

DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

September 28, 2016

MINUTES OF MEETING

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Committee met on September 28, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. in the City Council Committee Room, located on the second floor of Durham City Hall. The following people were in attendance:

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| David Bonk (TC Chair) | Chapel Hill Planning |
| Ellen Beckmann (TC Vice Chair) | City of Durham Transportation |
| Kumar Neppalli (Member) | Chapel Hill Engineering |
| Hannah Jacobson (Member) | City of Durham Planning |
| Pierre Osei-Owusu (Member) | City of Durham Transportation |
| Bergen Watterson (Member) | Carrboro Planning |
| Laura Woods (Member) | Durham County Planning |
| Sara Young (Alternate) | Durham County Planning |
| Peter Murphy (Member) | Orange Public Transportation |
| Tom Altieri (Member) | Orange County Planning |
| Max Bushell (Member) | Orange County Planning |
| Cara Coppola (Member) | Chatham County Planning |
| John Hodges-Copple (Member) | Triangle J Council of Governments |
| Lisa Jemison (Alternate) | Research Triangle Foundation |
| Julie Bollinger (Member) | NCDOT, TPB |
| Kelly Becker (Member) | NCDOT, Traffic Operations |
| David Keilson (Alternate) | NCDOT, Division 5 |
| Richard Hancock (Alternate) | NCDOT, Division 5 |
| Ed Lewis (Alternate) | NCDOT, Division 7 |
| Kayla Seibel (Alternate) | Chapel Hill Planning |
| Geoff Green (Alternate) | GoTriangle |
| Kurt Stolka | The University of North Carolina |
| Terry Bellamy | City of Durham Transportation |
| Bryan Poole | City of Durham Transportation |
| Dale McKeel | City of Durham/DCHC MPO |
| Felix Nwoko | DCHC MPO |
| Andy Henry | DCHC MPO |
| Meg Scully | DCHC MPO |
| Dale McKeel | DCHC MPO |
| Brian Rhodes | DCHC MPO |
| Jenny Green | GoTriangle |
| Danny Rogers | GoTriangle |
| Tammy Bouchelle | GoTriangle |
| Thomas Henry | GoTriangle |
| Alpesh Patel | Cambridge Systematics |

46
47 Quorum Count: 21 of 31 Voting Members

48
49 Chair David Bonk called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. A roll call was performed. The Voting
50 Members and Alternate Voting Members of the DCHC MPO Technical Committee (TC) were identified and
51 are indicated above. Chair David Bonk reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was being
52 circulated.

53 **PRELIMINARIES:**

54 **2. Adjustments to the Agenda**

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

57 **3. Public Comments**

58 Chair David Bonk asked if there were any members of the public signed up to speak. There were
59 no members of the public signed up to speak during the meeting.

60 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

61 **4. Approval of August 24, 2016 TC Meeting Minutes**

62 Chair David Bonk asked if there was any discussion of the August 24, 2016 meeting minutes.
63 There was no discussion of the minutes. Geoff Green moved to approve the August 24, 2016 meeting
64 minutes, and Max Bushell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

65 **ACTION ITEMS:**

66 **5. Spot P4.0 Division Needs Tier Project Priorities and Local Input Points**

67 Dale McKeel, LPA Staff

68
69 The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) Board
70 released the recommended assignment of Local Input Points for a public review and comment period at
71 its September 14, 2016 meeting. No comments have been received.

72 Dale McKeel reported that he has been in touch with three North Carolina Department of
73 Transportation (NCDOT) divisions, and they are still working on their point assignments. The divisions
74 will submit their points to the Division Engineer's office in Raleigh by September 30, 2016, and the state
75 will have a public comment period from October 10-21, 2016.

76 Chair David Bonk suggested that a subcommittee meet and make recommendations about point
77 assignments to the MPO Board.

78 Ed Lewis, NCDOT Division 7, stated that point allocations at the division level will not change and
79 that this information is on the division's website. Ed Lewis stated that his division allocated points based
80 on what is supported by MPOs and Rural Transportation Planning Organizations (RPO), what projects
81 have a strong technical score, and what is in line with the division's methodology. Ed Lewis noted that
82 the division planned to have meetings with the MPOs to make sure they are supporting projects that will
83 move forward. The division will have 2500 points to allocate, and based on the division's methodology,
84 500 points will go to non-highway projects. Ed Lewis emphasized the role of the technical score and the
85 points from the MPOs and RPOs in scoring projects in a competitive field.

