

DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BOARD

August 12, 2015

MINUTES OF MEETING

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Board met on August 12, 2015, at 9:00 a.m. in the Council Committee Room on the second floor of Durham City Hall. The following attended:

Mark Kleinschmidt (MPO Board Chair)	Town of Chapel Hill
Diane Catotti (MPO Board Vice-Chair)	City of Durham
Bernadette Pelissier	GoTriangle
Ellen Reckhow	Durham County
Jim G. Crawford	Chatham County
Damon Seils	Town of Carrboro
Brenda Howerton (alternate)	Durham County
William V. "Bill" Bell (alternate)	City of Durham
Renee Price (alternate)	Orange County
Lydia Lavelle (alternate)	Town of Carrboro
Ed Harrison (alternate)	Town of Chapel Hill
Mark Ahrendsen	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
Dale McKeel	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
Ellen Beckmann	City of Durham Transportation
Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO
Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
Lindsay Smart	DCHC MPO
Linda Thomas Wallace	Durham County
Joey Hopkins	NCDOT, Division 5
David Keilson	NCDOT, Division 5
Ed Lewis	NCDOT, Division 7
Darius Sturdivant	NCDOT, Division 8
Bergen Watterson	Town of Carrboro
Tina Moon	Town of Carrboro
David Bonk	Town of Chapel Hill
John Hodges-Copple	Triangle J Council of Governments (TJCOG)
Patrick McDonough	GoTriangle
Dick Ford	Downing Creek
Judith Swasey	Downing Creek
Thomas Swasey	Downing Creek
John Kent	Citizen
Lauren Horsch	Herald Sun
Tasuna Tayal	VHB
Albert Amorsely	DCA

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and the Roll Call was conducted.

Ethics Reminder

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt read the Ethics Reminder for Board members and asked Board members if there are any known conflicts of interest with respect of matters coming before the Board and requested that if there were any identified during the meeting for them to be announced.

There were no conflicts of interest stated by the Board members.

Adjustments to the Agenda:

There were handouts distributed at the meeting to be included in the meeting materials.

Public Comments

There were comments from the public. Judith Swasey from the Downing Creek Subdivision discussed the concerns of the Downing Creek Subdivision homeowners in relation to the proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail project (D-O LRT). She is a representative for the NC 54 Transit Impact Advocacy Group for her community and neighborhoods who would personally feel the adverse effects of the D-O LRT project. The group was commissioned by their home owner's Board of Directors to investigate and research the facts surrounding the light rail development and the impact to their neighborhood. Judith Swasey discussed the four -year timeframe in which the NC 54 Transit Impact Advocacy Group has consistently brought a variety of the main concerns to the planning bodies. Judith Swasey stated that there are dangerous deficiencies in the proposed C2 Route. The dangerous deficiencies include; (1) dangerous rail road crossings (2) lack of parking (3) potential traffic nightmares (4) dangerous situations for school buses and emergency vehicles and the (5) lack of integration with the NCDOT. Judith Swasey stated that the Army Corp of Engineers did not explicitly deny the use of the C1A route and that to her group's knowledge, it was never investigated to be an alternative to the north side of highway NC 54. Judith Swasey told the MPO Board that in the spring the GoTriangle group informed them that they would recommend the C2A routes as the preferred alternative despite their group's concerns. Judith Swasey

69 stated that there have been multiple meetings with GoTriangle, including individual neighborhood
70 meetings and that they have felt a lack of transparency, confusion regarding the process and some
71 unfairness. Judith Swasey stated that GoTriangle informed them that they would not consider any of their
72 proposed suggestions in the decisions. Judith Swasey stated that they were advised to seek relief from our
73 elected officials and that is what her group is seeking from the MPO Board. Judith Swasey requested that
74 the MPO review the plans for the NC 54 Corridor improvements, concerning both the light rail, and the DOT
75 proposals for widening the streets. Judith Swasey stated that in their research, they have found the Little
76 Creek route is dangerous and not compatible with the changes for highway NC 54. Meadowmont had
77 dedicated routes. Both Meadowmont and Downing Creek have the same D-O LRT concerns. Judith
78 Swasey advised that after they research findings, the current alternative should be considered
79 unacceptable to both their communities and mass transit, and that there should be much better solutions.

