

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

2 **14 February 2018**

3
4 **MINUTES OF MEETING**

5
6 The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Board met on February
7 14, 2018, 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	Damon Seils (MPO Board Chair)	Town of Carrboro
11	Wendy Jacobs (MPO Board Vice Chair)	Durham County
12	Karen Howard (Member)	Chatham County
13	Vernetta Alston (Member)	City of Durham
14	Ellen Reckhow (Member)	GoTriangle
15	Barry Jacobs (Member)	Orange County
16	Pam Hemminger (Member)	Town of Chapel Hill
17	Steve Schewel (Alternate)	City of Durham
18	Heidi Carter (Alternate)	Durham County
19	Jenn Weaver (Alternate)	Town of Hillsborough
20	Lydia Lavelle (Alternate)	Town of Carrboro
21	Michael Parker (Alternate)	Town of Chapel Hill
22	Penny Rich (Alternate)	Orange County
23		
24	David Keilson	NCDOT, Division 5
25	Richard Hancock	NCDOT, Division 5
26	Patrick Wilson	NCDOT, Division 7
27	Bryan Kluchar	NCDOT, Division 8
28	Julie Bogle	NCDOT, TPD
29	Nishith Trivedi	Orange County
30	Bergen Watterson	Town of Carrboro
31	Tina Moon	Town of Carrboro
32	Kayla Seibel	Town of Chapel Hill
33	Geoff Green	GoTriangle
34	Terry Bellamy	City of Durham
35	Ellen Beckmann	City of Durham
36	Bill Judge	City of Durham
37	Evan Tenenbaum	Durham County
38	Eddie Dancausse	Federal Highway Administration
39	Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
40	Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
41	Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
42	Aaron Cain	DCHC MPO
43	Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO
44	Mo Devlin	DCHC MPO
45	Anne Phillips	City of Durham
46	Bryan Poole	City of Durham

47	Heidi Perry	Resident
48	Tim Schwarzauer	Chapel Hill Transit
49	Brian Litchfield	Chapel Hill Transit
50	Scott Whiteman	Durham County
51	Natalie Murdock	League of Women Voters
52	Jan Cromarti	ABP

53
54 Quorum Count: 9 of 10 Voting Members

55
56 Chair Damon Seils called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. A roll call was performed. The
57 voting members and alternate voting members of the DCHC MPO Board were identified and are
58 indicated above. Chair Damon Seils reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was being
59 circulated.

60 Pam Hemminger made a motion to give Nina Szlosberg-Landis an excused absence. Vernetta
61 Alston seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

62 **PRELIMINARIES:**

63 **2. Ethics Reminder**

64 Chair Damon Seils read the Ethics Reminder and asked if there were any known conflicts of
65 interest with respect to matters coming before the MPO Board and requested that if there were any
66 identified during the meeting for them to be announced. There were no known conflicts identified by
67 MPO Board members.

68 Chair Damon Seils reminded the MPO Board to submit their 2018 ethics forms. Barry Jacobs
69 asked for and received clarification about whether the DCHC MPO ethics form was the same as the
70 GoTriangle ethics form.

71 **3. Adjustments to the Agenda**

72 Chair Damon Seils asked if there were any adjustments to the agenda. Felix Nwoko drew
73 attention to a handout pertaining to President Trump's new infrastructure plan. Steve Schewel asked
74 for and received clarification about the MPO Board's weighted voting procedure.

75 **4. Public Comments**

76 There were no public comments.

77 **5. Directives to Staff**

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

79 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

80 **6. Approval of January 10, 2018, Meeting Minutes**

81 Ellen Reckhow made a motion to approve the January 10, 2018, meeting minutes. Pam

82 Hemminger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

83 **ACTION ITEMS:**

84 **7. Safety Performance Measures and Targets Endorsement**

85 Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff

86 Felix Nwoko stated that the MPO was required to set safety performance measures and targets to
87 comply with a Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act requirement. Felix Nwoko stated that the
88 MPO would be required to set performance measures and targets for five areas. He discussed the timeline
89 for the adoption of safety targets. Felix Nwoko stated that the safety targets would need to align with other
90 plans, and would require coordination. He also discussed the methodology that the MPO used to develop its
91 targets, and the implications associated with not meeting the targets. Felix Nwoko discussed North Carolina's
92 safety targets, and why the recommendation is for the MPO to adopt the state's targets instead of
93 developing its own targets.