86 Chair David Bonk and Ed Lewis discussed the role that public comments will play in changing
87 point allocations.

88 Chair David Bonk inquired about other divisions. David Keilson, NCDOT Division 5, commented
89 that the division will be releasing scores for public comment shortly, and that the division anticipates
90 only a limited number of changes. David Keilson emphasized that Division 5 was interested in projects
91 that had a strong technical score and that are supported by planning partners and therefore have a
92 strong chance of being funded.

93 Chair David Bonk inquired whether it might make sense to gather information from the divisions
94 in order to update the MPO Board on where things stand at the October 12, 2016, MPO Board meeting.

95 Chair David Bonk also suggested asking the MPO Board to endorse changes to point allocations

96 recommended by the Technical Committee (TC). Geoff Green requested that the Lead Planning Agency
 97 (LPA) Staff identify projects where the MPO and the divisions have proposed allocating points so that
 98 the TC could intelligently evaluate competitive projects.

99 Ed Lewis and Chair David Bonk discussed the impact of regional projects that did not qualify for
 100 funding.

101 Felix Nwoko suggested that the TC authorize a subcommittee to make recommendations to the
 102 MPO Board. Vice Chair Ellen Beckman moved to authorize the subcommittee, and Tom Altieri seconded
 103 the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

104 Dale McKeel mentioned that Ed Lewis was interested in receiving feedback on Orange County
 105 projects, and was particularly interested in a list of priorities from Chapel Hill and Carrboro. Ed Lewis
 106 stressed how competitive the field was and noted that a priorities list would be very useful given the
 107 500-point limit for non-highway projects. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann, Ed Lewis, and Chair David Bonk
 108 discussed the merits of the 500 point allocation for non-highway projects and whether the bicycle and
 109 pedestrian projects that were submitted were competitive.

110 Geoff Green moved to recommend that the MPO Board hold a public hearing to approve the
 111 Local Input Points Assignment, and Max Bushell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

112 John Hodges-Copple asked for and received clarification about the scheduling of the Local Input
 113 Points vote.

114 **6. 2040 MTP Amendment #2 – Chapel Hill BRT**

115 Andy Henry, LPA Staff

116
 117 The MPO Board released Amendment #2 at their August meeting and conducted a public
 118 hearing at their September meeting. The Amendment changes references to the Chapel Hill Bus Rapid
 119 Transit (BRT) to make it clear that the route extends to Southern Village. The public comment period
 120 closed on September 26, 2016, and no comments were received.

121 Chair David Bonk asked whether the edits that appeared in the documents in the packet
122 pertaining to this agenda item were intentional and was told by Andy Henry that they were.

123 John Hodges-Copple expressed concern about the timeline and financial feasibility of the
124 proposed changes to BRT, and about the impact that funding for this project might have on Light Rail
125 Transit (LRT). There was continued discussion about the timeline and progress of the project. Andy
126 Henry and Geoff Green clarified that the project was moving forward quickly in order to be eligible for
127 federal funding.

128 Max Bushell asked about the amended project's impact on the fiscal constraint of the
129 Metropolitan Transit Plan (MTP) and Andy Henry responded that there would be no additional
130 information about the source of funding unless the financial model is completely rerun. Chair David
131 Bonk mentioned that there was a collaborative funding group trying to find alternative funding for the
132 LRT, and that additional funding for the LRT would free up funding for other projects.

133 John Hodges-Copple stressed the need for more detailed financial and ridership information
134 moving forward. Chair David Bonk and John Hodges-Copple discussed the best way to convey financial
135 and ridership information to the MPO Board. John Hodges-Copple, Andy Henry, and Chair David Bonk
136 discussed this project in relation to the MTP. There was discussion of the timeline for the MTP. Danny
137 Rogers discussed the funding group's work on the LRT. Danny Rogers also discussed the reasons,
138 primarily related to securing federal funding, for getting that project to the engineering phase. There
139 was some discussion of the relationship between the BRT and LRT projects.

140 John Hodges-Copple and Geoff Green discussed the phrasing that should be used in
141 recommending Amendment #2 to the MPO Board.

