

Connect 2045

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan

for the
Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
and the
Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning
Organization

Updated Public Review Draft

Version: 1-19-2018

Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization ❖ Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
2. What is the Plan?	4
2.1 Why Do We Need A Plan?	4
2.2 What Is In The Plan	5
2.3 How Will The Plans Be Used?	8
3. About Our Home	9
3.1 Our Region	9
3.2 Our People	10
3.3 Our Economy	11
3.4 Our Environment	12
3.5 Our Future	14
3.6 Our Challenge	14
4. Our Vision And How We Will Achieve It	17
4.1 Our Vision.	17
4.2 Goals and Objectives.	17
4.3 Performance Targets and Measures of Effectiveness.	18
5. How We Developed Our Plan.....	21
5.1 Who is Responsible for the Plan?	21
5.2 Stakeholder & Public Involvement Process	22
5.3 Triangle Region Transportation Model.....	27
5.4 Related Plans and Studies.....	28
6. Analyzing Our Choices	33
6.1 Land Use Plans and Policies	33
6.2 Socio-economic Forecasts	34
6.3 Trends, Deficiencies, and Needs.....	37
6.4 Alternatives Analysis.....	42
6.5 Performance Evaluation Measures	45
7. Our Metropolitan Transportation Plan	50
7.1 Land Use & Development	50
7.2 Roadways.....	51
7.3 Fixed Guideway and Premium Transit Services.....	52
7.4 Frequency- and Coverage-Based Bus Services	54
7.5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	55
7.6 Freight Movement.....	59
7.7 Transportation Demand Management (TDM).....	60
7.8 Transportation Technology & Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	62
7.9 Transportation System Management (TSM)	63
7.10 Rail Investments	64
7.11 Air Transportation	66
7.12 Recommended Special Plans, Projects and Studies	66
8. Our Financial Plan	69
8.1 Costs	69
8.2 Revenues	70
8.3 Balancing Costs and Revenues	76
9. Critical Factors in the Planning Process	80
9.1 Transportation - Air Quality Conformity.....	80
9.2 Environmental Justice.....	81
9.3 Safety and Security	91
9.4 Critical Environmental Resources	94
9.5 The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and the 2045 MTP	96
10. Post-2045 Comprehensive Transportation Plan Projects	99

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Road Projects List
- Appendix 2: Transit Technologies and Services [may be included in Final Report]
- Appendix 3: Transit Project List (Capital Area MPO)
- Appendix 4: Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects
- Appendix 5: Autonomous & Connected Vehicles [To be included in Final Report]
- Appendix 6: Complete Streets
- Appendix 7: Air Quality (MOVES output) [To be included in Final Report]
- Appendix 8: Public Comments [To be included in Final Report]
- Appendix 9: Acronyms
- Appendix 10: Detailed Transportation and Growth Maps [To be included in Final Report]
- Appendix 11: Year-of-Expenditure Financial Plan
- Appendix 12: Environmental Justice Maps and Critical Environmental Resource Maps

Online Interactive Project Maps:

CAMPO: <http://arcg.is/2D0kMfj>

DCHC MPO:

Highway: <http://arcg.is/2DkGhVf>

Transit: <http://arcg.is/2qMpNSQ>

A Note to Readers:

The heart of any transportation plan is the investments that will be made to serve the travel needs of our growing region's citizens, businesses and visitors. These investments take the form of road, transit, rail, cycling and walking facilities and services, together with related technologies. Maps are created to help visualize the nature of both the facilities in which we plan to invest and the existing and future population and jobs that the facilities are designed to serve. But the maps in this document are for illustrative purposes only and are subject to change and interpretation. The details of the investments are in the project lists that are included with this report.

This version of the plan is a public review draft. It is designed to include the key content of the plan, and to show the type and format of information that will be in the final adopted document. Some parts of the document, such as some of the appendices, will be created during the public review. In addition, some of the graphics in this version of the document are early drafts or lower-resolution images that will be upgraded in subsequent versions.

Comments may be submitted to either of the MPOs through their websites:

NC Capital Area MPO: www.campo-nc.us/

attention: Chris Lukasina

Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO: www.dchcmmpo.org/

attention: Andy Henry

Because this document addresses the official plans of both MPOs, the document is color-coded. Text and tables with a white background apply to both MPOs.

Text and tables highlighted in this green color apply only to the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO.

Text and tables highlighted in this yellow color apply only to the Capital Area MPO

1. Executive Summary

Transportation investments link people to the places where they work, learn, shop and play, and provide critical connections between businesses and their labor markets, suppliers and customers.

This document contains the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plans (MTPs) for the two organizations charged with transportation decision-making in the Research Triangle Region: the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) and the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO). These organizations, and the areas for which they are responsible, are commonly called “MPOs.”

The Metropolitan Transportation Plans are the guiding documents for future investments in roads, transit services, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and related transportation activities and services to match the growth expected in the Research Triangle Region.

The areas covered by this plan are part of a larger economic region. Transportation investments should consider the mobility needs of this larger region and links to the other large metro regions of North Carolina and throughout the Southeast. The Triangle Region is expected to accommodate substantial future growth; we need to plan for the region we will become, not just the region we are today.

Estimated 2013 and Forecast 2045 Population and Jobs	2013		2045		2013 to 2045 Growth	
	Population	Jobs	Population	Jobs	Population	Jobs
Capital Area MPO	1,120,000	540,000	2,030,000	1,000,000	920,000	470,000
Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO	400,000	260,000	620,000	450,000	210,000	190,000
Areas outside MPO boundaries	160,000	60,000	310,000	80,000	150,000	20,000
Total for area covered by the region’s transportation model	1,680,000	860,000	2,960,000	1,530,000	1,280,000	680,000

The Triangle has historically been one of the nation’s most sprawling regions and current forecasts project both continued outward growth and infill development in selected locations, most notably in the central parts of Raleigh, Durham and Chapel Hill and at community-defined activity centers like the planned mixed use center within the Research Triangle Park. A key challenge for our transportation plans is to match our vision for how our communities should grow with the transportation investments to support this growth.

No region has been able to “build its way” out of congestion; an important challenge for our transportation plans is to provide travel choices that allow people to avoid congestion where it cannot be prevented.

Our population is changing. The population is aging, more households will be composed of single-person and two-person households without children, the number of households without cars is increasing, and more people are interested in living in more compact neighborhoods with a mix of activities. Our plans are designed to provide mobility choices for our changing needs.

Our MPOs are tied together by very strong travel patterns between them; our largest commute pattern and heaviest travel volumes occur at the intersection of the MPO boundaries. Our MPO plans need to recognize the mobility needs of residents and businesses that transcend our MPO borders.

The region has a common vision of what it wants its transportation system to be:

a seamless integration of transportation services that offer a range of travel choices to support economic development and are compatible with the character and development of our communities, sensitive to the environment, improve quality of life and are safe and accessible for all.



The MPOs have jointly adopted goals and objectives to accomplish this vision and selected performance measures to track progress over time. Each MPO will have targets that reflect the unique characteristics and aspirations of the communities within each MPO. The *2045 Transportation Plan* commits our region to transportation services and patterns of development that contribute to a more sustainable place where people can successfully pursue their daily activities.

To analyze the transportation investment choices we have, the MPOs followed a systematic process involving significant public engagement. It began with an understanding of how our communities' plans envision guiding future growth. Community plans anticipate that five regional-scale centers in Raleigh, Durham, Cary, Chapel Hill and the Research Triangle Park are expected to contain large concentrations of employment and/or intense mixes of homes, workplaces, shops, medical centers, higher education institutions, visitor destinations and entertainment venues. Linking these activity centers to one another, and connecting them with communities throughout the region by a variety of travel modes can provide expanded opportunities for people to have choices about where they live, work, learn and play.



Next, planners used sophisticated software to forecast the types, locations and amounts of future population and job growth based on market conditions and trends, factors that influence development, and local plans.



Based on the forecasts, we looked at mobility trends and needs, and where our transportation system may become deficient in meeting these needs.

Working with a variety of partners and based on public input, we developed different transportation system alternatives and analyzed their performance, comparing the performance of system alternatives against one another and to performance targets derived from our goals and objectives.

The result of this analysis and extensive public engagement was a set of planned investments, together with a pattern of land development aligned with these investments. Additional studies were also proposed to ensure that the investments are carefully designed and effectively implemented. The core of the plan is the set of transportation investments described in Section 7, including:

- New and expanded roads;
- Local and regional transit facilities and services, including bus and rail;
- Aviation and long-distance passenger and freight rail services;
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities, both independent projects and in concert with road projects;
- Transportation Demand Management: marketing and outreach efforts that increase the use of alternatives to driving alone;
- Technology-Based Transportation Services: the use of advanced technology to make transit and road investments more effective—including the advent of autonomous and connected vehicles; and
- Transportation Systems Management: road projects that improve safety and traffic flow without adding new capacity.

In addition to these investments, the plan includes a focus on three issues where the ties between development and transportation investments are most critical: transit station area development, major roadway access management and “safe & healthy streets” whose designs are sensitive to the neighborhoods of which they are a part and the needs of a full range of users, including drivers, transit riders, cyclists and

pedestrians. The two MPOs will work with their member communities, the state, and regional organizations on these three issues to match land use decisions with transportation investments.

The plan anticipates that the region will match its historic focus on roads with a sustained commitment to high-quality transit service as well, emphasizing four critical components:

- Connecting the region's main centers with fast, frequent, reliable rail or bus services;
- Offering transit service to all communities that have adopted local transit revenues;
- Providing frequent transit service in urban travel markets; and
- Supplying better transit access, from "first mile/last mile" circulator services within key centers to safe and convenient cycling and walk access to transit routes.

Although the plan includes a new emphasis on transit investment, it envisions significant additional roadway investment as well. Major road projects are shown below and all projects are listed in Appendix 1. Section 7 of the Plan provides greater detail on planned roadway and transit investments.

Durham Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO		
2018-25	2026-35	2036-45
East End Connector will link US 70 to NC 147 (Durham Freeway) to form I-885	I-40 managed lanes (Wade Avenue in Wake County to NC 147)	I-40 managed lanes (NC 147 to US 15-501)
NC 147 (Durham Freeway) widened (East End Connector to I-40)	I-40 widening (US 15-501 to I-85)	I-85 widened (I-40 to Durham County)
US 70 lane addition and freeway conversion (East End Connector to Miami Blvd)	US 70 lane addition and freeway conversion (Miami Blvd to Wake County)	I-85 widened (US 70 to Red Mill Road)
	US 15-501 (Fordham Blvd) capacity improvements (Columbia St to I-40)	US 15-501 freeway conversion (I-40 to US 15-501 bypass)
Capital Area MPO		
2018-2025	2026-2035	2036-2045
I-40 widened from Wade Ave. to Lake Wheeler Road	I-40 widened from I-440 to NC 42 in Johnston County	I-87 widened from US 64 Bus to US 264
I-440 widened from Wade Avenue to Crossroads	I-87 widened from I-440 to US 264	NC 210 widened from Angier to Lassiter Pond Rd.
I-40 widened from I-440 to NC 42 in Johnston County	US 1 widened south from US 64 to NC 540	NC 50 widened from NC 98 to Creedmoor
US 64 W corridor improvements from US 1 to Laura Duncan Rd.	Managed lanes added to I-540 (Northern Wake Expressway) from I-40 to I-87	US 401 widened from Fuquay-Varina to MPO boundary in Harnett County
NC 540 toll road extended from Holly Springs to I-40 south of Garner	NC 540 completed as a toll road from I-40 to I-87/US 64 bypass	NC 96 widened from US 1 to NC 98
NC 50 widened and access management from I-540 to NC 98	Managed lanes added to I-40 from Durham County to MPO boundary in Johnston County	NC 56 widened from I-85 to MPO boundary in Franklin County

2. What is the Plan?

This document contains the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plans for CAMPO and the DCHC MPO. These plans are the guiding documents for future investments in roads, transit services, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and related transportation activities and services to match the growth expected in the Research Triangle Region.

2.1 Why Do We Need A Plan?

A transportation plan is essential for building an effective and efficient transportation system. The implementation of any transportation project, such as building a new road, adding lanes to a highway, purchasing transit buses, constructing a rail system, or building bicycle lanes with a road widening project, often requires several years to complete from concept to construction.

Once a community determines that a project is needed, there are many detailed steps to be completed: funding must be identified; analysis must be completed to minimize environmental and social impacts; engineering designs must be developed, evaluated, and selected; the public must be involved in project decisions; right-of-way may have to be purchased; and finally, the construction must be contracted and completed.

No matter which step one might consider the most important in this long process, the project always begins with the regional transportation plan. In fact, this basic planning concept is so important, that federal regulations require that a project must be identified in a metropolitan transportation plan in order for it to receive federal funding and obtain federal approvals.

Federal regulations not only require a metropolitan transportation plan, the regulations stipulate the contents of the plan and the process used in its development. The plan must have:


- A vision that meets community goals.
- A multi-modal approach that includes not only highway projects, but provides for other modes such as public transportation, walking, and bicycling.
- A minimum 20-year planning horizon.
- A financial plan that balances revenues and costs to demonstrate that the plan is financially responsible and constrained.
- An air quality analysis to show that forecasted emissions will not exceed air quality emissions limits, when a region is subject to air quality conformity requirements.
- A public involvement process that meets federal guidelines, and is sensitive especially to those groups traditionally left out of the planning process.

Regions like the Research Triangle must develop these plans at least every five years, and must formally amend these plans if regionally significant transportation investments are added, deleted or modified in the plans.

2.2 What Is In The Plan

Metropolitan areas in North Carolina prepare two distinct, but related **types of transportation plans**:

Figure 2.2.1



1. **Comprehensive Transportation Plans** (CTPs) are “needs-based.” They show all the existing and new and expanded major roads, transit services, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and related transportation activities that are needed to meet the growth and mobility aspirations of our citizens over the long term. The CTP has no defined future date by which the facilities and services would be provided, nor is it constrained by our ability to pay for facilities and services or the impacts of these facilities and services on our region’s air quality.
2. **Metropolitan Transportation Plans** (MTPs) are “revenue-based.” They show the new and expanded roads, transit services, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and related transportation activities that we believe we can pay for and build by the year 2045, and that will meet federal air quality standards.

This document focuses on the second of these two types of plans: the Metropolitan Transportation Plan that shows what we can achieve by 2045 with anticipated funding and that will preserve air quality. The road project lists in Appendix 1 include a separate list of projects that are beyond the funding ability of the MTP, but are included in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

The facilities and services in a MTP are a subset of the facilities and services in a CTP. Figure 2.2.1 shows this relationship between the MTP and CTP, and also the plans’ relationship to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), the ten-year program of projects that is also developed for metropolitan areas and that serves as the main implementing document of the MTPs for those projects and services that use state and federal funding. The current MPO-adopted MTIP covers fiscal years 2018-2027.

This document compiles the MTPs for the two areas under the jurisdiction of the organizations with the main responsibility for transportation planning in the Research Triangle Region:

1. The **Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization** (Capital Area MPO, or CAMPO) which covers all of Wake County and portions of Franklin, Granville, Harnett and Johnston Counties; and
2. The **Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization** (Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO, or DCHC MPO) which covers all of Durham County and parts of Orange and Chatham Counties.

Therefore, this is one document, so that those interested in transportation planning in the Research Triangle Region have a single, consistent reference to consult, but two plans, since there are state and federal requirements that each MPO be responsible for the plans, projects & services, funding, and air quality requirements within its jurisdiction.

This point merits emphasis: The selection of projects and allocation of funding to them is an *independent* decision by each MPO. This single document is a way to help these organizations make more consistent and complementary decisions within their spheres of authority, and to communicate these decisions to the citizens of the region.

To distinguish these lines of authority, this document is color-coded. Text and tables with a white background apply to both MPOs.

Text and tables highlighted in this green color apply only to the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO.

Text and tables highlighted in this yellow color apply only to the Capital Area MPO

Figure 2.2.2 summarizes key features of the two types of plans and different areas of authority, and indicates what is included in this version of the single regional document.

Figure 2.2.2

Authority	Capital Area MPO		Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO	
Name of the Plan	CAMPO 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	CAMPO Comprehensive Transportation Plan	DCHC MPO 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	DCHC MPO Comprehensive Transportation Plan
Area Covered	Wake County and parts of Franklin, Granville, Harnett and Johnston Counties	Same as CAMPO Metropolitan Transportation Plan	All of Durham and parts of Orange and Chatham Counties	Same as DCHC MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plan
Who requires this plan?	Federal Government	State Government	Federal Government	State Government
Plan's Horizon Year	2045	No Set Year	2045	No set year
Is this plan fiscally constrained?	Yes	No	Yes	No
Must this plan meet air quality standards?	Yes	No	Yes	No
What officially constitutes the plan?	All MTP maps, lists of projects, and the text of this document that applies either generally or specifically applies to the CAMPO area	Just the set of CTP maps that apply to the CAMPO area (no text, list of projects or written report)	All MTP maps, lists of projects, and the text of this document that applies either generally or specifically applies to the DCHC MPO area	Just the set of CTP maps that apply to the DCHC MPO area (no text, list of projects or written report)
What projects are included in the plan?	New and expanded facilities and services	Existing, new and expanded facilities and services	New and expanded facilities and services	Existing, new and expanded facilities and services
Is the plan included in this version of the document	Yes	No, but additional CTP roads are listed in Appendix 1	Yes	No

Figure 2.2.3 shows a map of the two MPO areas, outlined in **purple**, as well as two other important geographic areas to consider as one consults this plan:

1. The Triangle Air Quality Region, shown in white, which consists of all of Wake, Durham, Orange, Franklin, Granville, Harnett and Johnston Counties, plus four townships in northeastern Chatham County; and

2. The Triangle Regional Model (TRM) “modeled area,” outlined in **red**, which indicates the area covered by the region’s travel demand forecasting model: the tool that estimates future travel on existing and planned roads and transit services (see Section 5.3). Most of the data highlighted in this document represents travel within this modeled area.




Figure 2.2.3

The core of the plan is the set of transportation investments described in Section 7, including:

- New and expanded roads;
- Transit facilities and services, including bus and rail;
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities, both independent projects and in concert with road projects;
- Aviation facilities;
- Rail facilities for inter-city passenger and freight;
- Transportation Demand Management: marketing and outreach efforts that increase the use of alternatives to driving alone;
- Technology-Based Transportation Services: the use of advanced technology to make transit and road investments more effective, including planning for autonomous and connected vehicles; and
- Transportation Systems Management: road projects that improve safety and traffic flow without adding new capacity.

2.3 How Will The Plan Be Used?

Metropolitan Transportation Plans are used for several important decisions, including:

Programming projects. Only projects that appear in a Metropolitan Transportation Plan may be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for funding.

Preserving future rights-of-way for roads and transit facilities. The state and local governments use Metropolitan Transportation Plans to identify land that may need to be acquired and to ensure that new development does not preclude the eventual construction of planned roads and transit routes.

Designing local road networks. Metropolitan Transportation Plans chiefly address larger transportation facilities with regional impact. Communities can then use these “backbone” projects to plan the finer grain of local streets and local transit services that connect to these larger facilities.

Making land use decisions. Communities use regional transportation plans to ensure that land use decisions will match the investments designed to support future growth and development.

Making private investments decisions. Businesses, homeowners and developers use these plans to understand how their interests may be affected by future transportation investments.

Identifying key plans and studies. State, regional and local agencies use this plan to outline more detailed plans and studies that will be undertaken leading to future projects and investments.

Key points from this section:

- The Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) shows everything we would eventually like to do. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) shows everything we think we can afford to do by the Year 2045. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) shows everything in the MTP that we plan to do through 2027 that involves state or federal funding.
- This single document includes the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plans for two planning areas: the Capital Area MPO and the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO. Each of these organizations retains independent authority within its area of jurisdiction.
- These plans will be used by local, state and federal agencies to allocate resources for specific road, transit, bicycle and pedestrian investments, to ensure that land is preserved for these investments and to match land use and development decisions with planned infrastructure investments.
- This document also includes lists of projects beyond the time frame of the 2045 MTP which are included in the two MPO CTPs, and links to more information about these projects.


3. About Our Home

Transportation investments link people to the places where they work, learn, shop and play, and provide critical connections between businesses and their labor markets, suppliers and customers. So an important starting point for planning future investments is to understand the current state of our communities, and how they might change over the next generation.

3.1 Our Region

The Research Triangle is a burgeoning sunbelt metropolitan region. As defined by the census bureau, the region's metropolitan areas cover seven counties; six that are members of one or the other MPO plus Person County. More broadly, the economic region generally covers about 13 counties, stretching from the Virginia border on the North to Harnett, Lee and Moore counties in the south. Today, the seven metropolitan counties are home to about 1.9 million people and the 13-county economic region is home to 2.3 million people.

Figure 3.1.1
The Research
Triangle
Economic
Region



The Triangle Economic Region Metropolitan Counties

Chatham	DCHC
Durham	DCHC
Franklin	CAMPO
Johnston	CAMPO
Orange	DCHC
Person	
Wake	CAMPO

Nonmetropolitan Counties

Granville	CAMPO
Harnett	CAMPO
Lee	
Moore	

As the MPOs plan their transportation networks, it is important to consider not only mobility within their boundaries, but also the connections to the wider economic region and other regions in North Carolina. The Triangle is one of three large, complex metro areas along North Carolina's Piedmont Crescent, along with the Triad and Charlotte. Each of these regions has more than 1.5 million people and together, these three regions account for 56% of the state's population, 60% of its jobs and 68% of the value of all goods and services produced in North Carolina.




Figure 3.1.2 The "Big 3" Metro Regions

More importantly, as we consider future transportation investments, these three regions are expected to account for more than three-quarters of North Carolina's growth over the next generation, with the Triangle and Charlotte regions each absorbing 1/3 of North Carolina's growth.



This rapid population growth is part of a larger national trend, where over two-thirds of all population growth is expected to occur in a series of "megaregions," the fastest-growing of which are located in sunbelt areas like the Triangle. The Triangle, along with the Triad and Charlotte, are part of the Piedmont Atlantic Megaregion (PAM), stretching from Raleigh to Birmingham, and which is forecast to grow from 17.6 million people in 2010 to over 31 million people by 2050.

3.2 Our People

As our region has grown and as we add 1.3 million new people over the span of this plan to the part of the region covered by our forecast, the composition of our population is changing in ways that can influence the types of transportation investments we may choose to make:

- By 2030, 20% of Triangle residents will be 65 or older, up from 10% in 2000.
- In 2010, 32,000 households in the Triangle had no vehicle available, up from 29,000 in 2000 and 27,000 in 1990.
- We are highly mobile: 8% of households lived in a different county a year ago and another 9% changed houses within their home county.
- Almost 370,000 households – roughly 60% of the total – are households with only one or two people, and close to 50,000 people live in group quarters such as university dormitories.
- Surveys report that about a quarter to a third of households today would prefer to live in a compact, walkable neighborhood with a mix of activities, the kinds of neighborhoods that can be effectively served by transit. This would suggest that by the Year 2045, as many as one million Triangle residents would select a compact, walkable, mixed-use neighborhood if that option is available for them.

Figure 3.1.3 Where Future Population Will Locate in North Carolina (2015-2037)



3.3 Our Economy

The cornerstones of the region’s economy are the major universities and their associated medical centers, the technology firms exemplified by the companies in the Research Triangle Park and state government. Employment is concentrated in the three core Triangle Counties: Wake, Durham and Orange Counties have over 1 million jobs; the 7 counties in our MSAs have 1.2 million jobs and the 13-county economic region has nearly 1.4 million jobs. Figure 3.3.1 indicates the distribution of economic value by industry for our two MSAs. Figure 3.3.2 shows the geographical distribution of employment within the 13-county economic region.

The Triangle’s economy has proven resilient in the past, and the size of the region’s economy is substantial: the metropolitan region accounted for 24% of the value of goods and services produced in North Carolina in 2016 and at more than \$120 billion in today’s dollars, surpassed the economic value produced by 17 states (Figure 3.3.3).

The concentration of employment in several specific areas -- most notably the downtowns of Raleigh and Durham, the Research Triangle Park area and the university/medical center areas associated with Duke University, UNC-Chapel Hill, NC State University and North Carolina Central University -- results in significant commuting across the MPO boundary.

Figure 3.3.1 Gross Product by Industry-Triangle MSAs




Figure 3.3.2 Employment by County




Figure 3.3.3 Gross Product: Value of Goods & Services Produced (in \$billions)




Figure 3.3.4 shows the growth in cross-county commuting in the region while Figure 3.3.5 shows commuting flows, with the largest flow consisting of 82,000 people who commute each day between Wake County on the one hand and Durham and Orange Counties on the other.

Figure 3.3.4 Total Cross-County Commuting





Figure 3.3.5 Daily Commuting Flows (in thousands of commuters)




In fact, our most heavily traveled roadway is the section of I-40 near the Wake County-Durham County line, the border between our two Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organizations. Auto and truck traffic continues to grow at this location, and forecasts are that the trend will continue.

Figure 3.3.6 I-40 Traffic Volume west of I-540

3.4 Our Environment

Among the many environmental concerns in our region, land use, air quality and water resources are three that have critical connections to transportation investments. Land use is a particularly critical issue in a fast-growing region like the Triangle, since the pattern of future land use can have significant



influence on the efficiency and effectiveness of different transportation investments, especially transit services. Much of the Triangle Region is characterized by low-density development with different types of land uses, such as homes, offices and stores, separated from one another, a pattern commonly referred to as "sprawl." According to a national study that carefully examined measures of density, land use mix, road connectivity and "centeredness," the Triangle area ranked as the 3rd most sprawling among the 83 regions studied. The same study examined the environmental and social impacts of sprawl, concluding that persons in the most sprawling areas add many more miles of travel each day to their schedule, suffer more traffic deaths, and tend to endure worse air quality.

Air quality remains an important concern and is directly linked with the transportation system. Ozone is a strong oxidizer and irritant that has been shown to decrease lung function and trigger asthma attacks among the young, elderly, and adults who work or exercise outdoors.

Emissions from cars and trucks account for over one-half the emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) – the controlling pollutant in the formation of ground level ozone – in the Triangle Area. Given the serious health effects of ozone, the reduction of ozone emissions is an important goal of the MPO's transportation investments.

*Figure 3.4.1 Regional Measures of Sprawl
(lower scores indicate more sprawl)*



The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established standards for common air pollutants. A geographic area that meets or exceeds the standard for a particular air pollutant is called an “attainment area.” Likewise, an area that does not meet the standard is called a “non-attainment area.” Standards are set for a number of pollutants, including ozone, particulate matter and carbon monoxide. The Triangle area is currently in attainment, although in the previous three decades the area has been in non-attainment.

Attainment status can directly affect a community's economic development efforts, and federal funding for transportation improvements can be affected in non-attainment areas. New or expanded industrial developments proposing to emit air pollutants face stricter and more costly technology standards in non-attainment areas. For these reasons, the two MPOs continue to examine air quality impacts closely, although we are not required to do so.


Water quality is a regional concern as well. The Triangle Region is divided into two major drainage basins, both of which supply water for the Region's drinking water reservoirs. The southern/western part of the Region drains into Jordan Reservoir and the Cape Fear River basin. The northern/eastern part of the Region drains into the Falls of the Neuse Reservoir and the Neuse River basin. All of the major watercourses in the Region drain to water supply reservoirs and affect the quality of their waters. The NC Division Water Quality (DWQ) classifies streams according to their best intended uses. Intended uses could include water supply, aquatic life protection and swimming or other recreation. Using water quality data and field assessments, the DWQ has determined that several streams throughout the region are impaired either because they have poor water quality or do not support their intended uses. These streams include the New Hope, Third Fork and Northeast Creeks in the Cape Fear basin; and Ellerbe, Little Lick and Lick Creeks in the Neuse basin (among others).

The municipalities and counties in the region often apply special development standards for the purposes of water supply watershed protection. These standards often prohibit certain types of development in sensitive watershed areas, limit the intensity of development to minimize pollution from stormwater runoff, limit the amount of impervious surfaces allowed in new developments, and limit the disturbance of naturally vegetated areas on each side of most streams. Transportation plans must take into account the impact that new or widened roadways might directly have on water quality, and the indirect effects that transportation investments might have in spurring future development that could adversely impact water quality.

3.5 Our Future

The part of the Research Triangle Region covered by our forecast is anticipated to add 1.3 million people over the span of this plan, more than the current *combined* population of the seven largest cities and towns within our MPO boundaries: Raleigh, Durham, Cary, Chapel Hill, Apex, Wake Forest and Holly Springs.

Forecasts suggest that much of this future growth will continue to extend outwards from the urbanized area as it was most recently defined following the 2010 Census. Figure 3.5.1 shows how the urbanized areas around Durham and Raleigh have grown over the years. The Census defines urbanized areas as areas with more than 500 residents per square mile and strong commuting ties to a central city with more than 50,000 people.



Our future involves more than just growth; we also face rapidly evolving and technologies that could significantly shape the nature of travel. The advent of autonomous and connected vehicles could influence the designs of our streets, our need for parking, the relationship between our land uses and transportation network, and car ownership, all in as-yet-unknown ways.

3.6 Our Challenge

These characteristics of our home -- a rapidly growing population and economy, continuing risks to air and water quality, a propensity to disperse growth outwards, and disruptive technologies, create transportation challenges. More commuters are traveling longer distances, and the single-occupant automobile continues to dominate how we travel. And although we tend to focus on commuter travel, travel for such purposes as school, business, shopping, and social engagements constitute increasing shares of travel. These conditions have produced increasing demands on our transportation network, which in terms of “vehicle miles traveled” and other demand measures is experiencing a growth rate that is greater than that of our population. The consequences have been rising traffic congestion, increasing transportation infrastructure costs, and further pressure on our air, water, open space, and other environmental assets. Our region’s quality of life, a key attraction for professional and skilled workers and business investment to our region, may ultimately become threatened by the consequences of our patterns of growth and inadequate transportation infrastructure.

These consequences create many challenges for us, for example:

- How do we find the resources to invest in our transportation infrastructure, and to what extent does this demand for resources compete with other needs such as schools, water and waste treatment facilities, affordable housing, protection of green space and social services?
- As we expand our roadway network to meet growing travel demand, how can we minimize the negative impacts on our travel times, air and water quality, and open spaces?
- How do we design a transportation network that serves 1) the needs of different types of places, from downtowns to small towns to suburban areas to rural communities, 2) a range of socioeconomic groups and 3) our economic and environmental values?

Figure 3.6.1 Major Highway Projects Added Since 1995

One of the largest challenges facing our region is that despite major investments in road projects, congestion levels are increasing due to extensive population growth, increased travel within the region and large amounts of “pass-through” traffic on our interstate highways.

Figure 3.6.1 shows \$2.8 billion in major road projects that were completed in the past 20 years or are underway. **Red** lines are highways with interchanges, while **purple** lines are streets with intersections.





Figure 3.6.2 shows how levels of congested peak period travel have increased in the Triangle, in many of the regions with which we compete and for all large regions in the US. The graph shows that although the Triangle has comparatively less congestion, congestion levels consistently rise over time and that economically successful, fast-growing regions have not been able to “build their way out of congestion.”

Figure 3.6.2 Percent of Peak Travel in Congestion



We are undertaking the update of our long-range transportation plan to help ensure that we are able to meet the significant challenges we face. We must plan now for the roadways, transit services, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities that will be needed in 2045, if we expect to meet the travel demands of the place we will become. Our communities have opportunities to create and maintain a strong, growing economy, high quality of life, affordable housing market, culturally diverse populace, and sustainable environment. Our ability to anticipate and meet the challenges in planning, designing, and building an efficient and effective transportation network is a key element for ensuring that we can make the most of these opportunities.

Key points from this section:

- The MPO areas covered by this plan are part of a larger economic region. Transportation investments should consider the mobility needs of this larger region and links to the other large metro regions of North Carolina and throughout the Southeast.
- The Triangle Region is expected to accommodate a phenomenal amount of future growth, part of a larger national trend of growth in sunbelt “megaregions;” we need to plan for the region we will become, not just the region we are today.
- The Triangle is one of the most sprawling regions in the nation and current forecasts project both continued outward growth and infill development in selected locations, most notably in the central parts of Raleigh, Durham and Chapel Hill. A key challenge for our transportation plans is to match our vision for how our communities should grow with the transportation investments to support this growth.
- No region has been able to “build its way” out of congestion; an important challenge for our transportation plans is to provide travel choices that allow people to avoid congestion or minimize the time they spend stuck in it. Emerging, potentially disruptive technologies associated with autonomous and connected vehicles may significantly affect travel, but the nature and scale of these impacts remains highly uncertain, and may achieve substantial market penetration only in the long-term stage of this plan.
- Our population is changing. The population is aging, more households will be composed of single-person and two-person households without children, the number of households without cars is increasing, and more people are interested in living in more compact neighborhoods with a mix of activities. Our plans must provide mobility choices for our changing needs.
- Our MPOs are tied together by very strong travel patterns between them; our largest commute pattern and heaviest travel volumes occur at the intersection of the MPO boundaries. Our MPO plans should recognize the mobility needs of residents and businesses that transcend our MPO borders.

4. Our Vision And How We Will Achieve It

4.1 Our Vision

The region has a common vision of what it wants its transportation system to be:

a seamlessly integrated set of transportation services that provide travel choices to support economic development and that:

- *are compatible with the character and development of our communities,*
- *are sensitive to the environment,*
- *improve quality of life, and*
- *are safe and accessible for all.*

The 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan commits our region to transportation services and patterns of development that contribute to a distinctive place where people can successfully pursue their daily activities.

4.2 Goals and Objectives

The two Metropolitan Planning Organizations have worked together to develop a common set of goals and objectives that are designed to achieve the region's overall vision. Goals are short statements of intent; objectives provide two to four priorities within each goal on which we want to focus.

This plan is based on eight goals and their supporting objectives:

1. Connect People

Objectives:

- a) Connect people to jobs, education and other important destinations using all modes
- b) Ensure transportation needs are met for all populations, especially the aging and youth, economically disadvantaged, mobility impaired, and minorities.

2. Promote Multimodal and Affordable Travel Choices

Objectives:

- a) Enhance transit services, amenities and facilities.
- b) Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- c) Increase utilization of affordable non-auto travel modes.