94 Chair Damon Seils confirmed that the MPO numbers were calculated based on incidents that
95 occurred within the jurisdictional boundaries of the MPO. Felix Nwoko and Penny Rich discussed whether it
96 was possible to know whether the crashes being discussed involved local residents or visitors. Felix Nwoko
97 reviewed MPO crash data, and discussed common problems associated with crash data. Felix Nwoko
98 discussed the advantages of adopting the state's targets, such as not having to calculate Vehicle Miles
99 Traveled (VMT) for the MPO.

100 Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs and Felix Nwoko discussed the tools that the MPO could use to achieve its
101 safety targets, and whether the MPO planned to engage the community, law enforcement, and community
102 health groups to achieve its targets. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs and Felix Nwoko discussed potential ways to
103 engage the community in this process. Ellen Reckhow and Felix Nwoko discussed whether there are
104 investigations of fatal pedestrian crashes. Chair Damon Seils clarified that the MPO does not investigate
105 individual incidents, but that it was likely that the police investigates fatal pedestrian crashes. Pat Wilson
106 confirmed that the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) investigates every fatal crash on
107 state system roadways. Chair Damon Seils stated that he recently attended a Capital Area Metropolitan
108 Planning Organization (CAMPO) meeting where issues related to data quality and granularity were discussed
109 in relation to a similar agenda item. Felix Nwoko and Chair Damon Seils discussed whether it would be
110 possible to develop MPO specific targets in the future.

111 Pam Hemminger made a motion to approve the resolution endorsing NCDOT's Safety Performance
112 Targets. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

113 **8. 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)**

114 Andy Henry, LPA Staff

115 Andy Henry reviewed past steps in the development of the MTP. Andy Henry stated that the
116 MPO has received a lot of input on the MTP from other agencies, including the Federal Highway
117 Administration (FHWA). Andy Henry stated that the FHWA suggested that the FAST Act compliant
118 measures be incorporated directly into the MTP report. Andy Henry discussed how two FAST Act
119 performance measures, state of good repair and safety, were incorporated into the MTP report.

120 Ellen Reckhow and Andy Henry discussed an inconsistency with the truck delay performance
121 measure. Andy Henry discussed plans to complete all nine targets for the upcoming MPO Board
122 meeting.

123 Ellen Reckhow made a motion to extend the public review period for the MTP to March 2, 2018.
124 Karen Howard seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

125 **9. Draft FY2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

126 Meg Scully, LPA Staff

127 Meg Scully discussed recent steps in the development of the UPWP, and two minor changes that
128 were made to the UPWP since the MPO Board last saw it. Chair Damon Seils opened the public hearing
129 for the UPWP. There were no public comments. Chair Damon Seils closed the public hearing.

130 Ellen Reckhow made a motion to approve draft FY2019 UPWP. Pam Hemminger seconded the
131 motion. The motion passed unanimously.

132 Meg Scully stated that the MPO staff would send letters to local staff so that they could prepare
133 the local match funds for the next fiscal year budget.

134 **10. Transit Projects in SPOT 5.0**

135 Aaron Cain, LPA Staff

136 Aaron Cain provided a PowerPoint presentation that presented an overview of the projects that
137 were submitted in the Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) 5.0 process in September
138 2018. Aaron Cain stated that the vast majority of transit mobility projects submitted to SPOT 5.0 were
139 either from the DCHC MPO or CAMPO. Aaron Cain stated that in January 2018, the DCHC MPO formally
140 requested that CAMPO remove some of its Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects that could compete with the
141 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (DOLRT) project because of the concern that the BRT projects could
142 harm the DOLRT in SPOT scoring. CAMPO concurred, and removed nine transit mobility projects from
143 SPOT consideration in January 2018. Aaron Cain stated that the question then came up about what the
144 DCHC MPO would do in support of the DOLRT project. Aaron Cain reviewed the SPOT scoring process,
145 specifically the criteria used to evaluate transit mobility projects. Aaron Cain noted that at an estimated
146 cost of \$2.47 billion, the DOLRT is an expensive project that is going to have a high cost per ridership.