142 Cara Coppola stated that the line was blurred between the BRT and LRT and that it was
143 important to clarify the relationship between these two projects moving forward.

144 Andy Henry stated that he would clarify that the Amendment was for the purpose of a federal
 145 program and more clearly discuss the financial aspects of this project when this Amendment goes
 146 before the MPO Board.

147 John Hodges-Copple moved to recommend that the MPO Board approve Amendment #2 to the
 148 2040 MTP, and Kumar Neppalli seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

149 **7. 2040 MTP Amendment #3 –D-O LRT Extension to NCCU**

150 Andy Henry, LPA Staff
 151 Danny Rogers, GoTriangle

152 GoTriangle conducted preliminary engineering and ridership forecasts for a proposed light rail
 153 station at North Carolina Central University (NCCU) and found the station to be feasible and capable of
 154 generating very high ridership. GoTriangle has requested that the MPO amend the definition of the
 155 Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) project and
 156 amend the 2040 MTP to include the NCCU station for the D-O LRT project.

157 Danny Rogers discussed the decision to extend the line to NCCU, the feasibility of the project
 158 from an engineering perspective, and sources of funding for this project. Danny Rogers reported that
 159 the extension to NCCU was well-supported by the City of Durham and that there were plans to take this
 160 matter before the Durham County Commissioners.

161 Pierre Osei-Owusu and Danny Rogers discussed whether there would be collaboration with local
 162 bus systems on this project.

163 John Hodges-Copple commented that he was excited about this extension, as the original line did
 164 not extend to East Durham.

165 Andy Henry and Chair David Bonk discussed the timeline for public input on this project and for
 166 taking this project before the MPO Board.

167 John Hodges-Copple and Danny Rogers discussed how this extension would affect funding for the
 168 Durham Center City Station. Danny Rogers clarified that the Durham Center City Station was not as costly

169 as adding an extension to the line and that the station would most likely be added. Danny Rogers stated
170 that the cost of the Center City Station is considered part of the plan. Chair David Bonk inquired whether
171 this extension might affect the possibility of other extensions on the line and was told that this extension
172 does not preclude other extensions from an engineering perspective.

173 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann moved to recommend that the MPO Board set a public hearing
174 and set a public comment period on this proposed modification, and Pierre Osei-Owusu seconded
175 the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

176 **8. 2045 MTP –Socioeconomic Data – Guide Totals**

177 John Hodges-Copple, TJCOG

178 John Hodges-Copple presented the socio-economic guide totals to the TC. John Hodges-Copple
179 stated that his team was particularly interested in university growth assumptions, especially in Orange
180 County. John Hodges-Copple stated that university growth assumptions will have a large impact on the
181 employment that needs to be accommodated and he would not get to a final recommended guide total
182 until he could get to the university employment estimates. John Hodges-Copple promised to bring this
183 item back to the TC at the October 2016 meeting along with a learning scenario.

184 Felix Nwoko and John Hodges-Copple discussed whether they should share numbers that had
185 not been vetted by technical staff with the MPO Board.

186 Chair David Bonk questioned whether it would be useful to convey to the MPO Board that the
187 work was still in process, but stated that an update on the learning scenarios might be helpful.

188 John Hodges-Copple described the three types of scenarios and stated that the learning scenario
189 would be based on community plans information. John Hodges-Copple discussed the benefits of sharing
190 the learning scenarios with decision makers.

191 Terry Bellamy, Andy Henry, and John Hodges-Copple discussed how Nash County's declining
192 population will impact the model. John Hodges-Copple clarified that possibly half of North Carolina's
193 counties are not growing, but that there are plans to consult with Nash County's planning department

194 about whether they were seeing growth. John Hodges-Copple noted that his growth-allocation tool does
 195 not allocate loss, and loss may have to be manually accounted for.

196 John Hodges-Copple and Laura Woods discussed the relationship between community and
 197 aspirational plans. John Hodges-Copple clarified that he was particularly interested in doing the
 198 community plans scenario well and getting feedback on it.

199 Max Bushell stated that he was happy that time was being set aside to look at the learning
 200 scenario. Max Bushell inquired about differences in the single and multi-family split in the Summary 1
 201 and Summary 2 reports, and was told that these were designed to be examples only. Differences were
 202 due to the source of the data for each report.

