

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

2 **August 10, 2016**

3  
4 **MINUTES OF MEETING**

5  
6 The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization DCHC MPO Board met on  
7 August 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 (DCHC MPO Board Chair)	City of Durham
11 Damon Seils (DCHC MPO Board Vice Chair)	Town of Carrboro
12 Bernadette Pelissier (Member)	GoTriangle
13 Ellen Reckhow (Member)	Durham County
14 Brian J. Lowen (Member)	Town of Hillsborough
15 Lydia Lavelle (Alternate)	Town of Carrboro
16 Jim W. Crawford (Member)	NC Board of Transportation
17 Jim G. Crawford (Member)	Chatham County
18 Renee Price (Alternate)	Orange County
19 William V. "Bill" Bell (Alternate)	City of Durham/Mayor
20	
21 David Keilson	NCDOT, Division 5
22 Richard Hancock	NCDOT, Division 5
23 Patrick Wilson	NCDOT, Division 7
24 Jennifer Britt	NCDOT, Division 8
25 Max Bushell	Orange County
26 Tina Moon	Town of Carrboro
27 John Hodges-Copple	Triangle J Council of Governments
28 Ellen Beckmann	City of Durham
29 Karen Porter	GoTriangle
30 Patrick McDonough	GoTriangle
31 Michael Parker	Town of Chapel Hill
32 Eddie Dancausse	Federal Highway Administration
33 Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
34 Allison Cooper	Wake County Planning
35 Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
36 Dale McKeel	DCHC MPO
37 Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO
38 Lindsay Smart	DCHC MPO
39 David Bonk	Town of Chapel Hill
40 Peter Skillern	Reinvestment Partners
41 Bergen Watterson	Town of Carrboro
42 Kayla Seibel	Town of Chapel Hill
43 Robin Baker	City of Durham (Intern/CMO)
44 Scott Whiteman	City/County Planning
45	
46	

47 Quorum Count: 8 of 11 Voting Members

48  
49 Chair Steve Schewel called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. A roll call was performed. The Voting  
50 Members and Alternate Voting Members of the DCHC MPO Board were identified and are indicated above.  
51 Chair Steve Schewel reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was being circulated. Ellen  
52 Reckhow made a motion to excuse the absence of Don Moffitt, Member, City of Durham. Jim G. Crawford  
53 seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously. Lydia Lavelle recognized Michael Parker of the  
54 Chapel Hill Town Council during the roll call.

55 **PRELIMINARIES:**

56 **Ethics Reminder**

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

60 **Adjustments to the Agenda**

61 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any adjustments to the agenda. There were no adjustments  
62 made to the agenda.

63 **Public Comments**

64 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any members of the public signed up to speak.

65 Peter Skillern, a citizen residing at 2615 Indian Trail, Durham, NC, and Executive Director of  
66 Reinvestment Partners, a non-profit advocacy community development agency in Durham, spoke during this  
67 portion of the meeting. He stated that mass transit is important, progressive, and forward looking. Peter Skillern  
68 stated that the General Assembly's actions have delayed and increased the cost of the project. He urged the  
69 MPO Board to consider including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in its light rail plans and to keep the process of  
70 considering BRT transparent. He believes that BRT could provide greater flexibility and improve the equity of  
71 mass transit.

72 Chair Steve Schewel noted that GoTriangle has been considering alternatives in light of the situation  
73 with the State Legislature and further urged GoTriangle Board members to consider Peter Skillern's request.

74 **Directives to Staff**

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

76 Ellen Reckhow requested that the closure of the gravel portion of Pickett Road for safety reasons be  
77 reflected in the Directives to Staff. Felix Nwoko responded that he followed up on this issue and is coordinating  
78 with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). Chair Steve Schewel asked that this issue be  
79 added to the Directives.

80 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

81 **6. & 7. Approval of June 8, 2016 Meetings Minutes and 5307/5339 Split Letters**

82 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there was any discussion of the June 8, 2016, meeting minutes and the  
83 5307/5339 Split Letters. Vice Chair Damon Seils commented that Council Member Ed Harrison's name should be  
84 removed from line 65 of the minutes. There was no discussion of the 5307/5339 Split Letters.

