

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

2 **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

3 **Date: January 27, 2016**

4 **MINUTES OF MEETING**

5
6
7 The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Committee
8 met on December 16, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. in the City Council Committee Room on the second
9 floor of Durham City Hall. The following people were in attendance:

10		
11	David Bonk (TC Vice Chair)	Chapel Hill Planning
12	Kumar Neppalli (Member)	Chapel Hill Engineering
13	Lisa Miller (Alternate)	City of Durham Planning
14	Scott Whiteman (Member)	Durham County Planning
15	Ellen Beckmann (Member)	City of Durham Transportation
16	Margaret Hauth (Member)	Hillsborough Planning
17	Bergen Watterson (Member)	Carrboro Planning
18	Christina Moon (Member)	Carrboro Planning
19	Laura Woods (Member)	Durham County Planning
20	Linda Thomas Wallace (Member)	Durham County Planning
21	Cara Coppola (Member)	Chatham County Planning
22	Peter Murphy (Member)	Orange Public Transportation
23	Tom Altieri (Member)	Orange County Planning
24	John Hodges-Copple (Member)	Triangle J Council of Governments
25	Patrick McDonough (Member)	GoTriangle
26	Corey Liles (Member)	Research Triangle Foundation
27	Julie Bollinger (Member)	NCDOT, TPB
28	Mila Vega (Alternate)	Chapel Hill Planning
29	Hillary Pace (Alternate)	Chatham County Planning
30	David Keilson (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 5
31	Ed Lewis (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 7
32	Darius Sturdivant (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 8
33	Solanda Adkins	City of Durham
34	Janice Pointer	City of Durham
35	Dale McKeel	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
36	Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
37	Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
38	Lindsay Smart	DCHC MPO
39	Tyler Bray	Town of Cary
40	Albert Ampatey	DCA
41	Alvis Aikens	PAC-1/Citizen
42	Gwyn Silver	PAC-1/Citizen
43	Than Austin	UNC
44	Hong Qi Lu	NCDOT
45	Eddie Dancausse	FHWA

46 John Grant NCDOT
47 Albert Amoaley DCA
48 Jon Dodson GoTriangle
49 Eric Landfried GoTriangle

50
51
52
53
54
55

Quorum Count: 20 of 31 Voting Members

Vice Chair David Bonk called the meeting to order at 9:03 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. Vice Chair David Bonk reminded everyone that the meeting was recorded, and asked for everyone to speak into the microphones and state their name to facilitate the recording of the minutes.

PRELIMINARIES:

Adjustments to the Agenda

Vice Chair David Bonk asked if there were any adjustments to the agenda. There were no adjustments to the agenda.

64

Public Comments

Vice Chair David Bonk asked if there was any public comment on items that were not part of the agenda. There were no members of the public signed up to speak during the meeting.

68

CONSENT AGENDA:

5. Approval of December 16, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair David Bonk stated the consent agenda includes the minutes from the December 16th meeting, however they will be submitted on February 24th.

73

ACTION ITEMS:

74

75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

6. Proposed Transit Service Changes for the US 15/501 Corridor
Jon Dodson, GoTriangle

Jon Dodson, GoTriangle presented on the proposed transit service changes in the US 15/501 corridor that supports existing mobility and building the demand for light rail. Jon Dodson stated GoTriangle is looking at changes happening this fall and are looking to improve the efficiency of US 15/501 between Durham and Chapel Hill. GoTriangle is not proposing any changes to Chapel Hill Transit routes and they are not removing any service from Durham. Jon Dodson stated the goal is to create a faster and more reliant service, which includes 15 minutes at peak, and 30 minutes at mid-day Monday through Saturday, from Chapel Hill to Durham. Jon Dodson stated presently it's 30 minute peak and hourly in midday, so there would be an increase in frequency and they would extend the peak service to Carrboro since they currently do not provide the service. Jon Dodson reviewed a presentation that identified the specific areas affected. Jon Dodson said GoTriangle is looking to streamline the route by doing stop consolidation and in doing so, it would save 9 – 10 minutes per trip, and the customer experience would improve. There would be shared stops between GoTriangle, GoDurham, and Chapel Hill Transit. There was discussion amongst the group regarding the specific stops affected. Ellen Beckmann asked about apartment complexes near Old Chapel Hill Road. Ellen Beckmann asked if the apartments will still be served. Jon Dodson stated the apartments have their own shuttle service. Jon Dodson said GoTriangle is looking for approval in the April or May timeframe, with the hope that August would be the implementation. The TC staff could contact Jon Dodson if they needed any additional information. Felix Nwoko asked if the changes would take place in July. Jon Dodson stated GoDurham's changes would be completed in July and the GoTriangle changes would be completed in August. Felix Nwoko asked what GoTriangle's goals were for the changes. Felix Nwoko asked if the goal was increased ridership. Jon Dodson stated the goal encompassed a number of factors. One aspect is the traffic, specifically on US 15/501. Based on data from the last four years, traffic flow from Duke to UNC has increased. There was continued