80 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt thanked Judith Swasey for coming out and explained to her that they
81 would be discussing the process for public input on the D-O LRT later in the meeting. Chair Mark
82 Kleinschmidt advised her that it would be critical to participate directly in public input opportunities
83 specifically offered by GoTriangle. Judith Swasey agreed with Chair Mark Kleinschmidt and stated that she
84 would be watching for the dates to participate.

85 Ellen Reckhow stated that the NC 54 widening and D-O LRT should be a joint planning effort. She
86 realized this during the visit to the Charlotte LRT trip. Charlotte reconstructed roads around LRT stations to
87 function together. Ellen Reckhow said that it should be an idea that the Durham-Orange LRT should model.

88 Diane Catotti stated that she sees the logic in Ellen Reckhow comments, however would like to
89 caution that if it adds work to planning staff work programs it will impact the schedule for the NC 54
90 project and other staff tasks. Ellen Reckhow discussed that in the NC 54 planning process, consultants did
91 not seem to be aware of D-O LRT. The MPO Board agreed that they need a NCDOT point person, because
92 coordination between the NC 54 project and the D-O LRT project is needed.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked Mark Ahrendsen if there is a path that could help coordinate the requested work effort. Mark Ahrendsen stated that they could explore the option for NC 54 improvements and that the D-O LRT project will go through a detailed process, as well. The work could occur with D-O LRT design phase in the coming years. The City will check and follow up with NCDOT. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked Mayor Bell if he had questions. Mayor Bell stated that at some point in time, he would like to speak to NCDOT report specifically as it pertains to the roundabout t at Barbee Chapel Road. Mayor Bell had to leave early and his request was documented as a Corner view note #15.

Directives to Staff

The Directives to Staff were distributed as part of the meeting packet.

CONSENT AGENDA:

June 10, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes

Ellen Reckhow requested minor grammatical corrections to the June 10, 2015 minutes. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that it should be best practice that grammatical and minor grammatical changes to the minutes should just be accepted without objections and that MPO Board members could email those edits to MPO Staff.

Resolution to Request Transfer of STPDA Funds from FHWA to FTA **Meg Scully, LPA Staff**

On behalf of transit agencies, the Lead Planning Agency is requesting the transfer of STP-DA funds from FHWA to FTA for use on transit projects. This resolution supports the transfer for the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro urban area. The MPO Technical Committee recommended that the MPO Board approve the resolution to transfer STPDA funds.

A motion was made to approve the Consent Agenda items by Damon Seils and seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS:

8. Public Hearing for the 2040 MTP Amendment, draft FY16-25 MTIP, and CDR**Lindsay Smart, LPA staff****Andy Henry, LPA staff**

Lindsay Smart stated that on June 10, 2015, the DCHC MPO Board approved the release of the draft FY2016-2025 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), the draft amendment to the MPO's 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Conformity Determination Report (CDR) for the amended 2040 MTP and the FY2016-2025 MTIP. The three planning documents were available for public review and comment until July 31, 2015. An advertisement announcing the public comment period for the planning documents was run on June 14, 2015, in the Herald Sun and in the Triangle Tribune. On June 25, 2015, the City of Durham ran a Press Release inviting citizens to review the three planning documents and submit comments. Announcements for the release of the three planning documents were also made in early June 2015 on the DCHC MPO's website, Facebook page, and Twitter feed. Several public comments were received during the comment period. Lindsay Smart stated that the attachment in the meeting packet offered a compilation of written public comments that were received during the public comment period. Lindsay Smart summarized some of the comments and stated that MPO LPA staff will review the public comments in detail and prepare responses to each comment. The comments and responses will be reviewed and discussed during the MPO TC meeting in late August. The public comments and responses will be available to the MPO Board in September after the TC review's everything. The three planning documents will be included in the September 9, 2015, MPO Board meeting agenda for adoption.