203 Vice Chair Ellen Beckman and John Hodges-Copple discussed multi-family projections for
 204 Durham, Orange, and Wake counties. John Hodges-Copple used the example of Wake County to
 205 describe how he previously arrived at a good estimate of the split. John Hodges-Copple stated that the
 206 learning scenario should indicate whether there would be issues with estimating the split as there had
 207 been in the past.

208 This item was informational and did not require any action.

209 **9. Goals/Objective/Performance Measures**

210 Andy Henry, LPA Staff

211
 212 The TC Staff worked with the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) and
 213 local planners from the DCHC MPO to reduce the number of Performance Measures from 72 to 41.

214 Andy Henry noted that forecasts can be created for most performance measures because the
 215 measures are primarily based on data from the Triangle Regional Model.

216 Chair David Bonk asked when these measures would be adopted by the MPO Board and was
 217 told that these measures would not be adopted until the very end. Andy Henry stated that these
 218 measures are usually taken to the MPO Board to get a go ahead to use them for evaluating different
 219 scenarios. Andy Henry stated that scenarios will not be available until January, and that these scenarios

220 will come along with a base and a target. These performance measures will be used to evaluate different
 221 scenarios at that point.

222 This item was informational and did not require any action.

223 **10. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update**

224 Andy Henry, LPA Staff

225 Julie Bollinger, NCDOT

226 The draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) was submitted to the NCDOT for their
 227 internal review which should be completed by the first week of October. The CTP and its format were
 228 presented at the September MPO Board meeting.

229 Andy Henry reviewed the differences between the CTP and the MTP. Chair David Bonk stated
 230 that he thought the differences were not necessarily just about duration and fiscal constraint, but about
 231 the fact that old data was used for the CTP and new data was being used for the MTP. Andy Henry
 232 added that he would emphasize these differences in the future. Andy Henry noted that the CTP contains
 233 all projects and all study segments. Andy Henry also reviewed the CTP schedule.

234 Andy Henry stated that the CTP would replace thoroughfare plans and presented a list of
 235 counties with thoroughfare plans. Chair David Bonk and Felix Nwoko discussed the transition from state-
 236 sponsored thoroughfare plans, to multi-modal Long Range Transportation Plans, and federally required
 237 CTPs. Andy Henry stated that the CTP matches pretty well with thoroughfare plans but that he would
 238 like to get together with local jurisdictions to go over changes between thoroughfare plans and CTPs. He
 239 clarified that there was no adopted CTP for the region, although there was a draft four years ago that
 240 went along with the MTP process. Andy Henry noted that Durham would be most impacted by this
 241 issue, followed by Chapel Hill and Orange County. This issue will have little effect on Carrboro and
 242 Hillsborough.

243 Andy Henry discussed plans to comply with complete streets for the CTP. Andy Henry and Chair
 244 David Bonk discussed the schedule for obtaining public input for the CTP and for releasing the CTP to the

245 MPO Board. Cara Coppola asked whether a schedule of commissioner meetings and Transportation
 246 Advisory Committee meetings would be helpful and was told that it would. Terry Bellamy, Julie
 247 Bollinger, and Andy Henry discussed whether NCDOT had a complete streets policy. Vice Chair Ellen
 248 Beckman, Chair David Bonk, and Terry Bellamy discussed how the inclusion of complete streets affects
 249 funding for sidewalk projects.

250 Andy Henry reminded the TC that NCDOT would only approve the maps, not the report that
 251 goes along with the maps. Chair David Bonk and Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann discussed the impact that
 252 the CTP and MTP might have on local governments.

253 Cara Coppola noted it might be easier to make amendments once the maps are adopted.

254 Vice Chair Ellen Beckman, Chair David Bonk, and Max Bushell considered hypothetical scenarios
 255 in order to clarify how the MTP and CTP would be used.

256 Geoff Green noted that roads were either existing, needs improvement, or recommended. Geoff
 257 Green stated that it is possible to improve a road without changing its footprint if it is only the maps that
 258 are being adopted.

259 Terry Bellamy and Andy Henry discussed the possibility of adding a complete streets policy
 260 statement to the report in light of national trends and local demand for better bicycle and sidewalk
 261 facilities.

262 Andy Henry stated that he would change his October presentation to the MPO Board based on
 263 feedback he received from the TC.