101 discussion by the TC about the specific time changes and the traffic flow that is affecting service. Felix
102 Nwoko asked if there was any change in ridership. Jon Dodson stated they could be increasing frequency
103 which would hopefully increase ridership. Vice Chair David Bonk asked if there were any more questions.
104 John Hodges-Copple stated that the two routes that were overlapping at 30 minutes, would make that
105 deviation small, so they wouldn't compress that route. Eric Landfried stated this design would be an
106 overall 15 minute experience, so if you're leaving Durham station, the bus would leave every 15 minutes to
107 get to UNC. If you're near the midpoint area trying to access UNC from further down the route, it will still
108 take approximately 15 minutes.

109 Patrick McDonough stated this is the most intensive effort to date for transit service along US
110 15/501. Patrick McDonough asked if there is interest in more of these types of presentations,
111 presentations of bus service planning. Vice Chair David Bonk responded he thinks so, and assumes this
112 presentation will be given to the DCHC MPO Board at their meeting in February. Vice Chair David Bonk
113 mentioned to Jon Dodson that GoTriangle's process is usually to go to the public to get some input, and
114 noted GoTriangle will have the opportunity on February 9th. The Transportation Board for the Town of
115 Chapel Hill will be holding a Public Information meeting to provide the public with information about
116 various aspects about Chapel Hill Transit Services and Regional Services. Vice Chair David Bonk indicated
117 the DCHC MPO Board would be interested in gathering information they could use to go to the Town
118 Council as part of the budget process as it relates specifically to Chapel Hill Transit. Vice Chair David Bonk
119 stated there are questions about the use of sales tax and revenue and asked if it would be presented in a
120 way to show that the money is being used for service improvements. Allison Carpenter, Duke University,
121 stated that Duke University is a strong advocate for the change. This would be great for the 50,000 people
122 at Duke's campus. Margaret Hauth asked if there are stops on the deviation that are being removed. Jon
123 Dodson stated yes. Pierre Owusu suggested that the next time Durham is notified of a meeting, it is to
124 discuss this. Jon Dodson stated they have already met with Chapel Hill Transit. Ellen Beckmann asked how

125 many more resources are being devoted to the US 15/501 corridor. Jon Dodson stated they will be adding
126 one bus. Eric Landfried added that during the peak times they're not adding a lot of resources. But in the
127 off-peak times during the daytime hours on Saturdays are new dollars, from new revenues. Vice Chair
128 David Bonk stated the general consensus is that this kind of information is important and is welcomed.

129

130 **7. Proposed DCHC Methodology for Ranking Projects and Allocating Local**
131 **Input Points (SPOT P4.0)**