Lindsay Smart discussed the comments that were shared regarding the NC 54 project. The comments refer to the impact that it has on the access to the neighborhoods around the NC 54 project. The concerns were primarily about I-40 and Durham, Meadowmont and Chapel Hill and some comments pertained to run off and drainage issues in the East Park neighborhood. There were comments about

bike/ped tunnels that should be made available around I-40 and New Hope Creek as well as around I-85 and the Dry creek. People shared comments of interchange improvements for I-40 and NC 86. Hillsborough residents commented about the pedestrian's connections to Gold Park and connections in West Hillsborough. Lindsay Smart stated that the citizens seemed to be pleased that the Riverwalk is being extended but safe connections to the Riverwalk and Gold Park are needed. Lindsay Smart stated that there would be more detailed responses available in September.

Damon Seils asked Lindsay Smart if there would be more responses from the staff. Lindsay Smart stated yes and it would go to the MPO Technical Staff meeting in August for discussion and then the compilation of comments and responses will be put together and be available at the September meeting. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt opens the floor to Public Hearing.

Citizen John Kent stood up to speak. John Kent stated that he was from Chatham County but has a Chapel Hill address. John Kent discussed his three concerns primarily with the I-40 six lane construction projects in Orange County. John Kent's first concern was about erosion control. John Kent stated that there needs to be more special erosion control to protect the New Hope Creek and Dry Creek water quality. John Kent stated that they are in their twenty fifth year of volunteer water quality monitoring on New Hope Creek. In the Duke forest they have some very special fresh water aquatic habitat. The construction on NC 86 and I-40 interchange will attract run-off debris that will hurt the water quality that support the aquatic habitat. John Kent's second concern was the Dry Creek underpass north of 15-501 and I-40 behind New Hope Common and over to East Town Area. It is in the Chapel Hill Greenway Plan. John Kent's third concern is the fact that I-40 is a 24/7 meat grinder for our wildlife. There needs to be corrections. The road under I-40 was missed when it was originally built which would have made it wildlife friendly. John Kent stated that CE is going to be done for the wildlife and it is low level but we will be there. John Kent stated a fourth issue concerning that the Erwin Rd Bridge over I-40 should have a cantilever cycle track beyond the guardrail for bikes and pedestrians to get across.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt thanked John Kent for his comments and asked if there were any more public speakers or public comments. No one else signed up to speak.

Diane Catotti asked if a decision had been made on whether to have the September 9, 2015, meeting as an evening or during the day. The decision was made to have it in the evening.

Renee Price asked if there is a plan to take care of the Riverwalk to Gold Park issue because it is a precarious place. Lindsay Smart stated that she was not previously aware of that project being a high priority for Hillsborough and that the MPO would include it in the next planning process. In the short term or more immediately, the Town or County could evaluate the connection and submit it to the MPO for STP-DA funding or TAP funding for 2020 or later.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt had questions about the NC 54 and Barbee Road project description now saying intersection. He wanted to understand difference between intersection and interchange. Andy Henry answered the question by stating that they are not trying to limit the improvement to just being an intersection but they are not saying that the project will ultimately be an interchange. They would like for the project description to be open and flexible, so that all solutions can be studied. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that Chapel Hill Council has not agreed on the design for NC 54. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that the design needs some planning.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if there were any objections to closing the Public Hearing. There were no objections. Ellen Reckhow made a motion to receive the public comments and close the Public Hearing. Diane Catotti seconded the motion. The motion was carried out unanimously.

9. 2014 Mobility Report Card
Andy Henry, LPA Staff
Kosok Chae, LPA Staff

Andy Henry discussed the Mobility Report Card. The proposed action is to receive the 2014 Mobility Report Card, provide comments, and release the document for a minimum 21-day public comment period.