147 Ellen Reckhow commented that from years of attending transit conferences she has learned
148 that light rail ridership is usually underestimated, given that models look largely at commuter traffic, and
149 not special events. Karen Howard and Aaron Cain discussed whether ridership projections take

150 population growth into account. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs, Aaron Cain, and Geoff Green discussed
151 whether listed projects have called for state funding in the adopted transit plan. Aaron Cain clarified
152 that while the DOLRT has asked for state funding, the Chapel Hill BRT does not anticipate state funding
153 in the Orange County Transit Plan. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs asked for and received clarification about
154 whether the majority of projects under consideration for removal from the SPOT process were related
155 to buses, and Aaron Cain confirmed that the projects were all transit vehicle purchases. Ellen Beckmann
156 and Aaron Cain discussed funding assumptions for vehicle purchases. Barry Jacobs asked whether a
157 decision about projects needed to be made during the MPO Board meeting, and also requested a copy
158 of the materials.

159 Aaron Cain discussed how current life span assumptions might affect scoring for the DOLRT.
160 Chair Damon Seils and Aaron Cain described efforts that were being made to get the SPOT office to
161 modify their life span assumption for the DOLRT. Aaron Cain reviewed the TC subcommittee's
162 recommendations about projects that should be removed from the SPOT process in support of the
163 DOLRT. Aaron Cain and Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs discussed how removing certain projects and keeping
164 others could increase the score of the DOLRT project. Ellen Reckhow reflected on the life span of the
165 Boston light rail transit system. Aaron Cain clarified that the SPOT office likely believes that the DOLRT
166 will have a life span that exceeds 70 years, but that they need a methodology that can be applied to all
167 transit mobility projects in the state. There was discussion of the timeline for resolving the life span
168 issue, and how MPO Board members should vote in light of uncertainty about the life span issue.

169 Aaron Cain provided an overview of the projects that could be removed from the SPOT process,
170 and weighed the pros and cons for removing various projects. Ellen Reckhow reflected on the history of
171 the DOLRT project. Jenn Weaver discussed the ridership and overall importance of the Hillsborough
172 circulator and the Orange-Durham Express (ODX) bus for the Hillsborough community. There was
173 discussion of bus route abbreviations and their respective routes. Jenn Weaver commented that while

174 removing the Hillsborough circulator and ODX projects was manageable, removing the Chapel Hill BRT
175 project felt a bit harder. Aaron Cain commented that the ODX route could be submitted to SPOT 6.0
176 with no harm to the project. There was continued discussion of bus route names and their respective
177 routes.

178 Brian Litchfield commented that the Chapel Hill Transit projects were designed to potentially
179 make connections to existing or future regional projects, and that they are within corridors that are
180 either being served by the Chapel Hill BRT or the DOLRT. He added that the projects were submitted to
181 secure a local match for expansion buses. Chair Damon Seils stated that the MPO Board was being asked
182 to make a decision about the following: the GoTriangle projects, the Hillsborough circulator, and the
183 Chapel Hill BRT. Pam Hemminger commented that the BRT will serve the DOLRT, and that if the project
184 does not go forward at this point, it might die. Aaron Cain stated that removing the Chapel Hill BRT
185 would increase DOLRT scoring in three areas. Brian Litchfield stated that the Chapel Hill BRT has not
186 received funding in previous iterations of the SPOT process, and discussed the overall status of the
187 project. Chair Damon Seils and Aaron Cain discussed the impact that removing the BRT could potentially
188 have on the DOLRT. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs stated that the MPO board was committed to making sure
189 that the Hillsborough circulator project was realized, one way or another. There was discussion of other
190 potential sources of funding for the Chapel Hill BRT project, the cost of the project, and the amount of
191 non-federal dollars needed to fund the project.

