

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

October 26, 2016

MINUTES OF MEETING

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Committee met on October 26, 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)	Chapel Hill Planning
Hannah Jacobson (Member)	City of Durham Planning
Tasha Johnson (Member)	City of Durham Public Works
Pierre Osei-Owusu (Member)	City of Durham Transportation
Bergen Watterson (Member)	Carrboro Planning
Margaret Hauth (Member)	Hillsborough Planning
Laura Woods (Member)	Durham County Planning
Scott Whiteman (Member)	Durham County Planning
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
Corey Liles (Member)	Research Triangle Foundation
Julie Bollinger (Member)	NCDOT, TPB
David Keilson (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 5
Jennifer Britt (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 8
Geoff Green (Member)	GoTriangle
Kurt Stolka (Member)	The University of North Carolina
Terry Bellamy	City of Durham Transportation
Dale McKeel	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO
Eddie Dancausse	FHWA

Quorum Count: 19 of 31 Voting Members

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

42 are indicated above. Chair David Bonk reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was being
43 circulated.

44 **PRELIMINARIES:**

45 **2. Adjustments to the Agenda**

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

48 **3. Public Comments**

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

51 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

52 **4. Approval of September 28, 2016 TC Meeting Minutes**

53 Chair David Bonk asked if there was any discussion of the meeting minutes. There was no
54 discussion of the minutes. John Hodges-Copple moved to approve the September 28, 2016 meeting
55 minutes. Scott Whiteman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

56 **ACTION ITEMS:**

57 **5. 2040 MTP – Update to Environmental Justice**

58 Paul Black, CAMPO

59 This item will be discussed at the November 16, 2016 Technical Committee (TC) meeting.

60 **6. SPOT P4.0 Division Needs Tier Project Priorities and Local Input Points**

61 Dale McKeel, LPA Staff

62 The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) Board
63 adopted a motion to do the following during its October meeting: 1) Extend the public review and
64 comment period to November 9; 2) Grant DCHC MPO Local Planning Agency (LPA) staff the flexibility to
65 coordinate with other MPOs, RPOs, and divisions on the assignment of Local Input Points for the Division
66 Needs tier and make modifications to preliminary point assignments to maximize the number of projects

67 in the DCHC MPO area to receive funding through the SPOT P4.0 process; 3) Request that Division 8 put
68 Local Input Points toward the NC 751-O'Kelly Chapel Road intersection; 4) Request that Division 7 put
69 Local Input Points toward (a) Estes Drive Bike-Ped, (b) Jones Ferry Road Sidewalk, and (c) Barnes Street
70 Sidewalk, in that priority order; and (5) Request that Division 5 put Local Input Points toward the Duke
71 Belt Line Trail and not put points on the NC 751 widening between NC 54 and Auto Park Boulevard.

72 Dale McKeel stated that requests have been made to Divisions 5, 7, and 8 and he has not
73 received any additional information from the divisions. Dale McKeel informed the TC that the Triangle
74 Area Rural Planning Organization (TARPO) would like to donate points for the NC 54 operational
75 improvement project in Orange County. TARPO has put points on this project and would like to share
76 additional points with the MPO for the portion of the project that is in the DCHC MPO area. Dale McKeel
77 stated that there was no reason not to accept the points, and that Division 7 has not indicated that it
78 would put points on this project. Dale McKeel commented that he did not know what effect these
79 donated points would have funding for the project.

80 Bergen Watterson and Max Bushell commented that Carrboro and Orange County would be in
81 support of accepting the points from TARPO.

82 David Keilson stated that Division 5 received a request for additional points for the Duke Belt
83 Line Trail and they would re-evaluate the decision to put points on this project as more information
84 becomes available.

85 Chair David Bonk and Dale McKeel discussed the extension of the public comment period and
86 whether a recommendation to the MPO Board was needed at their November 9th meeting. Dale McKeel
87 stated that it was important that the staff have flexibility to respond to any additional information that
88 is received from the divisions and the public.

89 Felix Nwoko asked about the feasibility of the TARPO points and whether they could be added
 90 to the Duke Belt Line project. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann stated that points cannot be donated from an
 91 RPO to a division, only from RPOs to MPOs and vice versa.

92 This item was for informational purposes only and no action was required by the TC.

93 **7. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update**

94 Andy Henry, LPA Staff
 95 Julie Bollinger, NCDOT

96 Andy Henry reviewed the schedule for releasing the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)
 97 and noted that the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) internal review is not yet
 98 complete. Andy Henry referred to a handout in order to highlight changes that have been made to the
 99 draft CTP that went to NCDOT for their internal review. Andy Henry stated that three things would be
 100 changed in order to present the CTP to the MPO Board in November, 1) online maps, 2) online tables,
 101 and 3) some of the problem statements. Andy Henry stated that ArcGIS online maps would also be
 102 released on the MPO's webpage. Andy Henry asked the TC if he should bring these changes and final
 103 maps back to the subcommittee or whether he should share them with the TC for broader feedback.