The DCHC MPO released the Congestion Management Process - System Status Report 2014 for public comment in January 2015 and adopted the report in March 2015. That report provided the state with system performance and recommendations for future policy directions. LPA staff has also been developing the 2014 Mobility Report Card with significant input from local partners. The Report Card provides detailed performance, safety and activity data on the specific vehicle, transit, bicycling and pedestrian facilities in the MPO. In cases where consistent historical data is available, the Report Card provides a comparative analysis of the facility. The full report and executive summary for the Mobility Report Card, as well as a short presentation, were included as attachments to the meeting agenda. Andy Henry stated that he would review the 12 different chapters and 12 different indicators of the presentations and talk about the key findings to help familiarize you about what is in the report.

Ellen Reckhow wanted to commend the MPO staff. She said that it was an excellent report. Andy Henry stated that Kosok Chae should get the credit for the report.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if there was a motion to release the 2014 Mobility Report Card document for a minimum 21-day public comment period. Renee Price made a motion to release the 2014 Mobility Report Card document for a minimum 21-day public comment period. Bernadette Pelissier seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

10. SPOT 4.0 Existing Projects, New Interchanges/Intersections, and DCHC MPO Local Ranking Methodology Recommendations
Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff

Lindsay Smart stated that in July 2015, the DCHC MPO's subcommittee for the SPOT 4.0 process met to review and discuss several topics related to the commencement of SPOT 4.0. The MPO Technical Committee (TC) had recommendations for the MPO Board to approve the lists of proposed project modifications and new intersection/interchange projects and the MPO's project selection methodology. Recommendations from the DCHC MPO subcommittee were presented to the MPO TC during the July 22, 2015, MPO TC meeting. The MPO TC reviewed the recommendations and provided revisions to the MPO

215 LPA. Lindsay Smart handed out attachments for this agenda item which would present the proposed
216 recommendations from the MPO TC. Lindsay Smart delivered the PowerPoint presentation. In the
217 PowerPoint presentation, Lindsay Smart reviewed the key types of projects that she would be
218 discussing. Each project that has been carried over from Prioritization 3.0(P3.0) has a specific project
219 status or project type. Lindsay stated that in the SPOT 4.0 database, there are some projects listed as
220 committed projects, which means that they are under construction or they are programmed in the MTIP
221 through year 2020. Lindsay Smart discussed the deletions, modifications and different changes to the
222 new and old projects and the scoring of the SPOT 3.0 projects. Lindsay Smart discussed that throughout
223 the presentation and over the next year as they go through the process, you may hear prioritization 4.0,
224 SPOT 4.0. and P4.0 which will generally be the same thing. Lindsay Smart reviewed some key
225 definitions to keep in mind while she went over the presentation. The MPO has started the 4.0 process.
226 Lindsay Smart reviewed the different types of projects and not just modes of transportation. Lindsay
227 Smart reviewed the types of P4.0 projects and defined them as committed projects, existing projects,
228 holding tank projects, permanently deleted projects and new projects. Committed projects are projects
229 that are in the 2016-2020 MTIP/STIP and right-of-way or construction that is scheduled before the end
230 of 2020. Any highway or projects that are programmed for right-of-way construction before the end of
231 2020 are considered as committed. Lindsay Smart discussed the criteria used in the SPOT process to
232 identify the existing projects. Lindsay Smart gave examples; (1) the project is programmed in the STIP for
233 Right-of-Way or Construction, but not already a committed project (i.e. programmed after 2020) (2) the
234 project is a sibling of a programmed project (e.g. Section A is programmed, while Section B is post year) (3)
235 the project has a completed NEPA document (Approved CE, EA/FONSI, Final EIS, ROD or state versions of
236 these documents) (4) the project was actively being worked on as of December 2014, but was stopped due
237 to release of the Draft FY2016-2025 STIP and (5) the project received any amount of local input points in
238 P3.0. Lindsay Smart stated that the MPO TC recommends that the MPO Board should review the proposed

modifications to existing projects as the list has to be submitted to DOT by September 1, 2015. The existing projects that meet the set criteria will move forward with some modifications. Proposed modification to existing projects, deletions to existing projects, new intersection/interchange projects are due by September 1, 2015. The MPO Board should also review the DCHC MPO's methodology for selecting new projects for submission to NCDOT SPOT office for P4.0 scoring.

