworth, WSP USA

76 Will Letchworth explained that Managed Motorways are a collection of strategies and
77 technologies that work in concert with each other to provide an integrated corridor management
78 system. He stated that Managed Motorways keeps traffic flowing on highways at peak traffic times by
79 synchronizing the flow of vehicles entering a freeway to the available capacity. Will Letchworth then
80 presented a video on YouTube, which explained how Managed Motorways work. Following the video,
81 Will Letchworth stated that adding Managed Motorways has the same effect on capacity as adding an
82 additional lane to the freeway or highway but that it is a much cheaper solution. Will Letchworth
83 added that Managed Motorways was completed in Melbourne, Australia, and that there are cities in
84 the United States that are considering adding them as well.

85 Will Letchworth stated that Managed Motorways provide real time demand management by
86 using sensors to collect data on vehicle traffic every 20 seconds. Ellen Reckhow asked if it would be
87 possible for the public to access information about real time traffic patterns remotely. Ellen Reckhow
88 and Will Letchworth discussed the capability of traffic pattern information to interface with the public.

89 Renee Price asked about the location of the control center that would be needed to monitor
90 the Managed Motorways. Will Letchworth responded that the control center would be in a nearby
91 location and would have the ability of responding to crashes and other interruptions in traffic patterns
92 in real time. Renee Price and Will Letchworth discussed maintaining the infrastructure of the Managed
93 Motorways and the need for a local workforce.

94 Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs asked about the capacity of Managed Motorways for messaging
95 drivers in real time as conditions change on the affected road. Will Letchworth responded that there

96 are messaging signs, and that the control center operator has the ability to change the messages on the
97 signs. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs and Will Letchworth also discussed the need to educate the public
98 about Managed Motorways. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs asked if the North Carolina Department of
99 Transportation (NCDOT) already has a policy in place regarding Managed Motorways. Will Letchworth
100 stated that NCDOT Secretary James H. Trogon has been very receptive to Managed Motorways in
101 previous meetings.

102 Heidi Carter and Will Letchworth discussed the concepts of flow and density. Michael Parker
103 and Will Letchworth discussed how emerging technologies, such as autonomous vehicles, would be
104 integrated into the system. Will Letchworth stated that new technologies such as autonomous vehicles
105 can work with Managed Motorways. Michael Parker and Will Letchworth also discussed time needed
106 to implement Managed Motorways.

107 Chairman Damon Seils thanked Will Letchworth for his presentation and the MPO Board for
108 their questions.

109 No further action was required by the MPO Board.

110 **8. Initial Allocation of Local Input Points for Regional Impact Projects**

111 Aaron Cain, LPA Staff

112 Aaron Cain stated that, per the DCHC MPO Methodology, DCHC MPO staff compiled an initial
113 list of projects for local points for the current round of prioritization. Aaron Cain presented a map of
114 the locations for the highest ranking projects, which was requested during the previous MPO Board
115 meeting. He noted that the majority of projects are located in Durham County. He explained that the
116 DCHC MPO staff applied the Methodology to every project in the Regional Impact tier, including those
117 that could cascade down from the Statewide Mobility tier. He added that projects that received the
118 same Methodology score were then ranked based on their overall Strategic Planning Office of
119 Transportation (SPOT) quantitative score to determine if they should receive local points. Aaron Cain
120 stated that deviation is allowed from the Methodology as long as it is documented and acknowledged

121 by the MPO Board. Aaron Cain stated that, per the Methodology, no points would be allocated to
122 projects that cascade down from the Statewide Mobility tier that cost over \$5M. Aaron Cain also stated
123 that the point allocation for the Commuter Rail Project is dependent upon which Commuter Rail
124 Project is chosen due to the percentage of that project being located inside of the DCHC MPO's
125 jurisdiction. Aaron Cain added that he is in discussions with the Capital Area Metropolitan Organization
126 (CAMPO) about allocating points to a Commuter Rail Project.

127 Nina Szlosberg-Landis asked if the North Carolina Railroad (NCRR) is in agreement with the rail
128 projects that were identified for the allocation of points by the DCHC MPO. Aaron Cain responded that
129 the rail projects were initially requested by NCRR.

130 Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs and Aaron Cain discussed cascading projects and the impact on
131 funding allocation. Aaron Cain stated that a Statewide project that does not receive a competitive
132 quantitative score can cascade to the Regional tier in order to receive points for funding. Aaron Cain
133 explained that Statewide tier projects can be eligible for Statewide funding in future years. He added
134 that the Statewide tier projects receiving Regional funding would be taking money away from other
135 Regional projects that could only be funded by Regional funds. Chair Damon Seils suggested that the
136 MPO Board consider refraining from adding points to Statewide tier projects that cascade to the
137 Regional tier because they could be eligible for future Statewide funding.