3. Manage Congestion and System Reliability

Objectives:

- a) Allow people and goods to move with minimal congestion and time delay, and with greater predictability.
- b) Promote Travel Demand Management (TDM), such as carpooling, vanpooling and park-and-ride).
- c) Enhance Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), such as ramp metering, dynamic signal phasing and vehicle detection systems.

4. Stimulate Economic Vitality

Objectives:

- a) Improve freight movement.
- b) Link land use and transportation.
- c) Target funding to the most cost-effective solutions.
- d) Improve project delivery for all modes.

5. Ensure Equity and Participation

Objectives:

- a) Ensure that transportation investments do not create a disproportionate burden for any community.
- b) Enhance public participation among all communities.

6. Improve Infrastructure Condition

Objectives:

- a) Increase the proportion of highways and highway assets rated in 'Good' condition.
- b) Maintain transit vehicles, facilities and amenities in the best operating condition.
- c) Improve the condition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

7. Protect the Environment and Address Climate Change

Objectives:

- a) Reduce mobile source emissions, greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption.
- b) Minimize negative impacts on the natural and cultural environments.

8. Promote Safety and Health

Objectives:

- a) Increase the safety of travelers and residents.
- b) Promote public health through transportation choices.

4.3 Performance Measures of Effectiveness and Target Values

As part of the same process for creating the Goals and Objectives, the two MPOs developed a set of common Performance Measures related to the objectives that would enable tracking progress over time. Measures fall into one of three categories: i) those that can be determined quantitatively using analytic methods and data already available, ii) those that can be determined quantitatively, but will require new analysis methods and/or additional data, or iii) those that would need to use more qualitative methods, such as surveys or focus groups, to judge our progress.

Performance measures that are currently quantifiable were determined for three comparative conditions:

- 2015 – This is the current condition. It is the 2015 population and employment using the 2015 transportation network (e.g., highways and transit service).
- 2045 E+C – This is the “Existing plus Committed” (E+C) network which includes the existing and under-construction transportation network and the 2045 population and employment.
- 2045 – This is the 2045 MTP transportation network plan as adopted by the two MPOs using the 2045 population and employment.

Although the measures are common to both MPOs, each MPO may choose different target values they wish to achieve for each measure based on conditions and priorities specific to each MPO. A priority for the two MPOs once the Plan is adopted is to develop or refine specific target values and to use these values in prioritizing the implementation of projects.

The performance measures have been crafted to align with new and developing performance requirements under the Federal FAST Act, the nation's transportation law. In particular, both MPOs have approved performance measures and targets for transit asset state-of-good-repair measures that are FAST Act compliant (the DCHC MPO on June 14, 2017 and the Capital Area MPO on June 21, 2017) and are adopting the NCDOT FAST Act safety measures and targets with this Plan. Additional FAST-Act compliant measures and targets will be adopted through subsequent amendments to this Plan. The MPOs will continue to coordinate with NCDOT and other agencies to adopt Highway Safety Improvement Program measures as they are required.

The following measures are used for this plan; some of the measures support more than one objective:

<i>Performance Measure</i>	<i>FAST Act Target</i>
% of work and non-work trips by auto that take less than 30 minutes	
% of work and non-work trips by transit that take less than 45 minutes	
% of urbanized area within ¼ mile of pedestrian facilities	
% of planned investment in existing roadways (versus new alignment).	
Amount and % of population and jobs in "travel choice neighbor-hoods:" areas accessible to light rail, bus rapid transit, commuter rail and frequent bus service (½ mile to stations, ¼ mile to frequent bus service)	
Amount and % of legally binding affordable housing units located with ½ mile of transit infrastructure stations or frequent bus service	
% of Environmental Justice population and total population within ½ mile of bus service, 1 mile of rail service, ½ mile of bike facilities or ¼ mile of sidewalk	
Per capita transit service hours	
Total transit boardings per capita	
% of bus stops meeting defined facility criteria (e.g. benches, shelters, arriving bus status)	
5-year average of expenditures on cycling/walking facilities	
Proportion of jurisdictions with ordinance requirements for sidewalk construction or in-lieu fees	
Transit, cycling and walking mode shares (overall, in transit corridors, in travel choice neighborhoods)	
Average clearance time for crashes on principal roadways	
Daily minutes of delay per capita	
% of peak hour travelers driving alone	
Total individuals provided TDM program and activity support	
# of employees working for Best Workplace for Commuters employers	
Vehicle miles of travel (VMT) per capita	
Amount of ITS investments	
% of lane miles with NCDOT unacceptable pavement condition rating	
Number and % of structurally deficient bridges	

<i>Performance Measure</i>	<i>FAST Act Target</i>
% of reported potholes repaired within two days by NCDOT	
% of transit equipment meeting or exceeding useful life benchmark	CAMPO: 30% DCHC MPO: 50%
% of transit vehicles by asset class meeting or exceeding useful life benchmark	CAMPO: 30% DCHC MPO: 50%
% of transit facilities with condition rating below 3.0 on Federal Transit Administration Transit Economic Requirements Model scale	CAMPO: 40% DCHC MPO: 0%
% of cycling facilities by type (bike lanes, shared use paths, etc.) rated in good condition	
# of public participants in each process by type (in-person, email, survey, social media)	
Environmental Justice requirements met by 2045 MTP	
# of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries	↓ 5.3%/year (statewide)
# of total fatalities	↓ 5.1%/year (statewide)
Total fatalities rate (per 100 million vehicle miles traveled)	↓ 4.75%/year (statewide)
# of total serious injuries	↓ 5.1%/year (statewide)
Total serious injuries rate (per 100 million vehicle miles traveled)	↓ 4.75%/year (statewide)
% of adults who are physically active	
Minutes of truck delay per trip	
Freight buffer time index	
Average payback period of investments by mode	
% of TIP projects completed on-time (let to construction) by mode	
% of MTP projects built in the time period in which they first appeared	
% of TIP projects built in the time period in which they first appeared	
Emissions per capita from on-road mobile sources (ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, greenhouse gases)	
Energy consumption per capita from transportation sources	

Section 6.5 of this plan includes the results of analyzing the performance measures. This report also presents a detailed analysis of Environmental Justice issues in section 9.2 – *Critical Factors in Planning – Environmental Justice (EJ)*, and provides a comparison of the location of 2045 MTP projects and EJ populations in Appendix 12 – *Environmental Justice Project Tables*.

Key points from this section:

- Our MPOs have a single vision for what our region’s transportation system should achieve.
- Both MPOs adopted consistent goals and objectives to accomplish this vision, and a common set of performance measures to track progress towards the goals and objectives.
- Each MPO may choose different target values they wish to achieve, based on the conditions and priorities of the different MPOs.
- Performance measures are designed to align with Federal requirements under the FAST Act, the federal transportation law; and targets for safety and transit asset state of good repair are included as part of the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

5. How We Developed Our Plan

This section describes the organizations and technical tools used to develop the Plan, how the public was involved in the Plan's development and review, and other recent and on-going studies and plans that relate to the Plan.

5.1 Who is Responsible for the Plan?

Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are the regional organizations responsible for transportation planning for urban areas, and therefore are charged with developing their individual Plans. The Research Triangle Region has two MPOs: The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro (DCHC) MPO and the Capital Area MPO (CAMPO).

The CAMPO planning area covers all of Wake County and portions of Franklin, Granville, Harnett and Johnston Counties, along with 18 municipalities in these five counties. The DCHC planning area covers all of Durham County, a portion of Orange County including the towns of Chapel Hill, Carrboro and Hillsborough, and northeast Chatham County. *Figure 2.2.3* in Chapter 2 shows a map of the MPO boundaries. The DCHC MPO and CAMPO are also two of the eleven urbanized areas in North Carolina designated as Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) by the principal federal transportation legislation called *Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act*. TMAs are urbanized areas with a population over 200,000, and have additional responsibilities such as the development of a congestion management process and direct allocation of certain federal revenues. Much of the MPO organizational structure and processes are designed to address state and federal legislation related to transportation. Each MPO is comprised of two committees:

Policy Board (PB) – The Policy Board coordinates and makes decisions on transportation planning issues. The Board is comprised of elected and appointed officials from each county, municipality and major transit provider within the MPO, and from the NCDOT.

For the Capital Area MPO, these officials are from the counties of Franklin, Granville, Harnett, Johnson and Wake, the municipalities of Angier, Apex, Archer Lodge, Bunn, Cary, Clayton, Creedmoor, Franklinton, Fuquay-Varina, Garner, Holly Springs, Knightdale, Morrisville, Raleigh, Roseville, Wake Forest, Wendell, Youngsville and Zebulon, GoTriangle and the North Carolina Department of Transportation. The Board also has advisory (non-voting) members from the NC Turnpike Authority and the Federal Highway Administration.

For the DCHC MPO, these officials are from the City of Durham, the Town of Chapel Hill, the Town of Carrboro, the Town of Hillsborough, Durham County, Orange County, Chatham County, GoTriangle and the North Carolina Department of Transportation. The Board also has advisory (non-voting) members from the Federal Highway Administration.

Technical Committee (TC) – The TC is composed of staff members from our local governments, Triangle Transit, Research Triangle Park, Triangle J Council of Governments, Raleigh-Durham Airport Authority, Carolina Trailways, the NC Turnpike Authority and the largest universities in the applicable MPO: North Carolina Central University, University of North Carolina and Duke University in the DCHC MPO, and North Carolina State University in CAMPO. The TC staff, who provide technical recommendations to the Policy Board, are commonly transportation, land use, community, and facility planners and engineers. The final key organizational element of the MPO is the Lead Planning Agency (LPA). The LPA is responsible for the administration and oversight of the planning, project implementation, grant funding, and other MPO related activities. In the DCHC MPO, the LPA staff work for the City of Durham's Transportation Department. In CAMPO, the staff are employees of the City of Raleigh, but only work on MPO tasks.

5.2 Stakeholder & Public Involvement Process

Extensive input and coordination activities were used to develop the 2045 MTP. These activities included both regional coordination efforts between the two MPOs and involvement of the public and local elected officials by each MPO.

Regional Coordination

Several regional coordination activities were undertaken to ensure that the two MPO plans would be integrated and mutually supportive. The key coordination activities are described throughout the various sections of this report in detail. The following list provides a summary of key coordinated activities used to develop the Plan:

- County Transit Plans -- The DCHC MPO and their respective counties updated the Durham County Transit Plan and the Orange County Transit Plan in 2017. The Capital Area MPO and Wake County approved the Wake County Transit Plan in 2016. These plans designate the general design for improved bus, light rail, commuter rail and bus rapid transit in their respective counties, and the funding sources to finance these improvements.
- Connect 2045 CommunityViz -- The MPOs fund, guide and use the same Socioeconomic Data forecast process and model. This process convened local planners, developers and other professionals who impact the development process to create the Community Visualization land use model (version 2) and produce population and employment projections.
- Alternatives -- The MPOs jointly defined and evaluated the various land use and highway, bus transit and light rail transit alternatives, and selected the same land use alternative for development into the final Plan.
- Joint Policy Board Meeting -- The MPOs' conducted joint MPO Policy Board meetings on November 30, 2016 and November 30, 2017 to advance 2045 MTP coordination at the policy board level.
- Financial Plan -- The MPOs used the same financial methodologies and cost and revenue basis for highways, bus transit, rail transit, and all aspects of the plan.
- Triangle Regional Model (TRM) -- The MPOs used the same principal planning tool for the 2045 MTP, the Triangle Regional Model (TRM -- the region's travel demand model), version 6.
- Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures -- The two MPOs developed and used the same set of Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures to guide the selection of a land use scenario and of projects in the 2045 MTP process.

MPO Public Involvement Policy

Both MPOs have a formal public involvement policy that governs the public input process for not only the MTP process but for all major activities such as the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The policies prescribe: the methods for notifying the public; the type of input activities such as workshops and hearings; the minimum comment period; the use of visual techniques; and outreach to special groups such as low-income, minority and limited-English proficiency households, and people with disabilities. Policy updates are planned to increase engagement with agencies focused on travel & tourism, and on resiliency and the reduction of natural disasters. A regional resiliency assessment underway with the Triangle J Council of Governments can be used as a platform for expanding outreach and communication with agency partners. The public involvement policy for each MPO is available at:

CAMPO -- www.campo-nc.us

DCHC MPO -- www.dchcmpo.org

MTP Public Involvement Process

Decisions cannot be based solely on numbers and the interpretation of Goals and Objectives by staff and the MPOs Policy Boards. The 2045 MTP included a comprehensive public involvement process to use citizen and stakeholder input for providing a critical evaluation of the products for each stage of developing the plan. Citizens, public officials and board and commission members took advantage of a variety of planning and public input activities to voice their opinions and concerns.

Figure 5.2.1, Summary of Public Involvement Activities, demonstrates the breadth and depth of this public involvement effort by summarizing the many activities that occurred in each stage of the MTP's development for both CAMPO and DCHC MPO.

There are some notable details to the Figure 5.2.1 table. For example, the media effort was especially intensive and usually included:

- Draft documents and detailed supporting data available on the MPOs' Web sites;
- Notices in newspapers for workshops, hearings and other public involvement activities;
- Email lists to notify members of the community who have participated or indicated an interest in related planning activities. This included information about public workshops and input events as well as public hearings.
- Information was shared using social media platforms such as LinkedIn, Facebook, and Twitter, including a Facebook targeted ad campaign that reached more than 11,500 people across the region.
- Various formats for citizens to provide public comments included email, paper feedback forms, public workshops, information tables at community events, hearings and presentations at local elected officials' meetings.
- The DCHC MPO Goals and Objectives and CAMPO Alternatives Analysis were supported by online surveys that attracted over 800 respondents in one particular survey.

In addition, there were many workshops and targeted outreach in the various member jurisdictions or multi-jurisdictional areas, and over a dozen presentations to local elected officials, boards and commissions. As a result of this extensive outreach effort, many of the elected bodies and locally-appointed boards and commissions provided considerable input through formal resolutions to the MPO Policy Boards. Special outreach was made to environmental, cultural and other resource agencies, with local chambers of commerce and convention and visitors bureaus, and with providers of Transportation Demand Management services.

One of the commitments in a consultative process is to circle back with public participants and inform them of any final decisions or outcomes, and how their input influenced those outcomes. Upon adoption of the 2045 MTP document in early 2018, it is the intention of both MPOs to send a media release, email update, website update, and social media posts advertising the adoption as well as post on the websites a spreadsheet of comments received including a staff response regarding the disposition.

This public involvement process met and exceeded the MPOs' public involvement policies for developing a transportation plan.

The extent of the public involvement process to identify and choose projects for the 2045 MTP go beyond the MTP development process. Many 2045 MTP projects have been incorporated from local and MPO plans identified in section "5.4 -- Related Plans and Studies" of this report. These plans and studies have commonly employed their own extensive public involvement process.

Figure 5.2.1 – Summary of Public Involvement Activities

Decision	Activity				
	MPO Approval (2)	Public Hearing	Public Engagement	Draft for Public Review	Media Notification
Goals and Objectives					
CAMPO	10/19/16	--	Public notice	11/21/15 08/17/16	--
DCHC	01/10/17	03/09/16	Online survey & workshop	02/12/16	Yes
2045 Growth Guide Totals					
CAMPO	10/19/16 02/21/18	--	Public notice	08/17/16	--
DCHC	--	--	--	09/14/16	--
Transportation Model (2)	(TransCAD version 6)				
CAMPO	10/19/16 02/21/18	--	Public Notice	08/07/16 01/11/18	Yes
DCHC	01/10/18	--	Public Notice	12/13/17	Yes
Deficiency Analysis					
CAMPO	--	--	Public Notice	03/15/17	Yes
DCHC	--	--	--	06/14/17	Yes
Alternatives Evaluation					
CAMPO	08/16/17	--	Public notice	04/17/17	Yes
DCHC	--	09/13/17	4 workshops	08/09/17	Yes
Approve 2045 MTP (1)					
CAMPO	12/13/17	12/13/17	20 workshops (10 Transit, 10 multimodal)	10/31/17	Yes
DCHC	12/13/17	11/08/17	Public Notice	11/01/17	Yes
Adopt 2045 MTP & Report (2)					
CAMPO	02/21/18	02/21/18	Public notice	01/11/18	Yes
DCHC	01/10/18	--	Public notice	12/13/17	Yes

Dashed lines, "--", indicate that the activity was not carried out because it is not a formal part of the metropolitan transportation plan or the MPO's public involvement policy.

(1) Includes the principal parts of the 2045 MTP that are presented in the Preferred Option report, including the Goals and Objectives, socioeconomic data, project lists and maps, and the financial plan.

(2) Includes the principal parts of the 2045 MTP that were approved in December 2017, and the full report, Performance Measures and Targets that are already aligned with the Goals and Objectives, and the Triangle Regional Model (TRM) version 6.

Visualization Techniques

The use of visuals in reviewing a plan not only makes good sense but is a federal transportation policy requirement. The goal is to help the public and decision makers visualize and interact with transportation plans and projects, alternatives, large data sets and land-use information more effectively. The MPOs used extensive visual techniques throughout the 2045 MTP planning process to present data to the public, elected officials and staff. Visual highlights are summarized directly below. *Figure 5.2.2 Examples of Visualization Techniques* provides some samples; however, the MPOs' MTP Web sites demonstrate the extensive use of interactive maps, tables and graphics used throughout the 2045 MTP planning process.

Socioeconomic Data

There are "dot-density" maps of population and employment growth to the year 2045. Examples: see section 6.2 of this report, and the Land Use or SE Data Web pages on the MPOs' 2045 MTP Web sites.

Projects

All the highway, bus transit, rail transit and bicycle projects have been depicted on maps and listed in tables that included the project attribute data. Examples: see section 7 and appendices 1 through 4 of this report; and the 2045 MTP Web pages on the MPOs' Web sites, which include links to interactive online maps.

Deficiency Analysis

The deficiency analysis provided interactive and static maps of roadway congestion levels, travel time between key points and travel time isochrones. Examples: see section 6.3 of this report; and the deficiency analysis Web pages on the MPOs' Web sites, which include links to interactive online maps.


Financial Plan

The financial plan used pie and bar charts to present data. Examples: see MPOs' Web sites for draft reports and presentations throughout the planning process.

Others

The presentations throughout the 2040 MTP planning process and this final report have dozens of maps and graphics to depict everything from the status of the planning process to the relationship of the MTP, CTP and TIP.

Figure 5.2.2 -- Examples of Visualization Techniques



5.3 Triangle Region Transportation Model

The Triangle Regional Model (TRM) is a tool that was developed for understanding how future growth in the region impacts transportation facilities and services. The TRM can help identify the location and scale of future transportation problems, and proposed solutions to those problems can be tested using the TRM. The TRM is developed and maintained by the TRM Service Bureau housed at the Institute for Transportation Research and Education on behalf of the DCHC MPO, CAMPO, North Carolina Department of Transportation, and GoTriangle, the four organizations that fund the modeling effort and guide its development and use.

The modeled area covers approximately 3,400 square miles, and includes all of Wake, Orange and Durham counties and part of Chatham, Franklin, Granville, Harnett, Nash, Person, and Johnston counties. This area is divided into over 2,800 geographic areas (traffic analysis zones) for which detailed population and employment information is maintained. The highway system is represented by about 20,000 roadway links in 2013 (the calibrated base year) and about 22,000 roadway links in 2045. The roadway links are described by detailed characteristics including: length, number of lanes by direction, speed, and traffic carrying capacity. Transit services operated by GoRaleigh, GoDurham, Chapel Hill Transit, GoTriangle, GoCary, Wofline, and Duke Transit are represented in the model as well. Transit services are described by detailed characteristics including: length, stop locations, speed, frequency of service, and average rider-perceived fare.

The model produces summary statistics including: vehicle miles of travel, vehicle hours traveled, degree of traffic congestion, number of trips taken by travel mode, and transit riders. The model also computes trip statistics for each of the approximately 2,800 traffic analysis zones, categorized by mode, general trip purposes, and origin or destination zone. These statistics are shown elsewhere in the report in tables and maps. Statistics on speed and vehicle miles of travel by type of roadway are used to calculate air quality impacts for the plan.

The model is an advanced four step travel demand forecasting model. Models like the TRM forecast travel using the following sub-models, or steps:

- Trip Generation – based on population and employment data for each traffic analysis zone, calculate the number of trips people will make for various trip purposes, and the number of trips likely to go to destinations throughout the region.
- Trip Distribution – based on the number of trips generated for each purpose, the cost to travel from zone to zone, and the characteristics of the zones, calculate the trips from each zone to other zones.
- Mode Choice – based on the trips calculated in trip distribution, characteristics of the traveler, transit service characteristics, highway congestion, and other service characteristics, calculate for each trip purpose the number of trips made by automobile, carpooling, and transit.
- Trip Assignment – based on highway speeds and transit speed, find a route that takes the shortest time to get from one zone to another zone and sum the trips on that roadway or transit route. The model includes feedback to allow the travel times to include the effects of traffic congestion on the calculation of the shortest time on roadway links or transit services.

Model relationships were developed using 2006 household survey data, 2010 census data, transit survey data, traffic counts taken throughout the Triangle, and a survey of travelers entering or leaving the modeled area. The model was validated to 2010 traffic count and transit rider data. The model inputs were also updated to 2013 and validated to traffic counts and transit passenger counts. The model version used for this analysis was adopted for use in December, 2016 by the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO, Capital Area MPO, North Carolina Department of Transportation and GoTriangle and is referred to as TRM Version 6.

5.4 Related Plans and Studies

Although the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) serves as the main guiding document for regional transportation investments, many related transportation plans and studies feed into the development of the MTP and provide a more detailed look at projects, priorities, and selection issues.

This section highlights past and current plans and studies that have been used to inform the development of the 2045 MTP. Section 7.11, later in this document, identifies future plans and studies that are recommended to clarify issues and provide details for project selection for the next MTP.

Examples of studies undertaken in the region to better inform the development of the 2045 MTP, include: Corridor plans that address roadway design and operations on specific roadways; Small area plans that identify multimodal transportation investments and related development issues in a particular part of the region; and, Transit plans that range from broad regional vision to short-range investment plans for specific transit providers. Those that apply specifically to one MPO or the other are color-coded. CAMPO projects have this **yellow background** and DCHC MPO projects have this **green background**. Projects with no background color apply to both MPOs:

	Plan or Study	Type
1	<i>North Carolina Railroad Commuter Rail Capacity Study.</i> Identifies the capital costs needed for track improvements, stations and vehicles to provide peak-period, peak-direction commuter rail services between Goldsboro and Greensboro. www.ncrr.com/capacity-study.html	Transit Plan
2	<i>North Carolina Railroad Commuter Rail Ridership and Market Study.</i> Estimates ridership and revenues, and recommends service levels for commuter rail services. www.ncrr.com/capital-investment/commuter-rail-ridership-study/	Transit Plan
3	<i>CORE Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan.</i> A linked network of pedestrian, bicycle and greenspace facilities within the jurisdiction of 7 local governments and several regional agencies in the Center of the Region. www.tjcog.org/core-reports-downloads.aspx	Functional Plan
4	<i>Triangle Region Long Range Transportation Demand Management Plan.</i> Recommended 7-year investment strategy to provide regional TDM services, local TDM services in specified “hot spots” and an administrative structure to fund, manage, monitor and evaluate TDM services across both MPOs. http://tjcog.org/triangle-transportation-demand-management-program.aspx	Functional Plan
5	<i>Congestion Management Plan (CMP).</i> Collects travel and safety data for vehicles, pedestrian, bicycles and transit services to identify current and short-term trend congestion levels. Also, it defines congestion, identifies specific mitigation measures for congestion and provides a state of the system report to meet federal requirements. The DCHC MPO has a System Status Report and Mobility Report Card. http://www.dchcmpo.org/programs/cmp/default.asp The Capital Area MPO has a Congestion Management Process (CMP) and System Status Report. http://www.campo-nc.us/programs-studies/cmptdm	Functional Plan

	Plan or Study	Type
6	<i>Triangle Freight Study.</i> Evaluated current freight system needs and identified policy and project recommendations for future improvements to the freight network. The study included truck, rail, and air components and initiated the creation of the Regional Freight Stakeholder Advisory Committee. The study included a comprehensive regional analysis of freight, goods movement, and services mobility needs and developed recommendations for the 2045 joint MTP.	Functional Plan
7	<i>RDU Vision 2040.</i> A master plan of short-, medium-, and long-term development plans needed to meet future aviation demand, while considering potential environmental and socioeconomic issues. https://vision2040.rdu.com/	Functional Plan
8	<i>ITS Strategic Deployment Plan Update.</i> Plan includes a snapshot of best practices, list of projects, regional ITS architecture, and guidelines for maintaining the Plan. http://www.campo-nc.us/programs-studies/its	Functional Plan
9	<i>Wake Transit Plan –</i> Operating plan and capital program for transit services in the Wake County portion of the Capital Area MPO. This plan was developed to guide the public transportation improvements derived from a potential local option sales tax. https://www.waketransit.com	Transit Plan
10	<i>US 1 Phases I & II Corridor Studies.</i> Recommended a comprehensive multimodal transportation and growth plan that will preserve the functional characteristic of this corridor, manage the overall growth within the area, enhance the quality of life of its surrounding communities, and provide for the local and regional transportation needs along US-1 between I-540 and the northern MPO boundary http://us-1corridornorth.com/	Corridor Study
11	<i>NC 50 Corridor Study.</i> A comprehensive corridor study that recommended implementation actions designed to; Improve transportation mobility and traffic safety along the corridor, Preserve the residential and rural nature of the corridor while supporting regional economic development, and support activities to protect recreation, water quality, and the environment in the Falls Lake watershed http://www.kimley-horn.com/projects/nc50study/index.html	Corridor Study
12	<i>NC 54 and More Study.</i> A feasibility study that investigated the costs and impacts of proposed facility upgrades to the NC 54 Corridor from NC 540 to Northwest Maynard Road, within the Municipalities of Morrisville and Cary and recommended roadway widening, intersection improvements, improvements for pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit services, potential railroad grade separations, crossing consolidation, proposed rail transit, and proposed railroad expansion plans for freight, intercity passenger rail and commuter. http://www.townofcary.org/Departments/Engineering/Streets_and_Sidewalks/Streets_Projects/NC54_MoreFeasibilityStudy.htm	Corridor Study

	Plan or Study	Type
13	<p><i>Southwest Area Study.</i> Evaluated the dependence of local commuters on regional routes such as NC 55, US 401, NC 42, NC 540 and NC 210, coupled with potential demand for increased development in the southwest area of the MPO jurisdiction. Recommended initiatives addressed strategic improvements to regionally significant corridors, provision of increased transit/fixed guideway services, and sustainable development patterns.</p> <p>http://www.southwestareastudy.com/</p>	Special Area Study
14	<p><i>Northeast Area Study.</i> Initiated by CAMPO to identify a sustainable transportation strategy for the growing communities of Wake Forest, Knightdale, Raleigh, Wendell, Zebulon, Rolesville, Bunn, Franklinton, and Youngsville. This region encompasses 374 square miles of a unique mix of a large metropolitan area, small towns, suburbs and farming communities painted across a broad expanse of rural tapestry in both eastern Wake and southern Franklin counties. The study evaluated the dependence of local commuters on regional routes such as I-87/Future I-87, US 401, NC 98, NC 97, NC 540, , I-95, US 70, NC 42, NC 540, and NC 50, coupled with increasing development pressures in southeast Wake and northwest Johnston Counties. Recommended initiatives addressed strategic improvements to regionally significant corridors, provision of increased transit/fixed guideway services, and more sustainable development patterns. http://www.campo-nc.us/programs-studies/area-studies/northeast-area-study</p>	Special Area Study
15	<p><i>Southeast Area Study.</i> Evaluated the dependence of local commuters on regional routes such as I-40, I-95, US 70, NC 42, NC 540, and NC 50, coupled with increasing development pressures in southeast Wake and northwest Johnston Counties. Recommended initiatives addressed strategic improvements to regionally significant corridors, provision of increased transit/fixed guideway services, and more sustainable development patterns.</p> <p>http://www.southeastareastudy.com/</p>	Special Area Study
16	<p><i>Raleigh-Cary Rail Crossing Study.</i> The study evaluated potential improvements to the at-grade roadway/rail crossings from NE Maynard Road in Cary to Gorman Street in Raleigh, with a focus on how changes at the crossings will affect future land uses and connectivity within the community. In addition to looking at existing crossings, this study also considered possible new roadway extensions across the railroad within the corridor.</p> <p>http://www.rcrxstudy.com/</p>	Corridor Study
17	<p><i>NC 56 Corridor Study.</i> A joint effort among the Town of Butner, City of Creedmoor, Granville County, CAMPO, Kerr-Tarr RPO, and North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) to evaluate improvements for a 4.5-mile segment of NC 56 from 33rd Street in Butner to Darden Drive in Creedmoor. The goal of the study was to clarify the long-term vision for the corridor, while also identifying opportunities to address existing needs over a shorter timeframe.</p>	Corridor Study
18	<p><i>DCHC MPO Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP).</i> Deficiency analysis and maps of highway, public transportation, bicycle, pedestrian and multiuse path facilities and improvements needed in the long-range.</p> <p>http://www.dchcmopo.org/programs/ctp/default.asp</p>	Long-range Plan
19	<p><i>Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision (FEIS/ROD).</i> The FEIS evaluates the environmental,</p>	Transit Plan

	<p><i>transportation, social, and economic impacts of the transportation improvements, and the ROD is a concise public record of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) decisions.</i></p> <p>http://ourtransitfuture.com/library/lrt/</p>	
20	<p><i>Durham County Transit Plan and Orange County Transit Plan.</i> Identifies the transit projects, services, facilities and vehicles to be funded by four Tax District Revenue streams.</p> <p>http://ourtransitfuture.com/plans/</p>	Transit Plan
21	<p><i>North-South Corridor Study.</i> A 30-month study that evaluated a series of transit investments for implementation in the main north-south commuter corridor in Chapel Hills, and culminated in the adoption of a preferred-option that was accepted into the FTA Small Starts program.</p> <p>http://nscstudy.org/</p>	Transit Plan
22	<p><i>US 15-501 Corridor Study.</i> Traffic forecast and analysis used to identify policies and facilities to meet future travel demand and safety objectives, from Chapel Hill to Pittsboro</p> <p>http://www.dchcmpo.org/programs/local/corridor.asp</p>	Corridor Study
23	<p><i>NC 54/I-40 Corridor Study.</i> Study and recommendations to guide land use and transportation decisions and investments in the NC 54 corridor, from US 15-501 in Chapel Hill to I-40 in Durham.</p> <p>https://gis.dchcmpo.org/website/CorridorStudy/index.html</p>	Corridor Study
24	<p><i>Southwest Durham/Southeast Chapel Hill Collector Street Plan.</i> Small area plan recommending location of future collector streets and street designs to ensure future connectivity and multimodal street functioning.</p> <p>http://www.dchcmpo.org/programs/collector/swdurham/default.asp</p>	Functional Plan
25	<p><u>Local Bicycle Plans:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Carrboro Comprehensive Bicycle Transportation Plan, http://bit.ly/2z7c9JL -Chapel Hill Bike Plan, http://bit.ly/1uGbDZ5 -Chatham County Bicycle Plan, http://bit.ly/1TSdIUv -Durham Trails and Greenways Master Plan, http://bit.ly/2Cmfiax -Durham Bike+Walk Implementation Plan, http://bit.ly/2p2yHJS -Hillsborough Community Connectivity Plan, http://bit.ly/1UDAFHY -Orange County Comprehensive Plan: Transportation Element, http://bit.ly/1S5qjw1 	Functional Plan
26	<p><u>Local Pedestrian Plans:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Chapel Hill Mobility and Connectivity Plan, http://bit.ly/2zVt45w -Durham Trails and Greenways Master Plan, http://bit.ly/2Cmfiax -Durham Bike+Walk Implementation Plan, http://bit.ly/2p2yHJS -Hillsborough Community Connectivity Plan, http://bit.ly/1UDAFHY 	Functional Plan
27	<p><u>Local Multiuse Path Plans:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Chapel Hill Greenways Master Plan, http://bit.ly/1Pg2y4p 	Functional Plan

-Durham Trails and Greenways Master Plan, http://bit.ly/25KdgK3	
---	--

In addition, many plans that informed the development of earlier Metropolitan Transportation Plans continue to be used to support the development of the 2045 MTP, including:

- US 15-501 Major Investment Study, Phase II Report (December 2001).
- I-40 Express Lanes Feasibility Study (from I-85 to Wade Avenue, Orange, Durham and Wake Counties (FS-1205A), (2015).
- NC 147 Feasibility Study (from I-40 to NC 55) (FS-1205C), (2016).
- NC 54 widening, I-40 (exit 273) to NC 55 (FS 1005C), (2011)
- NC 751 widening, NC 54 to US 64 (FS-1008B), (2012)
- Northern Durham Parkway, I-540 to US 501, (Roxboro Rd.), (2014)

Key points from this section:

- Metropolitan Planning Organizations, or MPOs, are the organizations charged with creating and adopting Metropolitan Transportation Plans. MPOs are made up of all the local governments in the area, the NC Department of Transportation, plus other organizations with transportation responsibilities. This document includes the plans for the two MPOs in the Research Triangle Region: the Capital Area MPO and the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO.
- MPOs have 3 main organizational components: (i) the Policy Board, which is made up of local elected officials and a NC Department of Transportation board member; (ii) the Technical Committee, or TC, made up of technical staff from local, state and regional organizations that provide technical input; and (iii) the Lead Planning Agency, or LPA, which provides the staff support to carry out the MPO's responsibilities.
- Each MPO has an explicit, written Public Involvement Policy, which was used to garner public input into the plan and provide opportunities for public review and comment. Using maps, graphs, charts and other visual tools is an important part of conveying transportation-related information to a variety of stakeholders.
- One of the key tools used to understand the region's transportation challenges and the impacts of investments to address these challenges is the Triangle Regional Travel Demand Model (TRM), which covers both MPOs. A new and improved version of the model was used for the first time in the development of the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
- Many related transportation plans and studies are undertaken both to feed into the development of Metropolitan Transportation Plans and to provide a more detailed look at issues identified in or related to MTPs.