Lindsay Smart discussed and reviewed the presentation and handouts regarding the proposed modifications of the existing projects and proposed new intersections/interchanges. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if the modification of existing counted as new. Lindsay Smart answered no and stated that a modification only counts as a new project submittal if the modification is to a holding tank project. The question was also asked if there would be a need to change NC54/NC86/15-501 interchange description in the MTP amendment. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt recommended making Barbee/NC 54 into "intersection" not "interchange" like in the MTP. Lindsay Smart stated that NCDOT Division 5 would have to approve that change. Joey Hopkins of Division 5 stated that for the SPOT process to make the change, they would need something to score. If the project is changed to say intersection improvement, it is going to change the scope of the whole project. NCDOT would have to score the project differently. Right now, the dollars for the interchange are programmed late in the TIP because it scored well enough in SPOT 3.0 to be programmed into the later years but not well enough to be programmed earlier. Joey Hopkins recommended that it should stay the same as the current modification that was previously agreed upon so that they may be able to continue to score it. Later in the project development process whatever solution(s) are identified to solve the issue and that can be supported by both the local government and the DOT, is what will end up being funded. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that the problem is with NC54 conflicting descriptive language. Joey Hopkins said that interchange is the broader term. The dollars were programmed for an interchange. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt discussed that we should have a choice of interchange or intersection or be allowed to use both. Joey Hopkins stated that we could consider using

263 intersection/interchange versus getting rid of the word interchange all together so that we continue to
264 have the funding in place.

265 Ellen Reckhow discussed the MPOs need to identify policy for NC 54 because this is a really
266 important corridor. Ellen Reckhow would like to ask the MPO Technical Committee to look at this to get it
267 done right. Mark Ahrendsen stated that we could pull out the NC 54 study to update it. Ed Harrison stated
268 that Division 5 came very quickly to the understanding that there was a problem with the corridor study
269 when meeting with staff. Once it was pointed out, NCDOT knew that the problem had to be solved. Ed
270 Harrison stated that most questions asked for a timeframe for solutions. Joey Hopkins stated that it would
271 be at least three years from starting the design process for NC 54 because there are other projects
272 scheduled before it. Patrick McDonough stated that GoTriangle has to use the MTP for DO-LRT planning.
273 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated to use both interchange and intersection.

274 Diane Catotti asked Lindsay Smart to speak more on the deletion of the grade separation at
275 Blackwell and Magnum. Lindsay Smart stated that the deletion was requested by the City of Durham and
276 asked Mark Ahrendsen if he could describe the staff's perspective. Mark Ahrendsen stated that they are
277 trying to be responsive to the feedback from the council, community and other comments related to D-O
278 LRT.

279 Damon Seils discussed the NC 54 widening project in Carrboro that extends westward into Orange
280 County. Damon Seils stated that Carrboro does not support the widening of NC 54 to a four-lane
281 boulevard. Damon Seils distributed a Memorandum from the Town of Carrboro stating Carrboro's
282 opposition to the widening of NC 54. Lindsay Smart stated that Carrboro and Orange County staff had come
283 to an agreement on changing the wording on the widening project to say Operational Improvements of the
284 Corridor with Bicycle/Pedestrian Accommodations. Lindsay Smart stated that making a modification to the
285 description of an existing project required approval by the NCDOT Division.