85 Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to approve the June 8, 2016, Board meeting minutes with the  
86 exception of the inclusion of Council Member Harrison's name. Vice Chair Damon Seils made a motion to  
87 approve the consent agenda. Ellen Reckhow seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

88 Chair Steve Schewel noted that Mayor William Bell was out of the room for this vote.

89 **ACTION ITEMS:**

90 **8. Wake County Transit Plan**

91 Tim Gardiner, Wake County Planning

92  
93 The Wake County Transit Plan was approved by the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning  
94 Organization (CAMPO) on May 18, 2016, and by GoTriangle on May 25, 2016. Wake County is requesting that the  
95 DCHC MPO, Durham County, Orange County, and Burlington-Graham MPO approve the Wake County Transit  
96 Plan, specifically the financial plan as required by the Local Government Sales Tax Act (N.S.G.S. 105-508, et

97 seg), and also approve and execute the agreement between GoTriangle, Durham County, Orange County, Wake  
98 County, CAMPO, DCHC MPO, and Burlington-Graham MPO Setting Forth the Mutual Understanding of the  
99 Parties.

100 Tim Gardiner of Wake County Planning and Allison Cooper of the Wake County Attorney's Office  
101 presented on this issue. Allison Cooper presented highlights of the tax district and the financial plan agreement.

102 Ellen Reckhow requested hard copies of Section B of the Wake Transit Plan. Allison Cooper clarified that  
103 Section B is available at the end of the Wake Transit Plan that was attached to the agenda.

104 Allison Cooper called attention to specific highlighted sections on page 4 and 5 of the provided handout.  
105 She also referred to Article 4 on page 11 where the financial plan is identified and specified that Section 404  
106 addresses amendments to the plan. She pointed out that the agreement confirms that the Durham County and  
107 Orange County transit plans are independent from the Wake County transit plan. Allison Cooper stated that  
108 Wake County cannot use revenue collected from Durham County and Orange County, and that accounting  
109 firewalls would be put in place to separate collected tax revenue. Allison Cooper concluded her presentation by  
110 reminding the Board that the financial plan needs to be approved in order for Wake County to move forward  
111 with its referendum. If the financial plan is not approved, Wake County will have to start over and revisit the  
112 multi-county single-tax structure currently in place.

113 Vice Chair Damon Seils clarified that the statutory requirement is that counties approve the plan prior to  
114 Wake County levying the tax, not the bond referendum.

115 Bernadette Pelissier commented that throughout the process there were always concerns that money be  
116 kept separately by the counties. GoTriangle has maintained this separation by using different banks.

117 Ellen Reckhow stated that GoTriangle held a joint public hearing in Raleigh for the plan in May. The plan  
118 had incredible support from the public and elected officials.

119 Tim Gardiner resumed the presentation by highlighting the major guiding goals of the plan. These goals  
120 are creating stronger regional connections, connecting communities, creating a frequent reliable bus network,  
121 and boosting transit service across the community.

122 Chair Steve Schewel asked what the agreement contemplated for the 37 miles of commuter rail.  
123 Tim Gardiner stated that Durham County and Orange County can set their own priorities according to the  
124 agreement. Chair Steve Schewel commented on the “Transit Service Abundance (Revenue Hours Per Capita)”  
125 chart on page 7 of the Recommended Wake County Transit Plan attachment. He pointed out how well Durham  
126 and Chapel Hill revenue hours look compared to other peer cities.

127 Chair Steve Schewel reminded the Board that Wake County was requesting approval of the plan before  
128 absentee voting begins on September 9.

129 David Bonk stated that the staff and the MPO Technical Committee (TC) did not have a recommendation  
130 as they did not have the opportunity to thoroughly review the plan.

131 Ellen Reckhow stated that Durham County hoped that the MPO would take action today and that all  
132 other boards took action in May and June including GoTriangle, Durham County, and Orange County. Ellen  
133 Reckhow introduced a motion to approve the financial plan for Wake County and Bernadette Pelissier seconded  
134 the motion.

135 Mayor William Bell stated that he had already approved the plan as part of the GoTriangle Board and that  
136 he saw no reason not to approve it.