264 John Hodges-Copple stated that it might be helpful for the MPO Board to know when the
 265 NCDOT staff would use the CTP to make decisions. Chair David Bonk cited a project on US 15-501 to
 266 show how the CTP might be used for feasibility studies.

267 This item was informational and did not require any action.

268

269 **11. Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Funding**
 270 **Distribution for FY18**

271 Meg Scully, LPA Staff

272 On October 14, 2015, the MPO Board approved the formula and policy to distribute Surface
273 Transportation Program Direct Attribution (STP-DA) and Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds
274 to sub-recipients for FY2017 through FY2025 with the expectation that each year, prior to development
275 of the next year's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), the actual STP-DA and TAP allocation to
276 DCHC MPO would be entered into the formula as would the most recent certified National Transit
277 Database (NTD) data to be used in calculating the distribution to transit agencies. In December, 2015,
278 the approved formula was included as an attachment to provide background on an item addressing STP-
279 DA and TAP Funding for DCHC MPO Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects. At that time, the Board
280 expressed interest in reviewing the STP-DA/TAP distribution formula when it was again time to allocate
281 funds to sub-recipients for UPWP planning and other purposes.

282 Meg Scully stated that the Staff has plugged in the new FY18 STP-DA and TAP expected
283 allocation, and new NTD data in conjunction with local transit agencies, and was bringing this back to
284 the TC for review. This matter will also be presented to the MPO Board at its October 2016 meeting.
285 Meg Scully stated that the LPA routine planning and extra-planning budgets were decreased from last
286 year to better reflect what will be used in FY18, and noted that in FY19, they will increase again based
287 on expected needs in the UPWP.

288 Chair David Bonk and Meg Scully discussed how the FY18 STP-DA totals compared to last year's
289 estimates. Chair David Bonk asked for and received clarification about the \$570,000 that was put in
290 reserve.

291 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann stressed the need for oversight and noted that there are incentives
292 for looking at what is being proposed and potential tradeoffs. Meg Scully stated that Planning (PL) funds
293 are another piece of the formula and that they may also fluctuate. Chair David Bonk emphasized that
294 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann's point about oversight was well-made and noted that it makes sense for the

295 MPO Board to get a better idea of what they plan on spending in FY18. Chair David Bonk suggested that
296 it may be wise to get the oversight group together to better understand and assess how STP-DA funds
297 are being used. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann discussed the formula for determining the local discretionary
298 budget and cautioned that it varies. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann commented on the merits of making the
299 unobligated balance more transparent. Meg Scully discussed how the failure to implement projects
300 affects unobligated funds.

301 Chair David Bonk commented that the \$874,000 of combined STP-DA and TAP funds for regional
302 bicycle and pedestrian projects might be used for the Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road project. Chair David
303 Bonk highlighted a part of the program that stipulates that projects have to be regional in nature,
304 meaning they must span two jurisdictions. There was continued discussion of the regional stipulation of
305 this program and of the schedule for the Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road project. Vice Chair Ellen
306 Beckmann listed several projects that might benefit from this type of funding. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann
307 suggested holding a call for regional bicycle and pedestrian projects when the draft Transportation
308 Improvement Program (TIP) is released, and folding selected projects in the final TIP when it is adopted
309 in June 2017.

310 Dale McKeel asked whether there would be another Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Grant
311 Program (CMAQ) call for projects, and Meg Scully responded that she has been looking into this and
312 NCDOT reported that there is no plan to do so at this point.

313 Geoff Green asked for and received clarification about the source for vehicle data.

314 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann clarified that she wanted to see the unobligated balance and the
315 local discretionary balance as an informational item at the next TC meeting. Felix Nwoko agreed to these
316 requests. Felix Nwoko and Meg Scully discussed some of the complications associated with figuring out
317 the unobligated balance. Vice Chair Ellen Beckman stated that knowing even the straight unobligated
318 balance might be helpful as these dollars would be at risk if there is a rescission.

319 Max Bushell and Felix Nwoko discussed the call for projects that would be a part of the TIP and
320 whether projects needed to be on the regional map. Felix Nwoko clarified that projects would receive
321 extra points if they are on the regional map. Meg Scully and Vice Chair Ellen Beckman briefly discussed
322 the policy for selecting TAP projects.