286 Ed Lewis, NCDOT Division 7, relayed the discussion he had had with Carrboro staff regarding the
287 SPOT and STIP process. Ed Lewis stated that 65% is in DCHC area and 35% in TARPO area so the
288 modification to the project would need to be approved by TARPO as well. He felt that there should be a
289 compromise and a way to clarify the operational improvement aspects since this is an existing project.
290 They should use the statement widening to get evaluation and funding and put in as an intersection
291 projects. Operation Improvement is too vague for SPOT office. Ed Lewis stated that NCDOT was not saying
292 that widening is the solution. It is just one way for the corridor to be evaluated in SPOT. Bernadette
293 Pelissier asked what other language could be used for the project to be evaluated. Bernadette Pelissier
294 also stated that the NC 54 corridor had bus routes in half cent sales tax process, so could transit operations
295 along the corridor improve the corridor. Ed Lewis stated that NCDOT can look at other modes. Ed Lewis
296 stated that a good middle ground solution would be to keep P3.0 descriptions and intersections as new
297 projects, which do not count with the 14 submittals. Damon Seils stated that Carrboro was opposed to the
298 widening project and that there were too many unanswered questions. Ed Lewis stated that the SPOT
299 process is data driven and the data justifies the roadway being widened. NC 54 is a regional route and
300 NCDOT has TARPO's support for the widening. If there is no modification, then the project description will
301 remain as it is. NCDOT is willing to approve a modification to also submit an operational improvements
302 project so that both the widening project and the operational improvements project can be scored. Damon
303 Seils stated that what bothers him is that they have decided that widening is the ultimate solution. Damon
304 Seils asked what is being scored for Operational Improvements. Ed Lewis stated that it has been identified
305 that the problem are intersections on NC 54 to get scored. When comes time to put local input points on
306 projects in the spring, DCHC and DOT decide the points that they each want to assign to projects. Renee
307 Price stated that TARPO has not made decision. TARPO's TAC will be meeting tomorrow. Renee Price
308 stated that using funding for Bicycle/Pedestrian and transit makes more sense for projects. Lindsay Smart
309 stated that the project can be submitted as a Bicycle/Pedestrian and/or a transit projects for SPOT. Damon

310 Seils stated that there are some expectations on increased traffic along the corridor but he does not know
311 how much.

312 Mark Ahrendsen asked if MPO should delete the project and DOT would add it. Ed Lewis stated no,
313 we cannot do that because it is an existing project. Ed Lewis said that he would discuss the option of a
314 multi-lane improvement instead of a widening to four-lane improvement with Mike Mills. Chair Mark
315 Kleinschmidt stated that the options are to add Operational Improvements to see how it scores and
316 support operational improvements later with MPO local input points. Later, the MPO could choose to not
317 support a widening project and not put local input points on it. Damon Seils stated that he will not support
318 putting points on the widening project.

319 Vice-Chair Diane Catotti stated that the MPO needs a record/language. Lindsay Smart stated that
320 she could summarize the MPO's position on this project and make it available for public consumption.
321 Ellen Reckhow discussed that modernizations seems like improvements were needed. Ed Lewis stated that
322 modernization needs to be defined if you want to get quantitative points.

323 Vice-Chair Diane Catotti discussed the possibility of an at-grade crossing at Magnum and Blackwell
324 instead of grade separation. Mark Ahrendsen said the TSS had interim solutions for crossing. He
325 understands that you can keep separation and add modified crossing without using one of the 14 new
326 project allotments. Joey Hopkins agreed and said yes.

327 James G. Crawford discussed a bad accident that occurred this summer on O'Kelly Chapel Road.
328 James G. Crawford stated that there are safety concerns for this location. He would like better signage and
329 speed limit reduction. Lindsay Smart stated that Chatham County had submitted improvements along
330 O'Kelly Chapel Road and also improvements to the NC 751 and O'Kelly Chapel Road intersection on their
331 list of new projects for P4.0.

332 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if there was a motion to review, discuss, and approve the SPOT 4.0
333 recommendations from the DCHC MPO TC. Vice-Chair Diane Catotti made a motion to review, discuss, and

approve the SPOT 4.0 recommendations from the DCHC MPO TC, with the comments from the Board incorporated and the NC 54 project clarifications. Damon Seils seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