137 Vice Chair Damon Seils asked for clarification about the Wake County Transit revenue language. He noted  
138 that two terms, “Wake County tax revenue” and “Wake Transit Plan revenue,” were used in the agreement. He  
139 asked whether “Wake Transit Plan revenue” referred to funds generated by Wake County or funds provided to  
140 Wake County by federal sources. Allison Cooper stated that “non-Wake Revenue” was anything generated  
141 outside of Wake County and that “Wake County Transit revenue” should not mean anything that was derived

142 from the ½ cent sales tax. Allison Cooper stated that together the two terms “Wake County tax revenue” and  
143 “Wake Transit Plan revenue” describe everything that comes in revenue-wise.

144 Allison Cooper requested that in addition to approving the plan, an authorized signatory for the MPO  
145 Board sign the agreement.

146 Bernadette Pelissier stated that she voted in support of the plan twice, as part of the GoTriangle Board  
147 and the Orange County Board.

148 Ellen Reckhow commented that the Commuter Rail Bill allows for a levy of an additional supplemental tax  
149 for a special tax district in Research Triangle Park (RTP); this might be another funding tool.

150 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated that this plan is important for regional relations and regional transit and  
151 that he supported the motion.

152 Ellen Reckhow made a motion to approve the finance plan and authorize the appropriate signatory.

153 Bernadette Pelissier seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously carried.

154 **9. Revised Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP**

155 Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff

156  
157 Lindsay Smart presented on revised amendment # 2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. During the DCHC MPO  
158 Board meeting on February 10, 2016, the Board reviewed draft amendment #2 and released it for the public  
159 review and comment period. The DCHC MPO Board held a public hearing for draft amendment #2 on April 13,  
160 2016. The draft amendment has been out for public comment since February 10, 2016. To date, no public  
161 comments have been received. The previously reviewed draft amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP has been  
162 revised to remove the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) project from the amendment until further  
163 information is received.

164 Vice Chair Damon Seils made a motion to pass the amendment. Bernadette Pelissier seconded the  
165 motion. The motion carried unanimously.

166 **10. Public Hearing and Approval of SPOT P4.0 Regional Impact Category Project Priorities and Local Input**  
167 **Points**

168 Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff

169  
170 Lindsay Smart provided a summary of amendment #3 to the DCHC MPO FY2016-2025 TIP which cancels  
171 projects, amends projects, and adds new projects to the DCHC MPO TIP. This amendment serves to align the  
172 DCHC MPO TIP with the changes that have been made to the NCDOT State Transportation Improvement Plan  
173 (STIP) through monthly "Item N Highway Program" and "Item I Public Transportation Program" for the dates  
174 between February 1, 2016, and May 31, 2016. The amendment #3 also includes project amendment requests  
175 that the DCHC MPO LPA staff have received from DCHC MPO member jurisdictions and agencies. The MPO did  
176 not receive any additional comments from the public on the amendment.

177 Lindsay Smart stated that amendment #3 has locally managed and transit projects. Many locally  
178 managed projects have fallen behind schedule and there was a need to update the project schedules to bring  
179 them into the current year.

180 Ellen Reckhow commented that the Old Durham/Chapel Hill Road project received extra funding.  
181 Lindsay Smart clarified that this was done through the MPO.

182 Chair Steve Schewel asked Lindsay Smart to elaborate on the delays. Lindsay Smart stated that there  
183 was a lot of local staff turnover in the past couple of years and that every new jurisdiction has had new staff  
184 responsible for new project delivery. Planners work with the TC and MPOs to get projects funded in a variety of  
185 ways. Once a project is funded, it shows up in the TIP or local Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Some projects sit  
186 there until there are staff resources to move them forward or until there is the ability to use the MPO's on call  
187 contract to move them forward. There are certain milestones where the MPO staff has noticed delays. The MPO  
188 staff has designed their agenda based on reports from local staff about glitches in this process.

189 Vice Chair Damon Seils commented that community members might hear that the MPO Board was  
190 delaying projects but that the Board is not delaying projects, just updating the schedule of projects to reflect  
191 delays or other changes in scheduling that are happening on the local level.

192 Ellen Reckhow and Lindsay Smart had an exchange about the I-40 managed lanes issue.

193 Vice Chair Damon Seils made a motion to approve the amendment #3. Ellen Reckhow seconded the  
194 motion. The motion carried unanimously.