192 Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs and Aaron Cain discussed why projects that could potentially compete
193 with the DOLRT were submitted to the SPOT process to begin with. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs stated that
194 it was important that projects submitted through the SPOT process were also in the adopted transit
195 plans. She also expressed appreciation to CAMPO for removing projects that could potentially compete
196 with the DOLRT. Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs reflected on the importance of doing what is best for the
197 region, and on projected areas of growth in North Carolina. Michael Parker concurred with Vice Chair

198 Wendy Jacobs on the need to think regionally, and added that the Chapel Hill BRT is an integral part of a
199 regional system that does not only serve Chapel Hill or Orange County. He added that the Chapel Hill
200 BRT makes the light rail project stronger, and that the Chapel Hill BRT and the DOLRT are almost
201 inseparable projects. Michael Parker discussed the funds that have already been spent on the Chapel Hill
202 BRT, and noted that without SPOT funding, the Chapel Hill BRT may need to be withdrawn from the
203 Small Starts program and \$6 million may be lost. Michael Parker reiterated his support for the DOLRT,
204 and noted that no decision is without risks. Aaron Cain offered a clarification on the non-federal funds
205 needed for the Chapel Hill BRT.

206 Steve Schewel reflected on his recent conversations with staff about withdrawing projects in
207 order to support the DOLRT, and noted that staff had warned that the Chapel Hill BRT could eventually
208 compete with the DOLRT project. Steve Schewel reminded members that the MPO Board had previously
209 approved all projects to be submitted to the SPOT process for scoring. Steve Schewel quantified what
210 was at stake by not withdrawing the Chapel Hill BRT from the SPOT process. Steve Schewel reflected on
211 the transformative nature of the DOLRT project. He stated that he would be requested weighted voting,
212 and that he would request that all projects except for the GoTriangle Durham-Raleigh (DRX) and ODX be
213 removed from SPOT consideration. Steve Schewel stated that while it was a possibility that both the
214 Chapel Hill BRT and DOLRT might be funded, leaving the Chapel Hill BRT in for SPOT consideration was
215 not worth the risk. Steve Schewel reflected on the sacrifices that CAMPO, Wake County, and the
216 Durham County Commissioners have made in support of the DOLRT. Steve Schewel stated that he
217 supports the Chapel Hill BRT, and thinks that the MPO Board will figure out a way to get the project
218 done. In response to a question from Barry Jacobs, Steve Schewel explained that he recommended
219 keeping the GoTriangle projects because they will become positive for the DOLRT if the life span issue is
220 resolved in the MPO's favor.

221 Chair Damon Seils and Aaron Cain discussed the consequences of the life span issue not being
222 resolved in the MPO's favor. Aaron Cain reviewed the list of projects that the TC subcommittee
223 recommended removing from the SPOT process. Pam Hemminger and Aaron Cain discussed what would
224 happen if all of the projects were withdrawn from SPOT consideration and the DOLRT did not receiving
225 funding in the SPOT process.

226 Barry Jacobs expressed his appreciation for the collegial and collaborative tone of the MPO
227 Board's discussion, and reviewed how the Hillsborough circulator is currently funded. He also expressed
228 his support for the Chapel Hill BRT project, and discussed the risks inherent to both the Chapel Hill BRT
229 and DOLRT. Barry Jacobs requested that the MPO Board Chair write a letter to the North Carolina
230 Secretary of Transportation about the difficult situation that the DCHC MPO was placed in because of
231 the SPOT scoring methodology. Ellen Reckhow reiterated the risks associated with not receiving funding
232 for the DOLRT, and discussed other potential sources of funding for the Chapel Hill BRT, primarily the
233 foundation created by GoTriangle to raise private funds for the DOLRT.