104 Andy Henry and Chair David Bonk discussed whether identifying a list of issues and key projects
 105 might be useful for the MPO Board. Chair David Bonk suggested that it might be wise to get the TC
 106 subcommittee together in order to gain a better understanding of the issues at hand. Andy Henry urged
 107 TC members to send him their questions in the meantime.

108 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann commented on the overwhelming level of information available,
 109 especially for Durham. Andy Henry stated that he would highlight the projects of potential interest to
 110 the MPO Board.

111 John Hodges-Copple commented that it is important to identify what is being adopted and what
 112 would be in the reports that are not officially adopted. Andy Henry clarified that only the maps would be
 113 adopted by the NCDOT Board of Transportation, but that tables providing details about various projects

114 would be presented to that Board, as well. John Hodges-Copple suggested highlighting areas where
115 NCDOT and the MPO disagree in tables.

116 Chair David Bonk, Andy Henry, and Felix Nwoko weighed the benefits and disadvantages of
117 delaying the release of the CTP. Felix Nwoko pointed out that a delay could highlight inconsistencies in
118 methodologies between the CTP and the MTP. Cara Coppola stated that Chatham County would prefer
119 to move forward with this process. Scott Whiteman stated that he would be comfortable moving
120 forward in another month or so, as additional time to digest the information could be useful.

121 Andy Henry concluded that a delay of a month might be useful and that he would set up a
122 subcommittee meeting. Andy Henry stated that he would make the changes discussed by the TC and
123 that he would highlight issues of importance to the MPO Board.

124 This item was for informational purposes only and no action was required by the TC.

125 **8. FFY 2018-2019 CMAQ Funding**

126 Meg Scully, LPA Staff

127 Felix Nwoko, LPA Manager

128 Meg Scully stated that there is a call for projects using target funding amounts for Federal Fiscal
129 Year 2018 (FFY 18) and Federal Fiscal Year 2019 (FFY 19) for Congestion Mitigation and Air
130 Quality Improvement (CMAQ) projects. Applications will be due to NCDOT in March 2017. Meg Scully
131 stated that although target amounts will likely change, 2.3 million dollars will be used for FFY 18 and FFY
132 19 respectively. Applications are due to the MPO on December 16, 2016, so that they can be entered
133 into the NCDOT CMAQ website along with emission reduction forms and the resolution from the MPO
134 Board approving the projects. Those wishing to apply for funding should use the application that is
135 currently on the NCDOT website and the process should not be too different from the last application
136 cycle. Meg Scully asked TC members to email her if they wished to see applications from the last cycle.
137 Meg Scully stated that individuals would be responsible for their own emissions calculations.

138 Chair David Bonk asked Meg Scully to review the schedule and Meg Scully reviewed the
139 schedule. Meg Scully noted that she hoped that actual amounts for the two upcoming fiscal years would
140 be available soon, but that target amounts for the previous two fiscal years can be used if that is not the
141 case. Meg Scully and Chair David Bonk discussed when the subcommittee should meet and the timeline
142 for bringing their findings to the TC and the MPO Board.

143 Meg Scully stated that the goal was for applicants to apply for FFY 18 and FFY 19 at the same
144 time, and to program all of the 4.5 million dollars.

145 Pierre Osei-Owusu asked for clarification on the issue of expansion versus replacement and
146 emission factors and standards. Meg Scully stated that she has asked for guidance from NCDOT on
147 exactly which program calculations or factors should be used and which ones are acceptable. Meg Scully
148 noted that there was a staff member at NCDOT who is responsible for helping applicants understand
149 and use the right formula. Meg Scully and Eddie Dancausse discussed changes in the model that is used
150 for these calculations.

151 Eddie Dancausse urged applicants to ask questions, specifically about eligibility, as they
152 complete the application process.

153 John Hodges-Copple confirmed that applicants were being encouraged to apply for two years of
154 funding although only one year is required, and inquired about how funding for the upcoming two years
155 compared to funding for FFY 2017. Meg Scully discussed adjustments that were made to FFY 16 and FFY
156 17, and noted that funding was comparable to what was received in previous years. Meg Scully
157 cautioned that this could change as all NCDOT calculations are not yet complete.

158 John Hodges-Copple, Eddie Dancausse, and Meg Scully discussed whether the process for
159 calculating the amount that is sub-allocated to the MPOs and RPOs has changed.

160 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann asked whether these projects should be ready to obligate funds for
161 FFY 18 and FFY 19, and Meg Scully responded that funds should be used in FFY 18 and FFY 19. Meg

162 Scully and Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann discussed whether funds could be used for planning as well as
163 construction. Eddie Dancausse verified that planning must lead to construction. Vice Chair Ellen
164 Beckmann asked whether right of way is eligible for funding, and Eddie Dancausse noted that anything
165 that leads to completion of a project is eligible. John Hodges-Copple noted that emissions calculations
166 are based on the project.

167 Cara Coppola asked for and received clarification from Meg Scully and Eddie Dancausse about
168 what is included in the geographical boundary for projects.

169 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann, Eddie Dancausse, and Meg Scully discussed whether partial projects
170 could be funded. Eddie Dancausse noted that there is precedent for funding partial projects but that
171 new projects had a better chance of being funded.

