

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

2 **February 10, 2016**

3  
4 **MINUTES OF MEETING**

5  
6 The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization DCHC MPO Board met on  
7 February 10, 2016, at 9:00 a.m. in the City Council Committee Room, located on the second floor of  
8 Durham City Hall. The following people were in attendance:  
9

10 Steve Schewel (MPO Board Chair)	City of Durham
11 Damon Seils (MPO Board Vice Chair)	Town of Carrboro
12 Don Moffitt (Member)	City of Durham
13 Ellen Reckhow (Member)	Durham County
14 Barry Jacobs (Member)	Orange County
15 Brian Lowen (Member)	Town of Hillsborough
16 Pam Hemminger (Member)	Town of Chapel Hill
17 Ed Harrison (Alternate)	Town of Chapel Hill
18	
19 Joey Hopkins	NCDOT, Division 5
20 Patrick Wilson	NCDOT, Division 7
21 Craig Benedict	Orange County
22 Tom Altieri	Orange County
23 Bergen Watterson	Town of Carrboro
24 Tina Moon	Town of Carrboro
25 David Bonk	Town of Chapel Hill
26 John Hodges-Copple	Triangle J Council of Governments
27 Patrick McDonough	GoTriangle
28 Geoff Green	GoTriangle
29 Ray King	GoTriangle
30 Mark Ahrendsen	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
31 Ellen Beckmann	City of Durham
32 Bryan Poole	City of Durham
33 Eddie Dancausse	Federal Highway Administration
34 Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
35 Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
36 Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
37 Lindsay Smart	DCHC MPO
38 Dale McKeel	DCHC MPO
39 Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO

40  
41 Quorum Count: 8 of 11 Voting Members  
42  
43

44 Chair Steve Schewel called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. A roll call was performed. The Voting  
45 Members and Alternate Voting Members of the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board were identified and are indicated  
46 above. Chair Steve Schewel reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was being circulated.

47 **PRELIMINARIES:**

48 **Ethics Reminder**

49 Chair Steve Schewel read the Ethics Reminder and asked if there were any known conflicts of interest  
50 with respect to matters coming before the DCHC MPO Board, and requested that if there were any identified  
51 during the meeting for them to be announced.

52 Don Moffitt stated he was surprised to get an email from the State Ethics Commission (SEC) for his  
53 disclosure statement. The impression he got from the email was that he shouldn't be voting on matters until  
54 the SEC signs off on his disclosure statements. Lindsay Smart stated that Don Moffitt is correct. Lindsay Smart  
55 indicated that new DCHC MPO Board members that have not completed the Real Estate Disclosure (RED) and  
56 the Statement of Economic Interest (SEI) forms , and have not received letters of approval from the SEC cannot  
57 vote today. Chair Steve Schewel asked whether Don Moffitt still count as a part of the quorum. Lindsay Smart  
58 responded that Don Moffitt can be counted in the quorum.

59 Brian Lowen stated his situation is the same as Don Moffitt, meaning that he got an email too, and  
60 stated he will take care of it. Chair Steve Schewel stated he thinks all Board members need to do the same. The  
61 2016 State Ethics Commission's requirements are due by April 15, 2016. Chair Steve Schewel concurred.

62 **Adjustments to the Agenda**

63 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any adjustments to the agenda. Mark Ahrendsen stated that  
64 there are two things hand-outs in front of the Board members. One is the replacement for item #13; a handout  
65 that Lindsay Smart will address. The next one is information related to the SEC ethics requirements, available  
66 for review. Mark Ahrendsen stated that Lindsay Smart indicated that someone from the SEC may be available at  
67 the next meeting to go over the handout and any questions the DCHC MPO Board might have.

68 **Public Comments**

69 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any members of the public signed up to speak. There were no  
70 members of the public signed up to speak during the meeting.

71 **Directives to Staff**

72 The Directives to Staff were included in the agenda packet for review. Ed Harrison stated at the last  
73 meeting, the DCHC MPO Board asked GoTriangle to provide regular updates on the Durham- Orange Light Rail  
74 Transit (D-O LRT) project. He mentioned that Chapel Hill may want updates from GoTriangle on D-O LRT project  
75 more frequently than quarterly, as the project is moving forward quickly. Chair Steve Schewel stated the DCHC  
76 MPO Board decided to have quarterly reports from GoTriangle. Chair Steve Schewel stated he thinks if Board  
77 members would like to hear GoTriangle on a more frequent basis, they should let the DCHC MPO Board,  
78 GoTriangle, and Patrick McDonough know their interest. Mark Ahrendsen stated, should something come up  
79 between quarterly reports, Go Triangle staff will bring it to the DCHC MPO Board’s attention. Ed Harrison stated  
80 please do so.

81 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there was any discussion on the Directives to Staff. There was no further  
82 discussion.

83 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

84 **6. & 7. Approval of December 9, 2015 and January 13, 2016 Meetings Minutes**

85 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there was any discussion on the December 9, 2015, meeting minutes.  
86 Chair Steve Schewel and Vice Chair Damon Seils provided comments and suggested editorial revisions to the  
87 minutes. Chair Steve Schewel commented that on line 290 the word ethnicity should be replaced with  
88 specificity. Vice Chair Damon Seils stated that he has the same correction and sent Brian Rhodes and Lindsay  
89 Smart a few other corrections. Vice Chair Damon Seils asked if he needed to read the corrections. Chair Steve  
90 Schewel stated that the DCHC MPO Board probably prefers Vice Chair Damon Seils not to read them.

91 Pam Hemminger submitted an email correction to the MPO Staff for the January 13, 2016, meeting  
92 minutes that on line 250 remove Mark Ahrendsen's name and replace the name with Mark Kleinschmidt and  
93 add Damon Seils as attendants to a meeting.

94 Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to approve both sets of the minutes: December 9, 2015 DCHC  
95 MPO Board Meeting Minutes and January 13, 2016 DCHC MPO Board Meeting Minutes. A motion was made by  
96 Vice Chair Damon Seils and Ed Harrison seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

97 **ACTION ITEMS:**

98 **8. Proposed Transit Service Changes for the US 15/501 Corridor**  
99 **Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle**

100 Patrick McDonough represented Jon Dodson from GoTriangle. Patrick McDonough noted that the DCHC  
101 MPO Board requested quarterly updates. He stated GoTriangle will provide the DCHC MPO Board on March 9<sup>th</sup>  
102 their first quarterly report. He reiterated if there is anything that Board would like to hear specifically, to  
103 contact him or GoTriangle. He also indicated that GoTriangle is already working on the material for the report.

104 Patrick McDonough provided a website link to Our Transit Future that contains information about the  
105 public transit projects in Durham, Orange, and Wake counties bus and rail investment plans, and public  
106 involvement activities. Patrick McDonough stated that the website shows all the improvements that were  
107 made for Chapel Hill Transit, GoDurham, GoTriangle, and Orange Public Transportation services. Patrick  
108 McDonough stated that the website also shows the letters that have been sent to the city managers and county  
109 managers with each year detailing which funds are available. Patrick McDonough continued to explain that the  
110 website provides transparency of the money and the actual services that are rolling on the road as well as  
111 containe copies of the two annual reports for fiscal years 2013 and 2014, but not 2015. Patrick McDonough  
112 stated he has been working with GoTriangle staff in Public Involvement to update thea web pages. It now  
113 actually lists all of the projects. Patrick McDonough stated that the website links to the review public comments  
114 and project updates is as follows: [www.ourtransitfuture.com/projects/bus](http://www.ourtransitfuture.com/projects/bus).

115 Ed Harrison suggested that the website link be checked as he was unable to open the link, and Patrick  
116 McDonough repeated the website link name as above.

117 Patrick McDonough presented the Proposed Transit Service Changes for the US 15/501 Corridor. He  
118 elaborated on several elements of the proposal including the rationale for changes, the anticipated results, and  
119 recommendations. GoTriangle is trying to improve their efficiency. GoTriangle provides services in the corridor  
120 from US 15/501 Durham, all the way to Chapel Hill. GoTriangle is not proposing any changes to Chapel Hill  
121 Transit and routes, nor removing any service from Durham.