6. Analyzing Our Choices

This section explains what we did to better understand the choices facing our region, develop population and employment growth forecasts that reflect market trends and community plans, create and test alternative transportation scenarios, and compare these alternatives to one another and to performance measures that reflect the MPO's adopted goals and objectives.

6.1 Land Use Plans and Policies

Each community in the Triangle develops a comprehensive plan to outline its vision for the future and set policies for how it will guide future development to support that vision. So an important starting point for transportation plans is to understand these plans and reflect them in the future growth forecasts used to analyze transportation choices.

Local planners from communities throughout the region, along with experts in fields such as real estate development and utility provision, were brought together to translate community plans and market trends into the parameters used by the region's transportation model to generate travel forecasts: population and jobs by industry (see Section 5.3 for a more detailed explanation of the transportation model). To make sure the forecasts were consistent, transparent and based on the best available evidence, the region used sophisticated growth allocation software, called CommunityViz, to guide the forecasting effort.


The land use plans revealed that five regional-scale centers, depicted in Figure 6.1.1 are expected to contain large concentrations of employment and/or intense mixes of homes, workplaces, shops, medical centers, higher education institutions, visitor destinations and entertainment venues:

- Central Raleigh, including NC State University;
- Central Durham, including Duke University, North Carolina Central University and the Duke and Veterans Administration medical complexes;
- Central Chapel Hill & Carrboro, including UNC-Chapel Hill and UNC Hospitals;
- The Research Triangle Park; and
- Central Cary.

Linking these regional centers to one another, and connecting them with communities throughout the region by a variety of travel modes can afford expanded opportunities for people to have choices about where they live, work, learn and play.

In some cases, such as in central Cary, Durham and Chapel Hill & Carrboro, existing plans and the ordinances that implement the plans promote increased development of the activity centers. In addition, the Research Triangle Park recently adopted a new master plan that is designed to lead to more compact, mixed use development in selected locations, including a new Park Center in the heart of the RTP.

In addition to these regional centers, the review of community plans identified areas of the region that are most environmentally sensitive, including water supply watersheds, and places where existing neighborhoods warrant protection. Understanding the unique roles that different areas and different communities will play in the region as it grows established the framework for forecasting growth and designing transportation choices to serve this growth.



6.2 Socio-economic Forecasts

One of the initial critical steps in developing a Metropolitan Transportation Plan is to forecast the amount, type and location of population and jobs for the time frame of the plan. Based on community plans and data from local planning departments, the Office of State Budget and Management, the US Census Bureau and independent forecasters, estimates of “base year” (2013) and “plan year” (2045) population and jobs were developed by local planners for each of the 2,800 small zones (called Traffic Analysis Zones or TAZs) that make up the area covered by the region’s transportation model, called the Forecast Area.

Both to track and document the socioeconomic forecasts, and to permit analysis of different development scenarios, a robust land use mapping and analysis tool was used to account for the more than 700,000 individual parcels of land in the region. Using software called “CommunityViz,” each parcel was assigned one of 37 “place types” by local planners reflecting the kind of development anticipated by community plans, such as office building, retail center, mixed use development, single family home or apartment complex. In addition, each parcel was assigned a development status to indicate whether it was vacant, already fully developed, or partially developed or redevelopable. Depending on both the place type and the specific jurisdiction in which a parcel is located, average residential and employment densities were applied to determine the supply available to accept additional residential or commercial development.

Any constraints to development, such as water bodies, floodplains, stream buffers, or conservation easements were assigned to applicable parcels. The combination of place type, development status and development constraints established the “supply” side of the CommunityViz growth allocation model. Special attention was given to anchor institutions, such as the major universities and the RDU Airport. Future growth in these areas was based on meetings with and data from the people at these institutions involved in

facility planning and construction.

Panels of experts were convened to help determine the principal influences on where future development would occur, and to develop quantitative measures, called “suitability factors,” that could be applied to the parcels based on these influences. Examples of factors that influence development include availability of sewer service, proximity to highway interchanges or transit stations, and distances to major economic centers like the region’s universities.


Finally, a set of population and job control totals were developed from state and national demographic sources to establish the “demand side” of the model. These guide totals are available online at this link: <http://bit.ly/2AN8Qri>. CommunityViz was used to allocate single family housing units, multi-family housing units and jobs based on the available supply and the attractiveness of each parcel based on the suitability factors.

Figure 6.2.1 summarizes the major elements of the socioeconomic forecasts for different portions of the Forecast Area covered by the region’s transportation model, both the areas within the MPO boundaries and areas beyond the MPO boundaries (refer to Figure 2.2.3 for a map of the MPOs and the modeled area). More detailed information on a range of socioeconomic data for each TAZ is available from the Capital Area MPO and the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO and in documents available from the Triangle J Council of Governments describing the application of the CommunityViz model and its 2045 MTP results.

<i>Figure 6.2.1 Estimated 2013 and Forecast 2045 Jobs, Population and Households (1)</i>	2013			2045		
	Population	Households	Jobs	Population	Households	Jobs
Capital Area MPO	1,117,162	435,008	537,515	2,033,698	778,320	1,003,486
Franklin County (part)	40,320	15,275	6,575	70,414	26,935	15,582
Granville County (part)	19,555	7,408	3,416	31,800	11,904	4,936
Harnett County (part)	19,141	7,205	3,012	36,545	13,516	5,336
Johnston County (part)	97,380	35,170	18,546	179,180	64,636	38,151
Wake County	940,766	369,950	505,966	1,715,759	661,329	939,481
Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO	402,552	170,239	257,750	615,716	253,919	450,110
Chatham County (part)	20,732	9,147	3,644	27,988	11,938	3,820
Durham County	269,916	114,685	192,877	430,782	176,943	343,082
Orange County (part)	111,904	46,407	61,229	156,946	65,038	103,208
Areas outside MPO boundaries	159,949	63,337	55,303	308,235	117,215	77,341
Chatham County (part)	21,250	8,806	5,695	58,259	23,562	14,106
Franklin County (part)	11,912	4,919	6,418	14,802	6,119	6,868
Granville County (part)	10,646	4,118	4,957	13,931	5,331	7,101
Harnett County (part)	15,888	6,113	2,677	24,608	9,127	4,291
Johnston County (part)	47,731	18,168	22,294	137,006	49,156	29,021
Nash County (part)	4,075	1,531	300	5,784	2,164	409
Orange County (part)	16,508	6,699	2,983	19,130	7,706	3,865
Person County (part)	31,939	12,983	9,979	34,715	14,050	11,680
Total for forecast area	1,679,663	668,584	850,568	2,957,649	1,149,454	1,530,937

(1) These totals represent the values within the regional travel model’s traffic analysis zones, and may differ from values derived using other sources and methods; note that population includes people who are not in households, such as university dormitory residents.

The maps below show the distribution of population and jobs within the Forecast Area for the 2013 “base year,” the 2045 “horizon year” and for the growth from 2013 to 2045. Larger versions are available from the MPOs.



Population or Employment per square mile: 0 100 500 1,000 10,000 100,000

6.3 Trends, Deficiencies, and Needs

With the large increases in people and jobs expected in the region over the 30-year period between 2013 and 2045, the amount of travel -- often measured in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) -- in the Triangle is expected to similarly grow by well over 100 percent. Future stress on the regional transportation network is exemplified by the high levels of congestion predicted in 2045.

The congestion maps on the next page show the average volumes during the afternoon peak hour as predicted by the Triangle Regional Model. The 2013 “base year” Congestion Levels map indicates travel conditions in the year 2013, whereas the 2045 Deficiencies Map, or “Existing plus Committed” (E+C), forecasts travel conditions in the year 2045 using the current highway, transit and other transportation facilities and any facilities that are well on their way to being completed. This deficiencies network is often called the “no build” scenario, since it typically is the result of past decisions, not ones that still need to be made.

This worst case scenario is not intended to represent an actual possible outcome. Rather, comparing E+C to the 2045 MTP network illustrates the failure of our committed transportation improvements to meet the growth in anticipated travel demand that is forecasted to occur during the useful life of these investments. In reality, as congestion and travel delay began to reach the unacceptable levels, other contributing factors would begin to shift. Additionally, commute patterns would change as people began changing travel decisions.

The third map is the 2045 MTP congestion map, showing levels of congestion if we provide all the transportation facilities and services included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plans.

The maps presented on the following pages provide a picture of the challenge we face in developing realistic transportation investments that meet the diverse needs of our communities. Larger versions of these maps are available on the MPOs’ web sites. In addition, the MPO web sites have many other maps and tables that present the results of the Deficiency Analysis.

Trip Volumes and Capacity

The roadway networks shown on the next page are simplified representations taken from the region’s travel model. Thicker lines depict roadways with higher traffic volumes, thinner lines segments carrying lesser volumes. The colors correspond to Volume/Capacity ratios (this is the number of vehicles divided by the theoretical capacity of the road); greater Volume/Capacity ratios correspond with more congestion. A Volume/Capacity ratio below 0.8 (in **green**) is indicative of a relatively free flowing roadway with little or no congestion. Once the Volume/Capacity, or V/C ratio, rises towards 1.0, motorists will experience more periods of congestion. Volume/Capacity ratios greater than 1.0 (in **red**) represent roadways which are consistently congested throughout and beyond the peak hours of travel. The first map shows conditions in 2010. The 2045 E & C map shows that without significant new investments, chronic congestion will occur on major arterials and freeways throughout the region, and particularly within Wake County. The 2045 MTP map shows forecast conditions if we build and operate the facilities and services in this plan.


Travel Time


A more meaningful way to measure the effects of congestion to the average traveler is how it affects the time it takes to make a trip. Maps on the following pages illustrate these travel time effects in a number of ways.


Figure 6.3.1: I-40 near US 1 Interchange




The map at the lower right shows how average travel time in different zones changes between the road network that will be finished by 2013 and 2045 conditions. For example, if a zone has an average increase of four minutes, each trip in that zone in 2045 can expect to take an extra four minutes compared to today.








**PM Peak Travel Time
(in Minutes)**



The maps below convey travel time impacts in a different way, showing how far a person could travel from a given location by motor vehicle in a given amount of time during a typical afternoon “rush hour” in the Year 2045. Each color band represents 15 minutes of travel time.

County Border



6.4 Alternatives Analysis

In order to address the expressed Goals and Objectives, CAMPO and DCHC MPO developed and evaluated several alternatives in the process to create the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Each alternative was a combination of a transportation system, which includes a set of roadway, transit and other transportation improvements; and a land use scenario that distributes the forecasted population and employment for the Year 2045. These alternatives were run on the Triangle Regional Model (TRM) to produce a set of transportation performance measures that described how the transportation system will handle the travel demand generated by a particular population and employment distribution in the year 2045.

Performance measures, such as the level of roadway congestion, average travel time, and transit ridership, were used to evaluate and compare the various alternatives. No alternative in its entirety was advanced as the final adopted plan. The alternatives were designed to emphasize a particular mode in meeting the future travel demands so that the technical staff and public can understand how well that specific mode addresses travel demand and can choose various projects to create the final 2045 MTP. Figure 6.4.1 is a list of the combinations of transportation systems and land use that were used to create the Alternatives that were analyzed to develop the final 2045 MTP.

Figure 6.4.1 Alternatives Evaluated

#	Transportation System	Land Use Scenario
1	<u>Constrained</u> – Modest state and federal transit funding; current STI rail constraints remain; No increase in state or federal gas tax (declining revenues as efficiencies outpace growth); Wake County local option sales tax and funds per plan – additional projects beyond 10 years; STI-limited division tier road projects and ped-bike funding with no increase in historical local effort	<u>By Right</u> – Population and employment growth occurs based on current land use zoning or the equivalent.
2	<u>Constrained</u> – Modest state and federal transit funding; current STI rail constraints remain; No increase in state or federal gas tax (declining revenues as efficiencies outpace growth); Wake County local option sales tax and funds per plan – additional projects beyond 10 years; STI-limited division tier road projects and ped-bike funding with no increase in historical local effort	<u>Community Plans</u> – Population and employment growth occurs based on current land use plans.
3	<u>Moderate</u> – Restoration of original STI conditions with removal of rail constraints; No major change to state or federal gas tax or alternative, but assume FAST revenue trend; Wake County local option sales tax and funds per plan – additional projects beyond 10 years; Modest increase in local funding compared to historical trend	<u>Community Plans</u> – Population and employment growth occurs based on current land use plans.

#	Transportation System	Land Use Scenario
	<u>Moderate</u> – Restoration of original STI conditions with removal of rail constraints; No major change to state or federal gas tax or alternative, but assume FAST revenue trend; Wake County local option sales tax and funds per plan – additional projects beyond 10 years; Modest increase in local funding compared to historical trend	<u>Anchor Institutions & Mainstays (AIM) - High</u> – Population and employment growth based on current land use plans but incorporates development decisions of Anchor institutions (large "place-based" institutions with fixed locations that serve as major employment hubs and travel destinations) and Mainstays (key activity centers with the potential for significantly influencing mobility within the region).
4	<u>Aspirational</u> – More state/federal project success than local plans currently assume; Modest increase in federal or state revenues (e.g. based on higher investment states); STI refined to redefine statewide and regional projects for transit and remove constraints, while allowing more dollars for division tier roadways; Greater increase in local funding compared to historical record	<u>Community Plans</u> – Population and employment growth occurs based on current land use plans.
5	<u>Aspirational</u> – More state/federal project success than local plans currently assume; Modest increase in federal or state revenues (e.g. based on higher investment states); STI refined to redefine statewide and regional projects for transit and remove constraints, while allowing more dollars for division tier roadways; Greater increase in local funding compared to historical record	<u>Anchor Institutions & Mainstays (AIM) - High</u> – Population and employment growth based on current land use plans but incorporates development decisions of Anchor institutions (large "place-based" institutions with fixed locations that serve as major employment hubs and travel destinations) and Mainstays (key activity centers with the potential for significantly influencing mobility within the region).

The MPO staffs in conjunction with staff from the Triangle Regional Model Service Bureau worked together to create and run the model scenarios during the spring and summer of 2017. These options were further reduced to a “preferred option” that incorporated a road network, a bus transit network, and light rail and commuter rail transit investments. The resulting road, transit, and rail networks were approved by the Policy Boards of both MPOs, and modeled by the Triangle Regional Model Service Bureau.

The DCHC MPO developed a set of maps and tables to present the results of the Alternatives Analysis and posted them for easy access on the MPO web site.

CAMPO used the analysis results through an innovative method based on the return-on-investment within transportation corridors. Projects were identified for inclusion based on the results of input from local agency comprehensive and transportation plans as well as the recommendations from various special studies completed by CAMPO such as the Northeast Area Study and Southeast Area Study. These studies evaluated projects based on mobility and safety benefits as well as human and natural system impacts. From this "universe of projects", CAMPO evaluated over 600 roadway projects based on the benefits they would generate compared to their costs. This was used as a first draft of the plan, which was then refined via staff

input from the MPO and member agencies as well as stakeholder groups and the public. The majority of projects remained funded in the order of payback, while others were modified based on factors outside of what could be calculated.

The purpose of this step in the alternatives analysis was to calculate the benefit of each of the 600 projects with just two scenarios: one with no projects and one with all projects. After these two scenarios were run the payback calculation used the results to determine how much impact each road project had.

These calculations were based on three basic concepts; delay; primary and secondary benefits; change in vehicle miles traveled. Delay calculations measured a project's impact by the hours of delay it saves travelers. This is defined as the difference between the time to travel in light traffic compared to actual traffic conditions. The more cars on the road, the slower they travel, and the more delay increases.

The second concept is the idea of primary and secondary benefits. If a congested road is widened, vehicles will be able to travel faster and save time. This is the primary benefit of the project. Additionally, that project may alleviate traffic problems on other roads, improving their travel time as well. That is a secondary benefit. Thus, for all projects, both the primary and secondary delay improvements must be calculated.

The third, and final, concept is Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT). This is a measurement of how much a road is being used. It is similar to volume, but introduces a length component which allows overall use of a project to be calculated. If two projects are built next to each other, the one with higher VMT is being used more.

To determine the payback metric for each project, two model scenarios were run. The scenario with every project will have much less delay because many new roads have been built or widened. For each road in the model, the first determination is how much of the improvement is primary and secondary. Once this is calculated, the primary benefit is simply added up along the length of widening projects. The last part, secondary benefit, is divided among neighboring projects based on the increase in their use (VMT). A widening on a facility with little use will have little to no secondary benefit. Widening a road with a large increase in the VMT indicates vehicles being taken off nearby roads creating a lot of secondary benefit.

The primary and secondary benefits are added together and compared to the costs. The cost of the project divided by its annual delay benefit provides a number that describes the years required for a project to pay for itself. It's important to point out that this number is not the absolute, actual payback metric of the project for a number of reasons. For one, road widening projects have other benefits, like safety, which are not included in this calculation. Instead, this payback number is only good in comparing projects to each other in a relative sense. A project with a payback period of 1.5 years is a good indicator that the project could be a more cost-effective choice than another taking 10 years.

6.5 Performance Evaluation Measures

Evaluation measures provide a comparative set of metrics for statistical analyses between transportation systems and land use scenarios. Comparisons between transportation systems and land use scenarios can be performed in a number of variations. The comparisons as shown in each evaluation measure table on the next two pages also validate the usefulness of the Triangle Regional Model as a tool to perform travel forecasts and create output necessary for staff, elected officials, and the public to determine the best approach to invest limited financial resources in the regional transportation system.

Figure 6.5.1 compares the transportation network performance for the Capital Area MPO and Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO planning areas for the Year 2013, Year 2045 Deficiency network, and the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan network. The Year 2013 represents the current state of the system. The Year 2045 E+C (existing plus committed) network includes only those projects that will be operational in the next few years, but serving the forecast Year 2045 population and employment. The 2045 system represents the highway and transit networks from the 2045 MTP, serving the forecast Year 2045 population and employment.

The performance evaluation measures in this summary table are system-wide metrics and therefore do not provide performance information on specific roadways or travel corridors, or at the scale of a municipality or type of area (e.g., urban and suburban). The congestion maps (V/C maps), presented in Section 6.3, provide a more localized picture of transportation performance for individual roadways or roadway segments. The conclusions drawn from the performance evaluation measures (system-wide) and congestion maps (roadway specific) tend to be similar. For example, the 2045 Deficiency congestion map illustrates a high degree of regional congestion as compared to the 2013 congestion map. This is validated by comparing performance measure values for the 2045 Deficiency and 2045 MTP networks such as daily “Vehicle Hours Traveled” (VHT daily – Row 1.2). Vehicle Hours Traveled is highest for the 2045 Deficiency roadway network as compared to the 2013 base year and 2045 MTP networks.

Figure 6.5.1: Performance Evaluation Measures By Scenario (Based on TRM)

		2013 Base Year		2045 Existing + Committed		2045 MTP	
		CAMPO	DCHC	CAMPO	DCHC	CAMPO	DCHC
1	Performance Measures						
1.1.1	Total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT-daily)	28,099,995	11,861,507	51,767,600	19,286,704	54,535,952	19,275,165
1.1.1a	Total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT-per capita)	25	28	24	29	27	30
1.2.1	Total Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT-daily)	696,982	285,788	1,784,196	604,600	1,579,327	514,321
1.2.1a	Total Vehicle Minutes Traveled (VHT-per capita)	37	41	49	55	46	48
<u>1.3</u>	<u>Average Speed by Facility (miles/hour)</u>						
1.3.1	- Freeway	62	58	53	50	55	54
1.3.2	- Arterial	38	36	33	30	37	33
1.3.3	- All Facility	46	47	39	40	43	45
<u>1.4</u>	<u>Peak Average Speed by Facility (miles/hour)</u>						
1.4.1	- Freeway	60	57	47	47	52	52
1.4.2	- Arterial	37	35	30	28	36	31
1.4.3	- All Facility	45	46	36	38	41	43
<u>1.5</u>	<u>Daily Average Travel Length - All Person Trips</u>						
1.5.1	- Travel Time (minutes)	14	13	20	17	17	14
1.5.2	- Travel Distance (miles)	7.1	6.1	7.6	6.1	8	6
<u>1.6</u>	<u>Daily Average Travel Length - Work Trips</u>						
1.6.1	- Travel Time	22	20	33	24	27	21
1.6.2	- Travel Distance - Work Trips	12.9	10.9	13.7	10.2	14.1	10.5
<u>1.7</u>	<u>Peak Average Travel Length - All Person Trips</u>						
1.7.1	- Peak Travel Time	15	15	19	19	17	16
1.7.2	- Peak Travel Distance	7.2	7.1	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.9
<u>1.8</u>	<u>Daily Avg. Travel Length - Commercial Vehicle Trips</u>						
1.8.1	- Travel Time	10	10	12	11	11	10
1.8.2	- Travel Distance	7.2	6.7	6.8	6.5	7.2	6.9
<u>1.9</u>	<u>Daily Average Travel Length - Truck Trips</u>						
1.9.1	- Travel Time	12	11	14	13	13	12
1.9.2	- Travel Distance	8.5	7.9	8.2	7.6	8.6	8.1
<u>1.10</u>	<u>Hours of Delay (daily)</u>	67,957	25,300	577,595	165,151	339,957	86,529

		2013 Base Year		2045 Existing + Committed		2045 MTP	
		CAMPO	DCHC	CAMPO	DCHC	CAMPO	DCHC
1.10a	Minutes of Delay (daily) (per capita)	4	4	16	15	10	8
1.10.1	Truck Hours of Delay (daily)	2,442	1,206	16,980	8,457	10,382	4,732
1.10.1a	Truck Minutes of Delay (daily) (per trip)	1	1	5	6	3	3
<u>1.11</u>	<u>Percent of Congested VMT (volume > capacity) - All Day</u>						
1.11.1	- Freeway	1%	1%	18%	12%	15%	4%
1.11.2	- Arterial	3%	2%	17%	16%	10%	7%
1.11.3	- All Facility	2%	1%	16%	12%	10%	5%
<u>1.12</u>	<u>Percent of Congested VMT (volume > capacity) - Peak</u>						
1.12.1	- Freeway	2%	2%	32%	20%	25%	6%
1.12.2	- Arterial	5%	3%	28%	22%	15%	11%
1.12.3	- All Facility	3%	2%	27%	18%	17%	7%
1.12.4	- Designated truck routes	2%	3%	17%	20%	10%	9%
1.12.5	- Facilities w/bus routes	2%	3%	22%	18%	16%	6%
2	Mode Share Measures						
<u>2.1</u>	<u>All Trips - Mode Share</u>						
2.1.1b	- Drive alone (single occupant vehicle -SOV)	49%	46%	49%	45%	47%	44%
2.1.2b	- Carpool (Share ride)	43%	36%	42%	36%	42%	36%
2.1.3b	- Bus	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	3%
2.1.4b	- Rail	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	1%
2.1.5b	- Non-Motorized (Bike and Walk)	7%	15%	9%	16%	9%	17%
<u>2.2a</u>	<u>Work Trips - Mode Share</u>						
2.2.1b	- Drive alone (single occupant vehicle -SOV)	85%	80%	82%	79%	80%	77%
2.2.2b	- Carpool (Share ride)	11%	10%	10%	10%	11%	9%
2.2.3b	- Bus	2%	5%	1%	4%	4%	5%
2.2.4b	- Rail	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1%	2%
2.2.5b	- Non-Motorized (Bike and Walk)	3%	5%	6%	7%	4%	7%
<u>2.3a</u>	<u>Peak Trips - Mode Share</u>						
2.3.1b	- Drive alone (single occupant vehicle -SOV)	48%	46%	47%	45%	45%	43%
2.3.2b	- Carpool (Share ride)	45%	39%	44%	38%	45%	39%
2.3.3b	- Bus	1%	3%	0%	2%	1%	3%
2.3.4b	- Rail	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	1%

		2013 Base Year		2045 Existing + Committed		2045 MTP	
		CAMPO	DCHC	CAMPO	DCHC	CAMPO	DCHC
2.3.5b	- Non-Motorized (Bike and Walk)	7%	13%	9%	14%	8%	14%
3	Transit Measures						
3.1	Transit Ridership (regionwide)						
3.1.1	- GoTriangle (rail included in rail scenarios)	11,649		19,927		65,819	
3.1.2	- GoRaleigh	16,938		33,312		117,791	
3.1.3	- CHT	32,670		42,285		71,882	
3.1.4	- GoDurham	20,866		29,545		37,826	
3.1.5	- NCSU	17,820		22,728		16,693	
3.1.6	- DUKE	8,551		10,942		9,208	
3.1.7	- OPT	338		314		850	
3.1.8	- GoCary	1,869		3,194		6,670	
3.1.9	Total	110,699		162,247		326,735	
3.2	Total Rail Ridership	N/A		N/A		48,461	
4	Other Measures						
4.1	Total Daily Person Trips	4,705,474	1,907,904	8,260,218	3,022,162	8,878,617	3,022,820
4.1.1	Work Person Trips	710,791	238,603	1,215,124	379,742	1,299,322	374,656
4.2	Total Daily CV (commercial vehicle) Trips	306,988	121,623	533,629	199,019	559,006	199,405
4.2.1	Daily Truck Trips	128,046	50,122	223,043	82,975	233,985	83,979
4.3.1	Total Highway Lane Miles	6,532	2,533	6,987	2,632	9,496	2,904
4.3.2	Transit Service Miles	54,757		74,206		96,345	

Notes:

N/A = Not available

Travel time is in minutes, and travel distance is in miles.

CV = Commercial vehicles (which includes large and small trucks and vans).

Trucks = Subset of Commercial Vehicles that includes only large trucks.

Transit ridership is higher than transit trips because a trip involving a transfer counts as two riders in ridership numbers.

Average Speed (1.3 and 1.4), Percent of Congested VMT (1.11 and 1.12) and Hours of Delay (1.10) calculations do not include local streets or centroid connectors (which often represent local streets in modeling networks)

Key points from this section:

- The starting point for analyzing our choices is to understand how our communities' comprehensive plans envision guiding future growth.
- The next step is to make our best estimates of the types, locations and amounts of future population and job growth based on market conditions and trends and community plans.
- Based on these forecasts, we can look at future mobility trends and needs, and where our transportation system may become deficient in accommodating these trends and meeting these needs.
- Working with a variety of partners and based on public input, we then develop different transportation system alternatives and analyze their performance.
- We can compare the performance of system alternatives against one another and to performance targets derived from our goals and objectives.

7. Our Long Range Transportation Plan

Section 7 is the heart of our region's Metropolitan Transportation Plan. This section describes the investments we plan to make, when we intend to make them, and the associated land use development activities that promote an effective and efficient transportation system.

The transportation investments are summarized in the following categories:

- Roadways (with accompanying project list in Appendix 1)
- Public Transportation
- Bicycle and pedestrian projects
- Freight movement
- Aviation and Intercity Rail
- System Optimization including:
 - Programs to manage transportation demand
 - Intelligent transportation systems: technology investments
 - Transportation/congestion systems management: lower-cost roadway projects that do not add more travel lanes, but improve safety and/or operational efficiency.

7.1 Land Use & Development

Land use in the Triangle is the responsibility of each local government, not the MPOs. But few things influence the functionality and effectiveness of our transportation system as much as the locations, types, intensities and designs of existing and new developments in our region. If we are to successfully provide for the mobility needs of the 1.6 million people here today and the additional 1.3 million expected to be added over the timeframe of this plan, we will need to do a top-notch job of matching our land use decisions with our transportation investments.

The ties between regional transportation interests and local land use decisions are most pronounced in three cases:

1. Transit Station Area Development.
2. Major Roadway Access Management.
3. Complete Streets & Context-Sensitive Design.

Transit Station Area Development. The MPOs Metropolitan Transportation Plans include billions of dollars of capital investments in rail and bus rapid transit infrastructure to connect our region's five largest activity centers and link these centers to neighborhoods across the region (see major transit infrastructure investment descriptions in section 7.3). Ensuring that well-designed, compact, mixed use development occurs within the first half mile around transit stations is a key element in determining how cost-effective major transit investments will be. Working with a range of local and regional partners, the Triangle J Council of Governments and GoTriangle have been leading efforts to develop and share key land use and affordable housing practices that can be used by local governments and other organizations to support fixed guideway investments such as rail and bus rapid transit. Continuing to build on this collaborative approach is an important and cost-effective way to match local land use decisions with regional transportation investments.

Major Roadway Access Management. Roads serve two main purposes. One is mobility and the other is access. Mobility is the efficient movement of people and goods. Access is getting those people and goods to specific properties. A roadway designed to maximize mobility typically does so in part by managing access to adjacent properties. A good example is an Interstate Highway. While a motorist could expect to travel quite efficiently over a long distance using an Interstate Highway, the number of access points is restricted to only freeway interchanges every few miles. This type of roadway serves primarily a mobility function. At the other end of the spectrum, a local residential street would provide easy and plentiful access to all adjacent properties, but long distance travel on such a roadway would be time consuming and inconvenient. This type of roadway serves primarily an access function. Many costly road investments involve widening roads to provide additional travel capacity. Where these investments are made, the MPOs will work with the NCDOT and local communities to ensure that the new capacity is not inappropriately degraded by a pattern of “strip development” requiring numerous driveways and median cuts.

Complete Streets & Context-Sensitive Design. Roadways are the largest component of our communities’ public realm: the spaces all of us share with our neighbors and which provide access to the front doors of homes and businesses. Especially where roadways traverse town centers, walkable neighborhoods and important activity centers such as college campuses, the MPOs will work with the NCDOT and local communities to ensure that roads are appropriately designed to accommodate the full range of travel choices and that adjoining development is sited and designed to promote alternatives to auto travel. As the benefits of walking and cycling are better understood, creating safe and healthy streets is becoming a higher priority for MPO support.

So in the three instances summarized above: transit station area development, major roadway access management and complete streets whose designs are sensitive to the neighborhoods of which they are a part, the DCHC MPO and CAMPO are committed to work with their member communities and regional organizations such as the Triangle J Council of Governments and GoTriangle to coordinate land use decisions and transportation investments.

7.2 Roadways

This section contains a list of major road investments in the 2045 Capital Area MPO and Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plans. A full listing of all roadway projects, by time period is in Appendix 1.

Projects are separated into four categories based on anticipated date of completion. 2025 projects are projects already underway with full funding and an expected completion date by 2025, derived from the adopted Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The 2035 and 2045 projects are composed of projects selected through the alternatives analysis process described in Section 6.4 and that can be funded with existing revenue streams or reasonably foreseeable new revenue streams.

Due to anticipated funding constraints, a fourth category includes projects that had merit but could not be completed by 2045 with anticipated revenue. These projects that are not part of our fiscally constrained plans are compiled separately in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) for the DCHC MPO. Each project in the fiscally-constrained plan has a project identifier that is shown on the 2045 MTP Road Project Map. The project listing in Appendix 1 includes information on each project’s limits, length, present and future lanes, funded completion year, cost estimation and whether it meets federal definitions for a regionally significant or exempt project.

The resiliency and reliability of the roadway network is expected to improve with the implementation of this Plan. The planned investment in highway maintenance is approaching 50% of the non-transit budget for both MPOs, up from about 30% in the previous plan.

Figure 1.1 in the Executive Summary is a map of roadway projects by time period (2025, 2035, 2045, post-2045) and Figure 7.2.1 on the next page is a listing of the major highway projects by time period in each MPO. A larger version of the roadway map is available on the MPO web sites.

Figure 7.2.1. Major Highway Projects by MPO and Time Period

Durham Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO		
2018-25	2026-35	2036-45
East End Connector will link US 70 to NC 147 (Durham Freeway) to form I-885	I-40 managed lanes (Wade Avenue in Wake County to NC 147)	I-40 managed lanes (NC 147 to US 15-501)
NC 147 (Durham Freeway) widened (East End Connector to I-40)	I-40 widened (US 15-501 to I-85)	I-85 widened (I-40 to Durham County line)
	US 15-501 (Fordham Blvd) modernization (Columbia St. To I-40)	I-85 widened (US 70 to Red Mill Rd.)
	US 15-501 freeway conversion (I-40 to US 15-501 bypass)	
	US 70 lane addition and freeway conversion (East End Connector to I-540)	
Capital Area MPO		
2018-25	2026-35	2036-45
I-40 widened from Wade Ave. to Lake Wheeler Road	I-40 widened from I-440 to NC 42 in Johnston County	I-87 widened from US 64 Bus to US 264
I-440 widened from Wade Avenue to Crossroads	I-87 widened from I-440 to US 264	NC 210 widened from Angier to Lassiter Pond Rd.
I-40 widened from I-440 to NC 42 in Johnston County	US 1 widened south from US 64 to NC 540	NC 50 widened from NC 98 to Creedmoor
US 64 W corridor improvements from US 1 to Laura Duncan Rd.	Managed lanes added to I-540 (Northern Wake Expressway) from I-40 to I-87	US 401 widened from Fuquay-Varina to MPO boundary in Harnett County
NC 540 toll road extended from Holly Springs to I-40 south of Garner	NC 540 completed as a toll road from Holly Springs to I-87/US 64 bypass	NC 96 widened from US 1 to NC 98
NC 50 widened and access management from I-540 to NC 98	Managed lanes added to I-40 from Durham County to MPO boundary in Johnston County	NC 56 widened from I-85 to MPO boundary in Franklin County

7.3 Fixed Guideway and Premium Transit Services

A number of extensive transit planning efforts that have taken place in the last decade have resulted in transit plans in Durham, Orange, and Wake Counties. These county plans provide new dedicated revenue sources to finance significant transit improvements, including projects to produce enhanced regular bus

service, implement high-quality fixed-guideway transit projects, build improved transit infrastructure, and develop new services to connect job centers and population centers throughout the region.

Among the projects identified in the county transit plans and included in this 2045 MTP are a variety of premium transit investments that will provide dedicated transit corridors. These major projects will reduce transit time, improve reliability, and provide enhanced customer experiences. Three types of investments are included in this 2045 MTP:

- Light rail transit (LRT) provides frequent, all-day passenger rail service to serve allow compact and walkable development patterns. Light rail uses electric vehicles that run on a dedicated fixed-guideway to provide safe, quiet, and reliable transportation along congested transportation corridors, and stopping at stations that are easily accessible to existing neighborhoods and new transit-oriented development by walking, bicycling, bus, and automobile.
- Bus rapid transit (BRT) encompasses a variety of enhancements to regular bus service, such as enhanced stations with off-board ticketing, dedicated lanes that allow buses to bypass congested automobile traffic and improve system reliability, priority treatment at traffic signals, and other improvements.
- Commuter rail service operates in existing mainline rail corridors, serving stations that generally are spaced farther apart than in light rail networks. Commuter rail projects generally provide service during peak commuting hours, with occasional mid-day, evening, and weekend service.