195 **11. 2040 MTP Amendment #2 - Chapel Hill BRT**

196 Andy Henry, LPA Staff

197  
198 Andy Henry delivered a presentation on the Chapel Hill BRT project. Amendment #2 would change  
199 references to the Chapel Hill BRT in the 2040 Metropolitan Transit Plan (MTP) to make it clear that the route  
200 extends to Southern Village and would update the expected headways. These changes are shown in the relevant  
201 pages of Chapter 7 and Appendices 2 and 3. This amendment will not update the financial plan of the 2040 MTP.  
202 The cost increase for the Chapel Hill BRT, approximately \$62 million, is a fraction of the \$6.8 billion total MTP  
203 cost. The 2040 MTP also had a surplus of \$67 million that can cover the cost increase related to this project.

204 Ellen Reckhow and Andy Henry discussed a timeline for updates to the bus and rail investment plans.

205 Jim G. Crawford made a motion to release the 2040 MTP Amendment #2 for a minimum 42-day public  
206 comment period and schedule a public hearing for the September Board meeting. Ellen Reckhow seconded the  
207 motion. The motion carried unanimously.

208 Renee Price and Andy Henry had an exchange about balancing the finance plan.

209 Mayor William Bell departed the meeting at 10:12am.

210 **12. CTP and MTP Schedules**

211 Andy Henry, LPA Staff

212 Andy Henry gave a presentation on the differences between the Comprehensive Transit Plan (CTP) and  
213 MTP. The Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) has been submitted to the NCDOT for their internal review  
214 and will subsequently be released for public involvement. Tasks to develop the MTP, such as the Goals,  
215 Objectives, and Performance Measures, have already been initiated and the transportation network and SE Data  
216 scenarios are currently being developed.

217 Andy Henry referred to his handout diagram and handout schedule. He drew attention to the 1-page  
218 schedule for the CTP, at the bottom of which is the 2045 MTP. Andy Henry stated that the CTP and all of its



219 projects will be approved before any projects are released in the MTP. He also noted that the 2045 MTP would  
220 be finished on a four- year cycle.

221 There were no comments or questions and no action was required by the Board.

222 **13. Connect 2045: Update on SE Data, land use modeling, and scenarios**

223 John Hodges-Copple, TJOG

224 John Hodges-Copple provided a summary of the relationship between the CTP, MTP, and TIP. He stated  
225 that the CTP functions as a ceiling, the TIP as the floor, and the MTP as somewhere between the two. He noted  
226 that it was important to understand what scenarios are and what they will be used for. He called attention to  
227 three land use foundations or scenarios and explained how network foundations are paired with land use. The  
228 attachment "Connect 2045" presents the proposed land use and transportation scenarios. The attachment  
229 "Triangle Communities 2.0 Technical Overview" summarizes the Communities methodology.

230 There was discussion of how these scenarios related to the MTP and of how land use categories and  
231 parcels are assigned.

232 There was additional discussion of how this activity translated to other tasks and other fields of study.

233 Ellen Reckhow stated that it was important to recognize that modeling like this is valuable if elected  
234 officials follow their land use plans and zoning plans. John Hodges-Copple explained that these are huge  
235 regional models that may not show results of one development, even if it is a large development for a  
236 community. There was additional discussion about deviation from land use plans and how those deviations are  
237 accounted for in the models, such as D-O LRT.

238 Chair Steve Schewel stated that although looking at constrained scenarios makes sense, he did not want  
239 whatever scenarios the Board asked for to indicate that support for the D-O LRT was weakened. Ellen Reckhow  
240 stated that more data could justify the Board's resolve and can be used to argue for transit.

241 **REPORTS:**

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

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

244  
245 Chair Steve Schewel stated there was no report from the DCHC MPO Chair.

246 **15. Report from the DCHC MPO Technical Committee Chair**  
247 **David Bonk, DCHC MPO TC Chair**

248  
249 David Bonk stated that there was no additional report from the DCHC MPO TC Chair.

250 **16. Reports from LPA Staff**  
251 **Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

252  
253 Felix Nwoko stated that there was no additional report from the LPA Staff.