122 Patrick McDonough stated that every morning in Chapel Hill two GoTriangle buses pull up to a bus stop  
123 at almost the same time and leave for Durham only moments apart. One bus takes 15 minutes longer to get to  
124 Durham because the bus goes out to a more obscure route in Durham, and this frustrates customers. Patrick  
125 McDonough stated that GoTriangle's goal is to provide faster Regional Service, which is to include 15 minutes at  
126 peak from Chapel Hill to Durham. It currently takes 30 minute at peak. GoTriangle would increase the  
127 frequency to give people more departure choices. Another part of the Orange County improvement investment  
128 plan is that GoTriangle would extend the peak service to Carrboro since it is an extension of the US 15/501  
129 corridor. Carrboro currently does not have the service.

130 Patrick McDonough discussed GoTriangle's primary service along the US 15/501 corridor that was  
131 indicated in the presentation. Patrick McDonough explained route 405 (Durham and Patterson) sort of the light  
132 blue, and the route 400 (Durham and Chapel Hill) which has the deviation.

133 Patrick McDonough stated the Robertson Scholar Express Bus (RSX) is the yellow line that starts from  
134 Duke Chapel in Durham and goes to the Morehead Planetarium in Chapel Hill. As GoTriangle looks forward, the  
135 Robinson Scholar Express is not changing, but the accessing service is proposed for a change. For change, what  
136 GoTriangle is doing is streamlining the service. Patrick McDonough stated GoTriangle is removing service in the  
137 Route 400 deviation from SW Durham Drive, Old Chapel Hill Road, and University Drive on the Regional Service.  
138 Patrick McDonough stated GoTriangle will be adding back some of the service to GoDurham bus routes. Patrick

139 McDonough stated GoTriangle has been working on Park and Ride opportunity of Patterson Place. Patrick  
140 McDonough stated people were doing some parks and ride there already through the Durham Ordinance.  
141 Patrick McDonough stated Park-and-Rides served along route Durham Station (150 spaces) and Patterson Place  
142 (77 spaces) parking lots.

143 Patrick McDonough stated that the service and the current configuration of the 405 and 400 routes are  
144 much more different primarily because of the area, and it makes the travel time difference as described in the  
145 presentation. The services are closely identical with one route dipping in Patterson Place between Durham and  
146 Chapel Hill as one acting as Express Style. Also, Express Style during peak hours will begin in Carrboro and go on  
147 tracing the other route to Durham, as people arriving from Durham, it goes to the hospital first then goes back  
148 to 54 and resets in Carrboro.

149 Patrick McDonough stated riders will be able to ride the yellow line routes which has the Carrboro  
150 segment through Chapel Hill onto Durham. The scheduled travel time for weekday peaks is 35 to 59 minutes,  
151 Midday/Saturday is 55 to 60 minutes; and Night/Sunday is 50 to 55 minutes. GoTriangle built their schedules to  
152 acknowledge when traffic is heavier; they cut the corridor top end trip time down from 59 to about 50 minutes  
153 and about 9 minutes also off on midday and Saturday, and receive 9 minutes at night time.

154 Ed Harrison asked for clarification about the yellow line that starts at Jones Ferry Road Park and Ride.  
155 Patrick McDonough stated it is Jones Ferry Road at Abbey Court. Ed Harrison asked if it the only stops  
156 downtown Carrboro. Patrick McDonough stated there will be a stop discussion later in the presentation.  
157 GoTriangle does need to do some stop consolidation. The more the bus stops the slower the service is.

158 Patrick McDonough stated along East Franklin Street and Erwin Road, GoTriangle has to think about how  
159 many stops to continue to serve; this is an analyzed study. Also, when riding the 405 route, it will show today  
160 where three or four stops are having a heavy Boarding area. Ellen Reckhow stated the scheduled has a half an  
161 hour, but two routes leaving different half hours are staggered. Patrick McDonough stated at the upper end of

162 the travel time this little organization saves about 9 minutes between Durham and Chapel Hill most of the travel  
163 period.

164 Patrick McDonough stated the frequency is one of the big advances, and it is every 30 minutes and a  
165 few minutes ago it was uneven. In downtown Chapel Hill in the morning, there are two buses leaving for  
166 Durham at the same time, and one of them will get there 15 minutes slower than the other. The people  
167 traveling that direction may feel there are not many choices. The people are leaving Durham every 30 minutes  
168 from the Durham station. By one being slower, the people might not feel like there is a choice, and will need to  
169 get there the right time to leave on the bus if not 30 minutes before next bus. With the average departure, it  
170 will be every 15 minutes instead of every 30 minutes. It will not be exactly 15 minutes, even when the schedule  
171 pans out because of the stop at Patterson Place; it might be 12 minutes to 18 minutes.

172 Patrick McDonough stated the frequency existing for weekday peak is every 30 (uneven) minutes,  
173 Midday/Saturday is every 60 minutes; and Night/Sunday is every 60 minutes. He stated that GoTriangle team  
174 would like to go to the frequency existing; however, with the funding allocated this year, this is where the target  
175 hit.

176 Patrick McDonough asked for questions before he continued the presentation. Ellen Reckhow asked if  
177 there are any hidden or unintended consequences. There was a recent article a few days ago related to these  
178 changes in the Bull City buses and others. Patrick McDonough stated there are some consequences that we  
179 know of, and what they are. Patrick McDonough stated the area with University Drive, Patterson Place, and  
180 Garrett Road are the lowest ridership territory out there. As part of the GoTriangle improvement investment  
181 plan, this area is going to have a service eliminated. The improvements can be made along the US 15-501  
182 corridor regionally. GoDurham will pick up most of the people who are affected by the change. There are some  
183 changes to Route 10 that is sort of a streamlining when getting on University Drive.

184 Chair Steve Schewel asked what the reduced travel time would be for travel from for Woodcroft to  
185 Duke? Mark Ahrendsen and Patrick McDonough agreed the reduce trip time should be 25 minutes to 30

186 minutes. Mark Ahrendsen stated the reduce trip time with two buses running an hour; it should be 30 minutes.

187 Patrick McDonough stated a trip today from Woodcroft to Duke travel time would be 45 minutes to an hour.

188 Ellen Reckhow asked if there will be a park and ride opportunity at the south end of the new Route 10A.

189 Patrick McDonough stated that there is a Park and Ride option at the Woodcroft Shopping Center. Mark

190 Ahrendsen stated the South Square area has parking spaces for Park and Ride. Patrick McDonough stated

191 GoTriangle would look at the areas if the right opportunity emerged. He recapped that new service from the

192 Woodcroft area, which is on the map as pink, purple for future routes, and up to Duke can be relined. A rider

193 can transfer anywhere on University Drive. GoTriangle has made more bus routes accessible and no longer as

194 isolated. There are routes with two buses that make it easier to transfer.

195 Ellen Reckhow asked how close the routes are to the low income housing areas on Shannon Road. Mark

196 Ahrendsen stated that some residents could walk up Shannon Road to University Drive. Chair Steve Schewel

197 stated that there is no sidewalk on Shannon Road. There was additional discussion about providing sidewalks

198 and improving connectivity of existing sidewalks on Shannon Road for access to a library and to bus transit.

199 Patrick McDonough stated he will get with the GoTriangle service team and bring back an answer.

200 Patrick McDonough presented the impacts of the US 15-501 service improvement to the customers. He

201 stated it is removing the Route 400 deviation along SW Durham Drive, Old Chapel Hill Road, and University

202 Drive. The people living in this section will not have direct bus access anymore and will walk further due to the

203 fact of the lowest ridership in the corridor. They will need to drive to Patterson Place for Park and Ride. In

204 addition, to keep the travel time down, stop consolidation is very important. GoTriangle lost seven minutes in

205 travel time between Durham and Chapel Hill in the last two years. This will be considered a way to streamline

206 the route, especially on East Franklin Street and Erwin Road where there is more urban stopping. Patrick

207 McDonough explained that the map shows the urban areas where the people need to be informed of the stop

208 consolidation, example on the map – stops at AB, ACE, or E rather than ABCDE area. This will help keep



209 everyone on time. There are ways to get to the Durham station via Route 10 through Duke/VA, the New  
210 Woodcroft, the South Square and Duke/VA.