The specific projects included in this 2045 MTP include:

- The Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) Project, a light-rail system connecting Chapel Hill and Durham. The project is currently within the Engineering phase of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA's) Capital Investment Grants/New Starts program and is under active development. The project is anticipated to begin construction in 2020 and be completed by 2028. Further information about D-O LRT is available at ourtransitfuture.com.
- A westward extension of the D-O LRT Project from its initial terminus at UNC Hospitals to serve the town centers of Chapel Hill and Carrboro. This project is scheduled for 2035-45.
- Chapel Hill Transit's North-South Corridor BRT, an 8-mile, 16-station project along the primary north-south corridor in Chapel Hill, Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and Columbia Street. It is currently in FTA's Small Starts Project Development program. Additional environmental analysis and project design is underway, and revenue service anticipated to begin in the 2026-35 time period of this plan. Further information about this BRT project is available at nscstudy.org.
- A commuter rail system with an initial focus linking, Garner, Raleigh, and Cary in Wake County with the Research Triangle Park downtown Durham and West Durham. This project is currently being evaluated as part of a Major Investment Study funded by Wake County and Durham County. This initial phase is scheduled for the 2026-35 time period of this plan.
- A westward extension of the commuter rail system from west Durham to Hillsborough, where a new Amtrak intercity rail station is currently being developed by NCDOT, and an eastward extension from Garner to Clayton. These extensions are scheduled for the 2036-45 time period of this plan.
- A commuter rail extension running between Apex and Wake Forest/Youngsville via Cary and Raleigh. This phase is scheduled for the 2036-2045 time period of this plan.
- A BRT system connecting Raleigh, Cary, Morrisville, Research Triangle Park, and Garner. These projects and services are currently being evaluated as part of the Major Investment Study funded by Wake and Durham County as well as the Bus Implementation Plan funded by Wake County. The initial phase includes portions of both dedicated fixed guideway as well as mixed traffic BRT service and is scheduled early in the 2026-2035 time period of this plan.
- An extension of dedicated fixed guideway for the initial BRT corridors in Wake County as well as the addition of BRT service to Midtown in Raleigh is scheduled for the latter part of the 2026-2035 time period of this plan.

- An extension of dedicated fixed guideway and BRT service to New Hope Rd. in the New Bern BRT corridor in Raleigh is scheduled for the 2036-2045 period of this plan.
- A north-south BRT corridor in Cary along the Harrison-Kildaire Farm-Tryon Rd. corridor that will connect the SAS/Weston area to the Regency business park via downtown Cary is scheduled for the 2036-2045 time period of this plan.
- An eastward extension of the commuter rail system from Clayton to the Smithfield/Selma area, where Amtrak intercity rail service is currently operating. This extension is not included in the fiscally constrained portion of this plan and is depended on various other rail transit partners in Johnston County that are outside of the MPO boundary.

7.4 Frequency- and Coverage-Based Bus Services

The 2008 Special Transit Advisory Committee (STAC) produced an initial report identifying the need for additional transit services and setting forth a vision for providing higher-quality transit services along multiple transportation corridors within the MPOs. This effort sparked additional planning efforts throughout the region involving multiple counties, municipalities, residents, and other stakeholders. These different efforts coalesced into three transit plans that direct dedicated revenue to a variety of transit projects throughout the region:

- Durham County: In 2011, Durham County commissioners and voters approved the Bus and Rail Investment Plan with a new ½-cent sales tax and other revenues to fund transit expansion, including improved bus service, improved infrastructure; and premium transit services including D-O LRT and commuter rail. The plan was updated and renamed the Durham County Transit Plan in April 2017.
- Orange County: In 2012, Orange County commissioners and voters approved the County's Bus and Rail Investment Plan and identical funding sources as Durham County. The new dedicated revenues are being used to provide improved bus service and infrastructure, and pay the local share of the D-O LRT and North-South Corridor BRT premium transit services. The plan was updated and renamed the Orange County Transit Plan in April 2017.
- Wake County: The Wake Transit Plan and dedicated revenue sources were approved by county commissioners and voters in 2016. The plan focuses on four "Big Moves" to 1) connect the region; 2) connect all Wake County communities; 3) create a frequent and reliable urban transit network; and 4) provide enhanced access to transit. The plan proposes to develop a greatly expanded frequent bus network, bus service that connects the 12 Wake County municipalities, passenger infrastructure improvements; and the BRT and commuter rail services.

Increased regular bus service has been implemented by transit agencies throughout the three counties as well as by GoTriangle, the regional transit provider. In addition, the counties and transit agencies are investing in infrastructure such as improved customer bus stops and shelters, park-and-ride lots, and new vehicles. Local public transit systems coordinate and share facilities with private intercity bus operations; for example, the Durham Central Transit Station serves both Greyhound and MegaBus along with local/regional public routes.

The transit systems and MPO are putting greater emphasis on the maintenance of transit assets. Both MPOs approved transit asset performance measures and targets addressing State of Good Repair in June 2017.

Further information about the projects are included in the Durham County Transit Plan, Orange County Transit Plan, and Wake Transit Plan. Please visit ourtransitfuture.com, waketransit.com, and gotriangle.org for copies of the plans and updated information.

More information on bus transit projects including implementation years and type of service is in Appendix 3. The bus transit investment includes extending current service areas, but also emphasizes service improvements to the current service areas, as outlined in the county transit plans. Area transit agencies and the counties continually revise their current and proposed future route networks to optimize transit performance.

The proposed improvements in bus service include:

- Increased frequency: In the region, most buses operate on 30-minute headways most of the day. Each transit plan provides for more frequent service. Using county transit plan revenues, Durham County has implemented a “frequent bus network” with 12 miles of services that operate all-day at 15-minute frequencies, while the Wake Transit Plan proposes to grow the county’s frequent bus network from 17 miles in 2016 to 83 miles by 2027.
- Expanded span of service: By operating existing services later into the evening and on weekends, the bus system will provide enhanced access to jobs and other activities for more residents.
- Redesigned networks: Regular bus service will be reimagined to better connect with fixed-guideway services such as D-O LRT, N-S Corridor BRT, Wake County’s BRT lines, and commuter rail, increasing access to these high-quality transit spines.
- New service: New bus service provided to additional communities, including express services that run during peak commute times and local services such as circulators.
- Improved infrastructure: The county plans provide for additional customer-facing infrastructure such as bus shelters, benches, park-and-ride lots, and access improvements such as sidewalks and trails.
- Last-mile connections: The plans provide for services to provide the “last mile” connection between bus routes and patrons’ final destinations, using bus routes and innovative services such as on-demand bus shuttle routes.
- Electric buses: The area’s transit agencies are considering purchasing buses that couple electric propulsion with battery storage. If implemented, electric buses will have local air quality benefits, and may also provide improved passenger comfort and reduced operating costs.

7.5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Bicycle and pedestrian transportation are becoming integral forms of travel in the Triangle Region. The land use characteristics of local universities, business districts, and major activity centers encourage short trips that can be easily served by biking and walking. Urban centers retain attractive, grid street patterns with retail and residential developments that lend well to biking and walking, and the scenery of the region’s rural landscape provides opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian tourism and recreational cycling. Additionally, the area’s geography and mild year-round climate make these modes viable travel options.

Since the adoption of the region’s previous long-range plan in 2013, several important initiatives have been undertaken, including the following:

- In 2014 the N.C. Department of Transportation held a Complete Streets Summit to highlight how NCDOT’s Complete Streets Guidelines can be used to design and build streets that enable safe access for pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transportation users of all ages and abilities.
- Communities have hosted various bicycle and pedestrian events, including the annual Triangle Bicycle and Pedestrian Workshop sponsored jointly by the MPOs, and many activities during Bike Month and Bike to Work Week in May.
- The number of motor vehicle crashes involving pedestrians and bicycles has motivated federal, state, and local officials to conduct enforcement exercises and education campaigns focused on bicycle and pedestrian safety.
- Communities in both MPOs began participating in an NCDOT initiative to develop a systematic approach to counting pedestrian and cyclists by installing equipment that uses electromagnetic bicycle detectors and passive infrared technology to count bicycle and pedestrian traffic at key locations.
- The MPOs assisted N.C. State researchers study the economic impacts of bicycling and walking, with a particular focus on the usage and change in economic indicators on the American Tobacco Trail in Durham before and after the construction of a bridge that closed a gap in the 23-mile shared use path.

In response to the increased popularity of bike and pedestrian travel, CAMPO and DCHC MPO are encouraging the creation of a pedestrian and bicycle system that provides an alternative means of transportation, allows greater access to public transit, and supports commuting and recreational opportunities. Regional and statewide facilities such as the East Coast Greenway, the Cross-Triangle Greenway, and the American Tobacco Trail are heavily used as soon as segments are opened. Member governments coordinate planning efforts and strive toward the development of a safe, accessible, and convenient network of regional bicycle and pedestrian routes. Many local governments in the region have prepared their own citywide and county bicycle and pedestrian plans and/or facility inventories. Granville County, for instance, has established a Greenway Technical Committee to develop a network of trails for local and regional use.

Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian facilities in the Triangle region vary in type, condition and level of service. Urban areas within the MPO boundary are often outfitted with suitable sidewalk facilities, however many thoroughfares lack any pedestrian accommodations or relegate pedestrians to one side of the roadway. Historically, suburban development has been inattentive to pedestrian needs, leading to incomplete pedestrian networks within highly populated commercial and residential areas. Also, many areas once classified as rural are seeing increases in development, and citizens are demanding pedestrian access from their neighborhoods to nearby destinations. Local governments recognize these pedestrian needs, and are working toward filling the missing links in local sidewalk networks.



Many thoroughfares lack sidewalks

On a regional level, the MPOs encourage pedestrian projects. Most town and city governments have instituted sidewalk requirements for new development, and sidewalk upgrades are generally included in roadway construction projects. Most roadway projects in the 'Roadway Element' of the MTP are expected to provide appropriate accommodations for pedestrians, concurrent with roadway improvements. Missing links and gaps in the pedestrian networks will be constructed retroactively. Priority is generally given to areas with heavy pedestrian traffic generators, such as schools, parks and business districts.

The MPOs rely on the "NCDOT Complete Streets Planning and Design Guidelines" and other guidelines to identify appropriate facility type, and depend on local plans for project identification. The MPOs rely on the "NCDOT Bridge Policy" and "NCDOT Pedestrian Policy" to ensure that new bridges in the urban area include sidewalks or have sufficient bridge deck width to accommodate future sidewalks. Projects are prioritized on a regional level for funding allocation. The following table presents recent local plans and inventories used for facility recommendations.

Figure 7.5.1 – Local Plans and Inventories Used for Pedestrian Facility Recommendations

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carrboro Sidewalk Policy (1989) • Chapel Hill Mobility & Connectivity Plan (2017) • Durham Bike+Walk Implementation Plan (2017) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Durham Trails and Greenways Master Plan (2011) • Hillsborough Vision 2020 Plan (1991, revised 1998)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Angier Pedestrian Plan (2012) • Apex Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (2011) • Cary Pedestrian Plan (Imagine Cary) (2017) • Creedmoor Pedestrian Plan (2011) • Fuquay Varina Pedestrian Plan (2012) • Garner CTP (2018) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holly Springs CTP (2013) • Knightdale Pedestrian Plan (2011) • Raleigh Pedestrian Plan (2013) • Youngsville Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan (2014) • NCSU Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan (2011)

Bicycle Facilities

The 2045 MTP recommends extensive integration of bicycle needs into the design and construction specification of new highways and other future or ongoing transportation projects. The bicycle projects include off-road shared-use bicycle paths, on-road bicycle lanes and wide shared roadways in urban areas, as well as paved 4-foot shoulders on rural roads. Highway and transit project designs assume the provision of bicycle racks and other bicycle and pedestrian amenities at key locations such as park-and-ride lots, transit hubs, and major activity centers.



Bicycle parking at a bus stop near the American Tobacco Trail.

The 2045 MTP identifies statewide and regional bicycle routes in the Triangle region. Statewide routes include NCDOT-designated Bicycling Highways as well as the East Coast Greenway.

Regional bicycle routes provide links between major destinations and between urban centers; facilitate primarily utilitarian bicycle trips, though the routes can also serve recreational cycling; and serve as a backbone to a finer grained system of local bicycle routes in each jurisdiction.

The “NCDOT Complete Streets Planning and Design Guidelines” and AASHTO “Guide for Development of New Bicycle Facilities” act as construction standards for projects, and local agencies play a lead role in the implementation of new projects. The MPOs rely on the “NCDOT Bridge Policy” to ensure that new bridges have sufficient bridge deck width to accommodate planned bicycle facilities. Local plans supplement the MTP regional bicycle routes by identifying additional projects and development requirements to complete the regional bicycle transportation network. Figure 7.4.2 lists these local plans.

Figure 7.5.2 – Local Plans Used for Bicycle Facility Recommendations

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Carrboro Comprehensive Bicycle Transportation Plan (2009) | • Durham Trails and Greenways Master Plan (2011) |
| • Chapel Hill Mobility & Connectivity Plan (2017) | • Orange County Bicycle Transportation Plan (1999) |
| • Durham Bike+Walk Implementation Plan (2017) | |
| • Apex Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (2011) | • Morrisville Land Use and Transportation Plan (2008) |
| • Cary Imagine Cary Plan (2017) | • Raleigh Bicycle Transportation Plan (2016) |
| • Capital Area MPO Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (2003) | • Rolesville Bicycle Plan (2011) |
| • Fuquay-Varina Bicycle Plan (2015) | • Youngsville Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan (2014) |
| • Garner Forward Transportation Plan (2018) | • Zebulon Multimodal Transportation Plan (2001) |
| • Holly Springs Comprehensive Transportation Plan (2011) | |
| • NC State University Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (2011) | |

Education, Enforcement & Encouragement

In addition to facility improvement projects included in the MTP, the DCHC and Capital Area MPOs devised a series of local education, enforcement and encouragement programs. Outreach programs are essential

elements of any bicycle and pedestrian friendly community, and complement the engineered components of a bicycle and/or pedestrian route network. The following recommendations are intended to increase bicycle and pedestrian safety and provide the incentive to get more people biking and walking in the region.

Education

- Institutionalize bicycle and pedestrian safety education within public schools.
- Provide bicycle instruction to adult cyclists.
- Provide educational messages to better inform drivers and pedestrians about pedestrian and bicycle safety laws and best practices.
- Educate motorists on cyclists' rights to use the road.
- Establish a local fund for bicycle and motorist education.

Enforcement

- Update bicycle traffic laws.
- Provide an active enforcement program.
- Appoint a "Bicycle Liaison Officer".
- Develop "Bicycle Patrol Units" within local police departments.

Encouragement

- Offer incentives to employers to encourage employee bicycle commuting.
- Conduct a well-publicized annual "Bike-to-Work" week with multiple events.
- Improve access to transit for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Develop a publicity campaign to raise awareness of cycling issues.
- Conduct annual regional bicycle events.
- Publicize the region as "bicycle-friendly."
- Encourage community-based support for cycling.
- Develop cooperative relationships.
- Promote Safe Routes to Schools and walk/bike to school events.
- Participate in the Triangle Transportation Demand Management activities and programs.



Bicycle and pedestrian resource materials

The MPOs are also developing supplementary resources, such as bicycle maps, safety-education materials, and community action plans that provide a development strategy for the implementation of the five "E's" – engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation. Many member jurisdictions are proceeding toward great accomplishments in the outreach sector, including the national recognition of Carrboro, Cary, Chapel Hill, Durham, and Raleigh as "Bicycle Friendly Communities" by the League of American Bicyclists. The MPOs continually seek funding for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects, and several school activities have been completed using this funding source. With such progress already being made, it is certain that the DCHC and Capital Area MPOs will continue to advance toward a sophisticated, well-integrated bicycle and pedestrian transportation system over the next three decades.

Summary

The 2045 MTP does not specifically list bicycle and pedestrian projects. Local municipalities and counties have identified and prioritized these projects, and have coordinated their interaction at the jurisdiction boundary areas. As a result, the 2045 MTP defers to those local government plans.

The DCHC MPO bicycle and pedestrian policy basically expects any roadway or other transportation project, whether it is a new or improved facility, to include appropriate pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. That policy provides extensive integration of bicycle and pedestrian needs into the design and construction of new and improved highway and other transportation projects. In addition, the “NCDOT Complete Streets Planning and Design Guidelines” and other related guidelines provide planning and design guidance for use when building new projects or making changes to existing infrastructure. For bicycle facilities, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO adopted a Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) in May 2017 that lists all the local bicycle projects from the jurisdiction and county plans in the MPO area. The MPO has also identified statewide and regional bicycle routes in the MPO region, as listed in Appendix 4.

The Capital Area MPO map communicates an extensive regional layout of off-road bicycle and pedestrian facilities in conjunction with on-road facilities that will receive bicycle-pedestrian accommodations only. This on-road/off-road network is congruent in scope, and communicates opportunities for multiple forms of access throughout the region. Note that many roadway projects will incorporate bicycle and pedestrian accommodations in conjunction with capacity improvements; which is consistent with the principle of “universal access” as addressed in the Capital Area MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan adopted in 2003. Roads that will receive bicycle and pedestrian accommodations only are those roads that did not meet strict criteria for capacity improvements; but in practicing good transportation system management would qualify as candidates for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

Figure 7.5.3 - Bicycle & Pedestrian Investment

2018-2045 Bicycle and Pedestrian Investment (\$2016)		
Total	CAMPO	DCHC MPO
\$1,207,000,000	\$915,000,000	\$292,000,000

7.6 Freight Movement

Successful economic development depends on the fast and reliable movement of people, goods and information. For the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the two MPOs have been engaged in an extensive and systematic examination of freight trends and opportunities through a new Triangle Regional Freight Plan to ensure that goods movement is a key component of long-term transportation investment decisions. Although the MPOs will not formally adopt recommendations until later in 2018, some key freight movement forecasts and principles are expected to guide MPO transportation investment decisions.

The growing regional attention to freight movement has been matched at the state and federal levels. The most recent federal transportation legislation, the FAST Act, and North Carolina's Strategic Transportation Investments (STI) law place increased emphasis on freight planning and investment. Looking for opportunities to leverage state and federal interest is a driving force in the MPO's approach to freight movement.

An examination of trends and forecasts for the regional freight plan found that:

1. The highway system is and will remain the principal freight mode in the region: 80% of both freight tonnage and freight value in the region moves by truck. By 2045, the amount of freight moved by truck is expected to grow by a third. Because of its advantage in moving heavy commodities, rail carries 16% of the region's freight tonnage, but only 2% of its freight value, and is not forecast to grow significantly.

2. "Truck tonnages are expected to increase considerably out to 2045, especially for shipments to and from the Triangle Region."
3. "Projects are needed to ensure that the roadway network keeps up with the rapid increase expected of inbound and outbound shipments....improving the routes that are already congested that provide regional connection to Interstates and the rest of the State."
4. "Total freight rail volumes are forecasted to have minimal growth in the Triangle Region over the coming decades...chiefly due to the decline in coal, which offsets growth in other areas...total tonnage is expected to remain roughly constant out to 2045."

Key freight movement principles that the MPOs will use to inform investment decisions include:

1. As with the movement of passengers, paying close attention to the location of major freight facilities and destinations relative to the transportation network is important; linking industrial land use decisions to the careful design of road and rail access can yield cost-effective solutions. Just as Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) has become a principal tool in regional land use planning to support transit corridor investments, Freight-Oriented Development can help inform industrial land use planning and supply chain logistics along strategic freight corridors and in freight industry clusters.
2. Logistics and supply chain performance expectations change rapidly. In particular, supply chains designed for home deliveries continue to grow in importance with the explosion in e-commerce.
3. On the road system, freight bottlenecks with significant truck volumes should be a key priority, with a tiered approach to address trade routes that connect the Triangle to other regions, distribution and connectivity routes that link freight industry clusters with activity centers, and critical access routes serving industrial sites and redevelopment areas.
4. On the rail system, network reliability and speed will be important considerations for goods movement as bulk commodities like coal become less important, with the added benefit that reliability and speed are also important to passenger rail that shares tracks with freight trains.

7.7 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Each year, hundreds of millions of dollars are spent in the region on the supply side of mobility: building and maintaining roads, buying and operating buses, building sidewalks and bicycle facilities. Some of the most cost-effective mobility investments we can make are on the demand side: encouraging commuters to use our transportation facilities as efficiently as possible by carpooling, vanpooling, taking transit, telecommuting, walking or bicycling.



TDM Coordinators tabling at Red Hat

These marketing and outreach efforts targeted to commuters and the employers they work for are called Transportation Demand Management, or TDM.

The Triangle TDM program is active in Chapel Hill, Carrboro, Raleigh, Research Triangle Park, Durham County, Orange County, Wake County, Duke University, NC State University, UNC-Chapel Hill, and Wake Tech Community College. Since 2008, service providers in the region have undertaken a range of TDM projects, such as GoTriangle's New Year/New Commute and Bike Month regional campaigns, and Triangle J Council of Government's *Best Workplaces for Commuters* program. These TDM efforts can be very effective. In 2017, 96,000 workers were employed at a *Best Workplace for Commuters*, where their employer offers commute benefits such as subsidized transit passes, vanpooling, bicycle facilities or telework. The following travel, air

quality, and energy saving impacts were calculated due to the collective efforts of Triangle TDM service providers in FY16-17 :

- 5 million vehicle trips avoided
- 2.2 million gallons of gas saved
- 54 million commute miles reduced
- 36,027 alternative transportation users supported
- 43.8 million pounds of Carbon dioxide (CO₂) release prevented

The region's TDM program is based on the Triangle Region Transportation Demand Management Plan for the Triangle. Implementing the plan is designed to achieve a goal of reducing the *growth* in the amount of *commuter* travel by 25%. The plan provides both a more systematic framework for TDM coordination and significantly more state and federal funding for TDM. TDM Plan details are available at <http://www.tjcog.org/transportation-reports-downloads.aspx>

The TDM Plan recognizes that the most effective TDM strategies are targeted to employment “hot spots:” places where employment is concentrated, including sites where transit service is available and/or parking is costly or inconvenient, such as in downtowns and at university campuses.



TDM Coordinators tabling at Rex Hospital

Continuing to implement and extend this TDM Plan is included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Implementation includes:

- aggregating funding from the sponsors: state funds from NCDOT and federal funds allocated by the Capital Area MPO and Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO,
- issuing a competitive “call for projects” from providers of TDM services, and
- working with an Oversight Committee of state and MPO staff that works with applicants to refine their proposals and makes recommendations for funding.

Based on this plan and the current level of the region’s comprehensive, coordinated TDM program, the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plans include continued funding for TDM services and will follow the existing model where service providers supply a significant cost share to match federal and state funds.

The key Transportation Demand Management strategies in the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan are:

1. Continue to invest in a collaborative regional program between the two MPOs and NCDOT through a single coordinating agency providing administrative, fiscal and measurement services.
2. Periodically review and update the regional TDM plan to serve as the guidance document for regional TDM collaboration roles and responsibilities.
3. Use the forthcoming NC DOT PTD strategic plan to align the regional program with statewide resources and to leverage opportunities to collaborate with other regional TDM efforts.
4. Continue and strengthen the regional collaboration’s “three-legged stool” of services:
 - a. “foundational” services provided throughout the region by a designated regional service provider,

- b. local services in selected hot spots provided through a competitive process involving local service provider funding matches, and
 - c. support and recognition programs for measurable “best practice” employers
5. Periodically review and modify or expand “hot spot” locations where TDM efforts can be most effective, based on available funding.
6. Continue to examine the use of new technologies and innovative demand management techniques such as parking cash-out programs.

The region’s transportation demand management program can be a crucial component of the overall transportation system, prompting employers to encourage the use of alternatives to driving alone and assisting commuters in understanding and using these alternatives.

7.8 Transportation Technology & Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

Technology has always been an important part of the transportation system, from safety features on private vehicles to traffic information and traffic control signals and devices in public investments. This section of the plan addresses both vehicle technologies and public facility and service investments.

Technological advancement is anticipated to significantly affect mobility over the span of this plan. Much of this advancement is expected to be vehicle-oriented, with the advent of autonomous vehicles and connected vehicles. Levels of vehicle automation lie along a spectrum:

0	1	2	3	4	5
No Automation	Driver Assistance	Partial Automation	Conditional Automation	High Automation	Full Automation
A human driver is in control of all driving functions.	An advanced driver assistance system (ADAS) can assist the human driver in either steering or braking/accelerating, but never at the same time.	ADAS can control both steering and braking/accelerating simultaneously, but requires the human driver to continue to pay full attention at all times and assume control outside of those two functions.	All driving functions are performed by an automated driving system (ADS) in some circumstances, but the human driver must be able to respond when requested by the ADS. The driver assumes control in environments unmanageable by the ADS.	All driving functions are performed by an ADS in some circumstances, during which the driver does not need to pay attention. The driver assumes control in environments unmanageable by the ADS.	All driving functions are performed by an ADS in all circumstances. Human occupants are now passengers as opposed to drivers.

Although autonomous vehicle technology is expected to make in-roads in the near-term and mid-term, its market penetration may not result in substantial changes in public infrastructure investment decisions until the longer term period of this plan. Estimates of market penetration vary widely, but it is more likely that Level 4 and Level 5 vehicles will become a large enough share of the market to affect infrastructure design in the long-term phase of this plan than in the mid-term phase. Nevertheless, it would be appropriate to explicitly consider the possible impacts of faster or slower market penetration in decisions about fixed, costly and long-lived investments, such as parking garages or freeway widenings, especially if the investments would be difficult or costly to repurpose for a society with extensive automated and connected vehicles.

Significant market penetration may occur soonest for fleet vehicles such as trucks, buses and other vehicles where vehicle operators are a significant part of the cost of a service and where operator rest time (and thus vehicle down time) is important for safe operation. Appendix ____ includes additional information and sources on autonomous and connected vehicles.

In this plan, public investments in technology are grouped under the term "Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)," a set of diverse technologies designed to make existing transportation infrastructure, facilities and services more efficient and safer. The Capital Area MPO (CAMPO), Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO (DCHC MPO) and NCDOT jointly developed a prioritized list of improvements and a coordinated framework for ITS solutions for the region. This framework is scheduled for updating beginning in 2018.

The most recent Triangle Regional ITS Strategic Deployment Plan (SDP) update was completed in 2010. The update followed a needs based approach to project development and created a comprehensive prioritization of regional project needs. The Triangle ITS SDP included 175 projects totaling \$315 million across eight categories:

Triangle ITS Project Categories	
System Preservation	Highway
Emergency Management	Turnpike
Corridor Management	Transit
Regional Non-Infrastructure	Statewide Non-Infrastructure

The Triangle Strategic Deployment Plan contains a list of feasible ITS projects. The details of the solutions and technologies will continue to change as conditions change and transportation technologies advance. The list of ITS projects in the 2045 MTP and Triangle Regional ITS Plan is not intended to be exhaustive. As a result, it is possible that an ITS solution might be implemented that is not in these plans.

Following the completion of the SDP document in 2010, NCDOT began work on ten Highway, System Preservation, Transit, and North Carolina Turnpike related ITS projects totaling \$13.5 million.

The Strategic Deployment Plan is designed to "mainstream" ITS projects into the overall transportation planning process for both CAMPO and the DCHC MPO. This is being accomplished in a variety of ways. CAMPO's Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) has funded ITS projects annually using STP-DA funding, including investments in several strategic corridors such as US-64 and I-40. ITS projects are incorporated biennially through Transportation Improvement Program updates.

7.9 Transportation System Management (TSM)

Transportation System Management (TSM) solutions increase efficiency and safety by allowing the current transportation network to operate with fewer travel delays and increased capacity. These projects are often relatively inexpensive compared to building and widening roadways and making new public transit capital investments. They often provide cost effective solutions that can be implemented relatively quickly or in phases, and with comparatively few environmental impacts.

The following list provides examples of the types of TSM projects that are expected to be implemented through the 2045 MTP period. This list is not exhaustive because solutions will be designed for the unique challenges of a particular intersection or corridor, and the types of TSM solutions will continue to evolve.

- Widening of approach widths for key intersections;
- Installation and/or adjustment of traffic signals, including dynamic signal timing coordination and signal preemption;
- Provision and lengthening of turn lanes;
- Limitation or prohibition of driveways, turning movements, trucks, and on-street parking;
- Construction of median U-turn, Quadrant, continuous flow and other unique intersection and interchange designs;

- Fixing horizontal/vertical curves, insufficient ramp lengths, weaving sections and other geometric deficiencies;
- Implementing Bus on Shoulder System (BOSS) for transit buses and express shoulder lanes for all vehicles;
- Installation of traffic calming devices for residential neighborhoods; and,
- Traffic circles and roundabouts at appropriate intersections.

Individual TSM projects are not listed in the 2045 MTP because of their project-specific design characteristics and short planning-to-construction project cycle. Some projects might be included in project lists if they have been incorporated into a TIP or local CIP. The 2045 MTP financial plan specifically dedicates funding for TSM projects.

7.10 Rail Investments

The region is traversed by several key rail corridors, most notably the state-owned North Carolina Railroad Company (NCRR) right-of-way that stretches from Morehead City to Charlotte. Other major lines are owned by the region's two Class I railroads: Norfolk-Southern and CSX. The NCRR corridor carries both freight and intercity passenger rail traffic; existing passenger rail stations within the MPO boundaries include Raleigh, Cary and Durham. The CSX "S" line heading north from central Raleigh and south from central Cary intersects the NCRR corridor along a section carrying freight and passenger traffic. The CSX "S" line from Richmond to Raleigh and the NCRR from Raleigh to Charlotte is also part of the Federally-designated Southeast High Speed Rail (SEHSR) Corridor.

This *Rail Investments* section of the plan focuses on freight rail and intercity passenger rail that links the Triangle to other regions. Commuter rail and light rail services within the region located within or adjacent to existing rail corridors are addressed in *Section 7.3 Transit Services*. General freight issues--including freight carried by rail--are addressed in *Section 7.5 Freight Movement*. The recently completed draft freight plan notes that the volume of rail freight carried in and through the Triangle is expected to decrease slightly through the 2045 horizon year of this MTP, due in part to declines in coal shipments as the region's energy mix changes.

Rail planning and investments are frequently a cooperative effort between owners and operators of rail assets and partner agencies. For example, a project to straighten curves and replace an at-grade crossing with a bridge may involve funding and other contributions from the North Carolina Railroad, Norfolk-Southern and NCDOT's Rail Division. Funding from NCDOT is from state and federal sources, including Federal Railroad Administration competitive grants. Rail-related investments that involve roadway improvements and are included in the Transportation Improvement Program are included in the fiscal constraint analysis and transportation modeling that are part of this 2045 Plan. Investments that do not affect track capacity or cross streets are not specified in 2045 MTP project lists. Examples include safety improvements at highway-rail crossings or short sidings that serve adjacent properties.

Several projects and studies have been recently completed, are underway, or are planned to improve the performance of rail services within the region. Many are included within NCDOT's Piedmont Improvement



North Carolina Railroad Company/Nick D'Amato

Program that received \$520 million in Recovery Act funding targeted specifically for passenger rail improvements. Recent and on-going Triangle rail projects and studies include:

1. Cary Depot (\$2.3 million project completed in 2011)*
2. Raleigh Union Station
3. Hillsborough Passenger Rail Station
4. Raleigh West Street Grade Separation
5. NCDOT Capital Yard Railroad Maintenance in Raleigh (\$6.1 million project completed in 2012)*
6. Hopson Road Grade Separation and Nelson to Clegg passing siding (completed in 2015)*
7. Morrisville Parkway Grade Separation (completed in 2016)*
8. "NC 54 and More" Corridor Feasibility Study (road project in Morrisville along the NCRR right-of-way, including proposed grade separations of connecting roads and the railroad)
9. Raleigh-Cary Traffic Separation Study (phased approach)
10. Durham Traffic Separation Study
11. Hillsborough Traffic Separation Study
12. Raleigh East 2nd Main Track (study completed in 2013)
13. Morrisville to Cary 2nd Main Track (study completed in 2011)
14. Blue Ridge Road Grade Separation
15. Boylan Junction Improvements
16. Churton Street bridge widening over NCRR
17. NCRR Bridge over NC 54 Replacement (\$5.5 million project completed in 2006)

(* asterisk denotes part of Piedmont Improvement Program)

(** a Traffic Separation Study examines at-grade rail-highway crossings to determine short-, mid- and long-range opportunities for closure or bridges)

Current North Carolina intercity passenger rail service consists of three trains in each direction each day operated by Amtrak and serving the Durham, Cary and Raleigh stations. Two of the trains travel between Charlotte and Raleigh, while the third continues north from Raleigh to Washington, DC and New York City via a route heading east to Selma in Johnston County, then north along the CSX "A" line that roughly parallels I-95. Ridership has increased steadily on the service; during the federal fiscal year that ended in September 2017, ridership on the three trains was 427,000. During October 2017, 23,600 passengers boarded or alighted from the three trains at the three Triangle stations: Raleigh, Durham and Cary. Two additional Raleigh-Charlotte Piedmont daily trains are planned to be added upon completion of the Piedmont Improvement Program projects.

Planning for Southeast High Speed Rail envisions high performing rail operating within the region along the NCRR corridor east to Raleigh at speeds up to 90 mph, then north along the CSX "S" line at speeds up to 110 mph. The NCDOT Rail Division is leading efforts to provide a "sealed corridor" for higher speeds and additional trains, closing or bridging existing at-grade crossings where feasible to improve both safety and operations. The NCRR has led commuter rail capacity and ridership studies to better understand the interplay of freight and passenger rail operations within the region and the range of track investments that might be needed to accommodate increased shared use.

Due to the complexity of rail investments and the myriad of interested organizations, the MPOs helped initiate a Triangle Main Lines Forum in 2011 which has periodically brought together public and private sector owners and operators of critical rail assets along with the communities and anchor institutions adjacent to the rail lines. The forum is designed to help stakeholders: i) better understand projects affecting the region's main rail corridors, ii) identify interests of primary importance to the stakeholders, and iii) generate collaborative efforts to advance shared interests.