11. Public Involvement Schedule & Activity Coordination for D-O LRT

Andy Henry, LPA Staff

Tammy Bouchelle, GoTriangle

Andy Henry discussed that the DCHC MPO will conduct public involvement activities to review and endorse the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project (D-O LRT). During the same time, GoTriangle will implement a public involvement process for the DEIS in the fall of 2015. The activities of these agencies, as well as those of the local governments will need to be coordinated to avoid confusing the public and creating barriers or delays in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) review process. The MPO Technical Committee has forwarded the attached schedule and the list of key points for the MPO Board's consideration and discussion. GoTriangle's public input process is a 45-day review process. If the citizen wants their issues to be captured, they need to be sent directly to GoTriangle to be processed. The public need to be well advised that submitting comments to GoTriangle is the correct process.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if there was a motion to Review the D-O LRT public involvement activity and approve the schedule. Damon Seils made a motion to review the D-O LRT public involvement activity and approve the schedule. Bernadette Pelissier seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

REPORTS:

12. Report from the Board Chair, Mark Kleinschmidt, Board Chair

There were no reports from the MPO Board Chair.

13. Report from the Technical Committee Chair, Mark Ahrendsen, TC Chair

Technical Committee (TC) Chair Mark Ahrendsen briefly discussed the changes that are being

discussed in the State Legislation and General Assembly. TC Chair Mark Ahrendsen stated that the changes may have impact on County Government, City Government and some of the MPO work. TC Chair Mark Ahrendsen explained that Julie White with the Metro Mayors Coalition Office shared that there is a provision in both the House and Senate version of the budget that requires the Counties and Municipalities to pay the costs associated with requested project improvements, including enhancements to an existing project. TC Chair Mark Ahrendsen stated that basically the way that Julie White understands it, the language says that the locals may have to pay for it. What is not clear yet is what that exactly means and what projects that will impact. TC Chair Mark Ahrendsen stated that it was unclear if that means sidewalks, bike lanes, and lighting, or is it truly enhancements that may be functional. If it is the former, that could be harmful to a lot of the incidental kinds of projects that we have supported and paid for as part of the project budget. TC Chair Mark Ahrendsen stated that he just wanted to bring this subject to the MPO Board's attention, and would have to research deeper.

14. Report from LPA Staff
Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff

No verbal report from LPA staff was provided.

15. NCDOT Report

Joey Hopkins, NCDOT Division 5 introduced the new staff member on his team. The new staff member is David Kielson and he is the new planner/engineer. He is the first planner/engineer in Division 5 and he came from Division 12 where he was the first planner/engineer that Division 12 had ever had. David Kielson has a great background in transportation planning. Division 5 is thankful to have him. Joey Hopkins addressed the issue of a truck being stuck on Roxboro Road under the bridge. Joey Hopkins discussed a project to fix Roxboro and Gregson Street with red signal to stop over- height trucks from getting stuck. Joey Hopkins discussed the previous concern in the minutes about the roundabout. Joey Hopkins stated that Barbee/Herndon project bids came in at \$1.3 million over budget and has asked Durham to help cover

the difference. Safety dollars from the NCDOT have been used and the project still about half a million short. TC Chair Mark Ahrendsen stated that there is an interest in Legislative contingency funds. Joey Hopkins stated that local legislator can request from speaker. Joey Hopkins said that he would get back in touch with TC Chair Mark Ahrendsen to further discuss.

Ed Lewis, NCDOT Division 7, stated that Jones Ferry Rd project is getting to be re-let. There was one bidder on it and the bidder came in with an estimate that was way over the engineer's estimate. The project will be re-let this month. Ed Lewis stated that NCDOT believes the completion date will stay the same.

Darius Sturdivant, NCDOT Division 8, summarized the status of Division 8 projects. Darius Sturdivant stated that the resurfacing project along Farrington Road and Mount Charmel Church road projects are completed and the safety projects for NC751/New Hope Road project has been delayed until February 2017. Darius Sturdivant discussed that the American Tobacco Trail parking lot project is complete and open for use.

No report from NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch was offered.

No report from NCDOT Traffic Operations was offered.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

16. Recent News Articles and Updates

The letter was attached to the meeting agenda for review by the MPO Board.

Adjournment

There being no further business before the MPO Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for September 9, 2015 at 6 p.m., in the City Council Chambers.