211 Ed Harrison asked if the Blue Route will stop at all the existing stops on East Franklin Street. Patrick  
212 McDonough stated that GoTriangle had not made a determination yet. It will be analyzed to see if some or any  
213 will be eliminated.

214 Vice Chair Damon Seils asked about riders that travel to stops via bicycle. Vice Chair Damon Seils  
215 requested that if stops are consolidated, there should be a focus on providing adequate and secure bicycle  
216 parking. Some of the stops that were being discussed do not currently have adequate bicycle parking.

217 Patrick McDonough stated that amenities will be considered as part of stop consolidation.

218 Patrick McDonough stated that the Park-and-Ride serves routes along Durham and Patterson Place. He  
219 stated GoTriangle is trying to finalize the proposal this month. The timeline for GoTriangle to finalize the  
220 proposal starting in March or April (Outreach the Surveying as well as stakeholder and public meetings); April or  
221 May is GoTriangle approval months; and August is the month for service implementation. Patrick McDonough  
222 stated Jon Dodson is the lead project manager for this project.

223 Ellen Reckhow asked if there will be bus shelters at the new consolidated stops. Patrick McDonough  
224 responded that this question is similar to the question that Vice Chair Damon Seils asked about bicycle parking.  
225 Patrick McDonough stated that GoTriangle considers existing amenities as part of the bus stop consolidation  
226 process. Patrick McDonough stated he is sure that GoTriangle staff will look at bus stops without shelters

227 Chair Steve Schewel thanked Patrick McDonough for his excellent presentation. Vice Chair Damon Seils  
228 thanked Patrick McDonough with his assistant on the Carrboro service extension. They had waited for years for  
229 it to be completed.

230 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the MPO DCHC MPO Board on  
231 the Proposed Transit Service Changes for the US 15/501 Corridor presentation. Chair Steve Schewel asked for a

232 motion to receive the Proposed Transit Service Changes for the US 15/501 Corridor presentation. A motion was  
233 made by and seconded by Vice Chair Damon Seils. The motion carried unanimously.

234

235 **9. Proposed DCHC Methodology for Ranking Projects and Allocating Local Input Points (SPOT P4.0)**  
236 **Lindsay Smart, LPA staff**

237 Lindsay Smart presented the Proposed DCHC Methodology for Ranking Projects and Allocating Local  
238 Input Points (SPOT P4.0). Lindsay Smart stated this agenda item comes to the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board with  
239 the recommendation from the Technical Committee that the MPO Board to review the Methodology and  
240 approve the draft Methodology to be released for public review and comment. The Methodology will be sent to  
241 the NCDOT Review Committee and will come back in March for approval from the DCHC MPO Board.

242 Lindsay Smart stated that the Allocation of Local Input Points begins on page 15. The previous pages in  
243 in the Methodology describe the process the DCHC MPO Board has been going through since June 2015. These  
244 pages discuss how the priority lists of projects to be submitted to SPOT were developed. The project lists were  
245 brought to the DCHC MPO Board in August, September, and October for review and approval, and then the  
246 MPO Staff were approved to submit the final list of projects to the SPOT P4.0 online tool. These pages and this  
247 process does not have the same formal review requirement that the section on the Allocation of Local Input  
248 Points does for NCDOT.

249 As NCDOT begins to release the SPOT raw scores in late February or early March, project scores will  
250 available for each of the three funding tiers, Statewide, Regional, and Division. As the scores for the project and  
251 funding tiers are released, the DCHC MPO Board will have an opportunity to review the scores and determine  
252 which projects to assign Local Input Points. The DCHC MPO has 1,800 Local Input Points in the Regional  
253 category and the Divisional category, just like last time. There will be discussions with the Division and District  
254 Engineer to try to maximize all the points. The DCHC MPO Board can put points on a project and the hope is  
255 that Division and District Engineers from NCDOT will put points on the same project. If the project does not  
256 need those entire points to get it over the benchmark to receive funding, the MPO will not waste the points.

257 The minimum amount of points needed to get a project funded will be allocated to a project. This will maximize  
258 the number of projects that receive points and hopefully receive funding.

259 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions. Chair Steve Schewel asked what does  
260 Transportation Management Area (TMA) means, what does it means to us here? TMAs are urbanized areas  
261 greater than 200,000 people. Chair Steve Schewel read from the handout Methodology for Identifying and  
262 Ranking New Transportation Improvement Program Project Requests (dated 2.10.16) page 1 – When the results  
263 of the SPOT Prioritization process are made available, the MPO will follow this Methodology to rank projects  
264 and assign Local Input Points to high priority projects. Chair Steve Schewel stated he thought our points were  
265 put on before the prioritization process, how does that work. Lindsay Smart stated the MPO Local Input Points  
266 have not been assigned to any projects yet, and as NCDOT starts to release the scores for projects we submitted  
267 this past fall, then we will have the opportunity to assign our Local Input Points. Chair Steve Schewel asked  
268 where does NCDOT prioritization comes from. Lindsay Smart stated the prioritization is the SPOT tool that  
269 evaluates projects based on quantifiable data. It is NCDOT data-driven quantitative scoring process. Chair Steve  
270 Schewel asked NCDOT is prioritizing based on what, before it comes to us for our level. Lindsay Smart stated  
271 NCDOT is just scoring projects based on their data evaluation. NCDOT is not prioritizing projects; they are just  
272 scoring projects. Lindsay Smart reminded everyone of the procedure the DCHC MPO Board used in the fall 2015  
273 to review data and identify the projects for submission to NCDOT SPOT tool. Lindsay Smart explained the data  
274 sets were reviewed by NCDOT, MPOs, and local jurisdictions and agencies in late January. After receiving the  
275 data from NCDOT SPOT's office, DCHC MPO was allowed about a week to review projects and provide any  
276 updates and corrections to projects that were submitted to the SPOT online tool. Lindsay Smart shared some  
277 examples of information received from the NCDOT's SPOT office such as the cost estimate may not be right, and  
278 here is what it should be, or here is the feasibility study. Technical staff from all the jurisdictions provide  
279 assistance with reviewing and provided corrections to the projects. The updates were submitted to NCDOT's  
280 SPOT office on Friday, February 5, 2016. Chair Steve Schewel stated that's not a real prioritization or it is

281 informative. Lindsay Smart stated it is just evaluation of projects, not prioritization. Mark Ahrendsen stated it is  
282 the quantitative data-driven process up to that point. Vice Chair Damon Seils stated we assigned our points  
283 trying to piggyback on what the scores indicate, to get the best outcome for us. Lindsay Smart stated some  
284 projects do very well and we hope all our projects do well so that not as many projects need points to get  
285 funded in the TIP.

286 Chair Steve Schewel asked why the Board would put Local Input Points to projects and and it's required  
287 that we put them in the TIP. He read "participation in the STI process through submitting projects for  
288 evaluation and/or allocating Local Input Points to projects does not require the MPO to include these projects in  
289 the TIP." Chair Steve Schewel stated he wondered why we do that. Lindsay Smart stated that some projects  
290 arise through this process that the DCHC MPO may not support. The statement that Chair Schewel just read is a  
291 disclaimer for projects that go through STI that may not achieve the goals or may not be the desire of the DCHC  
292 MPO DCHC MPO Board. By federal legislation, we are allowed to not include certain projects if the Board so  
293 chooses.

294 Chair Steve Schewel referred to page 16 of the ranking processes for the Allocation of Local Input Points.  
295 He wanted to know do we have to lock in or if it would be possible just to retain total flexibility, or do we need  
296 to say that or methodology. He wanted to know are we putting "X" numbers of points on the various  
297 categories. He asked is it required or would you rather have more flexibility or just say that 1,800 points now or  
298 later. Ellen Beckmann stated she remembered that the last time we didn't have it in there, and then we  
299 submitted it for approval and NCDOT said the MPO shave to have something that says how the points will be  
300 distributed by modes. Ellen Beckmann stated I think it had to be written in it, and it is still in there about certain  
301 modes and some that are flexible, but you know with all of this where is the caveat that the DCHC MPO Board  
302 can do something different as long as it is for a reason, documented, and explained. Ellen Beckmann confirmed  
303 to Chair Steve Schewel that the DCHC MPO Board does have flexibility.