132 **Lindsay Smart, LPA staff**

133

134 Lindsay Smart presented on the DCHC MPO's Methodology for Identifying and Ranking TIP Project

135 Requests which is the process that the DCHC MPO will follow to develop the DCHC MPO's allocation of
136 Local Input Points among projects for input to the STI process. Lindsay Smart stated the process has not
137 changed significantly since the Technical Committee (TC) and MPO Board approved the original version in
138 2014. The changes that were made were slight modifications to make it a bit more applicable to the new
139 SPOT P4.0 process. There was one section in the original version that described the MPO's scoring and
140 ranking process that discussed gathering data and meeting with the TC and scoring projects and going thru
141 an MPO data-driven process. This time for SPOT 4.0, the TC is getting all that data and some of the
142 preliminary scores from NCDOT, so that process has changed. The language has changed to focus on how
143 the MPO will rank projects, but not be as specific. The high level policy and process for this has not
144 changed since the TC reviewed it and approved it a couple of years ago. Vice Chair David Bonk asked if
145 there were any questions. Ellen Beckmann asked if SPOT changed anything or given any new requirements
146 of what needs to be in the Methodology or their approval of the document. Lindsay Smart responded no,
147 and she was told the original Methodology was really good from the last time and was advised to make it a
148 little less specific to a particular SPOT process like P 3.0 and P4.0. Vice Chair David Bonk stated on page 6 of
149 the guide there is a listing of the categories for statewide mobility, regional impact, and division needs.
150 These are categories that are created by the state. Vice Chair David Bonk said if the percentages that are
151 related to those are also dictated by the state. Lindsay Smart answered yes. Vice Chair David Bonk asked if

152 the MPO has had any role in developing criteria or the proportionality of the waiting for the criteria.

153 Lindsay Smart answered that both were developed by the work group and approved by the Board of

154 Transportation this past summer. The MPO sent a couple of letters when Ellen Beckmann was still doing it

155 to request the MPO have input on the statewide projects as well as some of the percentages for Division

156 Engineer Points and Local Input Points being changed. Ultimately, the Workgroup recommended that it

157 stay this way, and that's what the Board of Transportation approved. Vice Chair David Bonk asked do we

158 still have that position that we want to see some of this changed. Vice Chair David Bonk stated he is sure it

159 will come up as part of the MPO Board discussion. Vice Chair David Bonk stated he believes during the

160 process everyone discussed a few things specifically on the proportionality issue, whether or not the fact

161 that they were interested in it is here, but how it was weighted is more of a question. Ellen Beckmann

162 stated she believes the structure is flawed and doesn't think it will be changed. Vice Chair David Bonk

163 stated even though it may not be able to be changed at the state level, is it a point we want to make with

164 the feds; it needs to be on record to say we're going to use this because it's been imposed on us, but we

165 think it's flawed. Lindsay Smart responded the TC did bring this up repeatedly during the certification

166 review. Lindsay Smart stated she doesn't know how much flexibility they have in modifying the SPOT

167 process and reminded everyone that today's agenda item is how the MPO will allocate Local Input Points

168 and not the MPO's objections to the SPOT process. Vice Chair David Bonk stated it should be reiterated to

169 the DCHC MPO Board that the TC did and still do have concerns about the way the proportions have been

170 allocated and the SPOT process doesn't meet the goals and objectives of the adopted MTP plan or even

171 the plan they will be considering going forward. There is a mismatch in the way the money is allocated in a

172 way a region would want to spend their money. Linda Thomas stated there have been issues related to the

173 state and state policy that they talk about and may present to the DCHC MPO Board. Linda Thomas stated

174 she believes at some point we have to go on record and hold them accountable for the response, and

175 that's our documentation as opposed to waiting until the next time comes up and we have to address it

176 again. Patrick McDonough stated when we vote on the MTP, the DOT is voting for the MTP and approving
177 it. Never the less, there are restrictions in policy and guidance that come through that make the ability to
178 apply money to the plan they voted for impossible. Patrick McDonough stated he doesn't understand how
179 policy making gets elevated, approved, and then sometimes altered from above. State level funding and
180 guidance haven't been written to receive those priorities in a way that make sense locally. Vice Chair David
181 Bonk stated if Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) were paying attention to the plans they would
182 understand there is a mismatch in how we have adopted the projects we want to implement over time
183 which is heavily weighted towards non-highway. If you look at the way the money is being spent, it's
184 inconsistent and in theory FHWA should be coming to us to ask why. Vice Chair David Bonk asked Lindsay
185 Smart if the MPO staff is asking the Board to approve the methodology. Lindsay Smart responded that
186 MPO staff is asking the TC to recommend that the MPO Board approve the Methodology be released for
187 the public review and comment period, and the MPO staff will still accept comments, if anyone else has
188 any during that period. Vice Chair David Bonk asked if there was a motion to recommend to the MPO
189 DCHC MPO Board to approve the draft and release for public review and comment. John Hodge-Copple
190 motioned to recommend to the MPO Policy Board to approve the draft and release for public review and
191 comment. Ellen Beckmann seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