Ensuring that any investments affecting our rail corridors are done with detailed attention to longer term impacts on forecast freight movement, inter-city passenger rail, regional rail connections contained in this MTP, and opportunities for High Speed Rail is a key strategy for the two MPOs in this plan. Ensuring that near term decisions do not constrain choices or drive up costs for mid-term and long-term services is an important consideration for the MPOs. As both in-region rail connections are implemented, and intercity rail services connecting the Triangle to other regions is expanded, taking steps to make sure that service is fast and reliable will be important to attract and retain ridership. For the most recent month reported (October 2017), only roughly half of Carolinian and Piedmont intercity passenger trains arrived on time, defined as within 20 minutes of scheduled time for the Carolinian and 10 minutes of schedule time for the Piedmont.

7.11 Air Transportation

Raleigh-Durham International Airport (RDU) serves both MPOs with passenger and air cargo services. The airport is located on 5,000 acres near the boundary between the two MPOs in Wake County, and is governed as an authority with board members appointed by the largest jurisdictions in the two MPOs: Wake County, Durham County, Raleigh and Durham City.

During 2016, RDU served 11 million passengers, about 90,000 tons of cargo and 190,000 aircraft operations.

Recent major projects have been designed to improve aviation services:

- Terminal 2 was completed in 2011; this \$573 million, 920,000 square foot project includes 37 boarding gates
- Terminal 1 reconstruction was completed in 2014; this \$68 million project rebuilt the oldest terminal at RDU.



RDU completed a new master plan – Vision2040 – in 2017. For more information on Vision2040 – and the investments it considers – visit <https://vision2040.rdu.com/>

Vision 2040's baseline forecast, used for this plan, envisions growth in enplaned passengers (those boarding air carriers at RDU) from 5.5 million in 2016 to about 8.5 million. No additional terminal gates are planned in the first ten years. General aviation operations are expected to grow modestly and remain below pre-recession levels.

7.12 Recommended Special Plans, Projects & Studies

Section 5.4 already identified corridor studies, small area plans, feasibility studies, functional plans or similar efforts that have been completed to provide input into the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. This section outlines possible plans or studies using the same format as the completed plans and studies described in Section 5.4. Although this section is not designed to list every plan or study that may be undertaken, it indicates some of the major efforts that the two MPOs and their partners anticipate to pursue through their annual Urban Planning Work Programs (UPWPs), the planning budget documents that guide

MPO activities each fiscal year. Also included are major efforts designed to improve the input data, accuracy and functionality of the region's principal analysis tool, the Triangle Region Travel Demand Model (TRM).

	<i>Recommended Plan or Study</i>	<i>Type</i>
1	<i>US 15-501 Corridor Study.</i> This MPO and NCDOT study will develop a corridor vision based on public and stakeholder input, identify capacity and safety deficiencies, propose policies and projects, and create an implementation plan. This is for the corridor between Fordham Blvd. and University Dr. 2019 completion expected.	Corridor Plan
2	<i>NC 54 West Corridor Study.</i> This MPO and NCDOT study will forecast and evaluate future land uses and traffic impacts, conduct public and stakeholder outreach, and develop projects and strategies for transportation improvements. 2018 completion expected.	Corridor Plan
3	<i>Downtown Durham Transportation Study.</i> This MPO and City of Durham study will create a transportation vision that will propose a strategy and projects that balance the current and future operational needs of all users. 2019 completion expected.	Small Area Plan
1	<i>Southwest Area Study Update.</i> Building off of the successfully completed comprehensive multi-modal studies (Southwest, Northeast, Southeast), the MPO will continue to develop updates of these studies on a recurring basis. The MPO will begin the update of the Southwest Area Study during FY 2018, with recommendations from that update carried forward to inform the 2050 MTP. The study will examine land use and socioeconomic forecasts in the area, and develop a long-range and interim list of multi-modal transportation improvement priorities for the subarea described.	Small Area Plan
2	<i>Northeast Area Study.</i> Building off of the successfully completed comprehensive multi-modal studies (Southwest, Northeast, Southeast), the MPO will continue to develop updates of these studies on a recurring basis. The MPO anticipates beginning the update of the Northeast Area Study during FY 2019, with recommendations from that update carried forward to inform the 2050 MTP. This study may include the municipalities Wake Forest, Rolesville, Knightdale, Wendell, Zebulon, Youngsville, Franklinton and Bunn, as well as the surrounding areas of Franklin and Wake Counties. The study would examine land use and socioeconomic forecasts in the area, and develop a long-range and interim list of multi-modal transportation improvement priorities for the subarea described.	Small Area Plan
3	<i>Southeast Area Study.</i> Building off of the successfully completed comprehensive multi-modal studies (Southwest, Northeast, Southeast), the MPO will continue to develop updates of these studies on a recurring basis. The MPO anticipates beginning the update of the Southeast Area Study during FY 2021 and inform future MTP updates. This study will cover the municipalities of Knightdale, Wendell, Zebulon, Archer Lodge, Clayton, and Garner. Surrounding areas in Johnston and Wake Counties will also be included. The study will examine land use and socioeconomic forecasts in the area, and develop a long-range and interim list of multi-modal transportation improvement priorities for the subarea described.	Small Area Plan
4	<i>Transit Systems Plan.</i> This study will assist in the development of the transit section of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan element of the MTP. This study will be conducted over multiple years, and will evaluate, identify and prioritize future transit needs for the region and will be incorporated into the next Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The study will utilize a needs-based planning process and engage transit stakeholders, including local governments and the public, throughout the	Transit Plan

	<i>Recommended Plan or Study</i>	<i>Type</i>
	study process. Specifically, the effort will include a detailed level of analysis of current and future transit system plans and needs, and provides recommendations for a regional decision-making framework to guide future transit policy decisions. The plan will identify priorities for transit and ancillary road, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements. The planning effort will also explore current demand-response service and make recommendations for improvements to meet future demand. Results of the planning effort should be a prioritized set of infrastructure improvements necessary to implement a fully-realized transit vision for the CAMPO area.	
5	<i>Major Corridors Study.</i> The MPO and NCDOT will create a transportation vision that will propose a strategy, projects, and programs that balance the current and future mobility needs, particularly in commuting corridors, for all users.	Corridor Study
1	<i>Triangle Regional Freight Plan.</i> The two MPOs and NCDOT conducted a freight flows, forecasts, capacities, performance, conditions and trends in the Triangle to develop a set of policy, program and project recommendations. 2018 completion expected.	Transportation Plan
2	<i>NC 98 Corridor Study.</i> The two MPOs and NCDOT are conducting a study to identify capacity deficiencies and safety issues, and to develop multimodal solutions to those deficiencies. 2018 completion expected. http://www.nc98corridor.com/	Corridor Plan
3	<i>Triangle Strategic Toll Study.</i> The two MPOs and NCDOT are conducting a study to develop a holistic implementation plan for tolling and managed lanes in the Triangle. It includes an evaluation of technologies, operational structures, performance measures, and financing/partnering mechanisms. 2019 completion expected.	Transportation Plan
4	<i>Intelligent Transportation Systems Plan Update.</i> The two MPOs and NCDOT are collaborating on an update of the Plan that will make recommendations on overall system architecture, data and other compatibility standards, infrastructure and operation needs.	Transportation Plan
5	<i>CommunityViz 3.0.</i> The 2040 MTP and 2045 MTP processes have provided the Triangle with future regional planning scenarios based on a land use model called Community Visualization. The model provides population and employment growth locations (socioeconomic data – SE Data) in a format that can be easily imported into the Triangle Regional Model (TRM). The CommunityViz3.0 effort will include an update of socio-economic data for use in the next MTP as well as more seamless links to TRM methods and technical changes to improve accuracy and precision of the forecasts.	Transportation Model Improvement
6	<i>Triangle Regional Model Services Bureau Activities.</i> The Triangle Regional Model Services Bureau will prepare for major model updates as well as shorter term model improvements. Examples of proposed activities include: (1) improve links to CommunityViz, (2) improve parking constraint model, (3) improve flexibility in treating the ridership benefits of premium transit services, and (4) examining ways to better address the travel of visitors and tourists and account for special events.	Transportation Model Improvement
7	<i>MPO & Transit Agency Information Sharing.</i> The MPOs and transit providers will develop mechanisms to share information to support transit performance measures, targets and project tracking.	Performance Measurement

8. Our Financial Plan

Federal regulations require the 2045 MTP to have a financial plan. This requirement means that the cost of the roadway, transit and other transportation facilities and services must be covered by state, federal, local, private and other transportation revenues that can be reasonably expected to be available. The Financial Plan provides a comparison of expected revenues and costs from 2015 through 2045 – the 30-year period of this plan.

All financial data in this section is presented in Year 2016 constant dollars, meaning the values indicate what it would cost to build the system if we paid for and built all the projects today. In reality, projects will be built over a 30-year time frame and inflation will affect costs. Appendix 11 provides additional data using the year-of-expenditure value that takes this inflationary effect into consideration.

The 2045 MTP divides projects into three time periods:

- Near-term: 2018 to 2025;
- Mid-term: 2026 to 2035; and
- Long-term: 2036 to 2045.

These periods are used not only as a matter of good planning practice that more evenly matches and distributes the total costs and revenues over the 30-year planning period, but also so we can analyze the impacts of our investments against air quality benchmarks.

8.1 Costs

The two MPOs used the same cost assumptions for the major parts of the plan, including:

- Roadway: The plan used the following hierarchy for highway costs. For example, the TIP cost was used for projects in the TIP, but if none is available (i.e., the project is not yet in the TIP), then the SPOT cost was used, and so on:
 - FY 2018-2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP);
 - Available feasibility studies
 - Strategic Planning Office of Transportation (NCDOT SPOT) data from the prioritization process.
 - 2015 highway cost estimate spreadsheet from NCDOT.
- Bus Transit and Rail Transit: Used two financial models with similar methodologies. One model is based on the Durham County and Orange County transit plans and the other is the model used by the Wake County transit plan.
- Travel Demand Management (TDM): Used costs estimates from the regional plan administered by the Triangle J Council of Governments.
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS): Used cost estimates from the Triangle Region Intelligent Transportation Systems – Project Evaluation and Prioritization Report. (March 2010).

8.2 Revenues

Roadway Revenues

The MPOs made an assumption that future Strategic Transportation Investment (STI) revenues beyond the year 2027 would continue to grow at the same linear rate that they are projected to grow within the 2018-2027 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) period. STI represents the majority of state and federal funding available for capital projects. STI revenues are divided into three categories of funding: Statewide Mobility, Regional Impact, and Division Needs. The method assumed that CAMPO and DCHC would receive a portion of the Regional Impact and Division Needs revenues commensurate with the MPOs' portion of the population within their respective regions and divisions, and that CAMPO and DCHC would receive a portion of the Statewide Mobility revenues commensurate with the average proportion of this funding that has gone to each MPO in previous cycles under the STI policy (34% for CAMPO and 10% for DCHC).

A similar approach based on the 2018-2027 STIP annual growth trend was used for projecting growth of the Highway Fund, which is used for maintenance and operations projects. For the Highway Fund, each MPO was assumed to receive an amount proportional to its population within the state. Because the population of the area is expected to grow faster than the state as a whole, this results in a growing percentage of funds for this region over time—in 2018, CAMPO contains 13% of the state population and DCHC contains 5% of the state population, but by 2045 these grow to 16% and 6% respectively.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds are exempt from STI, so they were calculated separately. The amount of funding for CMAQ was assumed to grow in the future at a rate consistent with the trendline growth rate of North Carolina Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds in the current federal transportation funding bill, the FAST Act.

The financial model assumes a 3.5% annual discount to adjust for inflation in the transportation sector. All revenues are reported in year 2016 dollars. It is important to note that some of the funds included in this statewide model, such as federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) do not have to be used for highways. Some of the funds can be “flexed,” or transferred, to programs for other transportation modes such as transit, pedestrian and bicycles.

The method used the fiscal year 2018-2027 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for the years 2018 through 2027. The STIP identifies the budgeted state and federal funding source for transportation projects and therefore is the best available source for near term revenue forecasts.

The NCDOT financial model and STIP do not represent all of the available highway revenue. The MPOs expect to have additional funding available from the following sources:

- Toll Revenues – A portion of revenues for managed lane and toll road projects are assumed to come from toll revenue bonds, which are paid back over time by users.
- Local Funding – Local governments often issue bonds to finance specific projects such as roadways, intersection improvements, street paving, bicycle facilities and sidewalks; the revenue to repay these bonds is typically the property or sales tax revenues received by the local government over time.
- Private Funding –Sections of some of the roads in the 2040 MTP, or widenings of existing roads, will be paid for by private developers as they develop adjacent property. Additionally, some of the rail crossing related projects include private funding from railroad partners.

Figure 8.1 identifies the highway revenue sources and calculation assumptions.

Figure 8.1: Roadway Revenue Assumptions

Item	CAMPO Assumptions	DCHC Assumptions
Capital - Federal / State (STI)	Continuation of linear revenue trend from 2018-2027 STIP period. Division Needs and Regional Impact category amounts based on MPO population within Division/Region. Statewide Mobility category amount based on average performance from previous two STI cycles.	Continuation of linear revenue trend from 2018-2027 STIP period. Division Needs and Regional Impact category amounts based on MPO population within Division/Region. Statewide Mobility category amount based on average performance from previous two STI cycles.
Maintenance -- Federal/State/Other	Portion of anticipated NCDOT Highway Fund revenues relative to MPO population. Future revenue growth based on linear revenue trend from 2018-2027 STIP period.	Portion of anticipated NCDOT Highway Fund revenues relative to MPO population. Future revenue growth based on linear revenue trend from 2018-2027 STIP period.
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality	Amount of CMAQ funding suballocated to MPO is grown at an annual rate consistent with the annual growth rate authorized in the FAST act.	Amount of CMAQ funding suballocated to MPO is grown at an annual rate consistent with the annual growth rate authorized in the FAST act.
Toll roadway	Staff forecast.	Staff forecast.
Local (Capital Improvement Program)	Staff forecast.	Staff forecast.
Private	Staff forecast.	Staff forecast.
Annual Inflation Rate	Assumes 3.5% annual inflation rate.	Assumes 3.5% annual inflation rate.

Transit Revenues

The transit financial models discussed in an earlier part of this section are used to forecast transit costs and revenues. In April 2009, the North Carolina House passed the Congestion Relief and Intermodal 21st Century Transportation Fund (House Bill 148). The legislation permits a local voter referendum to increase the sales tax to raise revenues for transit systems. The half-cent sales tax increase has been approved in Durham, Wake and Orange Counties. There are several major transit revenue assumptions in *Figure 8.2* that forecast the implementation of new revenue sources permitted by House Bill 148, including the ½ cent sales tax for transit services. In addition to these major assumptions, there are many detailed bus and rail transit revenue assumptions that are important enough to be identified in this report. *Figure 8.3 and Figure 8.4* present the detailed assumptions used for calculating the bus transit and rail transit revenues.

Figure 8.2: Major Transit Revenue Assumptions

Item	CAMPO Assumptions	DCHC Assumptions
Year begin ½ cent sales tax	Wake County: 2016	Durham County: 2013. Orange County: 2013.
Growth in sales tax	Wake County: 4% and 5%	Durham County: 4.33% Orange County: 3.71%
Increase in Vehicle Registration Fee	Wake County: currently \$5, increased to \$8, at 2% growth rate.	Durham County: currently \$5, increased to \$8, at 2.7% growth rate. Orange County: currently \$7, increased to \$10, at 3.3% growth rate.
New Vehicle Registration Fee	Wake County: new \$7 at 2% growth rate.	Durham County: new \$7 at 2.7% growth rate. Orange County: new \$7 at 3.3% growth rate.
Rental Car Tax	Wake County: 2.5% growth rate.	Durham County: 4.8% growth rate. Orange County: 4.8% growth rate.
Local Property Tax for Transit	None.	Durham County: 1 cent for 2 years to cover 30% of CRT extension local share. Orange County: 1 cent for 9 years to cover 70% of CRT extension local share. Chapel Hill/Carrboro: 1 cent for 13 years to cover LRT extension local share.

Figure 8.3: Detailed Transit Revenue Assumptions

Item	CAMPO Assumptions	DCHC Assumptions
Capital -- Federal & State	For existing services, assumes an amount of future federal/state funding that is consistent with current funding, keeping pace with inflation. For future CRT and BRT, assumes 50% of total cost is Federal. Uses 3.5% inflation factor.	For existing services, assumes an amount of future federal/state funding that is consistent with current funding, keeping pace with inflation. For Durham-Orange LRT, assumes 50% of total cost is Federal and 10% is State. For CRT, assumes 50% of total cost is Federal. For CRT extension to Hillsborough, assumes 62.5% Federal and 25% State. For LRT extension to Carrboro, assumes 65% Federal and 25% State. Assumes that STI regulations could be relaxed by final decade of plan to allow higher state contribution to projects. Uses 3.5% inflation factor.
Operations, Maintenance, Planning -- Federal & State	For existing services, assumes an amount of future federal/state funding that is consistent with current funding, keeping pace with inflation. For CRT, assumes 10% State funding and 28% Federal funding at start (Federal percentage decreasing over time after 2033). For BRT, assumes 10% State funding and \$1.8 million per year in Federal funding. For future local bus service, assumes 5% Federal funding at start (decreasing in percentage over time).	For existing services, assumes an amount of future federal/state funding that is consistent with current funding, keeping pace with inflation.
Local	For existing services, assumes an amount of future local funding that is consistent with current funding, keeping pace with inflation. For new services, assumes portion of local sales tax and vehicle registration fees and portion of GoTriangle revenues (see Figure 8.2). 68% of GoTriangle revenues used in CAMPO area.	For existing services, assumes an amount of future local funding that is consistent with current funding, keeping pace with inflation. For new services reflected in the Durham County and Orange County Transit Plans, assumes portion of local sales tax and vehicle registration fees and portion of GoTriangle revenues (see Figure 8.2). 32% of GoTriangle revenues used in DCHC area. For new services not reflected in the county transit plans, assumes additional funding from local sources (\$32 million).
Fares	For existing services, assumes future farebox revenues consistent with current levels, keeping pace with inflation. For CRT, assumes 20% of operating costs covered by fares. For BRT, assumes 24% of operating costs covered by fares. For local bus service, assumes increasing percentage over time for first decade, leveling out around 12% of operating expenses in 2026 and beyond.	For existing services, assumes future farebox revenues consistent with current levels, keeping pace with inflation. No assumption regarding farebox revenue for future services.
Bond Proceeds	Issue bonds for revenue to support system construction and capitalization.	Issue bonds for revenue to support system construction and capitalization.
Private (University Systems)	Private systems will cover own costs, thus revenues equal costs.	Private systems will cover own costs, thus revenues equal costs.

Additional/New Revenue Sources

The current transportation funding programs will not produce enough revenue to finance the multimodal transportation needs in the Triangle. Therefore, the MPOs have assumed Additional/New Revenue Sources to close this funding gap and presented this information in a separate table. The MPOs have a reasonable expectation to realize these new revenue sources based on the many local and statewide commissions that have studied transportation financing and recommended new funding sources. In fact, many solid steps have already been taken:

- In April 2009, the North Carolina House passed the Congestion Relief and Intermodal 21st Century Transportation Fund (House Bill 148). The legislation permits a local voter referendum to increase the sales tax to raise revenues for transit systems. The half-cent sales tax increase permitted in Wake, Durham and Orange counties by this legislation is used to calculate new revenue sources in the 2045 MTP. Since that time Durham, Orange, and Wake counties have enacted half-cent sales tax increases as well as increases in vehicle registration fees after successful local voter referenda. In Wake County these two revenue streams, along with the existing rental car tax, are on track to generate over \$90 million in FY 18 and are forecasted to exceed \$100 million by FY 2021.
- The Triangle Region has a rental car tax that produces approximately \$7 million annually to fund Triangle Transit services and studies;
- Several municipalities, such as the City of Durham and Town of Chapel Hill, have pushed for and received increases in the vehicle registration fee;
- The North Carolina Turnpike Authority (NCTA) was created in 2004 and is currently working to build the extension of NC 540; and,
- The Charlotte area has a sales tax in place, and the North Carolina Board of Transportation and General Assembly have ensured that the required state match has kept pace with this large revenue source.
- The US Department of Transportation (USDOT) as well as several states (most notably Oregon and California) have begun pilot projects for mileage based user fees (VMT) that could be used in conjunction with or to replace and expand the existing motor fuels tax funded revenue system. In 2016 the USDOT announced a \$95 million, five year grant program to test alternative revenue mechanisms including VMT based systems.

It is important to note the following background information on the Additional/New Revenue Sources proposed in the 2045 MTP:

- Many of these new revenue options would require legislation from the North Carolina General Assembly and/or the U.S. Congress. The MPOs are not empowered to invoke these tax and revenue program changes.
- The 2045 MTP envisions a level of effort to increase revenue for highways and transit that is similar to that depicted in the Plan. The exact type and mechanism for increasing these revenues, e.g., sales tax, property tax, VMT fees, is not a certainty. On the next page, Figure 8.4 presents the assumptions for Additional New Revenue Sources.

Figure 8.4: Assumptions for Additional/New Revenue Sources

Item	CAMPO Assumptions	CAMPO Amount
Sales Tax (or equivalent) Wake County	Level of effort equivalent to a 1/2 cent sales tax increase in 2026 for transportation improvements. Revenue increases commensurate with population. Requires legislation from N.C. General Assembly.	\$ 3,326
Sales Tax (or equivalent) Non-Wake Counties	Level of effort equivalent to a 1/2 cent sales tax increase in 2026 for transportation improvements. Revenue increases commensurate with population. Requires legislation from N.C. General Assembly.	\$ 183
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fee	New funding for transportation improvements based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Revenue changes commensurate with VMT for the CAMPO region from 2026 to 2045. Level of effort equivalent to 1 cent/mile generates \$1.265 Billion from 2026 to 2035 and \$1.454 Billion from 2036-2045.	\$ 2,729
Total		\$6,238

Airport Revenues and Costs

The Vision 2040 Master Plan for Raleigh-Durham International Airport (RDU) projects revenues for upcoming years and defines a list of projects to be constructed with those revenues. Through 2040, the Airport is forecasting \$2.7 billion in revenue (in year of expenditure dollars), from the following sources:

- \$1.5705 billion from RDU funds
- \$659.3 million from RDU debt
- \$182.2 million from federal funds
- \$281 million from customer facility charges
- \$10.5 million from NCDOT

The Vision 2040 Master Plan shows the following expenditures through the year 2040, using the revenues identified above:

- \$905.3 million in critical infrastructure preservation projects
- \$1.8 billion in discretionary infrastructure projects

The Master Plan also identifies additional projects that could be constructed if demand warrants and additional funding can be secured:

- \$677 million in private equity projects
- \$2.04 billion in deferred projects

8.3 Balancing Costs and Revenues

DCHC MPO – Roadways – \$7.5 Billion Roadway/Bike/Pedestrian Plan

Figure 8.5 shows the roadway related costs and revenues in separate sections and provides subtotals for the three horizon periods. The cost and revenue comparison shows a positive balance of \$212 million. There are relatively small differences in the 2018-2025 and 2026-2035 time periods but these amounts are due to timing differences between the revenues that are reported in the decade revenue becomes available (including some revenues that are paying off expenses from prior projects) and the costs that are reported in the decade a project opens, and therefore will be balanced as projects move through the Transportation Improvement Program process. One noticeable difference from past MTPs is the larger amount of funding shown for maintenance and operations, which is likely to make up a larger portion of overall spending in the region over time.

Figure 8.5: DCHC Roadway Funding

Cost Category (millions \$)		DCHC Total	TIP/ '18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Roadways & Alternative Transportation					
	Roadways (STI Statewide)	\$ 2,618	\$ 480	\$ 1,048	\$ 1,090
	Roadways (STI Regional)	\$ 390	\$ 24	\$ 190	\$ 176
	Roadways (STI Division)	\$ 443	\$ 53	\$ 167	\$ 223
	Maintenance & Operations (Highway Fund)	\$ 3,525	\$ 874	\$ 1,242	\$ 1,409
	Bicycle & Pedestrian (STI Division)	\$ 292	\$ 62	\$ 130	\$ 100
	Transportation Demand Management (STI Division)	\$ 44	\$ 9	\$ 20	\$ 15
	Intelligent Transportation Systems (STI Statewide)	\$ 74	\$ 14	\$ 35	\$ 25
	Transportation System Management (All Categories)	\$ 131	\$ 27	\$ 60	\$ 45
Roadways & Alternative Transportation Cost Total		\$ 7,518	\$ 1,542	\$ 2,892	\$ 3,083
Revenue Category (millions \$)		DCHC Total	TIP/ '18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Roadways & Alternative Transportation					
	STI Statewide Funds	\$ 2,421	\$ 542	\$ 898	\$ 981
	STI Regional Funds	\$ 667	\$ 37	\$ 277	\$ 353
	STI Division Funds	\$ 606	\$ 122	\$ 228	\$ 256
	STI Transition Project Funds	\$ 36	\$ 36	\$ -	\$ -
	Highway Fund (Maintenance & Operations)	\$ 3,525	\$ 874	\$ 1,242	\$ 1,409
	Toll Revenue Bonds	\$ 196	\$ 0.1	\$ 196	\$ -
	Local Funding - Bicycle & Pedestrian	\$ 75	\$ 35	\$ 20	\$ 20
	Local Funding - Roadways	\$ 75	\$ 25	\$ 25	\$ 25
	Private Funds	\$ 81	\$ 27	\$ 30	\$ 24
	CMAQ Funding	\$ 49	\$ 17	\$ 18	\$ 15
Roadways & Alternative Transportation Revenue Total		\$ 7,730	\$ 1,714	\$ 2,933	\$ 3,083
Difference		\$ 213	\$ 171	\$ 41	\$ 0

DCHC MPO – Transit – \$4.7 Billion Transit Plan

The values shown in Figure 8.6 represent both the costs and revenues for DCHC MPO transit services. The Existing Services section represents a continuation of the current transit services and program funding. The New Services section represents the additional funding made available by the transit sales tax and increased vehicle registration fees enabled by House Bill 148 and the subsequent county sales tax referendums, and the additional support from state and federal sources for improved bus transit services and new rail transit. The New Services are 70 percent of the total transit funding and include additional transit projects beyond those included in the Durham County and Orange County transit plans, indicating the MPO's increasing commitment to transit.

Figure 8.6: DCHC Transit Funding

Cost Category (millions \$)		DCHC Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Transit					
	Continued Funding for Existing Services	\$ 1,350	\$ 386	\$ 482	\$ 482
	Funding for New/Expanded Services in County Plans	\$ 3,130	\$ 1,356	\$ 1,303	\$ 471
	CRT Extension from West Durham to Hillsborough	\$ 160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 160
	LRT Extension from Chapel Hill to Carrboro	\$ 120	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120
Transit Cost Total		\$ 4,760	\$ 1,742	\$ 1,785	\$ 1,233
Revenue Category (millions \$)		DCHC Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Transit					
	State/Federal - to support existing service	\$ 259	\$ 74	\$ 93	\$ 93
	Local - to support existing service	\$ 682	\$ 195	\$ 244	\$ 244
	Fares - existing service	\$ 137	\$ 39	\$ 49	\$ 49
	Other Sources - to support existing service	\$ 272	\$ 78	\$ 97	\$ 97
	Local - new/expanded service (from county plans)	\$ 1,171	\$ 320	\$ 412	\$ 439
	Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$ 1,165	\$ 481	\$ 480	\$ 205
	Joint Development	\$ 44	\$ 0.4	\$ 43	\$ -
	Borrowing/Debt	\$ 736	\$ 460	\$ 272	\$ 4
	Additional local for CRT/LRT extensions	\$ 32	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32
	STI Regional Funds	\$ 261	\$ 95	\$ 96	\$ 70
Transit Revenue Total		\$ 4,760	\$ 1,742	\$ 1,785	\$ 1,233
Difference		\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -

CAMPO – Roadways – \$27.7 Billion Roadway/Bike/Pedestrian/Other Projects

Figure 8.7 shows the roadway related costs and revenues in separate sections and provides subtotals for the three decades of the plan. The cost and revenue comparison shows fiscal constraint across all horizon years in the plan. One noticeable difference from past MTPs is the larger amount of funding shown for maintenance and operations, which is likely to make up a larger portion of overall spending in the region over time.

Figure 8.7: CAMPO Roadway Funding

Cost Category (millions \$)		CAMPO Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Roadways & Alternative Transportation					
	Roadways (Statewide)	\$ 5,891	\$ 2,383	\$ 2,929	\$ 579
	Roadways (Regional)	\$ 3,101	\$ 804	\$ 1,125	\$ 1,172
	Roadways (Division)	\$ 5,266	\$ 371	\$ 2,030	\$ 2,864
	Maintenance & Operations (Highway Fund)	\$ 9,342	\$ 2,252	\$ 3,284	\$ 3,806
	Bicycle & Pedestrian	\$ 925	\$ 174	\$ 347	\$ 404
	System Optimization (TDM/TSM/CSM/ITS) All Categories	\$ 337	\$ 63	\$ 126	\$ 147
Roadways & Alternative Transportation Cost Total		\$ 24,862	\$ 6,046	\$ 9,842	\$ 8,973
Revenue Category (millions \$)		CAMPO Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Roadways & Alternative Transportation					
	STI Statewide Funds	\$ 8,020	\$ 1,749	\$ 2,936	\$ 3,336
	STI Regional Funds	\$ 3,101	\$ 804	\$ 1,125	\$ 1,172
	STI Division Funds (Includes Additional Revenue)	\$ 4,738	\$ 371	\$ 1,746	\$ 2,620
	STI Transition Project Funds	\$ 35	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ -
	Highway Fund (Maintenance & Operations)	\$ 9,342	\$ 2,252	\$ 3,284	\$ 3,806
	Toll Revenue Bonds	\$ 1,165	\$ 579	\$ 587	\$ -
	Local/Development Funding	\$ 1,213	\$ 515	\$ 442	\$ 256
	CMAQ Funding	\$ 131	\$ 44	\$ 47	\$ 39
Roadways & Alternative Transportation Revenue Total		\$ 27,744	\$ 6,348	\$ 10,167	\$ 11,229
Difference		\$ 2,882	\$ 302	\$ 324	\$ 2,256

CAMPO – Transit – \$6.6 Billion Transit Plan

The values shown in Figure 8.8 represent both the costs and revenues for CAMPO transit services. The Existing Services section represents a continuation of the current transit services and program funding. The New Services section represents the additional funding made available by the transit sales tax and increased vehicle registration fees enabled by House Bill 148 and the subsequent county sales tax referendums, and the additional support from state and federal sources for improved bus transit services and new rail transit. The New Services are approximately 70 percent of the total transit funding. This is consistent with the proportion of additional transit service identified in the 2040 MTP.

Figure 8.8: CAMPO Transit Funding

Cost Category (millions \$)		CAMPO Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Transit					
	Continued Funding for Existing Services	\$ 1,522	\$ 435	\$ 544	\$ 544
	Funding for New/Expanded Services	\$ 5,061	\$ 1,664	\$ 1,181	\$ 2,216
Transit Cost Total		\$ 6,583	\$ 2,099	\$ 1,725	\$ 2,760
Revenue Category (millions \$)		CAMPO Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Transit					
	State/Federal - to support existing service	\$ 262	\$ 75	\$ 94	\$ 94
	Local - to support existing service	\$ 854	\$ 244	\$ 305	\$ 305
	Fares - existing service	\$ 233	\$ 67	\$ 83	\$ 83
	Other Sources - to support existing service	\$ 172	\$ 49	\$ 61	\$ 61
	Local - new/expanded service	\$ 2,459	\$ 683	\$ 875	\$ 902
	Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$ 1,347	\$ 509	\$ 36	\$ 802
	Fares, State/Federal Operating Grants for new service	\$ 422	\$ 40	\$ 195	\$ 186
	Borrowing/Debt	\$ 834	\$ 432	\$ 76	\$ 327
Transit Revenue Total		\$ 6,583	\$ 2,099	\$ 1,725	\$ 2,760
Difference		\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 0

9. Critical Factors in the Planning Process

Our transportation investments influence more than just our ability to get from one place to another. How and where we develop roads, transit lines and other transportation services impact other things we value. The health and well-being of the natural environment, our neighborhoods, and those who live in them are vital to maintaining the quality of life our region is known for. Federal law recognizes these important considerations by requiring that Metropolitan Transportation Plans specifically address eleven planning factors:

- Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
- Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users.
- Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users.
- Increase accessibility and mobility for people and freight.
- Protect and enhance the environment.
- Promote energy conservation.
- Improve quality of life for the community.
- Promote consistency between transportation improvements and planned State and local growth and economic development patterns.
- Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system for all modes.
- Promote efficient system management and operation.
- Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

Each of these factors is addressed throughout this report. This section highlights the following critical factors:

- *Air quality*: demonstrating that transportation plans will further clean air goals and meet air pollutant standards;
- *Environmental Justice*: showing how transportation plans relate to communities that have been historically underserved or disproportionately impacted by transportation investments; and
- *Safety and Security*: addressing how the transportation plans and the organizations that implement them promote safer and more secure travel choices.

9.1 Transportation - Air Quality Conformity

Transportation-air quality conformity ("conformity") is a way to ensure that Federal funding and approval goes to transportation activities that are consistent with air quality goals. Conformity applies to metropolitan transportation plans—such as this one, to transportation improvement programs (TIPs), and to projects funded or approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in areas that do not meet -- or have recently not met -- air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, or nitrogen dioxide. These areas are known as "non-attainment areas" or "maintenance areas," respectively.

A conformity determination demonstrates that the total emissions projected for a plan or program are within the emissions limits ("budgets") established by the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality, and that transportation control measures (TCMs) – specific projects or programs enumerated in the SIP that are designed to improve air quality – are implemented in a timely fashion. As of October 1, 2016, the Triangle Region no longer has any conformity requirements related to our Metropolitan Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs as we have met all requirements under the Clean Air Act.