304 Ed Harrison referred to the Summary Table: Ranking Processes for the Allocation of Local Input Points  
305 on page 1. He referenced to the mode/project type column for bicycle and pedestrian on page 16 that the note  
306 in the funding category/regional column reads: No. The STI legislation does not allow any bike/ped to be  
307 considered for regional funding. He stated the continuing problem for him is that we have all these bi-divisional  
308 projects that need to happen, in particular, the Old Durham, Chapel Hill Road project. Lindsay Smart stated STI  
309 does not allow us to submit bike/ped projects in the regional funding category,.

310 Don Moffitt asked about the word “cascades” on page 16 which is under the table in the statement of  
311 “if a Statewide project cascades down to the regional category, it will be scored according to the Regional  
312 Methodology.” Lindsay Smart stated highway projects that are eligible to be scored and funded in the  
313 statewide category, they will be scored as Statewide, Regional, and Division category. This is the way a project  
314 cascades down. Lindsay Smart stated a local road that is a Division project or Regional project cannot also be  
315 scored at the Statewide tier, it is not eligible. So if it is eligible in the highest tier, the project is then eligible in  
316 the lowest tier, as well. Don Moffitt stated thank you.

317 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any other comments for Lindsay Smart.

318 Don Mofitt stated there was a reference to RPO’s. Lindsay Smart stated that RPOs have Local Input  
319 Points just like MPOs.

320 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the  
321 Proposed DCHC Methodology for Ranking Projects and Allocating Local Input Points (SPOT P4.0). Chair Steve  
322 Schewel asked for a motion to approve the draft Methodology and be released for public comments review and  
323 comment period, with any comments from the DCHC MPO Board incorporated as necessary of the Proposed  
324 DCHC Methodology for Ranking Projects and Allocating Local Input Points (SPOT P4.0). A motion was made by  
325 Vice Chair Damon Seils and seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried unanimously.

326 **10. Draft FY2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

327 **Meg Scully, LPA Staff**

328

329 Meg Scully presented the Draft FY2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Meg Scully provided  
330 background and an update on the changes that have been made since the DCHC MPO Board last reviewed of  
331 the FY2017 draft UPWP. The DCHC MPO is required by federal regulations to prepare an annual UPWP that  
332 details and guides the urban area transportation activities.

333 Meg Scully stated attachments have been provided to explain each UPWP change.

334 Meg Scully provided a summary of the list of changes in general category that have occurred: (1) minor  
335 edits identified during the review process; (2) re-allocation of City of Durham funds among various task codes to  
336 better reflect work to be performed in FY17; (3) addition of funds by Chapel Hill for the two-year Transportation  
337 and Connectivity Study (unused funds from FY16 will be de-obligated with the next FY16 amendment); and (4)  
338 addition of four regional studies with local match (funds were unused and de-obligated from FY16 UPWP).

339 Meg Scully stated that the Technical Committee (TC) recommended that the DCHC MPO Board hold a  
340 public hearing and approve the FY2017 UPWP including the resolution, self-certification process, and local  
341 match.

342 Ellen Reckhow asked about the study of the interaction between the NC 54 corridor and the D-O LRT.  
343 The DCHC MPO Board discussed merging planning for the D-O-LRT.

344 Mark Ahrendsen indicated that the integration of the NC 54 corridor and the D-O LRT project will be  
345 studied through the environmental process.

346 Ellen Reckhow stated the only thing is that at the last Durham-Chapel Hill workgroup meeting they had a  
347 discussion of might wanting to revisit the NC 54 corridor study. There are some interest in it, possibly  
348 massaging is not, it is less highway like and more multimodal friendly. That will require some revisiting and  
349 planning. There was additional discussion about concerns that Ellen Reckhow had regarding the corridor  
350 becoming more multi-modal to support the future D-O LRT.

351 Joey Hopkins (NCDOT Division 5) stated he agrees with Mark Ahrendsen, multi-modal connections  
352 would be considered during environmental. Chair Steve Schewel asked if the considerations that Ellen Reckhow

353 raises would be able to be incorporated in the process we have ongoing. Joey Hopkins stated that any comment  
354 like that, from the MPO Staff to our project team, is that project starts the project development process. Joey  
355 Hopkins stated we got the study that would certainly inform that project development process for NC 54. If  
356 there are any additional comments or concerns, they should be transmitted to NCDOT. Ellen Reckhow stated  
357 Chapel Hill has expressed some concerns about it. Ed Harrison stated Barbee Chapel Road and Ellen Reckhow  
358 agreed. Ellen Reckhow stated I think assuming that light rail does not end up in the corridor making sure that  
359 the corridor is very pedestrian and bike friendly will be critical.

360 Ellen Reckhow stated that perhaps a separate agenda item is needed to review and remember the NC  
361 54 corridor study. The future agenda item would revisit outcomes from the corridor study and provide DCHC  
362 MPO Board members an opportunity to comment and feel confident that their concerns are being heard.  
363 Especially because the D-O LRT project alignment has changed, the NC 54 corridor study was prepared since  
364 then. Mark Ahrendsen stated that the NC 54 corridor study is available for review online and staff could provide  
365 a summary presentation in the spring. He stated it has been a while since the NC 54 corridor study was  
366 completed. In addition to a summary, it might be helpful to have the presentation explain what the expected  
367 process would be for the NC 54 corridor project, and the light rail project and how they interface and capture if  
368 there is an opportunity to do that. Mark Ahrendsen stated go back and revisit the corridor study and simply  
369 take the concerns expressed and insure they are addressed in the next step for both of those projects.

370 Ellen Reckhow stated major changes have occurred since the NC 54 corridor study.

371 Chair Steve Schewel thanked Joey Hopkins and stated it sounds like NCDOT would need formal input.

372 Joey Hopkins stated yes, and to Mark Ahrendsen's comment about providing input, there are certainly  
373 opportunities throughout that process to do it. The MPO staff will be involved directly with the project  
374 development process, also opportunities for the public to comment too in both the development side and the  
375 design side.

376 Barry Jacobs asked about the Carrboro Town Hall meeting minutes or notes from the NC 54 west in  
377 Orange County that was held in the fall. He asked the MPO staff for a summary. Lindsay Smart stated that a  
378 meeting summary was prepared and circulated. She stated it was sent to the town of Carrboro for distribution.  
379 Lindsay Smart agreed to circulate the meeting summary again.

380 Felix Nwoko commented he has met again to flush out the a scope for a planning study for the corridor.  
381 He stated the MPO Staff met with Orange County and Carrboro staff.

382 Chair Steve Schewel requested Lindsay Smart send the DCHC MPO Board a copy of the meeting  
383 summary.

384 Meg Scully suggested the MPO Board open the public hearing for comments on the UPWP.

385 Chair Steve Schewel opened the public hearing for the comments on the Draft FY2017 UPWP.

386 Chair Steve Schewel asked for comments from the DCHC MPO Board.

387 Don Moffitt asked about page 32 task 3c5 – safety and drug control planning, and asked for clarification.

388 Felix Nwoko responded that it is regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) safety activities  
389 as conducting a drug control environment under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) program for operators  
390 of transit agencies, such as GoDurham, GoTriangle, and Chapel Hill Transit.

391 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the  
392 Draft FY2017 UPWP. Chair Steve Schewel closed the public hearing. Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to  
393 approve the Draft FY2017 UPWP and including the resolution, self-certification process, and local match. A  
394 motion was made by Ellen Reckhow and seconded by Barry Jacob. The motion carried unanimously.