234 Chair Damon Seils inquired whether the MPO Board wished to consider the three issues before
235 them separately or together. He also reflected on his position as a representative of the Town of
236 Carrboro, and the transit partnership between Carrboro and Chapel Hill. Chair Damon Seils discussed
237 the history and status of the Chapel Hill BRT project, and why the project is important to Chapel Hill. He
238 stated that the MPO Board's comments regarding finding a solution to funding for the Chapel Hill BRT
239 was very speculative. Chair Damon Seils stated that CAMPO's decision to remove transit mobility
240 projects that could compete with the DOLRT from the SPOT process was demonstration of a
241 longstanding partnership between the DCHC MPO and CAMPO. Chair Damon Seils added that a
242 weighted vote to remove DCHC MPO projects that could compete with the DOLRT would honor the
243 DCHC MPO's collaborative relationship with CAMPO. Ellen Reckhow and Aaron Cain discussed whether

244 the inclusion of the GoTriangle projects could be made conditional on the resolution of the life span
245 issue.

246 Jenn Weaver made a motion to remove the Hillsborough circulator from the SPOT 5.0 process.
247 Ellen Reckhow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

248 Ellen Reckhow made a motion to retain the GoTriangle projects in the SPOT process, only if
249 there is a positive resolution of the life span issue in time to make a decision. Steve Schewel seconded
250 the motion. Aaron Cain and Chair Damon Seils clarified that a positive resolution meant that the DOLRT
251 project would have a life span of 73 years. Aaron Cain asked that the motion be clarified to indicate that
252 staff would ultimately make the decision about the projects based on the resolution of the life span
253 issue. There was discussion of the timeline for the resolution of the life span issue. Chair Damon Seils
254 confirmed that the MPO Board's understanding of the motion was that the GoTriangle projects would
255 be retained only if the DCHC MPO received a positive resolution of the life span issue in time to make a
256 decision about including or not including projects in the SPOT process. There was discussion of whether
257 funding for the ODX project would provide support for a bus or a route, and how the funds would
258 support the route. Vernetta Alston asked that the motion be amended to specify that the GoTriangle
259 projects would be removed if the life span condition is not met. The motion passed unanimously.

260 Karen Howard made a motion to accept the TC subcommittee's recommendation to remove 10
261 projects from the SPOT process. Ellen Reckhow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

262 Barry Jacobs asked for the list from the presentation with details about the projects that were
263 removed following the meeting, and Aaron Cain agreed to provide him with the list. Penny Rich stated
264 that the list would be helpful in explaining the MPO Board's vote to the Orange County Board of
265 Commissioners. Chair Damon Seils reiterated that the TC subcommittee was unanimous in its
266 recommendation to remove the 10 projects.

267 Chair Damon Seils clarified that Steve Schewel's request for weighted voting was in effect in
268 response to an inquiry from Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs. There was discussion of whether language about
269 finding funding to make up the gap for the Chapel Hill BRT should be added to the MPO Board's motion
270 to remove the Chapel Hill BRT from SPOT consideration. Aaron Cain stated that MPO staff would work
271 with others to identify possible funding solutions for the Chapel Hill BRT. Michael Parker clarified the
272 amount of funding still needed for the Chapel Hill BRT project. Barry Jacobs reiterated that the amount
273 of funding needed for the Chapel Hill BRT is \$12 million, not \$6 million. Karen Howard stated that
274 removing the Chapel Hill BRT and finding alternate funding sources for the project should be two
275 separate motions, and Chair Damon Seils agreed. Chair Damon Seils and Aaron Cain explained the
276 weighted voting procedure in response to a question from Pam Hemminger.

277 Steve Schewel made a motion to remove the Chapel Hill BRT from SPOT 5.0 scoring. Ellen
278 Reckhow seconded the motion. Steve Schewel, Vernetta Alston, Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs, and Ellen
279 Reckhow voted in favor of the motion. Pam Hemminger, Chair Damon Seils, Barry Jacobs, Karen Howard,
280 and Jenn Weaver voted against the motion. After weighted votes were tallied, there were 21 votes in
281 favor of the motion, and 16 votes against. The motion passed by majority of weighted votes.

282 Steve Schewel made a motion to request that the MPO staff work with GoTriangle and County
283 staff to make recommendations about securing funding for the Chapel Hill BRT. Ellen Reckhow seconded
284 the motion. Pam Hemminger asked that the motion be amended to include Town of Chapel Hill staff,
285 and Jenn Weaver asked that language about the deadline for funding be included in the motion. The
286 motion passed unanimously.