Although the region is no longer required to demonstrate air quality conformity, both MPOs are committed to protecting air quality and health through transportation investments, for example, by continuing to operate a robust regional Transportation Demand Management program to encourage travelers to use lower polluting forms of transportation such as transit, carpools, vanpools, cycling and walking. The MPOs recognize that good air quality is a key component of the region's quality of life and that continued effort is needed to accommodate on-going rapid growth in ways that won't harm air quality.

Air Quality Analysis

Although not currently required, the two MPOs still calculate the regional emissions that would be produced based on highway and transit usage predicted in this transportation plan, using the latest EPA air quality model, MOVES. The projected emissions for the plan are then compared to the emissions limits (or "budgets") that were last established by the SIP. The final version of this plan document will report those emissions so that that region can continue to understand and respond to air quality conditions.

The MPOs undertake this voluntary analysis to recognize the importance of clean air to our region.

9.2 Environmental Justice

The intent of environmental justice is to avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations; and ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.

Environmental justice addresses fairness toward the disadvantaged and often addresses the possible exclusion of racial and ethnic minorities, low-income people, the elderly, and persons with disabilities or communication barriers from decision-making. The federal government has identified environmental justice as an important goal in transportation, and local and regional governments must incorporate environmental justice into transportation planning. Capital Area MPO and DCHC MPO goals that relate to the public transportation system, the protection of the natural environment and social systems, and the public involvement process each have objectives that support environmental justice. This support must be evident throughout the transportation planning process, including those processes for the long-range transportation plan, transportation improvement program, and specific project planning.

Even though the term "environmental justice" is not in federal legislation, the concept and its application have been developed through a succession of court cases, transportation regulations, agency memoranda, and Executive Orders. Much of the legal application is based on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that provides protection from discriminatory actions or results from federal, or federally assisted or approved, actions. In terms of transportation planning, environmental justice seeks to ensure that the disadvantaged:

1. Have access to the decision-making process;
2. Realize benefits from investments that are commensurate with the population as a whole;
3. Do not shoulder a disproportionate share of the negative effects and burden resulting from the implementation of transportation projects; and,
4. Do not incur a disproportionate share of the financial cost.

The Capital Area MPO and DCHC MPO have carried out a comprehensive and thorough set of activities to ensure that disadvantaged persons, as characterized in federal regulations, do not suffer discrimination in the transportation planning and implementation process. These activities have been in the area of both public participation and plan analysis. The following sections describe the environmental justice activities that occurred as part of the 2045 MTP. Detailed maps are contained in Appendix 12.

Access to the Decision-making Process

The Capital Area MPO and DCHC MPO ensured that all individuals, regardless of race, ethnicity, income, age, or disability, had access to the planning process. Throughout the plan's development, documents were available for public review several times.

CAMPO staff began conducting public outreach for the Draft 2045 MTP Preferred Scenario in the fall of 2017. The overarching goal for this phase of public engagement was to inform and consult. The specific goals were to

- Increase public awareness of CAMPO and the MTP (or that an official regional transportation planning process exists) in general
- Share information and solicit feedback on the Preferred Scenario (and later the Additional Funding scenario, as well),
- Inform the public of the comment period for the current 2045 Plan Update, and,
- Increase signups for CAMPO's email updates along with Twitter and Facebook followers.

One of the commitments in a consultative process is to circle back with public participants and inform them of any final decisions or outcomes, and how their input influenced those outcomes. Upon adoption of the 2045 MTP document in early 2018, it is the intention of CAMPO staff to send a media release, email update, website update, and social media posts advertising the adoption along with a spreadsheet of comments received including a CAMPO response regarding the disposition.

Outreach Mechanics

Each MPO has conducted outreach in ways that are most attuned to their audiences and consistent with their public engagement policies.

During the Fall of 2017, for the Draft 2045 MTP, CAMPO staff:

- Attended 10 public meetings or events to conduct outreach activities
- The CAMPO MTP website was regularly updated,
- Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter posts were repeatedly sent (Facebook campaign reached 11,500+ people),
- Multiple emails were sent to CAMPO's community contacts,
- Several community partners shared information (RTA, RTP, GoTriangle, GoRaleigh, Member Jurisdictions)

Public comments have come through a variety of sources, both official and unofficial. This includes verbal conversations with staff at public meetings, handwritten comment card submissions, emails, comments on Facebook, official letters from member jurisdictions, etc.

In the DCHC MPO, documents were available online and at all local public libraries and planning departments. Notice of the public review periods was published in local newspapers and sent by email and post office mail. Environmental justice community organizations and neighborhoods are included on the DCHC MPO's email and mail lists.

In addition, the DCHC MPO held public workshops for review of the Goals and Objectives, socioeconomic data and alternatives analysis. The DCHC MPO held three to four public workshops for each review period. These workshops were held throughout the MPO: one in Hillsborough, one in Chapel Hill/Carrboro, one in Pittsboro and one in Durham. The Hillsborough, Chapel Hill and Durham workshops were held at locations along public transportation routes. The Pittsboro workshop was not because Pittsboro does not have bus service. Accommodations were made at public meeting and hearings for the disabled.

Plan Benefits

The investments in transportation infrastructure included in the 2045 MTP will benefit the MPO's population in many ways including increased mobility, safety, time savings, economic development, and recreational opportunities. The investment in transit in particular will benefit low income populations that do not have access to personal vehicles and the disabled who may not be able to operate personal vehicles. Currently, tens of thousands of households in the Triangle do not have personal vehicles. The travel forecasts for the 2045 MTP estimate that a majority of transit trips will be made by people from households that do not have cars or low-income households with cars.

For the plan analysis, the DCHC MPO included performance targets that measured some of the plan's benefits to environmental justice communities including the percentage of the environmental justice population that lives within a ¼ mile of transit. The 2045 MTP results in the percentage of poverty households that lives within a ¼ mile of transit rising from 62% in the "no build" scenario to 65% with implementation of the 2045 Plan.

The bicycle and pedestrian network in the 2045 MTP is a composite of local government bicycle and pedestrian plans. Most of these local planning efforts included environmental justice criteria for project selection. Furthermore, the map of the bicycle network shows that the bicycle facilities are well distributed across the MPO – nearly all non-subdivision streets include on-road bicycle facilities in the plan. Therefore, the connectivity, safety, and recreational benefits that bicycle facilities provide are fairly distributed among the MPO's population.

Negative Project Impacts

The investments in transportation infrastructure included in the 2045 MTP will also have some negative impacts to some of the MPOs' population. While road widening projects may increase overall mobility, the residents near the project may be impacted negatively. Some of the negative impacts to nearby residents include increased traffic through their neighborhoods, increased vehicle speeds, land acquisition for necessary right-of-way, relocations of homes and businesses, a change in neighborhood character and land uses, etc. A project's net impact is not always clear and may be perceived differently by different residents. A project that increases property values, mobility, and economic development may also increase traffic, relocate homes and businesses, and change neighborhood character. Although it is difficult at this stage of project development to conclusively assess the overall impact of the highway projects included in the 2045 MTP, the two MPOs did complete several analyses of the potential negative impacts the projects may have on environmental justice communities.

During the development of the 2045 MTP, MPO staff often qualitatively evaluated individual projects for potential negative impacts and often eliminated projects that had significant potential negative impacts. Staff eliminated some projects based on factors such as limited right-of-way, neighborhood and community characteristics, and the historical impact of urban renewal.

The two MPOs analyzed the potential impact of the 2045 MTP highway projects and transit corridors to ensure that the potential negative project impacts were not disproportionately impacting environmental justice communities and that project benefits were also equitably distributed. This analysis was completed for the plan as a whole. Individual projects in the 2045 MTP may have significant negative impacts that will be studied more in depth during project development and design. These negative impacts are often able to be mitigated by context sensitive design.

Determining A Community Of Concern (Cofc)

The MPOs explored different methods to get at the fundamental question, "What is a community of concern?" Three principles guided the analysis:

1. If everyone is special, no one is special; we do not want to set the threshold too low or it could mask real and important differences between locations,
2. Be as inclusive as possible in light of the above; we do not want to leave areas out that could sustain meaningful negative impacts from the decisions we make, and
3. The final analysis should yield a pattern that allows for targeted outreach and a meaningful analysis of transportation investments.

The MPOs also gave careful consideration to the data values and sources used for the protected classes we evaluated:

1. Use of Census Block Groups in the 2-MPO region as the geographic unit. This is because they are updated each year, and some data are only available at this scale. It also helps compare urban, suburban, and rural areas in an “apples-to-apples” way.
2. Choice of which metric we use. By choosing to use the “median” as our measure, it gets around any extremes that may exist within the block group. For instance, if a millionaire has a house in a block group where most residents are low-income, the “mean” (what most people think of as the “average”) will give a misleadingly high value. By using a median, the primary makeup of the block group is reflected because extremes will not have as much impact.
3. Measuring each item we evaluate as a percentage. This also helps to create an “apples-to-apples” comparison for urban, suburban, and rural parts of the region.


The MPOs also tried to match the data that are available to the protected classes under the Title VI Program Coverage umbrella. Choosing what gets measured can impact the outcome. Regional partners sat down with other regional stakeholders involved in the statistical definition of what goes into identifying CofCs on February 4, 2016. CAMPO, DCHC MPO, Triangle J Council of Governments and NCDOT Community Studies staff reviewed existing methodologies and a draft proposal from CAMPO using percentiles to determine a threshold for “in” or “out”. On August 2nd the group reconvened with FHWA and NCDOT’s Office of Civil Rights included as well.

In looking what to measure, some things came to light: Even though gender is a protected class, the even distribution of men and women did not make it a useful measure geographically. As such, it is the one protected class that was not used for determining CofCs.

The same was true for disability in terms of where people are, but for the people affected the most by transportation investments, the group supported using Zero-car Households as a surrogate measure. Using a composite “minority” measure may miss some key groups. As an example, a block group that might be included for “Black alone” only needs around 32% of the block group to identify as Black. In a single minority measure, the threshold is around 57%, and if no other minorities are present this might miss too many people that need to be included. The final selection of how to measure led to using “Non-white Race” and “Hispanic/Latino Origin” as separate variables. Some block groups with Asian minority presence that may not meet the combined race threshold for minority trigger under “Linguistic Isolation” and thus be included.

It is important to understand that these are regional-scale, planning level proxies for actual EJ communities. When working with individual projects or specific outreach efforts, this analysis is just a guidance or screening tool to begin the identification of the actual communities.

Figure 9.2.1



The two MPOs determined the percent of total 2045 MTP highway project length and the percent of total 2045 MTP cost by project type that were in any block group with the presence of any protected class in the top quartile (top 25%). The results of this analysis are shown in the Figures below. Transit investment corridors were also analyzed for length, but not cost since they are not project-specific.

Figure 9.2.2 Project Portfolio Impact on Communities of Concern

CofC=Community of Concern	Region Total Miles	Region Miles in CofC	Percent in CofC	Total Investment	Total Investment in CofC	Percent Investment in CofC
New Location Highway	215	144	67%	\$ 3,011,713,868	\$ 1,664,872,717	55%
All Other Highway	280	200	71%	\$ 2,891,765,233	\$ 2,087,208,674	72%
Existing Highway Widening	886	522	59%	\$11,292,639,288	\$ 6,536,393,574	58%
Transit Corridors	1693	1431	85%	Cost Not Reported-Corridor not Project		

	CAMPO Total Miles	CAMPO Miles in CofC	Percent in CofC	Total Investment	Total Investment in CofC	Percent Investment in CofC
New Location Highway	166	100	60%	\$ 2,654,150,868	\$ 1,335,413,138	50%
All Other Highway	182	112	62%	\$ 1,825,195,233	\$ 1,084,867,111	59%
Existing Highway Widening	711	379	53%	\$ 8,248,301,288	\$ 4,187,251,716	51%
Transit Corridors	867	601	69%	Cost Not Reported-Corridor not Project		

	DCHC Total Miles	DCHC Miles in CofC	Percent in CofC	Total Investment	Total Investment in CofC	Percent Investment in CofC
New Location Highway	49	44	90%	\$ 357,563,000	\$ 329,459,579	92%
All Other Highway	98	88	90%	\$ 1,066,570,000	\$ 1,002,341,562	94%
Existing Highway Widening	175	142	81%	\$ 3,044,338,000	\$ 2,349,141,858	77%
Transit Corridors	905	830	92%	Cost Not Reported-Corridor not Project		

The distribution of the two-MPO region's roadway projects, both in terms of total project length and project costs, mirrors the distribution of the minority, low-income, and other protected classes of populations for both the region as a whole and for the individual MPOs. Therefore, the Capital Area MPO and the DCHC MPO conclude that the roadway and transit projects in the 2045 LRTP do not disproportionately impact minority and low income populations or other protected classes of persons, and that the project benefits are also fairly distributed across populations. Again, this analysis does not substitute for the individual project level analyses that will be completed for each project during design and development.

Figure 9.2.3 Title VI Compliance: CAMPO/DCHC New Location Roadway




Figure 9.2.4 Title VI Compliance: Roadway Widenings




Figure 9.2.5 Title VI Compliance: CAMPO/DCHC All Other Roadway





Figure 9.2.6 Title VI Compliance: CAMPO/DCHC Transit Investment Corridors



Financial Cost

Lastly, environmental justice also requires that the disadvantaged population not bear a disproportionate share of the financial cost of the plan. The 2045 MTP is financed by traditional revenue sources and new revenue sources. The 2045 MTP does not propose a change to the traditional funding sources so this was not analyzed for environmental justice impacts.

The new sources of revenue are:

1. Sales tax increase for public transit
2. Car registration fee increase
3. Toll roads and managed lanes

Typically, sales taxes are regressive, meaning that lower income households pay a higher percentage of their income in sales taxes than do higher income households (higher income households pay more in *actual* dollars in sales tax than lower income households, but these payments represent a smaller *proportion* of the total income of higher income households). Approved legislation in NC seeks to mitigate the “who pays” side of the equation by excluding many necessities from the sales tax, including food, medicine, utilities and shelter. By excluding these items, a typical household in the lowest 20% income group would pay about \$3 per month for the transit tax, based on analysis by the North Carolina Budget & Tax Center. Households in the top 1% income bracket would average \$57 per month and those rounding out the top 5% income bracket would average \$17 per month. Also, one financial analysis showed that the impact of a one dollar increase in the price of a gallon of gasoline is about ten times worse for low-income households than the impact of a ½ cent sales tax.

Moreover, looking at who pays is only half of the equation. Analysis should also consider who benefits. Transit service is disproportionately used by people with lower incomes and households that do not have access to cars. Currently, tens of thousands of households in the Research Triangle Region report having no vehicle available. Our region’s travel forecasts estimate that the majority of transit trips after we invest in rail service and greatly expanded bus service will be made by people from households without cars and low-income households with cars. So looking at the whole equation, a sales tax that is spent entirely on transit would provide a net benefit to households most dependent on transit service to reach jobs and educational opportunities, different from if a sales tax were spent on services that were used equally by lower income and higher income households.

Toll roads and managed lanes projects will require a detailed environmental review during project development. At that point, the project-level environmental justice impacts will be studied. The I-40 managed lanes project would require the payment of tolls to use the new lanes. Low-income populations will still have the option to use the facility by using the existing general purpose lanes free of charge. In addition, public transit vehicles will be able to use the facility free of charge. High-occupancy vehicles may also be able to use the new managed lanes free of charge. A decision has not yet been made on if there will be an exception for high-occupancy vehicles on some facilities.

9.3 Safety and Security

Metropolitan Planning Organizations are being encouraged to effectively address safety and security issues in accordance with policies outlined with the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) and subsequent Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act.

Federal requirements maintain the existing core program called the “Highway Safety Improvement Program” (HSIP). This program is structured and funded to make significant progress in reducing fatalities on highways as well as other modes that use highway, railroads, and other conduits within the transportation network. The HSIP increases the funds for infrastructure safety and requires strategic highway safety planning focused on measurable results. Other programs target specific areas of concern such as work zones and older drivers. Pedestrians, including children walking to school, are also a focus area for the program.

Both the Capital Area MPO and Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO have been proactive in addressing safety and security as a component of our overall transportation processes by pursuing the following actions:

- Vision Zero, a new approach to traffic safety, maintains that the loss of even one life or serious injury on our roads is not an acceptable price to pay for mobility. Designers and users of the roads share responsibility for the safety of all road users under the Vision Zero approach. Vision Zero views human error on roadways as inevitable, and advocates for roadway and vehicle design that accounts for human mistakes. Vision Zero uses the “5 E Strategy” – education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation – to achieve zero fatalities and severe injuries on roadways. First implemented in Sweden in the 1990s, Vision Zero has achieved great success in Europe and continues to gain momentum internationally and throughout the US.

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) adopted a Vision Zero program, NC Vision Zero, in 2016. NC Vision Zero serves as an umbrella organization for Vision Zero programs throughout the state. NC Vision Zero provides data, research, and other resources to support Vision Zero programs throughout North Carolina. NC Vision Zero has also assembled a statewide Vision Zero stakeholder group in order to facilitate communication between traffic safety stakeholders.

On September 18, 2017, the Durham City Council adopted the Vision Zero Durham Resolution making Durham the first city in North Carolina, and the first among its peer cities nationally, to officially adopt a Vision Zero program. The Vision Zero Durham Resolution affirms the Durham’s commitment to eliminating traffic deaths and serious injuries on Durham roadways, and provides a framework for City departments and community stakeholders to work together to achieve this goal. The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) passed a resolution in support of Vision Zero Durham on August 9, 2017. At the time of the 2045 MTP adoption, several other DCHC jurisdictions have begun to take action to adopt and implement Vision Zero programs.

- Video surveillance. The transit agencies in both MPOs (i.e. Capital Area Transit, Durham Area Transit Authority, Chapel Hill Transit, Cary Transit, Triangle Transit, and area human service providers) have or are in the process of providing on-board video surveillance cameras and transit station camera detection as a deterrent to crime; as well as providing Mobile Data Computers/Automatic Vehicle Locators on their vehicles. Cary Transit System’s paratransit vehicles have automated vehicle locator systems as well as video surveillance via DriveCam.
- Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS). The Capital Area MPO has created a regional Safe Routes to School program that is designed to coordinate SRTS activities throughout the MPO as well as provide policy leadership and technical assistance to local agencies and schools. Agencies within the Capital Area MPO are continuing to develop and implement SRTS activities that will benefit elementary schools and their adjacent neighborhoods throughout the community.
- Safety Metrics. Both MPOs include “Accident/Safety” metrics when determining the technical scoring and prioritization of roadway projects for their Transportation Improvement Programs.
- “Four E’s” for Biking and Walking. Both MPOs have adopted bicycle and pedestrian plans that include four significant pillars to strengthen the role of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in overall transportation planning. The “Four-Es” (i.e. education, engineering, enforcement, and encouragement) bring attention to the importance of safety through various public service announcements in the local media focused attention to these key areas of transportation network development. Furthermore, both MPOs continue to remain active in promoting bicycle and pedestrian activities through events such as Bike to Work Week and the SmartCommute Challenge.

These programs impact the region's overall transportation culture by promoting bicycle and pedestrian traffic and travel as a valuable mode of movement through the region.

- Watch 4 Me NC Campaign. Both MPOs have incorporated within those adopted bicycle and pedestrian plans expansion of bicycle accommodations and walkway infrastructure through both on-road and off-road facilities. The presence of walkway infrastructure will have a significant impact in the reduction of pedestrian crashes (particularly an 88 percent reduction in "walking along road" pedestrian crashes). The concern about pedestrian safety in the state of North Carolina (currently recognized by FHWA as a "Pedestrian Emphasis" state) has encouraged NCDOT to host pedestrian safety classes. These classes have been taken by staff from both MPOs. Both MPOs, in cooperation with the North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center (HSRC) and NCDOT are participating in the initial "Watch 4 Me, NC" campaign. This campaign is intended to improve pedestrian safety through educational messages directed at pedestrians and drivers as well as encouraging police enforcement of current pedestrian laws. The MPOs, along with NCDOT and HSRC, continue to build off of the initial campaign in Raleigh, Durham, Chapel Hill, and Carrboro. Both MPOs continue work to extended the campaign to the region's other communities in future years. A bicycle safety campaign will also be conducted in future years as well.
- Incident Management. Both MPOs have funded an Incident Management Plan, which includes strategies for improving:
 - Responder safety
 - Safe, quick clearance activities
 - Prompt, reliable, interoperable communications

The program directly addresses eight of the twelve strategies aimed at improving responder safety and safe, quick clearance of incidents; particularly along I-40, and other Interstate/freeway candidate facilities in the region. Both MPOs have been active with Incident Management Planning. Following the authorization of approximately to work on a project to improve the Traffic Incident Management Program in the Triangle, the two MPO pursued goals that involved reducing incident clearance time, increasing responder safety, reducing secondary incidents, and education of the public. The aforementioned pursuit was important based on the fact that for every minute traffic is disrupted, the chances for secondary crashes increase exponentially. The accomplishments included the following:

Incident Management Summit – August 15, 2013

A summit was held in August 2013 involving 60 people from various service agencies where presentations highlighted the need for coordinated traffic incident management were made and a demonstration exercise was performed. Positive feedback was received from online survey completed by the attendees. Mr. Whitley indicated 70% of all drivers do not know the state has fender bender and move over laws; therefore an effort must be made to make the public aware of those laws.

Establishment of the Incident Management Subcommittee

An Incident Management Subcommittee was created to develop a MOU for CAMPO and to develop a public education campaign for motorists. The MOU has been endorsed by the emergency response agencies throughout the region. It is a non-binding statement of principles but all agree that the MOU is important. Roles at incident scenes have been agreed upon by various responder agencies. This was taken to local police and fire associations with agreement from both groups.

Media Buys using Radio/TV, Online, Billboards

NCDOT worked in cooperation with the MPOs to purchase billboards to advertise a "Move Over and Fender Bender Laws Ad Campaign". NCDOT staff also worked to host a news conference that included the Secretary of NCDOT; as well as the leaders of the Incident management Subcommittee

to address the Move Over and Fender Bender Public Service Announcements (PSAs). Furthermore, NCDOT's Dynamic Messaging Signs (DMS) have been used to display the Move Over and Fender Bender PSAs; along with radio ads for a brief period of time. Finally, the NCDOT Communications staff has used social media to broadcast information concerning the laws.

Traffic Incident Management Memorandum of Understanding

The final draft of the MOU was presented and endorsed by both the Incident Management Subcommittee Meeting and the Congestion Management Process (CMP) Stakeholders Group meeting. The MOU has been circulated throughout the region for review and future adoptions by local government boards.

- Safety Audits. Both MPOs receive Traffic Engineering Accident Analysis (TEAAS) data from NCDOT's Transportation Mobility & Safety Division. The aforementioned division uses the data for Road Safety Audits for state maintained roads. Both MPOs will continue to work with NCDOT's Transportation Mobility & Safety Division to utilize data from future road safety audits to prioritize and fund future road projects.
- Safety Countermeasures. Additional safety countermeasures that are utilized by both state and local agencies within both MPOs include:
 - buffers or planting strips,
 - marked crosswalks,
 - "road diets (narrowing or eliminating travel lanes on roadways)
 - traffic calming/traffic control devices.

Both MPOs will support safety countermeasures on roads, and at signalized and unsignalized intersections where needed to ensure safety for the travelling public.

- ITS safety. Both MPOs were a part of the Triangle Regional ITS Strategic Deployment Plan Update that was finalized in May 2010. One of the goals of the ITS Strategic Deployment Plan is to "*Advance safe and efficient movement of people and goods throughout the region*". The three objectives associated with the goal include:
 - *Clear 90% of incidents in 60 minutes or less on the principle arterial network,*
 - *Reduce the number of crashes per 100 million vehicle miles by 10% over a three-year floating average on the principle arterial network, and*
 - *Decrease secondary incidents by 10% on the principle arterial network*

9.4 Critical Environmental Resources

The Capital Area MPO and DCHC MPO evaluated the 2045 MTP's impact on critical environmental factors. Developing a transportation system that provides mobility and access while protecting health, the environment, cultural resources, and social systems is important to both MPOs. Compliance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations is critical to the development of all transportation projects. The MPOs recognize that the MTP is one of the first steps in developing viable transportation projects that meet these laws and regulations. In addition, the MPOs recognize the tremendous impact that transportation projects have on land development patterns. The transportation network and land use regulations must be complimentary and work together to protect critical environmental resources.

This environmental evaluation at the long-range planning phase is the beginning of more extensive review. The NCDOT uses the Merger process to more effectively implement Section 404 of the Clean Water Act during the NEPA/SEPA decision-making phase of transportation projects. The MERGER process is supported by USACE, NCDENR, FHWA, stakeholder agencies and local units of government to more effectively mitigate environmental impacts such as those from storm water runoff.

The MPOs' environmental analysis was a voluntary effort coordinated with representatives from environmental and cultural resource agencies. At this stage in project development, it is impossible to conclusively and comprehensively analyze the impact each project may have on the environment. This analysis does not substitute for the more thorough project-level analysis that is required as part of the National Environmental Protection Act. The analysis below was intended to identify and flag early in the process projects that might have significant impacts on the environment and that might require costly mitigation measures.

For this analysis, the MPOs looked at all of the projects in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan project lists to ensure that a comprehensive record of all of the potential future projects was being evaluated. Many of the CTP projects are not in the final adopted 2045 MTP, and are considered to be beyond the 2045 time horizon of the plan. The MPOs created maps of the CTP projects overlaid on several environmental and cultural GIS files. The maps are grouped in the following themes with the following datasets:

- **Biodiversity and Wildlife Habitat**
 - NC Conservation Planning Tool – Biodiversity and Wildlife Habitat Assessment – this dataset classifies areas from 1 to 10 based on several metrics
 - Managed Areas
 - Conservation Tax Credit Properties
- **Development**
 - Hospitals
 - Schools (Public and Private) Colleges or Universities
 - Airports
 - Water and Sewer Service Boundaries
- **Farmland**
 - NC Conservation Planning Tool – Farmland Assessment – this dataset classifies areas from 1 to 10 based on several metrics
 - Voluntary Agricultural Districts
- **Forest**
 - NC Conservation Planning Tool – Forestry Lands Assessment – this dataset classifies areas from 1 to 10 based on several metrics
- **Gamelands, Hunting Buffers, and Smoke**
 - Gamelands
 - Gameland Hunting Buffers
 - Smoke Awareness Areas
- **Hazards**
 - Hazardous Waste Sites
 - Animal Operation Facilities
 - Active Permitted Landfills
 - Hazardous Substance Disposal Site
- **Historic Sites**
 - Local Landmarks
 - Local Historic Districts
 - National Register Historic Sites
 - National Register Historic Districts
- **Jurisdictions**
 - Jurisdictional Boundaries – This map is designed to identify the local jurisdiction that has planning and zoning authority in the vicinity of a project. Since each jurisdiction has different

zoning classifications and methodologies, a comprehensive zoning map could not be developed for the entire region.

- Parks and Recreation
 - Open Space and Conservation Lands
 - Boat Access Ramps
 - Trails
 - Greenways
 - Local and State Parks
- Water Resources
 - Impaired Streams
 - Outstanding Resource Management Zones
 - Ecosystem Enhancement Program
 - Target Local Watersheds
- Water Supply
 - Public Water Supply Sources
 - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitted Sites
 - Surface Water Intake
 - Water Supply Watersheds
 - Nutrient Sensitive Waters
- Wetlands and Floodplains
 - Floodplain Mapping Information Systems (FMIS)
 - Floodplains Wetlands

In addition, as a courtesy, the DCHC MPO also sent GIS shape files to resource agencies during the public review process. The agencies contacted were:

- United States Army Corps of Engineers
- NC Department of Natural Resources
- NC Wildlife Resources Commission
- United States Environmental Protection Agency
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service
- NC Department of Cultural Resources
- NC Department of Commerce
- NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources

The maps are shown in Appendix 12. Larger versions of the maps are posted on the MPOs' websites.

9.5 The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

The FAST Act initiated some new planning rules in *23 CFR 450* that are relevant to the MPOs' long-range transportation plans. The new planning rules (paraphrased in *italics*) and a discussion of how the MPOs have responded are presented below.

1. *New Planning Factors –306 (b)(9)(10)*

- A. *Improve resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate storm water impacts of surface transportation*

The resiliency and reliability of the transportation system has improved under the 2045 MTP because the investment in highway maintenance has substantially increased. In the previous MTP, the 2040 MTP, highway maintenance expenditures were 30% of the total non-transit budget. That figure is approaching 50% for both MPOs in the 2045 MTP.

In terms of storm water impacts, the local planning departments and NCDOT and the many resource agencies have taken an aggressive approach in implementing the state and federal regulations to limit the impacts from private structures and surface transportation. NCDOT continues to use the Merger process, which is supported by USACE, NCDENR, FHWA, stakeholder agencies and local units of government, to effectively implement Section 404 of the Clean Water Act during the NEPA/SEPA decision-making phase of transportation projects.

B. Enhance travel and tourism

The Triangle is not considered a travel or tourism destination. Nonetheless, the location of major universities draws travel to the area for university related special events, and some roadways such as I-40 serve as principal travel corridors for those traveling to the mountains or beaches. The 2045 MTP has a substantial investment in the roadways and public transportation that provide access to the major universities because the land use and travel modeling processes identify those areas as employment and education centers. Those centers and the subsequent forecasted congestion attract needed roadway improvements and transit services. For example, light rail or commuter rail provides access to all of the four major universities in the Triangle. In addition, there are major roadway improvements planned for those campuses, as well. In terms of tourism travel that passes through the Triangle, those travel corridors such as I-40 and the future I-87 will receive major capacity improvements.

2. The MPO shall set performance targets no later than 180 days after the State or Public Transportation Provider establishes performance targets – 306 (d)(3)

The CAMPO and DCHC MPO have approved these performance targets within the 180-day timeframe as the NCDOT and/or local public transportation providers have established them. The MPOs approved performance measures and targets for transit assets and State of Good Repair (SGR) on June 14, 2017 (DCHC MPO) and June 21, 2017 (CAMPO). In early 2018, the NCDOT safety measures and targets will be published as required by the FAST ACT and both MPOs will again review and approve those same measures within the 180-day time frame.

3. The MPO and public transportation providers shall jointly agree upon and develop specific written provisions for developing and sharing information related to the following -- 314(h):

- a. Transportation performance data*
- b. The selection of performance targets*
- c. The reporting of performance targets*
- d. The reporting of performance data to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes*
- e. The collection of data for the State asset management plan for the NHS*

The MPOs and transit providers are working on agreements that will likely be part of an inter-local agreement.

4. Documented Participation Plan shall include – 316(a):

- a. Public ports – There are not any ports in the MPO's planning area.*
- b. Private providers of intercity bus operators – Local transit systems coordinate and share facilities with the private, intercity bus operations. For example, the Durham Central Transit*

Station, which provides access to local fixed-route and regional transit systems, also has access to Greyhound and Mega Bus services. The MPO Technical Committees (TC) have designated a member from these private providers but they do not attend the TC meetings. The MPOs will continue to coordinate with private providers by sending them participation information through public input processes.

- c. Employer based commuting programs – The Triangle J Council of Governments (TJCOG) coordinates the Triangle TDM program for the entire Triangle Region. Chapter 7 of this report summarizes the TDM program. The following TDM Web page has program details that demonstrate the breadth and effectiveness of the program:
<http://www.tjcog.org/triangle-transportation-demand-management-program.aspx>
 - d. Vanpool programs – These programs are an integral and successful part of the Triangle TDM program. See subpart “c” above.
 - e. Transit benefit programs – These programs are an integral and successful part of the Triangle TDM program. See subpart “c” above.
 - f. Parking cash-out programs – Local government, transit agency and downtown organization planners have promoted parking cash-out programs to large residential developments, employment centers and universities. For example, local planners discuss unbundling “free” parking spaces from apartment rental fees with developers and property management firms. However, the MPOs are not aware of any bona fide parking cash-out programs in the region.
 - g. Shuttle or telework programs -- These programs are an integral and successful part of the Triangle TDM program. See subpart “c” above.
5. *The MPO shall consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPA when developing the MTP and TIP MPO – 316(b)*
- a. *Tourism* – The MPOs do not have specific internal requirements to work directly with tourism focused agencies. This requirement will be added to the next update of the MPO’s public participation plan.
 - b. *Natural disaster risk reduction* – The MPOs do not have specific internal requirements to work directly agencies that are focused on the reduction of natural disaster risks. This requirement will be added to the next update of the MPO’s public participation plan.
6. *MPO has option to conduct and include PEL process – 318(e)*
The MPOs have not conducted the PEL process.
7. *MPO shall have Congestion Management Process – 322*
- a. *An MPO serving a TMA may develop a congestion management plan*
The MPOs have approved Congestion Management Process plans and have implemented the plans through completion of System Status Reports and other reports such as a Mobility Report Card.
 - b. *Consider employer-based travel demand reduction strategies: intercity bus, employer-based programs, carpool, vanpool, transit benefits, parking cash-out, telework, job access projects.*
The Triangle TDM program, which is summarized in chapter 7 of this report, makes use of these strategies. The following TDM Web page identifies the strategies and evaluates their effectiveness: <http://www.tjcog.org/triangle-transportation-demand-management-program.aspx>

8. *MPO shall include the consideration of intercity bus service – 324 (f)(2)*

See the response to #4-c above.

9. *MPO shall have performance targets – 324(f)(3)(4)*

- a. *MTP shall include a description of the performance measures and targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system*
- b. *A system performance report evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets including progress achieved by the MPO to reach performance targets*

In response #2 above, the MPOs commit to approving regulated performance measures and targets by at least 180 days after state and/or public transportation providers have done so. In addition, as detailed in chapter 4 of this report, the MPOs have established a set of MTP performance measures and targets that are aligned with the agency's goals and objectives.

10. *MPO may voluntarily elect to conduct scenario planning – 324(f)(4) (ii)*

As detailed in the land use plans and policies and Alternatives Analysis sections of chapter 5 of this report, the MPOs have made extensive use of scenario planning. Different land use plans are matched with different sets of transportation investments (e.g., large highway investments, large fixed-guideway investments) to create modeled outputs.

11. *TIP shall include to the maximum extent practicable – 326(d)*

- a. *Description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the MTP*
- b. *Link investment priorities in the TIP to achievement of performance targets in the plans*

The MPOs will provide written text and analysis as the performance measures take effect and as the Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP) under the 2045 MTP are updated and implemented.