395 **11. Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures**

396 **Andy Henry, LPA Staff**

397  
398 Andy Henry presented the Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures presentation. He stated the goal  
399 for today is to approve the document to be released for the public review and comment period, with any  
400 comments from the DCHC MPO Board incorporated as needed. Andy Henry stated a public hearing will be held



401 in March. The MPO Staff will return in April for DCHC MPO Board's approval. Andy Henry stated he would like  
402 to get the information out to the public today.

403           Andy Henry stated that a workshop took place and was conducted by the MPO staff for the DCHC MPO  
404 Board members to draft the Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures for the 2045 MTP on January 13,  
405 2016. He stated they did not get to the performance measures, but based on input from the workshop, staff  
406 modified the Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures based on workshop input. Andy Henry provided an  
407 overview of the MPO DCHC MPO Board workshop and described the two attachments to the agenda. Andy  
408 Henry described the changes to the Goals and Objectives that have been made as a result of input received from  
409 the DCHC MPO Board members during the workshop.

410           Chair Steve Schewel stated that the new draft is a tremendous improvement and appreciated the  
411 workshop and the opportunity to provide input in the workshop setting. He felt the MPO Staff had captured  
412 what the DCHC MPO Board talked about regarding goals. Chair Steve Schewel stated these are the goals he can  
413 get behind.

414           Vice Chair Damon Seils provided a suggestion for performance measures for Equity. Vice Chair Damon  
415 Seils said that at the December 9, 2015, meeting he was interested particularly in the Environmental Justice  
416 category and how the staff would think about specifying ,some of it because it may be a more a difficult  
417 category in a sense of design and performance measures. He said that maybe it would be clearer in his mind if  
418 he saw the performance measures of the category. He suggested connecting (item D) the measure of the  
419 number of participants in public meetings to the first performance measure of increasing participation from  
420 Environmental Justice communities (item A). Vice Chair Damon Seils stated that in other words, communities  
421 looking to prioritizing investment and doing a better job in servicing their participation specifically called out as  
422 one to measure and to improve.

423           Andy Henry agreed with the Vice Chair Damon Seils' suggestion for the performance measures for the  
424 Ensure Equity category. He stated we will add that. Andy Henry stated MPO LPA Staff tried to keep the

425 performance measures quantitative as possible. Andy Henry stated I think the MPO LPA Staff can come up with  
426 something.

427 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated it was great and thanked Andy Henry.

428 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any comments.

429 Ellen Reckhow commended the MPO LPA Staff on how well it was organized and very productive. She  
430 felt a lot had been accomplished in a short period of time.

431 Ed Harrison asked how they publicize the Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures document release.

432 Chair Steve Schewel asked Andy Henry how the Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures would be  
433 advertised.

434 Ed Harrison asked what type and level of public participation is expected at this stage in the process.

435 Andy Henry described the public engagement process for this stage of the planning process, newspaper,  
436 survey mailing, mailing list from different jurisdictions, and DCHC MPO website. Andy Henry stated that most  
437 often, the DCHC MPO receives the most feedback once lines that represent propose projects are drawn on  
438 maps.

439 Chair Steve Schewel stated Lauren Horsh from The Herald- Sun newspaper may want to run a story on  
440 the DCHC MPO Board's goals.

441 Don Moffitt suggested that each jurisdiction has its own public relations office. Perhaps this could be  
442 distributed through each jurisdiction's Public Relations office. Don Moffitt stated he is keeping with Vice Chair  
443 Damon Seils' suggestion on linking up to like increasing percent in Environmental Justice (Ensure Equity  
444 category) population on what can we change and what can we add, what groups might we reach out too, that  
445 might increase that percentage.

446 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated perhaps change where you hold a public hearing and who is attracted to  
447 the event.

448 Ellen Reckhow stated some details are needed in the narrative that directly links the fact that these  
449 Goals and Objectives drive the MPO DCHC MPO Board planning process, and try to have the people understand  
450 the contents.

451 Chair Steve Schewel stated these are good ideas and asked if there were any other thoughts.

452 Andy Henry stated on the second page there are performance measures that are linked to the  
453 objectives. He stated the MPO LPA Staff is trying to keep the performance measures qualifiable and  
454 understandable. The goals and objectives for the performance measures on the second page will probably  
455 change the most because LPA Staff will work on those. Andy Henry stated that after the data is checked, the  
456 LPA Staff will come back with some suggestions and may have some repetitive the goals and objectives  
457 performance measures.

458 Andy Henry stated the second thing is that the MPO LPA staff and CAMPO in Raleigh, NC are working  
459 together on their set of goals and objectives. Each MPO can have different goals and objectives from working  
460 together, but staff is trying to keep them as close as possible together.

461 Don Moffitt stated when tempting to get certain kinds of participation making sure that it goes to  
462 Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Commission of Durham for example Environmental Affairs. Don Moffitt asked if a  
463 public event can be held at the Durham Station.

464 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there be a public hearing associated with the goals and objectives  
465 performance measures.

466 Andy Henry stated the public hearing meeting is scheduled for the March DCHC MPO Board Meeting.  
467 There was further discussion about DCHC MPO staff facilitating a public input opportunity in the afternoon peak  
468 time at Durham Station.

469 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the  
470 Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures. Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to approve the document be  
471 released for public review and comment period, with any comments from the DCHC MPO Board incorporated as

472 needed. A motion was made by Bernadette Pelissier and seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried  
473 unanimously.

474 Don Moffitt asked does the MPO DCHC MPO Board need to schedule the public hearing meeting or will  
475 the MPO LPA Staff do it.

476 Chair Steve Schewel and Meg Scully stated the public hearing is during the regular MPO Board meeting.

477 **12. Draft Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP**

478 **Lindsay Smart, LPA staff**

479  
480 Lindsay Smart presented the Draft Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. This is the first proposed  
481 amendment to the FY2016-2025 TIP. Lindsay Smart stated Draft Amendment # 1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP comes  
482 from the Technical Committee to review and release for public comments. She stated that there will be a public  
483 hearing in March and an adoption of the amendment approval in April.

484 Lindsay Smart provided a brief overview on the projects included in the amendment.

485 There was a discussion about the location of the Carrboro (Downtown Multi-Use Path) project for the  
486 Town of Carrboro.

487 Chair Steve Schewel commented he liked the format of the two amendments. You are able to see the  
488 original information and the changes to the project.

489 Lindsay Smart stated that the project information sheets were directly from the DCHC MPO Funding  
490 Database website.

491 Don Moffitt stated that the City of Durham (#C-5183 Sidwalks in Durham) project for Alston Avenue  
492 seemed to be shortening based on the reduced cost. What drove the decision to reduce the scope of the  
493 project for Alston Avenue?

494 Dale McKeel stated that the plan was to originally do sidewalks on two sections of Alston Ave. The  
495 Public Works Department did cost estimate. It would cost more money to do both sections of Alston Avenue;

496 therefore, the project was scaled back and the remaining funds transferred to City of Durham (#C-5572 West  
497 Ellerbe Creek Greenway) trail project.

498 Lindsay Smart stated the funds for Alston Avenue that were not needed are being applied to or  
499 programmed to the West Ellerbe Creek Greenway trail project. The amendment to the West Ellerbe Creek  
500 Greenway project is listed in the summary sheets.

501 Ed Harrison asked about NCDOT (#I-5707 I-40 Auxiliary Lane) -- what is an auxiliary lane? Lindsay Smart  
502 stated it is an additional outside lane in between exits. There was additional discussion on existing auxiliary  
503 lanes examples.

504 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments on the Draft Amendment #1 to the  
505 FY2016-2025 TIP.

506 Ed Harrison asked that the Old Chapel Hill Road only address Durham City's part. Vice Chair Damon Seils  
507 stated the Old Chapel Hill Road's part for Chapel Hill has been programmed. Lindsay Smart stated the new STP-  
508 DA funding that Chapel Hill received for the project has not been programmed because information is needed  
509 from Chapel Hill to prepare the amendment. The previous funding for the Chapel Hill portion has been  
510 programmed.

511 Vice Chair Damon Seils asked if that will be a future amendment for Chapel Hill.

512 Lindsay Smart responded that if Chapel Hill provides information for the changes to the project before  
513 the March Board meeting agenda, she can include the changes in amendment #1. Otherwise, a new or future  
514 amendment will be needed.