138 Aaron Cain stated that a final review of the Regional projects for the TC should be scheduled in
139 June and a final review for the MPO Board in July in order to best allow the DCHC MPO staff and the TC
140 to coordinate with the Divisions for point allocation. There was discussion about the feasibility of such
141 a meeting because the MPO Board does not typically meet in July. There was discussion about setting a
142 tentative date for July 11 and allowing the MPO Board time to review their schedules for availability.

143 Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs and Aaron Cain discussed the geographic imbalance of the initial
144 points list. Aaron Cain stated that the TC had a subcommittee meeting where proposed changes to the

145 list were made, but the TC has not yet voted on the amended list. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs requested
146 that MPO staff forward an updated allocation points list to the MPO Board well ahead of the June
147 meeting so that members have ample opportunity to review the recommended changes. Chair Damon
148 Seils discussed the need to balance geographic equity while ensuring that projects are competitive.
149 Chair Damon Seils and Aaron Cain also discussed how current corridor studies will impact the allocation
150 of points on various projects.

151 Chair Damon Seils stated that the MPO Board would not make changes to the list at the
152 moment, and that the Methodology requires a public comment period.

153 Ellen Reckhow made a motion to release the Initial Allocation of Local Input Points for Regional
154 Impact Projects for public comment. The motion was seconded by Jenn Weaver. The motion passed
155 unanimously.

156 **REPORTS:**

157 **9. Triangle Toll Study Update**

158 Andy Henry, LPA Staff

159 Andy Henry stated that the DCHC MPO, CAMPO, and NCDOT hired the consultant, WSP, to
160 conduct a tolling study in the Triangle region. He added that the goal of the study is to determine if
161 toll lanes and/or managed lanes are advisable in the Triangle. Andy Henry stated advantages of toll
162 lanes include environmental benefits and easing traffic congestion. Andy Henry also stated that the
163 study's purpose is to develop a strategy to address funding, equity, and consensus-building issues.
164 Andy Henry stated that potential solutions for these issues can be found on the Best Practices
165 document on the Triangle Toll Study website.

166 Ellen Reckhow and Andy Henry discussed how High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes impact
167 standard toll lanes and relate to lowering traffic congestion. Andy Henry also discussed bond funding
168 and revenue of toll lanes. Renee Price requested more information on how different regions
169 approach tolling and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes.

170 Ellen Reckhow and Andy Henry discussed whether tolls would be adjusted based on traffic
171 demand. Nina Szlosberg-Landis stated that environmental groups have historically been in favor of
172 toll lanes and other incentives for people to carpool. Nina Szlosberg-Landis and Vice Chair Wendy
173 Jacobs discussed that historically some of the issues that have been raised in relation to the
174 economic equity of toll lanes. Pam Hemminger stated that driverless cars would also need to be
175 considered in toll lane plans.

176 No further action was required by the MPO Board.

177 **10. MPO Collector Street Plan**

178 Andy Henry, LPA Staff

179 Andy Henry stated that the DCHC MPO and many of its local jurisdictions already have
180 collector street plans, however, many of these plans may be antiquated and together they only cover
181 a portion of the MPO planning area. He added that the Lead Planning Agency (LPA) staff believes that
182 some roadways that were included in the recently adopted Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)
183 and the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) will be funded, built, and function as collector
184 streets, not as arterial roadways. Andy Henry stated that the MPO staff proposes creating an MPO-
185 wide Collector Street Plan.

186 There was discussion about whether a collector street plan at the MPO level is warranted
187 Pam Hemminger stated that local jurisdictions could make their own Collector Street Plan, which
188 would then be incorporated into the MPO Collector Street Plan. Andy Henry stated that communities
189 would be able to keep or revise their current Connector Street Plan if they choose. Ellen Reckhow
190 suggested using an approach where the MPO could inform local areas of general guidelines or
191 frameworks to use for their Collector Street Plans. Renee Price added that joint planning would be
192 advisable for this process.

193 Chair Damon Seils stated that there could be issues if the local member jurisdictions
194 perceived that the MPO was mandating what their Collector Street Plan should be, which could then

195 impede or halt the process. Andy Henry stated that the local jurisdictions could keep their plans if
196 they choose, and the MPO would collect each plan and merge them. Chair Damon Seils asked about
197 the potential process for developing and incorporating a new MPO-wide Collector Street Plan. Andy
198 Henry stated that having an MPO Collector Street Plan would facilitate connectivity in the border
199 areas between municipalities. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs stated that involving CAMPO in any MPO
200 Collector Street Plan would also improve connectivity. Andy Henry stated that an MPO Collector
201 Street Plan would help streamline future MTP and CTP planning and coordination.

202 Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs commented on the importance of collaborating regionally, using a
203 multimodal approach, and considering the relationship between collector streets and corridor
204 studies. Andy Henry answered that an MPO Collector Street Plan would include recommendations
205 for multi-modal travel. Ellen Reckhow stated that multi-modal connectivity is important when
206 developing a Collector Street Plan.