172 Pierre Osei-Owusu, Meg Scully, and Eddie Dancausse discussed how the process can be
173 expedited and whether projects have to be flexed. Chair David Bonk pointed out that one impact of
174 flexing would be a state match for transit projects, but that a match would not be available for highway
175 projects. Meg Scully suggested that Pierre Osei-Owusu communicate relevant information to all parties
176 throughout the flexing process in order to expedite the process. Eddie Dancausse reiterated the
177 importance of asking questions throughout the process. Andy Henry asked that answers to all questions
178 be shared with the TC.

179 This item was for informational purposes only and no action was required by the TC.

180 **9. 2045 MTP -- Learning Scenario**

181 John Hodges-Copple, TJCOG

182 John Hodges-Copple drew attention to a handout and discussed the factors that have gone into
183 creating the learning scenario. John Hodges-Copple discussed differences between version 5 and version
184 6 of the Triangle Regional Model (TRM), particularly changes in employment categories. John Hodges-
185 Copple stated that the learning scenario would be run the following week. Communities may adjust
186 development based on information coming out of scenarios, and scenarios may have to be recreated.

187 Andy Henry and John Hodges-Copple discussed the elements of the learning scenario that the
188 TC should give feedback on and the timeframe for providing such feedback. Chair David Bonk asked
189 whether the learning scenario would be brought to the MPO Board in December, and John Hodges-
190 Copple clarified that the MPO Board would not be asked for recommendations on or to adopt the
191 learning scenario. John Hodges-Copple stated that the learning scenario would be used to explain things
192 at the joint MPO meeting at the end of November and that individual MPOs might want to bring the
193 learning scenario to their boards in November. John Hodges-Copple stated that a discussion of this item
194 should be added to the agenda for the joint MPO Board meeting at the end of November. Chair David
195 Bonk commented that the MPO Board will most likely want to discuss the learning scenario at length at
196 its December meeting and that it should be added to the agenda for that meeting, as well. Chair David
197 Bonk suggested that John Hodges-Copple also review the sequence of moving from the learning
198 scenario to the real scenario at the December MPO Board meeting.

199 John Hodges-Copple discussed how the fiscal constraint of the MTP would affect real scenarios.

200 Chair David Bonk asked Felix Nwoko for a brief description of the differences between versions 5
201 and 6 of the TRM. Felix Nwoko clarified that the MPO Board is supposed to approve use of the model
202 and that he intended to summarize the differences between the two models for the TC and the MPO
203 Board at the time of that approval. Felix Nwoko clarified that this information would be brought before
204 the TC in November 2016 and the MPO Board in December 2016.

205 Max Bushell and John Hodges-Copple discussed sharing the results of the learning scenario with
206 Orange County. Chair David Bonk and John Hodges-Copple discussed whether a subcommittee should
207 get together to discuss the results of the learning scenario. Chair David Bonk and John Hodges-Copple
208 discussed a timeline for looking at the results of the first scenario. John Hodges-Copple recommended
209 that the TC get in touch with him, Aspen Romeyn, or Ben Bearden with any questions about the learning
210 scenario.

211 This item was informational and no action was required by the TC.

212 **REPORTS:**

213 **15. Reports from the LPA Staff**

214 Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff

215 Dale McKeel stated that two groups would be speaking at the November TC meeting during the
 216 public comment period. One group will speak about pedestrian access to Cedar Ridge High School, and
 217 the other will request additional signage for bicycles on a section of Old Fayetteville Road/ Old NC 86.

218 In response to a question from Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann, Felix Nwoko stated that the joint
 219 MPO meeting would take place at the Friday Center on November 30, 2016. Felix Nwoko promised to
 220 send out an email with the specific time of the meeting the following day, but noted it would likely be at
 221 9 a.m. or 10 a.m. Bergen Watterson asked whether this meeting was for the TC or the MPO Board, and
 222 Felix Nwoko responded that although it was for the MPO Board, everyone is invited.

223 **16. Report from the DCHC MPO TC Chair**

224 David Bonk, DCHC MPO TC Chair

225 Chair David Bonk stated the TC should put together a summary of recent bicycle count data in
 226 order to respond to an inquiry that came up at the last MPO Board meeting.

227 **17. NCDOT Reports**

228 There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 5.

229 There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 7.

230 Jennifer Britt, NCDOT Division 8, stated that Darius Sturdivant has transitioned to Division 6, and
 231 that his replacement has not been found.

232 Julie Bollinger, NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch, stated that ADT maps have been released
 233 by the traffic survey group and is on the NCDOT website. Shapefiles will be released on Friday, October 28,
 234 2016.

235 Julie Bollinger discussed the impact of the Reorganization Through Reduction (RTR) program on
236 her division. She noted that they have lost nine people and six vacancies through the voluntary RTR
237 program, and that a reorganization plan should be available by November 14, 2016.

238 Andy Henry and Julie Bollinger discussed the role that consultants might play in the future of the
239 division.

240 There was no additional report from NCDOT Traffic Operations.

241 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

242 **18. Recent News, Articles, and Updates**

243 **ADJOURNMENT:**

244 There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Technical Committee, the meeting was
245 adjourned at 10:20 a.m.