515 Ed Harrison asked what the status of the Chapel Hill portion is. He thinks the answers will need to come  
516 from NCDOT.

517 David Bonk stated that the Chapel Hill portion of the project is about a year behind the Durham portion.  
518 The Durham portion has finished the right-of-way acquisition. His understanding Chapel Hill is about to start it  
519 and part of the issue is negotiating or contacting the new owners of the Blue Cross Blue Shield property and

520 State Employee's Credit Union to let them know there will be a need for some their of land for right-of-way,  
521 easement, etc. for the project. During the transition period, Chapel Hill has had difficulty contacting them.  
522 David Bonk stated the good news is his understanding the actual right-of-way cost for Durham side is lower than  
523 it had been projected and is hoping this will occur for Chapel Hill.

524 Ed Harrison stated the main question is when it will be built.

525 Dale McKeel stated that construction is scheduled to start on the Durham side in the fall of this year.  
526 Duke Energy is in the process of relocating utilities, then it will go out for bids in the fall.

527 Ed Harrison asked if this would take care of the Poe Road roundabout.

528 Dale McKeel responded yes.

529 Vice Chair Damon Seils asked about three projects in Carrboro for amendment clarification.

530 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated first one is the Downtown Multi-Use Path project. He stated that the amendment  
531 says it is a new project being added to TIP. It will be designed and constructed in FY2017 and FY2018. He stated  
532 the second amendment is filling the gap between the two existing Greenways in northern Carrboro and Morris  
533 Grove Elementary School. The amendment is accelerating the project schedule for that, and what is the  
534 change? Lindsay Smart answered additional STP-DA funding is being added in FY 2017, and updated the project  
535 schedule from prior year FY2016 to FY2017. The schedule is being updated. Damon Seils stated the third  
536 project is the same which is the Homestead Road to Chapel Hill High School extension of the Bolin Creek  
537 Greenway taking their previous approved funds. Lindsay Smart answered that the project looks like it is on the  
538 same schedule for FY16 and FY17. Vice Damon Seils stated they both use similar language, and really is about  
539 moving funds that have not been obligated yet. Lindsay Smart responded yes, the amendment brings the  
540 phases of projects to be current and adds additional funding. Vice Chair Damon Seils thanked Lindsay Smart.

541 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the MPO DCHC MPO Board on  
542 the Draft Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to review proposed  
543 TIP amendment #1 and approve the proposed amendment to be released for the public review and comment

544 period, with any comments from the MPO DCHC MPO Board incorporated as necessary to the Draft  
545 Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. A motion was made by Vice Chair Damon Seils and seconded by Ellen  
546 Reckhow. The motion carried unanimously.

547 **13. Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP**  
548 **Lindsay Smart, LPA staff**

549  
550 Lindsay Smart presented the Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. This is the second proposed  
551 amendment to the FY2016-2025 TIP. Lindsay Smart stated the Draft amendment #2 added new projects: a. #P-  
552 5706 East Durham Siding and b. Nine new projects as one the #P-5710 Grade Separations at Blackwell Street  
553 and Mangum Street; b. Make changes to projects U-5717 US 15/501 (at Garrett Road), I-3306A I-40, TE-5205  
554 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit; and c. Changes to five Breaks of project U-5774 NC 54. The new projects and  
555 the changes to the existing projects are described in detail in the attachments to this agenda item.

556 Don Moffitt asked if all the ones listed in the memo are included in the package. Lindsay Smart stated  
557 the projects should be included in the package and was there any particular one he was looking for? Don Moffitt  
558 stated the first two projects he found, but not the third one. He located the third one and then indicated that  
559 the projects were listed in a different order.

560 Chair Steve Schewel asked for information the recommendation from the Technical Committee (TC).  
561 Lindsay Smart stated the TC reviewed the proposed TIP amendment #2, provided comments, recommended  
562 that project #C-5178 be transferred to draft amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP and that the DCHC MPO  
563 DCHC MPO Board provide guidance to the MPO staff and the MPO Technical Committee on the appropriate  
564 public outreach and engagement strategy to be conducted for draft amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP.  
565 Lindsay Smart stated there are some very big changes being proposed and large projects.

566 Chair Steve Schewel stated some we like better than others.

567 Mark Ahrendsen stated the reason for two sets of amendments proceeding at the same time they really  
568 have different backgrounds on both of those. He stated the first set the DCHC MPO Board initiated the

569 amendments to add the allocation of STP-DA funds. He stated the second one is that NCDOT initiated as the  
570 result of the some actions of the General Assembly that certain projects in generally providing additional  
571 funding that allows other projects to be accelerated, and include some funds appropriate without passing  
572 judgment on either one to allow them to proceed as separate tracks. That is why the amendments are brought  
573 forward in that way.

574 Chair Steve Schewel thanked Mark Ahrendsen for the information.

575 Chair Steve Schewel asked Mark Ahrendsen did he have any recommendations on how the DCHC MPO  
576 Board might would like to proceed with public input and timing. He asked is there are any ways the MPO Staff  
577 would like to propose to the DCHC MPO Board that they should be acting or thinking about.

578 Mark Ahrendsen stated they are asking that both amendments be available for public comments and  
579 hold public hearings in March to officially receive input. He stated both amendments could be brought back to  
580 the DCHC MPO Board for consideration at the April meeting; however, it is the DCHC MPO Board choice to how  
581 they will handle it.

582 Chair Steve Schewel asked does it fit with the DCHC MPO Board's goals and timing with the D-O LRT  
583 decision.

584 Lindsay Smart stated yes.

585 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the  
586 Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP.

587 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated that setting the public hearing is no committing to a decision about either  
588 amendment.

589 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments.

590 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the MPO DCHC MPO Board on  
591 the Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP.



592 Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to review proposed TIP amendment #2, approve project #C-  
593 5178 be transferred to draft amendment #1 to the FY2016-2015 TIP and included as part of the amendment  
594 process for draft amendment #1. Provide guidance to the MPO staff and the MPO Technical Committee on the  
595 appropriate public outreach and engagement strategy to be conducted for amendment #2 to the FY2015-2025  
596 TIP, and approve the proposed amendment to be released for the public review and comment period. A motion  
597 was made by Vice Chair Damon Seils and seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried unanimously.

598 Ellen Reckhow asked when the DCHC MPO Board did their 2040 MTP plan was the D-O LRT project  
599 included in the modeling for our community . Did the DCHC MPO Board have any sense or curiosity of the  
600 impact of removing or if this reduction for light rail would hold and the project did not go forward, can we  
601 access what that does to the community in terms of congestion in the corridor. Ellen Reckhow stated she thinks  
602 it is interesting information to have. She stated perhaps look to get the cap changed in the spring.

603 Lindsay Smart stated there have been MPO Staff conversations about it, in terms of what would the  
604 model say for the 2045 MTP. Lindsay Smart did not know if the MPO staff can run the model and have the  
605 numbers by the next meeting, but she can bounce it around with Felix Nwoko.

606 Ellen Reckhow stated the DCHC MPO Board should have the information by the meeting in April  
607 because they are trying to make an important decision.

608 Felix Nwoko stated that the MPO would be able to tell the MPO Board in March if the model could be  
609 run this spring to analyze these impacts. Felix Nwoko suggested that the D-O LRT No Build Scenario might be  
610 another good resource to look at for this information.

611 Don Moffitt stated two large projects were sort of glossed over. He stated the grade separation project  
612 and the East Durham Siding project are vast projects; these projects have vast impacts on the of citizens in the  
613 City of Durham. He feels the grade separations should be looked at carefully before any steps are made  
614 forward. He stated there has been enormous amounts of decisions and debates within the City among several  
615 different parties about the wisdom of various grade separation strategies or any grade separation strategies and

616 when NCRR told GoTriangle to move the D-O LRT somewhere else, the City lost all sorts of energy for during any  
617 grade separations. We have a handful of freight trains and the impact of grade separation will be separating the  
618 City or dividing the City. He asked where did these projects come from, what is driving them, how do we have  
619 only \$500,000 to spend on light rail and coming up with hundreds of millions of dollars to build the great wall of  
620 Durham?