254 **17. NCDOT Reports:**

255 Richard Hancock, NCDOT Division 5, stated that Alston Avenue was let in July to Zachary Construction  
256 from San Antonio, Texas. There was a washout from flooding on Glenn Road and the road should be re-opened  
257 by mid-September. Old Chapel Hill Rd was scheduled for let in September, but will now be let in January because  
258 of issues with Surface Transportation Program-Direct Attribution (STP-DA) funding which cannot be used for  
259 utility relocation.

260 NCDOT is considering replacing the 30-inch pipe under Trenton Road with a 72-inch pipe. There is no  
261 recommendation for improvement for pipes and drainage from I-40. Funding and responsibility for this  
262 replacement have not yet been identified. Ellen Reckhow suggested that City/County Stormwater Department  
263 might look at the area.

264 Pat Wilson, NCDOT Department 7, reported that the traffic signal at NC 54 and Dodsons Crossroads is in  
265 operation as of August 10, 2016.

266 Vice Chair Damon Seils and Pat Wilson discussed the Franklin/Merritt Mill/Brewers intersection project in  
267 Carrboro.

268 Jennifer Britt, Assistant District Engineer, Division 8, reported that Lystra Road has been reopened and  
269 that there is a lot of new paving in Chatham County. There was some discussion of SPOT 4.0 and 3 non-highway  
270 projects put forward by the Town of Cary.

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

272 There was no report from the NCDOT Traffic Operations.

273 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

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

275 All handouts are available on the website.

276 Vice Chair Damon Seils commented on an article sent from the Town Clerk of Carrboro on a new  
277 federal rule about the consolidation of MPOs. He wondered whether this rule would affect the region and  
278 whether the staff was aware of it. Felix Nwoko is tracking this issue very carefully.

279 **19. Proposed Repurposing Request of Durham Earmark**

280 Dale McKeel, LPA Staff

281 Dale McKeel presented on the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A  
282 Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) legislation (2004) which included an earmark for Durham for the acquisition of  
283 rail corridors for use as bicycle and pedestrian trails. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016 included a  
284 provision allowing (but not requiring) states to “repurpose” earmarks that are more than 10 years old. The  
285 Durham earmark is eligible for repurposing under this provision. MPO and MPO LPA staff learned that NCDOT  
286 intended to repurpose the Durham earmark to the U-3308, Alston Avenue (NC 55) project, and requested  
287 that, if NCDOT is intent on repurposing the Durham earmark, to repurpose the funds instead toward the  
288 construction of STIP Project EB-4707B, Old Durham-Chapel Hill Rd (SR 2220), from Pope Road (SR 1113) to  
289 Garrett Road (SR 1116), in Durham County. NCDOT has responded that the funds will be repurposed to EB-  
290 4707B as requested.

291 Chair Steve Schewel and Dale McKeel discussed reasons for the loss of the earmark and whether the  
292 Board or any individual bodies could take action to support keeping the earmark for the beltline. Dale McKeel  
293 reported that the earmark was gone from the beltline, and there was nothing that the Board could do to get  
294 it back.

295 There was no request for action on this issue.

296 **20. Report on North Carolina Non-Motorized Volume Data Program**

297 Dale McKeel, LPA Staff

298  
299 In 2014 the North Carolina Non-Motorized Volume Data Program was launched by NCDOT with  
300 cooperation from Metropolitan Planning Organizations and local governments. Continuous count stations  
301 were installed in several locations, including Carrboro, Chapel Hill, and Durham. The report provided an  
302 overview of the program and data collected during the first 12-month collection period. One additional count  
303 location was added in Durham in 2015, on the northern section of the American Tobacco Trail, and two  
304 additional locations have been identified in Durham for 2016 (Main Street in front of Duke East Campus, and  
305 Cornwallis Road between NC 55 and Research Triangle Park).

306 There was no motion or action for this agenda item.

307 **21. Training for Locally Managed Federal**

308 Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff

309  
310 In the spring and summer 2016 the MPO LPA staff and local jurisdictional staff have reviewed lists of  
311 locally managed projects that have fallen behind schedule. The outcome of these discussions has been that  
312 the MPO LPA staff will work with FHWA and NCDOT to facilitate a one-day training workshop on different  
313 aspects of locally managed projects. The workshop is scheduled for Wednesday, August 31, 2016.

314 There was no motion or action for this agenda item.

315 **ADJOURNMENT:**

316 There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:18 a.m.