192

193 **8. Meg Scully**
194 **Draft FY2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

195

196 Meg Scully presented the annual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) that details and guides
197 the urban area transportation planning activities. Meg Scully mentioned at the last meeting, she reviewed
198 the UPWP, however now there are several changes. Meg Scully stated everyone should have a copy that
199 went to the MPO Board in December, and it was released for a public comment period. There are a few
200 minor edits that need to be made. The MPO staff also received several requests from agencies
201 requesting changes.

202 Meg Scully stated the City of Durham has worked to reallocate their funding across task codes.
203 They're keeping their funding levels the exact same but they're taking a closer look at what they expect
204 to do with the funds next year. There's an additional set of regional projects proposed and there is an
205 attachment for those four projects. Meg Scully reviewed the projects. In conjunction with CAMPO, the
206 projects are the NC 98 Corridor Study, the Triangle Toll Study, and the CSX Study. They would be funding
207 shared products. The DCHC MPO portion for FY17 would be \$25,000 for the toll study, and \$50,000 for
208 the CSX study. Meg Scully said the MPO staff has budgeted for those in the local match from funds they
209 de-obligated last year to bring forward to this year. The fourth regional project is for the NC 54 Corridor
210 Study in Carrboro and Orange County. This is a collaborative project. The UPWP would have this as a
211 special studies project, with the additional local match being provided by Orange County and Carrboro.
212 Meg Scully stated the TC has some changes that Chapel Hill would like to make however, she didn't have
213 the details.

214 Vice Chair David Bonk stated the change Chapel Hill needed to make was regarding a
215 transportation and connectivity study project that's being initiated in this year's work planning program.
216 The timeline for this study will span two fiscal years, so it needs to be determined what funds to keep in
217 this year's planning work program, and remove the remainder into next year's work program to cover
218 the project in total. This involves an amendment to this year's planning work program and modification
219 to the 2017 Work Program. Chapel Hill is still working with the consultant for them to give Chapel Hill an
220 estimate of what they will spend this year versus last year.

221 Felix Nwoko stated the NC 54 Corridor study was initiated by elected officials in Carrboro. Felix
222 Nwoko stated there is such a philosophical difference between Carrboro, Orange County, and NCDOT on
223 the appropriate cross-section for NC 54. The Town of Carrboro staff is proposing to do a corridor study
224 and ascertain what the ultimate cross session will be. The Town of Carrboro staff has reached out to
225 MPO because this study cannot be done in isolation. The exact split for cost share is not set yet. The

226 MPO staff needs to have a discussion with Division 7 and NCDOT. For the purpose of the UPWP, there is
227 \$50,000 for the project, and the TC will flush out the details. Ellen Beckmann asked who is managing
228 this. Felix Nwoko replied the Town of Carrboro with assistance from the MPO.

229 For the two regional projects, the MPO staff is working with CAMPO. Felix Nwoko stated the
230 MPO wants to be at the table when the discussion takes place since several issues have come up. Ellen
231 Beckmann stated the split should be based on geography not the numbers that we have come up with.
232 There was further discussion on how the cost share split should occur. Felix Nwoko stated the split
233 discussion details will be flushed out at a later time. John Hodges-Copple stated being careful about
234 basing project splits based on things like mileage because it may be fine for this project, but may come
235 back to bite us on other projects that may be more expensive later. John Hodges-Copple suggested the
236 way to go with it is to say here is the amount of funding that the MPO gets for planning.

237 John Hodges-Copple stated that at some point if you want to look at commuter rails from
238 Hillsboro to Raleigh or Garner; if you start establishing funding splits based on measurement of facility
239 lanes, not knowing what might come down the pike; he doesn't believe that is the strategic way to go.
240 Vice Chair David Bonk stated the issue for the Board is that we pay a local match, and that's where the
241 monies come from. It's as much a local as the federal in this case, to the degree we try to maintain a
242 certain level of local expense as we go forth in these planning studies. There was continued discussion
243 on the 60/40 split.