287 Barry Jacobs reiterated his request that Chair Damon Seils write a letter to the Secretary of
288 Transportation. Chair Damon Seils stated that he would work with staff to write a letter to the Secretary
289 of Transportation requesting that their expressed support for the success of the DOLRT be realized.
290 Chair Damon Seils thanked the MPO staff, staff from the transit agencies, particularly GoTriangle and

291 Chapel Hill Transit, for their work in recent months on submitting projects to the SPOT process. Lydia
292 Lavelle, Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs, and Ellen Reckhow commended Chair Damon Seils for his leadership
293 skills, and for the work that he put in preparing for the agenda item. Ellen Reckhow reflected on the
294 collegial and respectful manner of the MPO Board. Pam Hemminger recommended that staff formally
295 thank CAMPO for removing projects from the SPOT process that may have competed with the DOLRT
296 project.

297 **11. Amendment #1 to the FY2018-2027 TIP**

298 Aaron Cain, LPA Staff

299 Aaron Cain stated that the DCHC MPO Board adopted the FY2018-2027 Transportation
300 Improvement Program in November 2017, and that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) reconciled
301 the DCHC MPO TIP with the FY2018-2027 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in January
302 2018. He added that additions and amendments to local projects that differ from the initially-adopted
303 STIP can now be added to the TIP. Aaron Cain stated that no comments were received during the public
304 comment period or during the public hearing.

305 Pam Hemminger made a motion to approve Amendment #1 to the FY2018-27 TIP. Ellen Rechow
306 seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

307 **12. Draft Local Input Points Methodology**

308 Aaron Cain, LPA Staff

309 Aaron Cain discussed recent steps in the development of the Local Input Points Methodology.
310 He added that no public comments were received on the draft methodology, and that the draft has not
311 changed since the MPO Board last saw it. Chair Damon Seils opened the public hearing. There were no
312 public comments. Chair Damon Seils closed the public hearing.

313 Ellen Reckhow made a motion to adopt the Local Input Points Methodology. Karen Howard
314 seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

315 **REPORTS:**

316 **13. Report from the DCHC MPO Board Chair**

317 Damon Seils, DCHC MPO Board Chair

318 Chair Damon Seils reminded the MPO Board about the upcoming North Carolina Association
319 of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (NCAMPO) conference that will be held in Durham in April
320 2018. He also discussed a recent CAMPO meeting that he attended with Vice Chair Wendy Jacobs.
321 Chair Damon Seils stated that the DCHC MPO will continue to demonstrate its partnership with
322 CAMPO, and that the DCHC MPO would continue to work at the staff level and the policy level to be
323 collaborators with CAMPO. He asked that staff continue to arrange twice yearly chair and vice chair
324 meeting with CAMPO. There was discussion of the date of the next joint meeting with CAMPO. Chair
325 Damon Seils added that while he has already thanked CAMPO Board members for removing projects
326 from the SPOT process to help the DOLRT, he would comply with Pam Hemminger's request to write
327 a formal letter of thanks.

328 **14. Report from the DCHC MPO Technical Committee Chair**

329 Ellen Beckmann, DCHC MPO TC Chair

330 Ellen Beckmann provided an update on the work of the NCDOT bicycle and pedestrian
331 stakeholder committee.

332 **15. Reports from LPA Staff**

333 Felix Nwoko, LPA Manager

334 There was no additional report from the LPA staff.

335 **16. NCDOT Reports:**

336 There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 5.

337 Pat Wilson, NCDOT Division 7, stated that he wanted to set up a meeting between Chapel Hill
338 and Carrboro in the coming weeks. There was discussion of staff present who could assist with setting
339 up the meeting.

340 There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 8.

341 There was no additional report from NCDOT Transportation Planning Division.

342

343

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

344

17. Recent News, Articles, and Updates

345

ADJOURNMENT:

346

There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Board, the meeting was adjourned at

347

11:38 a.m.