621 Lindsay Smart stated the funding from the light rail project would go to the next projects that scored  
622 highly in SPOT 3.0. These two projects and a project in Wake County and a project in Greensboro would have  
623 been the next ones to receive funding.

624 Mark Ahrendsen stated this is just following the process and that's where we are moving now.

625 Don Moffitt stated these are dollars that where going to be spent in the communities and still spent in  
626 the communities. If the legislation changed, will the dollars still be spent in the communities for projects?

627 Chair Steve Schewel referred to Joey Hopkins for information.

628 Joey Hopkins stated his understanding there are five total projects that the funding that cannot be spent  
629 on the light rail is being spent on. He stated two projects are in Durham, maybe two in CAMPO, and one in  
630 Greensboro. These projects are like Lindsay Smart stated they are further down the priority list on the other  
631 modes that are eligible for that funding, but because the law now restricts the limits amounts that can go to  
632 light rail NCDOT has to go down the list and fund the next projects. Joey Hopkins stated he does think that the  
633 two in Durham and two in CAMPO from what he recalls would have to be re-scored in the future because of  
634 where the schedule falls. Joey Hopkins stated if the law is changed and the cap is lifted, then the light rail will  
635 be the highest scoring project again and it will be able to pull the funds back out. Vice Chair Damon Seils stated  
636 it is already scored. Joey Hopkins stated it has already been scored; it is capped. It has to be re-scored and the  
637 score will change in SPOT.4.0. He does not know what the rescoring will be, but the scoring formula has  
638 changed. He believes maybe there is a project in Greensboro that does not need to be re-scored. He thinks the  
639 project falls in the first years of the STIP and it will receive the funding and stay there. He stated again it will be

640 further down the list and does not mean the light rail project would not get funded, but it may push it further  
641 back if the cap is lifted.

642           There were several discussions on the public hearing scheduling. Lindsay Smart stated the DCHC MPO  
643 Board can schedule a public hearing whenever the Board would like to have one. Lindsay Smart stated the  
644 original plan was to have the public hearing in March and along with amendment # 1, but there are a lot of  
645 changes made between the two amendments. Lindsay Smart stated the DCHC MPO Board can have a public  
646 hearing in April to separate the two amendments so the public would have a more clearer understanding of  
647 what is happening; however, that is the DCHC MPO Board's decision. Lindsay Smart stated another public  
648 engagement can be done at a night meeting if the MPO Board would like that.

649           Chair Steve Schewel stated he would like the MPO Staff's recommendation. Do you care about March,  
650 April or May?

651           Lindsay Smart stated the MPO Staff recommends April.

652           There was a discussion on public hearing schedule. The public hearing meeting will be in April to receive  
653 the input additional information and it aligns with the legislation calendar.

654           Don Moffitt stated this is a moving target and holding a public hearing it will be hard to have the people  
655 to give back. They can only give feedback to whats been offered, but not to what might be offered. Don Moffitt  
656 stated if time is not the factor then I would urge not to not have a vote today, but moving the date or come back  
657 to discuss it later, because it is a moving target.

658           Chair Steve Schewel referred to Lindsay Smart regarding the date for the public hearing.

659           Lindsay Smart stated that having the public hearing in April and hearing public comments gives more  
660 opportunities to advertise for that hearing and possibly generate some public excitement about it. At that  
661 point, the decision is if up to the DCHC MPO Board in May for adoption. There is also the STIP amendment that  
662 has to be done. Even if the schedule is being pushed out more and more that is fine, but NCDOT has to amend

663 their STIP as well. Lindsay Smart stated there are different processes going on and the processes for amendment  
664 # 1 and amendment # 2 should probably be separated.

665 The DCHC MPO Board continued to discuss the public hearing date recommendation and the delay of  
666 other projects.

667 Joey Hopkins commented on the three projects. He stated two of the projects are amendments that are  
668 due to new projected revenue. These two projects are not related to the light rail project. The one that is  
669 related to light rail is the NC 54 project. It would be the third one, and it was delayed a year for construction to  
670 allow time to require right-of-way. He does not believe it is a major issue of putting the public hearing off a  
671 month or two with STIP not matching the TIP, but if the light rail is questioned it will delay things longer. He  
672 stated his preference would be to have the documents match and go forward with the project development  
673 process on the projects. He stated they both are outside the four year window; therefore, it is okay. It is not a  
674 huge issue.

675 Chair Steve Schewel asked Joey Hopkins to recommend a date for the public hearing.

676 Joey Hopkins stated he thinks April is fine. The only reason he mention the light rail question because it  
677 delays things. He would have concerns having NCDOT moving forward with any project development even with  
678 the projects outside the four year window if the two documents did not match. Joey Hopkins stated in the short  
679 term it is okay. Joey Hopkins stated he wanted it noted in the records. Even though they are in amendment # 2,  
680 are really a separate question than the light rail question and the rail project that is listed. He mentions NCDOT  
681 amendment has already been approved. He stated NCDOT BOT does their part for the STIP. Then it is sent to  
682 the MPO's to concur. Joey Hopkins stated for clarification he does not think it is a big deal. He stated he thinks  
683 it would be a different question if any of the projects were inside the four year window then it would not  
684 conform. He stated NCDOT official STIP right now has approved amendments and the DCHC MPO Board has  
685 not, officially they would have to go back to the document both have approved, back in October. He stated that

686 is the official document, but that one is not conforming to the State law at this time, even though those match  
687 we would not move forward with that project because of the State budget.

688 Don Moffitt asked could the two light rail projects be removed of amendment #2 and move them to  
689 amendment #3 and move amendment # 2 forward.

690 Lindsay Smart stated, yes.

691 Mark Ahrendsen stated you could, but you could also do it later after gathering public input. He stated  
692 seeming you might need to gather more information or there may be a reason for the delay and separate them  
693 at that time. He does not think it precluded you from it doing at that time if you determine it is helpful to do it.

694 Mark Ahrendsen stated if it is not, keep the projects on the same track.

695 Barry Jacob stated he had the same question on putting the projects in one amendment. He stated the  
696 DCHC MPO Board should review after the public hearing and decide to separate them or leave them, and  
697 assume at this point the MPO Staff understands what the ramification of any delay or do not consider them  
698 significant, but the further the DCHC MPO Board goes it maybe more pertinent.

699 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated that the DCHC MPO Board has flexibilities with what we do with either of  
700 the amendments.

701 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the  
702 Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP for a public hearing date.

703 Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to set the public hearing for April and review proposed TIP  
704 amendment #2, approve project #C-5178 be transferred to draft amendment #1 to the FY2016-2015 TIP and  
705 included as part of the amendment process for draft amendment #1, and approve the proposed amendment to  
706 be released for the public review and comment period. A motion was made by Vice Chair Damon Seils and  
707 seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried unanimously.

708 **REPORTS:**

709 **14. Report from the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board Chair**

710 **Steve Schewel, DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board Chair**

711

712 There was no report from the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board Chair.

713 **15. Report from the DCHC MPO Technical Committee Chair**

714 **Mark Ahrendsen, DCHC MPO TC Chair**

715

716 There was no report from the DCHC MPO Technical Committee Chair.

717 **16. Reports from LPA Staff**

718 **Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

719

720 There was no report from the LPA Staff.

721 **17. NCDOT Reports:**

722 Joey Hopkins, NCDOT Division 5, provided an update that Alston Avenue (Project U-3308) will be letting  
723 and opening for bids in the month of June. He stated that the traffic signals planned for Gregson, Peabody, and  
724 Roxboro on the low bridges of the foundations are finished. The footings are dug at Gregson Street and Roxboro  
725 Road; the contractors are on site and hope to finish with the steel and concrete today. Joey Hopkins stated the  
726 Triangle Connector, known as the East End Connector U-0071 project, has a press release that went out  
727 yesterday, February 9, 2016, about NCDOT's plans on the traffic shift into the median of NC 147 if you're heading  
728 southbound on the Durham Freeway, which will occur on February 12, 2016. The contractor has the paving done  
729 and a lot of stripping down except for the tie end points. That's to allow construction on the southbound  
730 direction for the ramp to tie in as heading to Research Triangle Park (RTP).