207 No further action was required by the MPO Board.

208 **11. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Amendment #1**

209 Andy Henry, LPA Staff

210 Andy Henry stated that the MPO staff requested that the DCHC MPO and NCDOT amend the
211 CTP to change the proposed future configuration of the portion of Farrington Road between Southwest
212 Durham Drive and Falconbridge Road Extension from a four-lane divided road into a two-lane cross-
213 section. He added that a two-lane cross-section is more appropriate for that short portion. Andy Henry
214 continued that the portion of Southwest Durham Drive that is north of the Southwest Durham
215 Drive/Farrington Road convergence is defined as the future four-lane divided facility, and as a result the
216 converged section will be capable of handling the combined vehicles to and from the 2 two-lane
217 roadways to the south. Andy Henry stated that the MPO staff noticed that the identified portion of
218 Farrington Road was defined as a four-lane cross-section when GoTriangle staff inquired about the
219 future status of the roadway because it submitted the Durham-Orange Light Rail (D-O LRT) Rail

220 Operations and Maintenance Facility (ROMF) to the City of Durham for development review. Andy
 221 Henry stated that the MPO requires a 42-day public comment review period for MTP and CTP adoption.
 222 Pam Hemminger made a motion to release Amendment #1 to the CTP for public comment. Ellen
 223 Reckhow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

224 **12. Amendment #3 to the FY2018-2027 TIP**

225 Aaron Cain, LPA Staff

226 Aaron Cain stated that, for Amendment #3, the new language suggested by the NCDOT consists
 227 of performance management targets and requirements from the Federal Highway Administration
 228 (FHWA).

229 Aaron Cain stated that there is one locally initiated project to be amended, C-5650, South
 230 Greensboro Street Sidewalks, as well as several modifications and additions from NCDOT.

231 Aaron Cain stated that there was a recent case in federal court, South Coast Air Quality
 232 Management District v. the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which requires further scrutiny for
 233 certain amendments to the MTPs and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP). Chair Damon Seils
 234 asked if this ruling would impact the C-5650 project. Aaron Cain responded that only major transit
 235 projects, all highway projects, and other projects that affect air quality would be affected, but bike and
 236 pedestrian projects are exempt. Nina Szlosberg-Landis and Aaron Cain discussed the history of emissions
 237 standards and enforcement as it relates to this ruling. Eddie Dancausse of FHWA and Lydia Lavelle
 238 discussed the fact that this case remains in the appeals process. Eddie Dancausse stated that he is
 239 proceeding with this new administrative process in order to mitigate delays on current and future
 240 projects.

241 Wendy Jacobs made a motion to pass Amendment #3 to the FY2018-2027 TIP. Pam Hemminger
 242 seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

243 **REPORTS:**

244 **13. Report from the Board Chair**

245 Damon Seils, Board Chair

246 Chair Damon Seils stated that the North Carolina Association of Metropolitan Transportation
247 Organization (NCAMPO) conference in Durham, NC, was a well-attended, successful event. Vice Chair
248 Wendy Jacobs added that NCDOT Secretary James H. Trogdon mentioned that the D-O LRT project is a
249 high priority within the NCDOT. Chair Damon Seils also stated that there would be a joint meeting with
250 the CAMPO Board on May 31 and encouraged the MPO Board to attend.

251 **14. Report from the Technical Committee Chair**

252 Ellen Beckmann, TC Chair

253 Ellen Beckmann stated that she attended the NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian All City Stakeholder
254 Group Meeting. She added that the group presented their Complete Streets Policy Review findings,
255 which she will send to LPA staff for further review and comment.

256 **15. Report from LPA Staff**

257 Felix Nwoko, LPA Manager

258 There was no report from the LPA Staff

259 **16. NCDOT Report**

260 Richard Hancock, NCDOT Division 5, stated that the East End Connector project has ramps
261 closed and detours in place. He added that there is also a public meeting to address a noise wall
262 material issue. Richard Hancock also stated that there were changes to the Alston Avenue project,
263 which have resulted in ramp and lane closures. He added that there are utility issues on Alston Avenue
264 between Liberty Street and Main Street, which will result in lane closures for an extended period of
265 time and that there will be a public meeting addressing this issue. Richard Hancock stated that the Old
266 Chapel Hill Road project is progressing despite ongoing utility issues. Richard Hancock also stated that
267 there have been utility issues for the Herndon-Barbee roundabout project, which have resulted in
268 delays.

269 Pam Hemminger stated that there is a safety issue involved with the lack of signage and
270 lighting at the Pope Road roundabout project. Richard Hancock stated that he plans to contact the
271 Resident Engineer's office to obtain the planning information for signage and lighting. Ellen Reckhow
272 and Richard Hancock discussed the lack of signage coming onto I-85 from Roxboro Road warning
273 drivers about long delay periods due to construction.

274 There was no report from NCDOT Division 7.

275 Bryan Kluchar, Division 8, stated that there will be a Prioritization 5.0 public meeting on June
276 7 in Aberdeen, NC.

277

278 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

279 **17. Recent News, Articles, and Updates**

280 **ADJOURNMENT:**

281 There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Board, the meeting was adjourned at
282 11:33 a.m.