10. Post-2045 Vision: Comprehensive Transportation Plan Projects

Many worthy projects that would help ease congestion, improve access and provide travel choices are not able to be funded within the constraints of existing and reasonably anticipated revenue sources, and therefore are not included in the fiscally constrained 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. These projects are typically included in each MPO's Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). These unfunded projects are listed in the appendices with an implementation year beyond 2045.

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro CTP was adopted in May 2017. The web page containing the full report and interactive maps is <http://bit.ly/DCHCMPO-Adopted-CTP>

Appendix 1. Roadway Project List – CAMPO and DCHC MPO

Each row in the table is a separate highway project. Projects are color-coded by MPO (green for DCHC MPO and yellow for CAMPO) and separated by time period. The three time periods, 2025, 2035 and 2045, are used in the financial plan. The attribute information for each project is presented by columns, and includes the following:

- MTP ID – This unique number facilitates the tracking and mapping of projects in the plan.
- Highway Project – The highway project is the name of the road.
- From/To – This usually identifies the name of the two road intersections between which the project is to be constructed.
- Existing Lanes – This identifies the number of current travel lanes. “-” indicates an interchange or a new road alignment – in other words, there is no existing road.
- Proposed Lanes – This identifies the number of travel lanes proposed in the plan; if the number of lanes does not increase from the existing lanes, the project does not propose to add through lanes but instead will make safety, intersection, multimodal s or other improvements.
- Improvement Type –
 - Widening is the addition of travel lanes.
 - Modernization can include safety, intersection (e.g., turn lanes), multimodal or other improvements, but does not include the addition of travel lanes.
 - Upgrade refers to capacity and safety improvements to interchanges.
 - New Location is a new roadway.
 - New is the conversion of an intersection to an interchange.
 - Freeway is the conversion of an existing road to a limited access highway (which is a roadway type often referred to as interstate).
 - Expressway is the conversion of an existing road to a highway that is mostly limited access.
- Length – The centerline mileage of the project.
- Estimated Cost – The total costs includes those estimated costs to be incurred from 2018 through 2045. Cost estimates come from feasibility studies, current and past Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP), NCDOT’s SPOT prioritization process, and the NCDOT Contract Standards and Development Unit project cost workbook.
- STI – This indicates the project’s STI (Strategic Transportation Investment) funding tier: statewide, regional or division.
- Regionally Significant – Regionally Significant projects provide access to and from the region, or to major destinations in the region. Note that the FHWA functional classifications serve a different purpose than the local functional classification used by the MPO, and as a result, the two classification systems are significantly different. Generally, the regionally significant designation includes interstate highways, U.S. highways, freeways, and North Carolina signed roads that are the primary road in a corridor. Rail transit facilities, which are described in a separate section, are considered regionally significant. The Regionally Significant designation can be important if the region is required to show the Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQ Conformity) for the MTP. Under AQ Conformity, if a Regionally Significant project is changed (e.g., completion year, capacity) after the 2045 MTP has been adopted, then the Conformity Determination process might have to be redone.
- TIP# -- The project reference number for those projects which are contained in the 2018-27 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
2025 MTP											
F10	I-440 Widening	US 1/64	Wade Avenue	4	6	Widening	3.5	\$348,002,000.00	St	Yes	U-2719
F11-1a	US 1 North - Upgrade to Freeway	I-540	Thornton Road	4	8	Widening	1.62	\$124,700,000.00	St	Yes	U-5307A
F11-1b	US 1 North - Upgrade to Freeway	Thornton Rd	Burlington Mills Rd	4	8	Widening	1.55	\$120,100,000.00	St	Yes	U-5307B
F11-1c	US 1 North - Upgrade to Freeway	Burlington Mills Rd	New Falls of Neuse Blvd	4	6	Widening	1.96	\$64,050,000.00	St	Yes	U-5307C
F11-1d	US 1 North - Upgrade to Freeway	New Fall of Neuse Blvd	NC 98 (Durham Rd)	4	6	Widening	2.32	\$64,050,000.00	St	Yes	U-5307C
F13	NC 147 Toll Extension (CAMPO Portion)	NC 540	McCrimmon Pkwy / Little Drive	0	4	New Location	1.6	\$23,880,000.00	St	Yes	U-5966
F15a1	US 64 / Laura Duncan Interchange (New)	US 64	Laura Duncan Rd	-	-	Interchange	0	\$38,200,000.00	St	Yes	U-5301A
F15a2	US 64 / Lake Pine Interchange (New)	Lake Pine Drive	Lake Pine Drive	-	-	Interchange	0	\$38,200,000.00	St	No	U-5301B
F15a3	US 64 (superstreet)	US 1	Lake Pine Dr	4	6	Superstreet	2.49	\$36,400,000.00	St	Yes	U-5301C
F16	I-40	US 1-64	Wade Avenue	4	6	Widening	3.89	\$81,058,666.94	St	Yes	I-4744
F43	I-40	US 1/64	Lake Wheeler Rd	6	8	Widening	4.43	\$27,250,000.00	St	Yes	I-5701
F43b	I-40 / US 1 / US 64 Interchange	I-40 / US 1 / US 64	I-40 / US 1 / US 64	-	-	Interchange	-	\$151,750,000.00	St	Yes	I-5703
F44a	I-40 (East)	I-440	US 70 Business (Garner)	6	8	Widening	4.4	\$106,600,000.00	St	Yes	I-5111A
F44b	I-40 (East)	US 70 Business (Garner)	NC 42	4	8	Widening	6.3	\$153,400,000.00	St	Yes	I-5111BA and BB
F44b1	Cleveland Road / I-40 Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$35,945,500.00	St	No	I-4739
F44b2	NC-42 / I-40 Diverging Diamond Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$35,945,500.00	St	No	I-4739
F4c1	NC 540 TriEx / Veridea Parkway Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$13,202,805.00	St	No	R-2635
F5	NC 540 Tri-Ex (Phase IV)	NC 55 Bypass	US 401 (South)	0	6	New Location	7.8	\$172,519,000.00	St	Yes	R-2721
F6	NC 540 Tri-Ex (Phase V)	US 401 (South)	I-40 (South)	0	6	New Location	8.7	\$425,527,000.00	St	Yes	R-2828
F82	I-40/NC 54 DDI	NC 54	NC 54	-	-	Interchange	2	\$8,004,000.00	St	No	I-5873
F83	I-440 Interchange Improvements	Wake Forest Road (SR 2000)	Wake Forest Road (SR 2000)	-	-	Interchange	2	\$10,632,000.00	St	No	I-5708

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A10	Old Wake Forest Rd	Litchford Rd / Atlantic Blvd	Capital Blvd	2	4	Widening	1.2	\$8,600,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A104a	Morrisville Parkway	Green Level Ch Rd	NC 55	0	2	New Location	1.83	\$24,802,000.00	Div	Yes	U-5315 A B
A111	Reedy Creek Turn Lane	N.E. Maynard Rd	Harrison Avenue	2	3	Turn Lane	1.17	\$13,390,000.00	Div	No	U-5501
A114a	Ten Ten Rd	US 1	US 1	-	-	Interchange	0.4	\$26,392,087.00	St	No	U-5825 A
A114b	Ten Ten Rd	Kildaire Farm Road	US 1	2	4	Widening	2.1	\$15,259,000.00	Div	No	U-5825B
A118b	NC 55	Jicarilla Rd	Kennebec Church Rd	2	4	Widening	1.6	\$27,514,000.00	Reg	Yes	R-5705 C
A118c	NC 55	Kennebec Church Road	North Broad St	2	4	Widening	0.94	\$9,706,000.00	Reg	Yes	R-5705 B
A119	McCrimmon Parkway	Airport Blvd	NC 54	2	4	Widening	0.83	\$20,702,000.00	Div	No	U-5747 B
A124c1	Northside Loop (east)	N. White St / Flaherty Ave	West of undeveloped section of Royal Mill Avenue / Oak Grove Church Rd	0	3	New Location	1	\$8,768,623.50	Div	No	N/A
A124c2	Northside Loop (east)	Flaherty Ave	Eastern portion of existing Royal Mill Avenue	0	3	New Location	0.1	\$8,768,623.50	Div	No	N/A
A127a	Ligon Mill Rd Connector	US 1A	NC 98 Bypass	2	4	Widening	0.61	\$5,576,756.64	Div	Yes	N/A
A127b2	Ligon Mill Rd Connector	Richland Creek	NC 98	0	2	New Location	0.75	\$5,851,243.13	Div	No	N/A
A130a	Mitchell Mill Rd (West)	US 401	Watkins Rd	2	4	Widening	1.37	\$13,650,975.00	Div	No	N/A
A130c	US 401/Mitchell Mill Rd Interchange (New)	-	-	-	-	Interchange	2	\$64,620,000.00	Reg	Yes	U-5748
A139	US 70 / Timber Drive Interchange (New)	Hammond Road	Timber Drive	-	-	Interchange	2	\$18,938,000.00	Reg	No	U-5744
A13c	Falls of Neuse Blvd	I-540	Durant Rd	4	6	Widening	1.54	\$11,798,000.00	Div	No	U-5826
A16	Rock Quarry Rd	Old Birch Dr	Sunnybrook Rd	3	5	Widening	1.2	\$10,200,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A160a	Ralph Stephens Rd (Part NL)	Ralph Stevens Rd Ext	NC 55	2	4	Widening	0.59	\$4,843,512.96	Div	No	U-5318
A160b	Ralph Stephens Rd (Part NL)	Ralph Stevens Rd	NC 55	0	4	New Location	0.38	\$3,285,316.32	Div	No	U-5318
A160d	Ralph Stephens Rd (Part NL)	Piney Grove Wilbon	Ralph Stevens Rd	0	4	New Location	0.34	\$3,260,846.16	Div	No	U-5318
A160e	Ralph Stephens Rd (Part NL)	Avent Ferry	Ralph Stevens Rd	0	4	New Location	0.48	\$4,437,781.92	Div	No	U-5318
A164a2	Green Level Church Rd	O'Kelly Chapel Rd	McCrimmon Parkway	2	4	Widening	0.91	\$8,319,423.84	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A164b	Green Level Ch Rd	Carpenter Fire Station Rd	Morrisville Parkway	2	4	Widening	1.21	\$11,062,091.04	Div	No	N/A
A164c1	Green Level Church Rd	Folklore Way	O'Kelly Chapel Rd	2	4	Widening	0.4	\$3,656,889.60	Div	No	NOT IN TIP
A166	Center St/1010	US 1	Apex Peakway	2	4	Widening	1.04	\$9,507,913.00	Div	No	U-5825A
A171	Green Level West Rd	NC 55	I-540	2	4	Widening	0.9	\$8,228,001.60	Div	No	U-5500
A174c	Martin Pond Road Widening	Wendell Falls Parkway	Poole Road	2	4	Widening	0.5	\$4,104,672.00	Div	No	N/A
A187b1	Apex Peakway (East)	Center St / Ten Ten Rd	NC 55	0	4	New Location	0.8	\$8,800,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A187c1	Apex Peakway (South)	Tingen Rd	Old US 1	0	2	New Location	0.65	\$3,971,153.55	Div	No	N/A
A199	Pullen Rd	Western Blvd	Centennial Pkwy	0	2	New Location	0.4	\$3,451,895.34	Div	No	N/A
A207a3	Judd Parkway NE	Products Road (future ext)	Old Honeycutt Road	2	4	Widening	0.6	\$1,350,000.00	Div	No	U-5927
A207c	Judd Parkway W	Wilbon Rd	NC 42	0	4	New Location	1.2	\$26,200,000.00	Div	No	U-5317
A20b	Hillsborough St Safety & Enhancement (Road Diet)	Gardner St	Gormat St	4	4	TSM	0.84	\$1,000,000.00	Div	Yes	U-4447
A215a	Jones Dairy Rd	NC 98 (Wake Forest Bypass)	Chalk Rd	2	4	Widening	0.8	\$7,313,779.20	Div	No	N/A
A218e	Jessie Dr (part NL)	NC 55	Ten Ten Rd	0	2	New Location	1.58	\$10,417,520.30	Div	No	N/A
A219a1	McCrimmon Parkway Ext	NC 54	Davis Dr	2	4	Widening	1.1	\$13,000,000.00	Div	No	U-5747A
A220a	Morrisville Carpenter Rd	Page St	Davis Dr	2	4	Widening	0.6	\$9,000,000.00	Div	No	U-5618
A220b	Morrisville Carpenter Rd	Davis Dr	Louis Stephens Dr	2	4	Widening	0.7	\$6,399,556.80	Div	No	N/A
A220c	Morrisville Carpenter Rd	Louis Stephens Dr	Good Hope Ch Rd	2	4	Widening	0.28	\$2,559,822.72	Div	No	N/A
A222c	NC 54	Perimeter Park Dr	Northern Twn Limits	2	6	Widening	1.8	\$25,336,000.00	Reg	Yes	U-5750
A236a	Chapel Hill Rd	NW Maynard Rd	Academy St	2	4	Widening	1	\$11,310,000.00	Div	Yes	N/A
A236b	Chapel Hill Rd	Academy St	NE Maynard Rd	2	4	Widening	1	\$11,500,000.00	Div	Yes	N/A
A240c	South Harrison Avenue	Dry Rd	Kildaire Farm Rd	0	2	New Location	0.23	\$1,794,381.23	Div	No	N/A
A26a	McCrimmon Parkway	Airport Blvd	Aviation Parkway	0	2	New Location	1.43	\$11,487,602.57	Div	No	U-3620
A26b	McCrimmon Parkway	Airport Blvd	Aviation Parkway	2	4	Widening	1.43	\$11,870,000.00	Div	No	U-5828
A27c1	Louis Stephens Dr Ext (NL)	Little Drive	Poplar Pike Lane	0	4	New Location	0.72	\$3,036,000.00	Div	No	U-5827
A28b	Davis Dr	Farm Pond Rd	US 64	2	4	Widening	1.1	\$10,056,446.40	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A2b	Southall Rd	Southall Rd (Existing)	Hedingham Blvd	0	4	New Location	0.28	\$3,800,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A407b3	NC 42	NC 50	I-40	2	4	Widening	2.17	\$12,713,033.00	Reg	Yes	R-3410B
A412	US 70 - Upgrade to Freeway	Durham / Wake County Line	Lumley/Westgate Rd	4	6	Widening	2.69	\$47,500,000.00	St	Yes	U-5518 A
A414	Kildaire Farm Connector	Sunset Lake Rd	Holly Springs Rd	0	4	New Location	0.9	\$9,612,521.10	Div	No	R-2721
A427a	Avent Ferry Rd	Piney Grove Wilbon	Elm St	2	4	Widening	0.6	\$5,485,334.40	Div	No	U-5889
A427b	Avent Ferry Rd	Cass Holt	Piney Grove Wilbon	2	4	Widening	0.72	\$5,399,222.40	Div	No	U-5889
A439	Buck Jones Rd	Farmgate Rd	Xebec Way	2	3	Turn Lane	1.05	\$6,500,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A440a1	Carpenter Fire Station Rd	Cameron Pond Drive	NC-55	2	4	Widening	0.94	\$7,850,005.80	Div	No	N/A
A440b	Carpenter Fire Station Ext	NC 55	Morrisville Carpenter Rd	0	4	New Location	0.3	\$3,204,173.70	Div	No	U-5502
A448	Six Forks Rd	Ramblewood Road	Lynn Road	4	6	Widening	2.4	\$45,000,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A450	RTP Access Routes	Internal RTP access points	External access points	2	4	New Location	0.84	\$6,299,092.80	Div	No	U-4410
A46a	Tryon Rd	Lake Wheeler Rd	Par Drive	2	4	Widening	1.3	\$6,800,000.00	Div	No	U-4432
A46b	Tryon Rd	Norfolk Southern Rail	Existing Tryon Rd Alignment	0	4	Widening	0.5	\$14,273,729.00	Div	No	U-4432
A46c	Tryon Rd	New Tryon Rd Alignment	S. Wilmington St	2	4	Widening	0.09	\$2,569,271.00	Div	No	U-4432
A480b	US 401(South)	Ten Ten Rd	NC 540	4	6	Widening	1.07	\$21,985,000.00	Reg	Yes	U-5746
A486	NC 54-Blue Ridge Grade Separation	Blue Ridge Rd	Beryl Rd	4	4	Grade Separation	1	\$28,634,000.00	Reg	No	U-4437
A49a	Poole Rd	Maybrook Dr	Barwell Rd	2	4	Widening	1	\$9,800,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A521	O'Kelley Chapel Rd	Louis Stephens Dr	NC 55	0	4	New Location	0.62	\$5,946,248.88	Div	No	N/A
A54	Pleasant Valley Rd	Duraleigh Rd	Glenwood Avenue	2	3	Widening	0.34	\$1,367,377.83	Div	No	N/A
A557	Green Lvl W Rd Widening	NC 540	Green Level Ch Rd	2	4	Widening	0.95	\$12,923,000.00	Div	No	U-5500
A562	Wade Ave Widening	I-40	I-440	4	6	Widening	2.91	\$39,565,000.00	St	Yes	U-5936
A57	Sandy Forks Rd	Falls of Neuse	Six Forks Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.31	\$9,850,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A605a	High Speed Rail - Rogers Rd Intersection	Rogers Rd	Rogers Rd	2	4	Grade Separation	-	\$10,890,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A608b	NC 98 Widening	Hampton Way	Tyler Run Dr	2	3	Widening	1.23	\$2,547,625.00	Reg	Yes	U-5118BB

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A610	Stadium Dr Widening	US 1	US 1A	2	3	Widening	1.29	\$893,000.00	Div	No	U-5515
A615	Marsh Creek/ Trawick Rd Median	Capital Blvd	New Hope Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.41	\$10,700,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A619c	US 401 Median	NC 55/42 (FV)	Judd Parkway	4	4	Median	1.18	\$9,120,000.00	Reg	Yes	U-5980
A622	NC 55 Widening	Apex Peakway (South)	Salem St	2	4	Widening	0.89	\$5,581,930.00	Reg	Yes	U-2901 B
A623d2	Hilltop Needmore Extension	Herbert Atkins Road	Basal Creek (East Fork)	0	2	New Location	0.3	\$1,938,327.30	Div	No	N/A
A630	Judd Parkway NW	NC 55	Judd Pkwy (NL)	2	4	Widening	0.57	\$4,949,287.20	Div	No	N/A
A634	US 70 / Brier Creek Interchange	-	-			Interchange	0	\$13,400,000.00	St	Yes	U-5518C
A635b	US 401 Superstreet	Legend Rd	Purser Dr	4	4	Superstreet	1	\$3,245,000.00	Reg	No	U-5302
A637	401/55/42 Interchange	East of Fuquay-Varina	-			Interchange	2	\$54,684,000.00	Reg	No	U-5751
A638	US 70 / Jones Sausage Int. Improvements	-	-	4	6	Widening	1.74	\$7,000,000.00	Reg	Yes	U-5520
A640	Aviation Parkway Interchange (Impr)	National Guard Dr	I-40	-	-	Interchange	0.42	\$24,853,000.00	St	Yes	I-5506
A641	Airport Blvd Interchange (Impr)	-	-			Interchange	0.82	\$34,720,000.00	St	Yes	I-5700
A642	N Harrison Ave HSR Grade Sep	Adams St	W Chatham St	4	4	Grade Separation	0	\$22,600,000.00	St	No	P-5708
A644	Chatham / Maynard Grade Separation	-	-	2	2	Grade Separation	0	\$38,000,000.00	St	No	P-5718
A645	US 70 / TW Alexander Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	2	\$29,300,000.00	St	No	U-5518B
A646	Tarboro St Road Diet	New Bern Ave	Martin Luther King Jr	4	3	TSM	0.88	\$1,000,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A647	West St Extension	Martin St	Cabarrus St	0	2	New Location	0.28	\$10,000,000.00	St	No	U-5521
A648	US 1 / Friendship Interchange	Old US 1 Highway	Friendship Road	-	-	Interchange	0	\$13,946,625.00	St	Yes	
A64a	Aviation Parkway	Gateway Centre Blvd	Dominion Dr	2	4	Widening	0.58	\$6,957,000.00	Div	No	U-5811
A64b	Aviation Parkway	Evans Rd	NC 54	2	4	Widening	0.9	\$10,795,000.00	Div	Yes	U-5811
A64d	Aviation Parkway	I-40	Gateway Centre Blvd	4	6	Widening	0.92	\$11,035,000.00	Div	Yes	U-5811
A650	Kipling Realign	US 401	Harnett Central Rd	0	2	New Location	0.49	\$1,625,000.00	Div	No	R-5523
A651	Apex Peakway / Salem St Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	0	\$12,500,000.00	St	No	U-5928

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A656	New Hope Road Grade Separation	-	-	-	-	Grade Separation	-	\$15,346,000.00	St	No	P-5715
A659	Durant Rd Grade Separation	-	-	-	-	Grade Separation	-	\$12,525,000.00	St	No	P-5720
A681	Dixie Forest Road	Spring Forest Road	Atlantic Ave / Litchford Road	2	3	Widening	0.25	\$1,600,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A682	Blue Ridge Rd	Duraleigh	Crabtree Valley Avenue	2	3	Turn Lane	2	\$10,500,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A683a	Barwell Rd	Rock Quarry Rd	Berkley Lake Drive	2	3	Turn Lane	1.15	\$10,800,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A684	Blount/Person Streets Two Way Conversion	Blount St / Person St / Sasser St	Blount St / Person St / Hoke St	-	-	TSM	4.1	\$6,100,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A685	Wake Forest Rd / Brookside Drive Roundabout	-	-	-	-	TSM	-	\$2,300,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A686	Atlantic Avenue Widening	Highwoods Blvd	New Hope Church Rd	4	4	Widening	1	\$11,600,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A696	New Hope Church Rd	Green Rd	Deana Ln	2	3	Widening	0.4	\$2,637,180.00	Div	No	N/A
A82a	Trinity Rd Ext	Walnut Creek	Cary Towne Blvd	2	4	Widening	0.34	\$8,938,045.41	Div	No	N/A
A82b	Trinity Rd Ext	Walnut Creek	Chatham St	0	2	New Location	0.44	\$2,688,165.48	Div	No	N/A
A85b1	Leesville Rd	Westgate Rd	O'Neal Rd (@ Leesville Road Campus)	2	4	Widening	1	\$11,600,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A86a	Leesville Rd	I-540 Interchange	New Leesville Blvd	2	4	Widening	1.17	\$10,696,402.08	Div	No	N/A
A90b	US 401 Rolesville Bypass	US 401	US 401	0	4	New Location	4.5	\$42,625,440.00	Reg	Yes	R-2814b
A90c	US 401 Widening	US 401 Rolesville Bypass	Flat Rock Church Rd	2	4	Widening	6.64	\$27,950,000.00	Reg	Yes	R-2814C
A96b	NC 55	Salem St	Bryan Dr	2	4	Turn Lane	0.53	\$3,324,070.00	Reg	Yes	U-2901 B
Grnv108	NC 56 Realignment	NC 50	US 15	2	2	Intersection Realignment	0.5	\$4,480,000.00	Reg	No	R-5707
Hrnt4a	NC 55	North Broad Street	Church St	2	3	Turn Lane	1.78	\$12,400,000.00	Reg	Yes	R-5705A
Jhns11	Front St Ext	Front St	NC 42	0	2	New Location	0.92	\$4,901,925.60	Div	No	U-3605
Jhns1b	NC 42 East Widening	Glen Laurel Rd	Buffaloe Rd	2	4	Widening	4.35	\$43,100,000.00	Reg	Yes	R-3825
Jhns2a	NC 42 West	US 70 Business	US 70 Bypass	2	4	Widening	3.1	\$27,430,000.00	Reg	Yes	R-3410A
Jhns2b	NC 42 West Widening	US 70 Bypass	I-40	2	4	Widening	4.27	\$25,015,967.00	Reg	Yes	R-3410B
2035 MTP											