323 Chair David Bonk asked why the TC was being asked to authorize the implementation of a policy
324 that was already approved. Meg Scully stated that it was important to have the TC's recommendation
325 before approaching the MPO Board. Meg Scully clarified that she was asking the TC to reaffirm its
326 support of a previously approved distribution policy and reiterated that the policy has already been
327 adopted.

328 Laura Woods moved to recommend that the board approve this FY18 STP-DA TAP distribution
329 based on the previously approved formula but using actual STP-DA TAP allocation to the MPO, the most
330 current certified NTD data, the 2010 census population data as that was the data used to allocate funds
331 to the MPO, and the expected LPA routine and special planning budget for FY18 UPWP; and Vice Chair
332 Ellen Beckmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

333 **12. Approval of Amendment #5 to the FY2016-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
334 Meg Scully, LPA Staff

335 Amendment #5 to the DCHC MPO FY2016-2025 TIP proposes the addition of Section 5310
336 projects as approved in the Program of Projects on June 8, 2016 by the MPO Board, a modification to
337 the funding year for a GoDurham CMAQ project, and requests from NCDOT including two modifications
338 to schedules and the addition of a right-of-way project.

339 Dale McKeel noted that one of the amendments is for reimbursements for local divisions to
340 review right of way certifications and new agreements for projects allow NCDOT to charge up to 10% for
341 reviewing these projects. Dale McKeel stated that the relationship between the money that is approved
342 for right-of-way certification and the money that NCDOT is charging needs to be understood. Dale
343 McKeel stated that he would look into this issue and that it should not preclude adopting the

344 amendment. Vice Chair Ellen Beckman stated that it would be nice if each of these fees were treated
 345 the same as NCDOT is being paid 10% for each individual project. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann stated that
 346 treating fees the same way would give local jurisdictions more certainty about project costs.

347 Geoff Green moved to recommend that the MPO Board approve Amendment #5 to the FY2016-
 348 2025 TIP, Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

349 **13. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) FY18 Development Schedule**

350 Meg Scully, LPA Staff

351
 352 The DCHC MPO is required by federal regulation to prepare a Unified Planning Work Program
 353 (UPWP) each year that details and guides the urban area transportation planning activities. Funding for
 354 the UPWP is provided on an annual basis by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the
 355 Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The Lead Planning Agency (LPA) and jurisdictions that receive
 356 FHWA or FTA planning funds participate in the UPWP development process.

357 Meg Scully stated that the process is similar to last year and described the schedule for this
 358 process. Meg Scully asked TC members to do as much work as possible by the November deadline so
 359 that issues can be addressed ahead of time and changes are as minimal as possible.

360 Chair David Bonk stated that the oversight committee needs to meet and discuss their proposed
 361 program for next year with the MPO. Chair David Bonk stated that the local bodies need to get input
 362 from the MPO on the direction of next year's planning work.

363 Meg Scully added that the packet will include a list of activities for the LPA Staff produced by
 364 Felix Nwoko. Chair David Bonk suggested that it might be wise to discuss highlights of these activities at
 365 the October meeting and Felix Nwoko agreed.

366 No action was required by the TC for this item.

367 **REPORTS:**

368 **14. Reports from the LPA Staff**

369 **Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

370 Felix Nwoko stated that there was no additional report from the LPA Staff.

371 **15. Report from the DCHC MPO TC Chair**
372 **David Bonk, DCHC MPO TC Chair**

373 Chair David Bonk stated that there was no additional report from the DCHC MPO TC Chair.

374 **16. NCDOT Reports**

375 There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 5.

376 There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 7.

377 There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 8.

378 Julie Bollinger, NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch, stated that Chatham County and Siler City
379 adopted a CTP on September 9, 2016. Goldston will adopt the CTP on October 3, 2016, and Triangle Area
380 Rural Transportation Planning Organization (TARPO) is scheduled to approve the CTP on October 13.

381 Chair David Bonk and Julie Bollinger discussed whether the MPO would approve the CTP for the
382 county, since it is part of the county. Julie Bollinger stated that the MPO area is not included, as it is in
383 NCDOT's CTP, not the county's.

384 There was no additional report from NCDOT Traffic Operations.

385 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

386 There were no informational items.

387 **ADJOURNMENT:**

388 There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Technical Committee, the meeting was
389 adjourned at 11:19 a.m.