244 Patrick McDonough stated he wanted to get a sense of if there is a land use component for the
245 CSX Rail Study. Tyler Gray responded that the study originated with Cary looking at the corridor and how
246 it works through the town of Cary and what its being used for, its limitations and how they can use it in
247 the future. The MPO had multiple discussions with the County, City, and Town staff, and elected
248 officials, and if the MPO would be interested in this type of study; the Town of Cary were as well. Scott
249 Whiteman asked if anyone knows if CSX is willing to give up this line. Tyler Bray responded there is work

250 that has come up every 10 years. CSX knows how underutilized the rail line is but Tyler Bray isn't sure if
251 there have been conversations about CSX selling the line.

252 John Hodges-Copple stated his sense is to ask and answer some of the questions that were laid
253 out, and to the degree that line does become available, have a study done that supports purchasing the
254 line. John Hodges-Copple stated it will be opportunistic to do the study. The TC continued to discuss the
255 timing of the study.

256 Meg Scully stated the TC needs to recommend the MPO Board hold a public hearing and
257 approve the UPWP.

258 Vice Chair David Bonk requested a motion to refer the recommend the Unified Planning Work
259 Program for FY17 to the MPO Board for public hearing and approval on the same day. Margaret Hauth
260 made a motion to refer the revised Planning Work Program for FY17 to the MPO Policy Board for public
261 hearing and approval on the same day. Tom Altieri seconded the motion. Vice Chair David Bonk stated
262 there's a motion on the floor to recommend the draft as revised. The motion passed unanimously.

263
264 **9. Board Workshop – Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures**
265 **Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff**
266

267 Lindsay Smart presented on behalf of Andy Henry. The TC reviewed the goals, objectives and
268 performance measures for the 2045 MTP and recommended the MPO Board review and approve them.
269 The MPO Board reviewed them in December and requested a Board Workshop at their January meeting.
270 The workshop took place in January after the Board meeting. There were stations around the room. The
271 Board members were put into groups. The Board members moved from station to station with the LPA
272 Staff facilitating each station. The Staff received good feedback from the Board. The Board was glad to
273 get the one-on-one help, and was able to understand how they were defining goals. The Workshop ran
274 out of time because of the Martin Luther King Jr. event in downtown Durham. The MPO staff didn't get
275 as much input from Board members on performance measures but the MPO technical staff has been

276 meeting and reviewing possible performance measures to determine if data and metrics are available.
277 The MPO staff will continue to meet between now and March to review possible performance
278 measures. Various performance measures will be reviewed and there will be a final proposal for the
279 measures in April. Patrick McDonough stated he saw the item that had some of the targets from other
280 MPOs.

281 Vice Chair David Bonk has a question about the chart that showed the performance measures.
282 Vice Chair David Bonk stated the chart shows that the performance measures column is a work in
283 progress, and asked what's the third column that says objectives. Lindsay Smart stated the TC will see
284 the performance measures in their March meeting and indicated the third column is the result from the
285 input.

286 Vice Chair David Bonk asked if there were any questions, and there were none. Vice Chair David
287 Bonk asked what is the designated timeframe for this. Felix Nwoko responded a hearing will be in March
288 and approval will be in April. Vice Chair David Bonk requested a motion to recommend the Goals and
289 Objectives to the MPO Board. Ellen Beckmann made a motion to refer this to the MPO Board and Patrick
290 McDonough seconded the motion. A motion passed unanimously.

291
292 **10. Draft Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP**
293 **Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff**
294

295 Lindsay Smart presented Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP which is a collection of project
296 changes that have been in the works since June or July of 2015. Lindsay Smart stated the staff was
297 waiting until the 2016-2025 TIP was adopted before collecting information from the member
298 jurisdictions about projects needing to be updated. Lindsay Smart referenced a summary sheet and
299 reviewed the changes.