731 Joey Hopkins stated that the contractor, Dragados, is still continuing to have some issues. Their progress  
732 is good and doing a good job, but there are some issues with a number of shutdowns of erosion controls (5  
733 times). Joey Hopkins stated NCDOT Division 5 is trying not to receive a notice of violation from North Carolina  
734 Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR).

735 Joey Hopkins stated the contractor, Dragados, is having issues with the railroads (RR) on Highway 70.  
736 Joey Hopkins stated this could potentially delay the project because the railroad bridge project is really the  
737 controlling operations. Joey Hopkins stated this is getting railroaded flaggers to allow them to work in the

738 railroad right-of-way in a safe manner. Also, having problems getting submittal reviews back in a timely matter  
739 from the NC Railroad Company. Joey Hopkins stated they are trying to work through the issues and mediate it.

740 Joey Hopkins commented on the performance measure about the removal of the delivery project goal.  
741 He believed it should still be a stand along goal. He does not have statistics for the DCHC MPO Board, but does  
742 have the Statewide statistics. He stated NCDOT is working on a project that looks at the local delivery project and  
743 local administer projects. The statewide delivery rate is 37% of these projects and its very low.

744 Chair Steve Schewel asked the delivery rate of the DCHC MPO Board. Joey Hopkins stated he did not  
745 know the number, but will report back to the DCHC MPO Board with an answer. He stated Division 5 has their  
746 problems with Alston Avenue and Old Chapel Hill Road, but their delivery rate is over 80%. He stated they have  
747 certainly room for improvement. Joey Hopkin stated he would like to see NCDOT and Division 5 both rates get  
748 closer together than where they are.

749 Joey Hopkins stated the improved infrastructure condition goal is good. Since the first of the year,  
750 NCDOT has a two-day response and repair time for potholes, ten days on safety items, and 15 days on others.  
751 Joey Hopkins stated there is an online system to submit and track responses to work requests or continue to call  
752 NCDOT Division 5 to report a problem. Joey Hopkins stated since January, they have received over 1,300  
753 problems reported. Wake County has the highest reported problems over 900. He stated the other problems  
754 can be divided over the other counties. Joey Hopkins stated these numbers can be high in the tracking system  
755 online due to overlapping of reporting and repairing time. Joey Hopkins provided instruction on entering  
756 information on the website NCDOT.gov to report potholes and getting the information in the right hand. It can  
757 be used to locate information on NCDOT.

758 Joey Hopkins stated they do have a project in SPOT for the southern side of NC-147 from the East End  
759 Connector project to I-40. In the MTP, it is listed six lanes, it is being scored as eight lanes. This is being done for  
760 two reasons: 1) the cost difference between six and eight are not that great that's because to build a six lane out  
761 there you got to widen it to manage the traffic during construction and if you are building six you will tear the

762 widen out which may not make sense and 2) the traffic numbers are showing there is a need for eight lanes. Joey  
763 Hopkins stated he does not know what will come out of project development of that project but he stated that  
764 wants the MPO Board to be aware of this change. Joey Hopkins stated the recommendation is eight lanes and  
765 NCDOT will come back to the Technical Committee and the DCHC MPO Board to change the MTP.

766 Ellen Reckhow asked when you say the south side are you talking about taking the side going towards  
767 Raleigh from Durham from two to four lanes and leaving the others. Joey Hopkins stated no, I mean the south  
768 end. He stated the northbound and southbound directions, both four lanes so it will be eight lanes total. It will  
769 be the East End Connector to I-40.

770 Ellen Reckhow asked if about it was going to six lanes right around the East End Connector.

771 Joey Hopkins stated the project is in the MTP and scored in SPOT. We are now evaluating for an eight  
772 lanes because the cost is not that different, and there is a need for it. Ellen Reckhow agreed with Joey Hopkins.

773 Mark Ahrendsen stated he does not disagree with the forecast on NC I47 between the East End  
774 Connector and I-40 is significant, but probably the greatest challenge is the number of lanes in there and what  
775 will be done with I-40. There will be four lanes going southbound; but if I-40 is not fixed, then the four lanes will  
776 not do any good. Mark Ahrendsen stated the key will be dealing with the interchange too. Mark Ahrendsen  
777 stated most of the congestion is particularly between Alston Avenue and Chapel Hill Street where the  
778 interchanges are. He stated maybe auxiliary lanes or even ramp metering some of these we see where ramps  
779 coming on has the delays. Once you past Alston Avenue chokes point, it starts to pick up again. Mark Ahrendsen  
780 stated it is really in that most congestion area where you got closely spaced interchanges, which may be a need  
781 to do some modernization, may be the short term best fit.

782 Ellen Reckhow stated she hopes when the East End Connector opens, the traffic will be diverted 70 to 85  
783 going to RTP and not come down on that part of NC I47 to go east.



784 Joey Hopkins stated he thinks that might be the reason there is not one in the MTP now, because of the  
785 model shows when the through traffic of the northern Durham traffic get off the East End Connector; therefore,  
786 you will not need to come up Duke or Gregson Street to get back and forth.

787 Chair Steve Schewel thanked Joey Hopkins for his report.

788 Ed Harrison asked about the status of the Old Durham Chapel Hill Road project. He stated Mike Kneis is  
789 the contact person. Ed Harrison and Joey Hopkins agreed Mike Kneis is the contact person for the project.

790 Patrick Wilson stated he did not have any additional updates beyond what has been distributed in the  
791 report.

792 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated letters have gone out from NCDOT to people along North Greensboro  
793 Street and Estes Drive Extension in Carrboro for project U-5846 which is a placeholder for a roundabout at the  
794 intersection. We do not know what the project will actually be. Vice Chair Damon Seils stated he has heard  
795 from people about a letter. The letter states "This is to notify you that the above project has been identified for  
796 construction," which makes it sound like we know what is going on there and things are full steam ahead. Vice  
797 Chair Damon Seils stated he thinks they can use some clarity around what the plans are and when will the  
798 people be notified of the design of the project. He stated the letter implies the project is further along.

799 Patrick Wilson apologized for the confusion of the letter. He stated typically when NCDOT sends letters  
800 out letting people know a survey is being done, NCDOT tries to eliminate a lot of uncertainty when they go out  
801 and it did not happen in this case. This one is further out in the future than some of the other ones, we are  
802 working on so we are presently working with a private engineering firm to negotiate our quantities to make the  
803 design ready for the project. We have not skipped the process. There are still public meetings that will be  
804 scheduled as part of the process. We are trying to get ahead as part of project delivery. We are trying as much  
805 as we can on the front end. Therefore, we are conducting surveys now then there will be ample time for public  
806 input once the project gets going and we have a design firm on staff under contract, the firm can start doing the

807 work for us. Vice Chair Damon stated he wanted to give Patrick Wilson a heads up because people are asking  
808 questions.

809 Patrick Wilson stated he will bring that to his staff attention.

810 Chair Steve Schewel ask if there were any questions.

811 Ed Harrison asked about East Main/East Franklin Street four-lane roundabout project. Ed Harrison  
812 stated it is a problem place. He asked what is the action plan. Patrick Wilson stated that is in the report as well  
813 and has the same status as the project in Carrboro. The project is a few years out and in the process of  
814 negotiating with a project engineering firm to provide with a grade. NCDOT are not quite underway with the  
815 design firm. Once NCDOT gets the firm underway, NCDOT will be scheduling public meetings along the way until  
816 we bring that project to letting.

817 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated Jones Ferry Road is looking amazing.

818 Patrick Wilson stated he will pass that on.

819 There was no report additional from the NCDOT Division 8.

820 There was no report from the NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch.

821 There was no report from the NCDOT Traffic Operations.

822 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

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

824 All handouts are available on the website.

825 **ADJOURNMENT:**

826 There being no further business before the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board, the meeting was adjourned at  
827 11:14 a.m.