300 On Amendment 1 the first change was to cancel the project break for NCDOT Safety to School
301 project. The next project is the City of Durham's request to have the U4726 HL Barbee Road sidewalks

302 cancelled. Since the project costs up to \$36,000, it was done in house. Those STPDA funds will be
303 transferred to the EB-4707B. Vice Chair David Bonk asked if the funds will go back to the Durham
304 portion of the project or the project as a whole. Dale McKeel responded that the Durham portion
305 needed additional funding.

306 Lindsay Smart stated the next project is the new downtown Multiuse Path. Carrboro requested
307 that it be added to the TIP. They were awarded CMAQ funding as a result of the CMAQ call for projects
308 that the TC and Board supported this past summer. Lindsay Smart stated NCDOT requested the MPO
309 staff modify the MPO TIP to add a new break to an interstate project that's going on; the I-540 bridge
310 over I-40 in order to keep it separate from other improvements that are going on. Lindsay Smart stated
311 Carrboro received CMAQ funding and are applying it to Jones Creek Greenway. The Jones Creek
312 Greenway project is being amended to show the additional CMAQ funding. The City of Durham has
313 requested the MPO modify the Alston Avenue sidewalk project. Three aspects of the project are
314 changing. There are changes termini, the schedule, and reducing the project cost. The funding that's not
315 needed for Alston Avenue will be applied to West Ellerbe Creek trail, the City of Durham has
316 overmatched with local funding and needs the additional CMAQ funds to move this project forward. The
317 City of Durham requested a modification to the University Road Bike/Ped project. The map for this was
318 incorrect, so we will be updating the map for this. NCDOT requested the Auxiliary Link project be
319 amended to delay construction from 2021 to 2022 to allow additional time for railroad coordination.
320 Bolin Creek Greenway Phase 1b is a new project that is being added to the TIP. The TC and the Board
321 approved allocating the MPOs STPDA regional Bike Ped project funding to this project back in December
322 and the IPO, TC and the Board approved 2017 STPDA funds be applied to this the Bolin Creek Greenway
323 Phase 1b project as well as the Chapel Hill portion of the Old Durham Chapel Hill Road project.
324 Vice Chair David Bonk stated we have Amendment 1 on the table for consideration and the request is to
325 recommend this to the DCHC MPO Board for their review and their approval that it be released for

326 public review and comment. Lindsay Smart corrected the motion stating the request is that they review
327 and release it for public comment in February and will probably be adopted in April but have a public
328 hearing at the end of the public comment period in March. John Hodges-Copple made a motion to
329 review and release it for public comment. Margaret Hauth seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

330
331 **10. Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP**
332 **Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff**
333

334 Lindsay Smart presented Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. Lindsay Smart stated in
335 early January the MPO received a list of actions that were approved by the Board of Transportation at
336 their January meeting and amendment #2 reflects those actions which also includes a couple of
337 outstanding items from December. The first project is adding a new project to the TIP; the East Durham
338 Siding Rail project. The second is also new; Grade Separations at Blackwell and Mangum Street. The
339 third is making a change to the Campus Walk Avenue, and LaSalle Street Sidewalk project to delay
340 construction from 2015 to 2016. Additional time is needed for the Right of Way acquisition. The next is
341 to accelerate Right of Way and construction for the I-40 project; the ITS improvements. The next change
342 is converting the existing at-grade intersection at US 15/501 and Garrett Road. The change to that
343 project is to accelerate Right of Way and construction. There were changes to all of the breaks for the
344 NC 54 project. Changes are being made to B, C, E, F, and H. The changes being made is to delay
345 construction from 2024-2025 to allow additional time for Right of Way for acquisition and utilities. The
346 last project is the update of the Durham Orange Rail project to reflect the budget state cap of \$500,000.

347 John Hodges-Copple stated he is tempted to make a motion to separate the two Amendments
348 because it may be more difficult for folks. John Hodges-Copple recommended, instead of asking the
349 Board to release it for public comment that they instead provide guidance to the LPA staff and the TC on
350 how to conduct public engagement. Ellen Beckmann commented that perhaps it needs more than one

351 month of public comment and review. Lindsay Smart added that it would be released in February and
352 approved in April with a public hearing in March.

353 Vice Chair David Bonk supported John Hodges-Copple recommendation to recommend
354 Amendment # 2 to the DCHC MPO Board with the request that they give us guidance on how to proceed
355 with it. Lindsay Smart added maybe the Board can release it in March with a public hearing in April and
356 adoption in May. John Hodges-Copple asked if anyone had a problem if he made a motion like that.
357 Ellen Beckman asked if we would we be able to move the Campus Walk and LaSalle Street Sidewalk
358 project to Amendment 1 because that seems to be more suitable. Vice Chair David Bonk stated it can be
359 added to the motion.

360 Bergen Watterson asked does acceptance of this Amendment by the TC and Board mean all
361 those funds dedicated to the Light Rail project are relinquished to other projects or is that up for
362 discussion. What does it mean? Patrick McDonough answered in the 1st under STI, and we have the 1st
363 budget directive amending STI. It's a hard question. There are a lot of moving parts.

364 John Hodges-Copple stated his motion is two parts. The first motion is to move project C-5178
365 the Campus Walk Avenue and Lasalle Street Sidewalk project to Amendment 1, and have it be subject to
366 the schedule and TC recommendation for the previous meeting agenda item. For the remaining projects,
367 we request the MPO Board provide guidance to the LPA Staff and the TC on how best to conduct public
368 engagement on Amendment 2, and subsequent to that guidance, the TC would then make a
369 recommendation regarding releasing for public comment. Scott Whiteman seconded the motion. The
370 motion carried unanimously.

371

372

373

REPORTS:

374 **11. Reports from the LPA Staff**

375 **Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

376 Felix Nwoko stated Chair Mark Ahrendsen recently announced his retirement, effective April 1st.
377 His last meeting will be in March. At the next meeting MPO staff will bring the 2014 Bylaws to review the
378 process for electing a replacement Chair. Vice Chair David Bonk asked if there were any questions. There
379 were no questions.

380
381 **12. Report from the DCHC MPO TC Chair**
382 **David Bonk, DCHC MPO TC Vice Chair**

383 Vice Chair David Bonk noted there was no report from the Chair.

384

385 **13. NCDOT Reports**

386 David Keilson, NCDOT, Division 5 stated the Alston Avenue project was having problems with
387 moving utilities and NCDOT were anticipating letting the contract in June and August. At University Drive
388 where a roundabout was planned, after getting a forecast and doing more analysis, NCDOT found that a
389 roundabout would adequately handle the traffic. We are currently working with City Staff to provide
390 more details about what the improvements will look like. Vice Chair David Bonk asked if there were any
391 questions. There were no questions.

392 Ed Lewis, NCDOT, Division 7, stated everyone should have a copy of the report. There really
393 wasn't anything additional to report to the TC today that isn't covered in the written report that is an
394 attachment. Everything is moving along, and all projects are still in development. Vice Chair David Bonk
395 mentioned at the MPO Board meeting that Patrick Wilson attended, there were questions from Mayor
396 Hemminger about the status of projects. The roundabout at Harbinger Road was letting sometime this
397 summer that triggered that we haven't seen the designs. Ed Lewis stated the Division was being directed
398 by Chief Holder to reduce our time on this project and it will take six months to get everything done. The
399 Town of Chapel Hill will be involved in that project. Vice Chair David Bonk asked about the
400 improvements at the intersection of Main, Franklin, Merritt Mill, and Brewer Lane and a consultant has

401 taken that on. Ed Lewis stated we're still pulling stuff together to be sure we are clear on what we want,
402 and if we need to hold additional meetings with you all, we will.

403 Darius Sturdivant, NCDOT, Division 8, stated there was a sinkhole on Lystra Road in Chatham
404 County. It was on the news and our guys were sent out to take care of it. We are putting together an
405 emergency contact for let, and that may take about 5-6 months to complete. The road detours are
406 already placed. We will keep you posted.

407 There was no report from NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch.

408 There was no report from NCDOT Traffic Operations.

409

410

411 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

412 **14. Recent News, Articles, and Updates**

413 Felix Nwoko stated he made a request that the NCDOT to provide the TC with the breakdown of
414 North Carolina funding allocations. As the MPO gets the information, the MPO will share it.

415 **ADJOURNMENT:**

416 There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Technical Committee, the meeting was
417 adjourned at 10:53 a.m.