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
F110	US 1	US 64	NC 540	4	6	Widening	5.3	\$200,716,129.00	St	Yes	U-6066
F110a	US 1 / NC 55 Diverging Diamond Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$22,300,000.00	St	No	N/A
F11-1e1	US 1 North - Upgrade to Freeway	NC 98 (Durham Road)	Harris Road	4	6	Widening	1.85	\$90,112,000.00	St	Yes	U-5307 D
F11-1e2	US 1 North - Upgrade to Freeway	Harris Road	US 1A (Youngsville)	4	6	Widening	3.91	\$43,981,165.80	St	Yes	N/A
F14	Clayton Bypass Widening	I-40	US 70	4	6	Widening	8.69	\$97,748,422.20	St	Yes	N/A
F15a	US 64 West Conversion to Expressway	Laura Duncan Road	I-540	4	6	Widening	5.7	\$51,193,039.59	St	Yes	N/A
F15b	US 64 West Conversion to Freeway	NC-540 Tri-Ex Turnpike	NC 751	4	6	Widening	3.2	\$67,978,386.00	St	Yes	N/A
F17	Aviation Parkway Ext	Brier Creek Parkway	US 70	0	4	New Location	1.79	\$33,160,066.14	Div	Yes	U-4721[A]
F3	NC 540 Tri-Ex (Phase VI)	I-40 (South)	US 64 East Bypass	0	6	New Location	10.8	\$315,430,000.00	St	Yes	R-2829
F40	I-40 Managed Lanes	Durham County Line	Wade Avenue	0	2	Widening	9.2	\$579,090,000.00	St	Yes	I-5702
F41	I-40 Managed Lanes	Wade Avenue	Johnston County	0	2	Widening	21.29	\$211,274,569.00	St	Yes	N/A
F41b	I-40 Managed Lanes	Johnston County	Cornwallis Rd	0	2	Widening	2.88	\$20,462,870.00	St	Yes	N/A
F42b	I-540 Managed Lanes	I-40	US-64 Bypass	0	2	Widening	25.82	\$367,809,456.96	St	Yes	N/A
F44c	I-40 (East)	NC 42	NC 210	4	6	Widening	6.78	\$89,679,815.78	St	Yes	N/A
F44d	I-40 (East)	NC 210	CAMPO MAB	4	6	Widening	6.78	\$94,574,375.28	St	Yes	N/A
F45	I-40 Managed Lanes	Cornwallis Rd	NC 210	0	2	Widening	4.47	\$26,920,480.00	St	Yes	N/A
F46	I-40 Managed Lanes	NC 210	CAMPO MAB	0	2	Widening	6.75	\$36,179,936.00	St	Yes	N/A
F7a	US 64 East	US 64 Bypass (Wendell)	US 64/US 264 (Zebulon)	4	6	Widening	7.35	\$92,070,546.75	St	Yes	N/A
F81a	I-40 Widening	Wade Avenue	US 1/64	6	8	Widening	4.18	\$37,734,000.00	St	No	I-5704
F81b	I-40 / Wade Avenue Interchange Improvement	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$30,000,000.00	St	No	N/A
F86	Capital Blvd - Corridor Upgrades	I-440	I-540	0	0	New Location	5.25	\$54,227,013.75	St	No	N/A
A1	Perry Creek Rd Ext (Widening)	US 401	Fox Road	2	4	Widening	0.53	\$4,350,952.32	Div	No	N/A
A101	US 70	Lumley/Westgate Rd	Duraleigh/Millbrook Rd	4	6	Widening	3.3	\$105,548,000.00	Reg	Yes	U-2823
A104b	Morrisville Parkway	Green Level Ch Rd	NC 55	2	4	Widening	1.83	\$15,000,000.00	Div	Yes	N/A
A112a	Smithfield Rd	US 64 Bypass	Major Slade Rd	2	4	Widening	2.6	\$23,769,782.40	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A113	Ten Ten Rd	Holly Springs Rd	Bells Lake Rd	2	4	Widening	1.95	\$17,827,336.80	Div	No	N/A
A114c	Ten Ten Rd	Holly Springs Rd	Kildaire Farm Road	2	4	Widening	1.3	\$11,884,891.20	Div	No	N/A
A120	Tryon Rd Ext	Garner Rd	Rock Quarry Rd	0	4	Widening	2.15	\$26,310,434.85	Div	No	U-3111
A124a	Northside Loop (Harris Rd)	US 1A	White St	0	3	New Location	0.44	\$7,205,384.34	Div	No	N/A
A133	Burlington Mills Rd	US 1	US 401	2	4	Widening	4.77	\$35,769,848.40	Div	No	N/A
A134	Litchford Rd	Old Wake Forest Rd	Falls of Neuse Rd	3	4	Widening	2.99	\$27,335,249.76	Div	No	N/A
A135a	Lead Mine Rd	Town & Country Rd	Millbrook Rd	3	4	Widening	0.54	\$4,936,800.96	Div	No	N/A
A135c	Lead Mine Rd	Lynn Rd	Sawmill Rd	2	4	Widening	0.99	\$9,050,801.76	Div	No	N/A
A136a	Lake Wheeler Rd	Tryon Rd	Penny Rd	2	4	Widening	1.79	\$13,423,066.80	Div	No	N/A
A136b	Lake Wheeler Rd	Penny Rd	Ten Ten Rd	2	4	Widening	3.55	\$29,143,171.20	Div	No	N/A
A136c	Lake Wheeler Rd	Ten Ten Rd	Hilltop-Needmore Rd	2	4	Widening	3.4	\$27,911,769.60	Div	No	N/A
A137a	Old Stage Rd	US 401	Ten Ten Rd	2	4	Widening	4.2	\$31,495,464.00	Div	No	N/A
A137b	Old Stage Rd	Ten Ten Rd	Rock Service Statoin	2	4	Widening	1.49	\$11,470,823.93	Div	No	N/A
A137c	Old Stage Rd	Rock Service Station	NC 42	2	4	Widening	3.27	\$24,521,468.40	Div	No	N/A
A138a	Timber Dr/Jones Sausage Connector	US 70	Timber Dr Ext	0	4	New Location	0.72	\$7,690,016.88	Div	No	N/A
A138b	Timber Dr/Jones Sausage Connector	Jones Sausage Rd	US 70	0	4	New Location	0.28	\$10,400,000.00	St	No	N/A
A138c	Timber Dr/Jones Sausage Connector	White Oak Rd	I-40 (South)	2	4	Widening	1.68	\$15,358,936.32	Div	No	N/A
A138d	White Oak-Guy Rd Connector	White Oak Rd	Guy Rd	0	4	New Location	1.92	\$18,186,854.40	Div	No	N/A
A13d	Falls of Neuse Blvd	Durant Rd	Old Falls of Neuse Blvd	4	6	Widening	2.06	\$20,372,215.50	Div	No	N/A
A140a	Vandora Springs Rd & Ext	Timber Dr	Old Stage Rd	2	4	Widening	1.02	\$9,325,068.48	Div	No	N/A
A140b	Vandora Springs Rd & Ext	Old Stage Rd	US 401	2	4	Widening	1.62	\$14,810,402.88	Div	No	N/A
A142a	Timber Dr East	Waterfield Rd	White Oak Rd	0	4	New Location	1.17	\$12,496,277.43	Div	No	N/A
A143a	White Oak Rd	US 70	I-540	2	4	Widening	4.46	\$40,774,319.04	Div	Yes	N/A
A143a1	I-40 / White Oak Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$13,946,625.00	St	No	N/A
A143b	White Oak Rd	I-540	NC 42 (Johnston Co.)	2	4	Widening	2.53	\$23,129,826.72	Div	No	N/A
A148a1	Eagle Rock Rd	Kioti Dr	Old Tarboro Rd	2	4	Widening	0.7	\$5,845,749.00	Div	No	N/A
A148a2	Eagle Rock Rd	Old Tarboro Road	Martin Pond Rd	2	4	Widening	0.75	\$6,263,302.50	Div	No	N/A
A149b2	Poole Rd	Richardson Road	Jake May Drive	2	4	Widening	1	\$7,498,920.00	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A150	NC 98	Durham County Line	NC 98 Bypass	2	4	Widening	8.86	\$81,000,104.64	Reg	Yes	N/A
A155c	T.W. Alexander Dr Ext	Brier Creek Parkway	Leesville Rd	0	4	New Location	1.8	\$17,050,176.00	Div	No	N/A
A161	Skycrest Dr Ext	New Hope Rd	Forestville Rd	0	4	Widening	3.4	\$50,923,058.29	Div	No	N/A
A162	Buffaloe Rd	Southall Rd	Stone Station Drive	2	4	Widening	1.5	\$13,713,336.00	Div	No	N/A
A163a	Holly Springs Rd	Old Holly Springs Rd	N. of 540 Interchange	2	4	Widening	4.44	\$40,591,474.56	Div	No	N/A
A163c	Friendship Rd Widening	Richardson Rd	Old Holly Springs Apex	2	4	Widening	3.58	\$31,084,996.80	Div	No	N/A
A164c2	Green Level Church Rd	Kit Creek Road	Precept Way	2	4	Widening	0.95	\$8,685,112.80	Div	No	N/A
A165a2	Airport Blvd Ext	Garden Square Ln	NC 54	0	4	New Location	0.84	\$15,852,021.36	Div	Yes	N/A
A165b	Airport Blvd Ext	Davis Dr	Louis Stephens Rd	0	2	New Location	0.36	\$3,139,829.04	Div	No	N/A
A167	Wendell Northern Bypass	US 64 BUS (west)	Old Zebulon Road	0	2	New Location	2.4	\$14,240,772.00	Div	No	N/A
A168a	Green Level Ch Widening	Green Level West	Jenks Rd	2	4	Widening	1.76	\$13,198,099.20	Div	No	N/A
A168b	Green Level Church Rd	Green Level West	Morrisville Parkway	2	4	New Location	1.86	\$13,947,991.20	Div	No	N/A
A169c	Richardson Rd (East)	Poole Rd	Knightdale-Eagle Rock Rd	0	4	New Location	0.5	\$4,736,160.00	Div	No	N/A
A173	New Hill Olive Chapel Rd	Old US 1	Chatham Co.	2	3	Widening	4.46	\$16,106,496.12	Div	No	N/A
A174b	Old Battle Bridge / Tarboro Rd	Knightdale-Eagle Rock Rd	Wendell Blvd	0	4	New Location	0.8	\$7,577,856.00	Div	No	N/A
A181b	Old US 1	Humie Olive Rd	Apex Peakway	2	4	Widening	2.53	\$18,972,267.60	Div	No	N/A
A186c	Holland Rd Turn Lane	Old US 1	Kelly Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.49	\$5,380,869.78	Div	No	N/A
A187b2	Apex Peakway (East)	Laura Duncan	Old Raleigh Road	2	4	New Location	0.3	\$2,742,667.20	Div	No	N/A
A187b3	Apex Peakway (East)	Old Raleigh Rd	Center Street	2	4	New Location	0.75	\$6,856,668.00	Div	No	N/A
A190	New Hill Holleman Rd Widening	Old US 1	Avent Ferry Rd	2	4	Widening	4.85	\$39,377,514.30	Div	No	N/A
A193a	Sunset Lake Rd	US 401	Hilltop-Needmore Rd	2	4	Widening	2.65	\$19,872,138.00	Div	No	N/A
A193b	Sunset Lake Rd	Hilltop-Needmore Rd	Optimist Farm Rd	2	4	Widening	2.55	\$23,312,671.20	Div	No	N/A
A195	Creedmoor Rd	Glenwood Ave	Strickland Rd	4	6	Widening	4.11	\$40,645,536.75	Reg	Yes	N/A
A2	Perry Creek Rd Ext (Part NL)	Fox Rd	Buffaloe Road	0	4	New Location	1.77	\$22,251,814.83	Div	No	N/A
A200	Creech/Jones Sausage Connector	Creech Rd	Jones Sausage Rd	0	4	Widening	1.09	\$10,324,828.80	Div	No	N/A
A201a	Rock Quarry Rd	New Hope Rd	Battle Bridge Rd	2	4	Widening	1.4	\$20,350,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A201b	Rock Quarry Rd	Battle Bridge Rd	East Garner Rd	2	4	Widening	3.3	\$30,169,339.20	Div	No	N/A
A202	East Garner Rd	Rock Quarry Rd	Shotwell Rd	2	4	Widening	3.22	\$24,146,522.40	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A203	Auburn-Knightdale Rd	Grasshopper Rd	Raynor Rd	2	4	Widening	7.58	\$56,841,813.60	Div	No	N/A
A205	Six Forks Ext	Atlantic Avenue	Capital Blvd	0	4	New Location	0.56	\$25,981,124.00	Div	Yes	N/A
A207a2	Judd Parkway NE	NC 55	Products Road (future ext)	2	4	Widening	1.5	\$11,248,380.00	Div	No	N/A
A21	Lake Boone Trail Ext	Blue Ridge Rd	Edwards Mill Ext	0	4	Widening	0.28	\$2,990,562.12	Div	No	N/A
A217a	Sunset Lake Rd	Main St	Optimist Farm Rd	2	4	Widening	3.4	\$31,083,561.60	Div	No	N/A
A217b	Sunset Lake Rd Ext	Old Holly Springs Apex	Main St	0	4	New Location	1.7	\$18,156,984.30	Div	No	N/A
A217c	Sunset Lake Rd Ext	Woodfield Deadend Rd	Main St	2	4	Widening	0.99	\$7,423,930.80	Div	No	N/A
A218a	Old Holly Springs Apex Rd	Holly Springs Rd	Jessie Dr	2	4	Widening	2.52	\$23,592,212.28	Div	No	N/A
A218b	Jessie Dr (part NL)	Veridea Parkway	NC 55	0	4	New Location	1.64	\$17,516,149.56	Div	No	N/A
A218c	Veridea Parkway	Tingen Rd	Jessie Dr	2	3	Turn Lane	1.06	\$3,828,001.32	Div	No	N/A
A218d	Tingen Rd	Apex Peakway	Old Holly Springs Apex Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	0.55	\$3,598,001.55	Div	No	N/A
A219a2	McCrimmon Parkway Ext	Davis Dr	Louis Stephens Rd	2	4	Widening	0.82	\$4,727,273.00	Div	No	N/A
A219b	McCrimmon Parkway Ext	Louis Stephens Rd	NC 55	0	4	New Location	0.94	\$8,903,980.80	Div	No	N/A
A221	NC 54	N.W. Maynard Rd	Wilson Rd	2	6	Widening	0.93	\$8,502,268.32	Reg	Yes	N/A
A222b	NC 54	Weston Parkway	McCrimmon Pkwy Grade Sep	2	4	Widening	2.4	\$59,132,337.60	Reg	Yes	N/A
A223a	Kit Creek Rd	Wake Rd	Green Level Ch Rd	0	4	New Location	0.42	\$3,978,374.40	Div	No	N/A
A224a	Johnson Pond Rd	Optimist Farm Rd	Hilltop-Needmore Rd	2	4	Widening	2.05	\$18,741,559.20	Div	No	N/A
A228a	NC 50	Timber Dr	I-540	2	4	Widening	4.91	\$36,819,697.20	Reg	Yes	N/A
A228c	NC 50	NC 42	NC 210	2	4	Widening	5.63	\$42,516,352.73	Reg	Yes	N/A
A230	S.E. Maynard Rd	Cary Towne Blvd	Walnut St	4	6	Widening	0.26	\$2,571,250.50	Div	No	N/A
A231	Trinity Rd	Edwards Mill Rd Ext	Trenton Rd /Arrington Rd	2	4	Widening	1.1	\$10,056,446.40	Div	No	N/A
A233a	NC 54	Reedy Creek Rd	Chapel Hill Rd	4	6	Widening	0.4	\$3,955,770.00	Reg	No	N/A
A237a	Old Apex Rd	West Chatham St	Cary Parkway	2	4	Widening	1.55	\$14,170,447.20	Div	No	N/A
A27d	Louis Stephens Dr Ext (part existing)	Poplar Pike Lane	Airport Blvd	2	4	Widening	1.22	\$10,188,305.40	Div	No	N/A
A3	Spring Forest Rd Ext	US 401	Buffaloe Rd	0	4	New Location	1.52	\$31,389,472.00	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A300	US 70	US 401	I-40	4	6	Widening	4.3	\$70,417,777.50	Reg	Yes	N/A
A301	US 70	I-40	NC 42	4	6	Widening	7.21	\$71,302,754.25	Reg	Yes	N/A
A302b	Eastern Angier Bypass	Benson Rd	NC 210	0	4	New Location	0.5	\$4,104,672.00	Div	No	N/A
A302f	Eastern Angier Bypass	Kennebec Rd	NC 55	0	4	New Location	0.35	\$3,356,753.40	Div	No	N/A
A37	Walnut St	Maynard Rd	Macedonia Rd	4	6	Widening	1.29	\$12,757,358.25	Div	No	N/A
A39	Alston Avenue	Kit Creek Rd	NC 55	2	4	Widening	2.12	\$15,897,710.40	Div	No	N/A
A402a	Buffaloe Rd	Spring Forest Rd Extension	Forestville Rd	2	4	Widening	0.95	\$19,247,948.00	Div	No	N/A
A403a	Hodge Rd (Widening)	Poole Rd	US 64	2	4	Widening	3.15	\$30,180,781.13	Div	No	N/A
A404	South Franklin St (part NL)	NC 98 (Wake Forest Bypass)	Rogers Rd	2	4	Widening	1.1	\$10,056,446.40	Div	No	N/A
A406a	Shotwell Rd	East Garner Rd	US 70	2	4	Widening	0.86	\$7,862,312.64	Div	No	N/A
A406c	Shotwell Rd Widening	Main St	Old Baucom Rd	2	4	Widening	2.12	\$15,897,710.40	Div	No	N/A
A407a	NC 42	NC 401	Old Stage Rd	2	4	Widening	4.1	\$30,745,572.00	Reg	Yes	N/A
A407b2	NC 42	John Adams Rd	NC 50	2	4	Widening	4.39	\$32,920,258.80	Reg	Yes	N/A
A41	Kildaire Farm Rd	Ten Ten Rd	Kildaire Farm Connector	2	4	Widening	2.03	\$18,558,714.72	Div	No	N/A
A415	Milburnie Rd	Hodge Rd Ext	Forestville Rd	2	4	Widening	1.5	\$14,044,568.34	Div	No	N/A
A416	Fox Rd	Old Wake Forest Rd	US 401	2	4	Widening	2.06	\$18,832,981.44	Div	No	N/A
A417	Spring Forest Rd	Fox Rd	US 401	3	4	Widening	0.67	\$8,125,290.00	Div	No	N/A
A422	New Pearl Rd	Barwell Rd	Auburn Church Rd	0	3	New Location	1.77	\$15,520,463.60	Div	No	N/A
A423	Woods Creek Rd	Friendship Rd	Old Holly Springs Apex Rd	2	4	Widening	1.46	\$14,002,457.04	Div	No	N/A
A429a	Leesville-Westgate Connector	Westgate Rd	Leesville Rd	0	4	New Location	1.18	\$26,880,940.56	Div	No	N/A
A432	Skycrest Dr	Brentwood Rd	New Hope Rd	2	4	Widening	1.6	\$14,627,558.40	Div	No	N/A
A434	Sunnybrook Rd	Rock Quarry Rd	Poole Rd	3	4	Widening	1.81	\$16,547,425.44	Div	No	N/A
A435	Battle Bridge Rd	Rock Quarry Rd	Auburn-Knightdale Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.85	\$6,680,945.70	Div	No	N/A
A440c	NC-55/Carpenter Fire Station Road DDI	NC-55	Carpenter Fire Station Road	-	-	Interchange	-	\$14,876,400.00	Reg	No	N/A
A444	NC 50	I 540	NC 98	2	4	Widening	5.06	\$82,016,000.00	Reg	Yes	U-5891
A446	Glenwood Avenue	Womans Club Dr	Oberlin Rd	4	6	Widening	1.07	\$10,581,684.75	St	Yes	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A449	Perry Rd Ext	Apex Peakway	NC 55 Bypass	0	4	New Location	2.01	\$35,414,588.79	Div	No	N/A
A457	Westgate Rd	Leesville Rd	US 70	2	4	Widening	1.4	\$12,799,113.60	Div	No	U-2918
A480a	US 401(South)	US 70	Ten Ten Rd	4	6	Widening	5.59	\$77,328,266.79	Reg	Yes	N/A
A49b	Poole Rd	Barwell Rd	I-540	2	4	Widening	1.57	\$14,353,291.68	Div	Yes	N/A
A51	Smithfield Rd	Forestville Rd	Bethlehem Rd	2	4	Widening	1.57	\$14,353,291.68	Div	No	U-3441
A511	Piney Grove Wilbon Rd	Brayton Park Rd	Southern FV Bypass	2	4	Widening	6.5	\$48,742,980.00	Div	No	N/A
A530	Evans Rd	Aviation Parkway	Weston Parkway	4	6	Widening	0.5	\$4,944,712.50	Div	No	N/A
A531a	Purfoy Rd Widening	US 401	Holland Rd	2	4	Widening	1.41	\$12,242,973.60	Div	No	N/A
A534b	US 401 Widening	Judd Pkwy	Eastern Parkway	2	4	Widening	1.53	\$11,473,347.60	Reg	Yes	N/A
A535c	NC 42 Widening	Christian Light Rd	Cass Holt Rd	2	4	Median	2.94	\$22,046,824.80	Reg	Yes	N/A
A543b	Rex Rd Realignment	Avent Ferry Connector (NL)	Cass Holt Rd	0	4	New Location	0.31	\$3,119,945.40	Div	No	N/A
A544a	Avent Ferry Cnctr	Old Holly Springs Apex	Holly Springs Rd	0	4	New Location	0.99	\$9,377,596.80	Div	No	N/A
A544b	Avent Ferry Cnctr Widening	Holly Springs Rd	Rex Rd	0	4	New Location	3.33	\$31,542,825.60	Div	No	N/A
A545	Arthur Pierce Rd	Kildaire Farm	Holly Springs Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.03	\$6,097,806.00	Div	No	N/A
A547	Stephenson Rd	Ten Ten Rd	Sunset Lake Rd	2	4	Widening	2.03	\$13,279,896.63	Div	No	N/A
A559	Sweet Springs Ext.	Rex Rd	Cass Holt	0	2	New Location	1.31	\$7,600,352.76	Div	No	N/A
A560a	Jones Franklin Widening	Western Blvd	I-440	2	3	Turn Lane	1.09	\$6,750,451.13	Div	Yes	N/A
A560b	Jones Franklin Widening	I-440	Dillard Dr	2	4	Widening	1.22	\$10,015,399.68	Div	Yes	N/A
A564	Hillsborough St Widening	Western Blvd	Bashford Rd	2	4	Widening	1.09	\$9,965,024.16	Div	No	N/A
A577	Ackerman Road	NC 50	White Oak Rd	0	2	New Location	1.64	\$11,710,846.29	Div	No	N/A
A579	Old Faison Rd Widening	Hodge Rd	Bethlehem Rd	2	4	Widening	2.06	\$19,164,213.78	Div	No	N/A
A580	Old Faison Rd Ext	Bethlehem Rd	Smithfield Rd	0	4	New Location	0.76	\$7,198,963.20	Div	No	N/A
A584	Western Wendell Loop	Wendell Blvd	Poole Rd	0	4	New Location	1.69	\$12,673,174.80	Div	No	N/A
A589	Forestville Rd Ext	Mailman Rd	Old Knight Rd	0	2	New Location	3.52	\$24,659,606.40	Div	No	N/A
A591	Mailman Rd Widening	Smithfield Rd	Knightdale-Eagle Rock Rd	2	4	Widening	1.45	\$11,800,932.00	Div	No	N/A
A59a	N.E. Regional Center	Gresham Lake Rd	I 540	0	4	Widening	0.59	\$9,979,963.95	Div	No	N/A
A59b	Sumner Blvd Ext	Old Wake Forest Rd	Capital Blvd	0	4	New Location	0.38	\$14,058,620.00	Div	No	N/A
A59c	N.W. Regional Center	Ruritania	Gresham Lake Rd	0	4	Widening	0.99	\$10,905,005.55	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A613	Harris Rd Widening	US 1	US 1A	2	4	Widening	1.42	\$23,171,966.40	Div	No	N/A
A616a	New Hill Place	NC 55 (Bus)	NC 55 Bypass	0	3	New Location	1.08	\$8,503,775.28	Div	No	N/A
A616b	New Hill Place	NC 55 Bypass	Old Holly Springs Apex	0	4	New Location	0.71	\$6,389,079.84	Div	No	N/A
A617a	US 401 Bypass	US 401 (E of FV)	NC 55	0	6	New Location	6.41	\$145,979,684.40	Reg	Yes	N/A
A619a	US 401 Widening	NC 540	US 401 Bypass	4	6	Widening	1.58	\$17,772,440.40	Reg	Yes	N/A
A619b	US 401 Widening	US 401 Bypass	NC 55/42 (FV)	4	6	Widening	3.32	\$37,344,621.60	Reg	Yes	N/A
A623b	Hilltop Needmore Widening	Johnson Pond Rd	Sunset Lake Rd	2	4	Widening	2.09	\$15,672,742.80	Div	No	N/A
A623c	Hilltop Needmore Widening	Sunset Lake Rd	Keith Hills St	2	4	Widening	0.68	\$5,099,265.60	Div	No	N/A
A624a	Honeycutt Connector	Avent Ferry Rd	Cass Holt Rd	0	4	New Location	0.82	\$7,767,302.40	Div	No	N/A
A624b	Honeycutt Connector	Cass Holt Rd	Piney Grove Wilbon	0	4	Widening	0.87	\$8,240,918.40	Div	No	N/A
A625	James Slaughter Rd Widening	Stewart Rd	Bass Lake Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	0.55	\$3,256,110.00	Div	No	N/A
A629	Stewart Rd	James Slaughter Pkwy	Judd Pkwy	2	3	Turn Lane	1.3	\$7,696,260.00	Div	No	N/A
A639	I-87 / I-495 Bypass Widening	I-440	US-64	6	8	Widening	9.73	\$115,124,664.60	St	Yes	N/A
A643	Chatham / Trinity Grade Separation	-	-	2	2	Grade Separation	0	\$50,410,000.00	St	No	N/A
A64c	Aviation Parkway	I-40	Airport Blvd	4	6	Widening	1.6	\$30,818,341.13	Div	No	N/A
A652	NC 55	Morrisville Carpenter Rd	NC 540	4	6	Widening	1.55	\$17,434,989.00	Reg	Yes	N/A
A664	Hilltop Road Relocation	Hilltop Road	Lake Wheeler Road	0	2	New Location	0.53	\$2,350,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A669	Lucas & Old Crews Connector / Mama's Way & Hinton Oaks Ext	Hinton Oaks Avenue	Marks Creek Road	0	2	New Location	4.66	\$28,470,116.22	Div	No	N/A
A66a	O'Kelley Chapel Rd	Alston Avenue	NC 55	2	4	Widening	1.21	\$9,073,693.20	Div	No	N/A
A66b	O'Kelley Chapel Rd	Alston Avenue	NC 751	2	4	Widening	1.13	\$8,473,779.60	Div	No	N/A
A672	Unicon Drive Ext	Height Lane	Unicon Drive	0	2	New Location	0.15	\$1,187,576.25	Div	No	N/A
A675b	Southport Drive Connector	Southport Drive	Southport Drive	0	2	New Location	0.5	\$2,966,827.50	Div	No	N/A
A678	Square Loop Interchange	US 401 South	Ten Ten Road	-	-	Interchange	-	\$18,753,676.70	Reg	No	N/A
A679a	Northern Judd Parkway	NC 55 / Broad St	Old Honeycutt Road	0	2	New Location	2.74	\$53,449,214.70	Div	No	N/A
A679b	Northern Judd Parkway	NC 55 / Broad St	Old Honeycutt Road	2	4	Widening	2.74	\$25,049,693.76	Div	No	N/A
A683b	Barwell Rd	Berkley Lake Drive	Poole Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.2	\$7,911,540.00	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A687	Corporate Center Extension	Corporate Center Dr	Bashford Rd	0	2	Grade Separation	0.5	\$22,000,000.00	St	No	N/A
A689	Beryl Road Realignment	Beryl Road	Royal St	2	2	Intersection Realignment	0.24	\$5,000,000.00	St	No	N/A
A69	Holly Springs Rd	Cary Parkway	Penny Rd	2	4	Widening	2.22	\$18,224,743.68	Div	No	N/A
A70	Holly Springs Rd	Penny Rd	Ten Ten Rd	2	4	Widening	1.22	\$10,015,399.68	Div	No	N/A
A71	Holly Springs Rd	Ten Ten Rd	Kildaire Farm Rd Connector	2	4	Widening	0.84	\$7,679,468.16	Div	No	N/A
A75b	Yates Store Rd	Yates Store Rd	Morrisville Parkway	0	4	New Location	1.09	\$10,453,889.16	Div	No	N/A
A75c	Wimberley Rd	Morrisville Parkway	Green Level West Rd	0	4	New Location	1.46	\$14,002,457.04	Div	No	N/A
A77b2	West Lake Rd	Ten Ten Rd	Middle Creek Park Avenue	2	4	Widening	1.23	\$11,244,935.52	Div	No	N/A
A79a	Crabtree Valley Ave / I-440 Connector	I-440	Blue Ridge Rd	0	2	New Location	0.15	\$72,568,194.00	St	No	I-5870
A79b	Crabtree Valley Ave Widening/Realign	Blue Ridge Rd	Creedmoor Rd	3	4	New Location	0.61	\$18,096,806.00	St	No	I-5870
A82c	Trinity Rd Ext	Walnut Creek	Chatam St	2	4	Widening	0.44	\$4,022,578.56	Div	No	N/A
A85b2	Leesville Rd	O'Neal Road (A Leesville Road Campus)	Lynn Rd	2	4	Widening	1.75	\$15,998,892.00	Div	No	N/A
A86b	Leesville Rd	New Leesville Blvd	TW Alexander Dr Ext	2	4	Widening	0.97	\$8,867,957.28	Div	No	N/A
A87	New Leesville Blvd Ext	Terminus	Carpenter Pond Rd	0	4	New Location	0.47	\$9,500,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A88	New Rand Rd	NC 50	Old Garner Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.63	\$10,746,508.50	Div	No	U-3607
A90c1	US 401 & NC 98 Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$12,523,500.00	St	No	N/A
A90d	US 401 Widening	Flat Rock Church Rd	Fox Park Rd	2	4	Widening	5.32	\$16,333,091.00	Reg	Yes	R-2814D
A94	NC 55	NC 540	Kit Creek Rd	4	6	Widening	1.58	\$11,907,535.07	Reg	Yes	N/A
A98	NC 55 Bypass	North Main St	Honeycutt Connector	4	6	Widening	5.95	\$66,927,861.00	Reg	Yes	N/A
A98a	Holly Springs Road Interchange	Holly Springs Road	NC-55 Bypass	-	-	Interchange	-	\$19,897,185.00	Reg	No	N/A
A98b	South Main Street Interchange	South Main Street	NC-55 Bypass	-	-	Interchange	0	\$19,897,185.00	Reg	No	N/A
Frnk1	US 1	Extend frwy project from US-1A	CAMPO MAB	4	6	Widening	8.28	\$131,004,519.53	St	Yes	N/A
Frnk11	Lane Store Extension	Oak Park Blvd	Lane Store Rd	0	2	New Location	1.39	\$8,064,496.44	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
Frnk13	Western Service Rd	Bert Winston Rd	Pocomoke Rd	0	2	New Location	2.7	\$14,812,340.40	St	No	N/A
Grnv35	Woodland Church Rd	Wake Co. line	Bruce Garner Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	4.41	\$15,925,930.02	Div	No	N/A
Grnv94	I-85 / Brogden Interchange (New)	-	-	-	-	Interchange	3.94	\$13,946,625.00	St	Yes	N/A
Grnv951	24th Street Extension	26th Street	East Lyon Station Rd	0	2	New Location	0.72	\$8,219,000.00	Div	No	U-5829
Jhns13a	Ranch Road Extension	US 70 BUS / NC 42	Ranch Road	0	2	New Location	0.4	\$2,556,411.00	Div	No	N/A
Jhns4a1	North Connector	NC 42 East	Covered Bridge Rd	0	2	New Location	2.33	\$12,782,501.16	Div	No	N/A
2045 MTP											
F7b	US 64 East	US 64 Bypass (Wendell)	US 64/US 264 (Zebulon)	6	8	Widening	7.35	\$85,609,455.75	St	Yes	N/A
F84	I-540 Managed Shoulder	US 1	I-495 (Kinightdale Bypass)	0	1	TSM	18.1	\$77,089,736.00	St	No	N/A
F85	I-540 Managed Shoulder	I-40	US 1	0	1	TSM	7.72	\$32,880,263.00	St	No	N/A
A102	Edwards Mill Rd Ext - part III	Chapel Hill Rd	Western Blvd Ext	0	4	New Location	0.7	\$46,425,000.00	Div	Yes	U-3817
A112b	Smithfield Rd	Major Slade Rd	Johnston Co. line	2	4	Widening	1.4	\$12,799,113.60	Div	No	N/A
A117	New Hope Rd	Old Poole Rd	Rock Quarry Rd	2	4	Widening	1.8	\$16,456,003.20	Div	No	N/A
A118a	NC 55	Old Honeycutt Road	Jicarilla Rd	2	4	Widening	2.69	\$29,055,000.00	Reg	Yes	R-5705D
A125a2	Forestville Rd	Buffaloe Rd	Rogers Rd	2	4	Widening	7.5	\$68,566,680.00	Div	No	N/A
A125b	Heritage Lake Rd	Rogers Rd	End of Existing Heritage Lake Rd	2	4	Widening	0.93	\$8,502,268.32	Div	No	N/A
A126a	Ligon Mill Rd	Burlington Mills Rd	US 1A	2	3	Turn Lane	2.32	\$9,330,342.84	Div	No	N/A
A126b	Ligon Mill Rd	US 401	Burlington Mills Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	2.57	\$16,943,881.50	Div	No	N/A
A127b1	Ligon Mill Rd Connector	NC 98 Bypass	Richland Creek	0	4	New Location	0.25	\$8,499,834.00	Div	No	N/A
A127b3	Ligon Mill Rd Connector	Richland Creek	NC 98	2	4	Widening	0.75	\$6,856,668.00	Div	No	N/A
A127c	Ligon Mill Rd Connector	NC 98	Stadium Dr	0	4	Widening	0.78	\$8,330,851.62	Div	No	N/A
A130b	Mitchell Mill Rd (East)	Watkins Rd	Jonesville Rd	2	4	Widening	1.57	\$14,353,291.68	Div	No	N/A
A131c	NC 96	US 401	SE of Youngsville	2	3	Turn Lane	4.14	\$30,160,768.37	Reg	Yes	N/A
A135b	Lead Mine Rd	Millbrook Rd	Lynn Rd	2	4	Widening	1.12	\$10,239,290.88	Div	No	N/A
A136d	Lake Wheeler Rd	Hilltop-Needmore Rd	US 401	2	4	Widening	0.57	\$4,679,326.08	Div	No	N/A
A137d	Old Stage Rd	NC 42	NC 210	2	4	Widening	5.39	\$40,419,178.80	Div	No	N/A
A137e	Old Stage Rd	NC 210	NC 55	2	4	Widening	3.57	\$26,771,144.40	Div	No	N/A
A14	Ray Rd	Leesville Rd	Strickland Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	3.21	\$21,163,369.50	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A144	NC 50	Timber Dr	US 70	2	3	Turn Lane	1.5	\$9,889,425.00	Reg	Yes	N/A
A148b	Eagle Rock Rd	Martin Pond Rd	Lake Myra Rd	2	4	Widening	2.47	\$18,522,332.40	Div	No	N/A
A148c	Eagle Rock Rd	Lake Myra Rd	Covered Bridge Rd	2	4	Widening	4.97	\$37,567,065.53	Div	No	N/A
A148d	Eagle Rock Rd	-	-	2	4	Widening	3.08	\$23,096,673.60	Div	No	N/A
A149a	Poole Rd	I-540	Martin Pond Rd	2	4	Widening	5.6	\$51,196,454.40	Div	No	N/A
A155b	T.W. Alexander Dr	Aviation Parkway	US 70	4	6	Widening	1.02	\$17,722,990.69	Div	Yes	N/A
A157a	Eastern Parkway	Piney Grove Wilbon	NC 55	0	4	New Location	4.2	\$40,081,177.13	Reg	No	N/A
A157a1	Eastern Parkway / US 401 Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$12,523,500.00	Reg	No	N/A
A157a2	Eastern Parkway / Angier Road Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$12,523,500.00	Reg	No	N/A
A163b	Friendship Rd Widening	Old Holly Springs Apex	New Hill Holleman	2	4	Widening	1.93	\$17,075,830.20	Div	No	N/A
A169d1	NC 231 (Southern Wendell) Bypass (pc)	NC 231	Wendell Blvd	0	4	New Location	2.7	\$25,894,954.80	Div	Yes	N/A
A169d2	NC 231 (Southern Wendell) Bypass (pc)	Wendell Road at Stott's Mill Road	NC 231	0	4	New Location	0.7	\$6,713,506.80	Div	Yes	N/A
A172	Kelly Rd	Jenks Rd	Old US 1	2	4	Widening	5.23	\$47,813,831.52	Div	No	N/A
A178a	Olive Chapel Rd	Kelly Rd	NC 55	2	4	Widening	1.93	\$17,644,492.32	Div	No	N/A
A178b	Olive Chapel Rd	Richardson Rd	Kelly Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.81	\$11,933,239.50	Div	No	N/A
A178c	Olive Chapel Rd	New Hill Olive Chapel Rd	Richardson Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.31	\$8,636,764.50	Div	No	N/A
A179a	Richardson Rd	US 64 (West)	Olive Chapel Rd	0	4	New Location	1.42	\$25,974,194.40	Div	No	N/A
A179b	Richardson Rd	Olive Chapel Rd	Humie Olive Rd	2	4	Widening	1.86	\$13,947,991.20	Div	No	N/A
A179c	Richardson Rd	Humie Olive Rd	Old US 1 Highway	0	4	New Location	2.33	\$22,070,505.60	Div	No	N/A
A184	Apex Barbecue Rd	Old US 1	Olive Chapel Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.32	\$8,702,694.00	Div	No	N/A
A186a	Friendship Rd Widening	Friendship Road	Winding Way	2	3	Turn Lane	1.23	\$4,921,659.60	Div	No	N/A
A186b	Friendship Rd Widening	Winding Rd	Old US 1	2	3	Turn Lane	0.5	\$4,341,480.00	Div	No	N/A
A187a	Apex Peakway Widening (North)	Olive Chapel Rd	Laura Duncan Rd	2	4	Widening	1.6	\$14,627,558.40	Div	No	N/A
A187c	Apex Peakway Widening (South)	Broadstone Way	Old US 1	2	4	Widening	1.25	\$11,427,780.00	Div	No	N/A
A187d	Apex Peakway (West)	Old US 1	Olive Chapel Rd	2	4	Widening	1.09	\$9,965,024.16	Div	No	N/A
A192	Graham Newton Rd	Penny Rd	Optimist Farm Rd	2	2	Widening	2.83	\$18,513,353.43	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A197b	Cent Campus Connector & Interchange	Main Campus Dr Connector	I-40	0	4	New Location	0.38	\$18,336,477.36	Div	Yes	N/A
A204	Bethlehem Rd	Smithfield Rd	Old Faison Rd	2	4	Widening	0.93	\$6,973,995.60	Div	No	N/A
A207d	Judd Parkway SE	US 401	US 401	2	3	Turn Lane	1.76	\$10,419,552.00	Div	No	N/A
A214	Garner Rd	Tryon Rd	Rock Quarry Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	7.16	\$47,205,522.00	Div	No	N/A
A215b	Jones Dairy Rd	Chalk Road	Averette Rd	2	4	Widening	2.1	\$19,198,670.40	Div	No	N/A
A216a	Jones Dairy Rd Ext	Averette Rd	US 401	2	4	Widening	2.87	\$26,238,182.88	Div	No	N/A
A218f	Jessie Dr (part widening)	NC 55	Ten Ten Rd	2	4	Widening	1.58	\$11,884,891.20	Div	No	N/A
A224b	Johnson Pond Rd	Hilltop-Needmore Rd	US 401 North	2	3	Turn Lane	2.56	\$16,877,952.00	Div	No	N/A
A228b	NC 50	I-540	NC 42	2	4	Widening	1.85	\$13,873,002.00	Reg	Yes	N/A
A229	NC 54	Chapel Hill Rd	Harrison Avenue	4	6	Widening	0.8	\$7,911,540.00	Reg	No	N/A
A233b	NC 54	Reedy Creek Rd	Harrison Avenue	4	6	Widening	0.99	\$9,790,530.75	Reg	No	N/A
A234	Western Blvd	Gorman St	Pullen Rd	4	6	Widening	1.21	\$11,966,204.25	Div	No	N/A
A235b	US 1A	Rogers Rd	Forbes Rd	2	4	Widening	0.26	\$2,376,978.24	Reg	No	R-3600
A237b	Old Apex Rd	Cary Parkway	Laura Duncan Rd	2	4	Widening	0.39	\$3,565,467.36	Div	No	N/A
A240a	North Harrison Avenue	Reedy Creek Rd	Weston Parkway	4	6	Widening	0.81	\$8,010,434.25	Div	No	N/A
A240b	North Harrison Avenue	Weston Parkway	I-40	6	8	Widening	0.48	\$12,564,134.10	Div	No	N/A
A27a	Louis Stephens Dr Ext (part NL)	Wake County Line	Kit Creek Rd	2	4	Widening	1.23	\$9,223,671.60	Div	No	N/A
A27b	Louis Stephens Dr Ext (part NL)	Kit Creek Rd	O'Kelly Chapel Rd	2	4	Widening	1.13	\$8,473,779.60	Div	No	N/A
A2a	Southall Rd	Skycrest Dr	Buffaloe Rd	2	4	Widening	1.54	\$15,000,000.00	Div	No	N/A
A302c	Rawls Ch Rd Widening	US 401	Rawls Ch Rd Extension	2	4	Widening	3.32	\$27,255,022.08	Div	No	N/A
A302d	Eastern Angier Bypass	Wimberly Rd	Stratus St	0	4	New Location	0.39	\$3,740,382.36	Div	No	N/A
A302e	Eastern Angier Bypass	Stratus St	Kennebec Rd	2	4	Widening	0.96	\$7,880,970.24	Div	No	N/A
A302g	Kennebec Ch Realign	Rawls Ch Rd	NC 55	0	4	New Location	0.7	\$6,713,506.80	Div	No	N/A
A34	Cary Parkway	Evans Rd	Harrison Avenue	2	4	Widening	1.74	\$15,907,469.76	Div	No	N/A
A36c	Chatham St	N.E. Maynard Rd	I-40 bridge	2	4	Widening	0.93	\$8,502,268.32	Div	No	N/A
A38	Tryon Rd	US 64	Kildaire Farm Rd	4	6	Widening	0.8	\$7,911,540.00	Div	No	N/A
A400a	Ten-Ten Rd	Bells Lake Rd	Old Stage Rd	2	4	Widening	5.1	\$38,244,492.00	Div	No	N/A
A400b	Ten Ten Rd	Old Stage Rd	NC 50	2	4	Widening	3.43	\$25,721,295.60	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A401a	NC 97	Wendell Blvd	Hospital Rd	2	4	Widening	4.6	\$42,054,230.40	Reg	Yes	N/A
A401b	Hospital Rd	NC 97	Mack Todd Rd	2	4	Widening	0.18	\$1,645,600.32	Div	No	N/A
A401c	Hospital Rd	Mack Todd Rd	Barbee St Ext	0	4	New Location	0.42	\$4,485,843.18	Div	No	N/A
A401d	Moss Rd	Barbee St Ext	Morphus Bridge Rd	2	4	Widening	1.86	\$13,947,991.20	Div	No	N/A
A402b	Buffaloe Rd-Riley Hill Connector (part NL)	Forestville Rd	Rolesville Rd	2	4	Widening	4.44	\$35,347,540.80	Div	No	N/A
A402c	Buffaloe Rd-Riley Hill Connector (part NL)	Rolesville	Riley Hill Rd	0	3	New Location	4.4	\$28,306,449.60	Div	No	N/A
A402e	Proctor St	NC 96 (North)	Shepard School Rd	2	4	Widening	0.85	\$6,374,082.00	Div	No	N/A
A403b	Hodge Rd Ext	US 64	Old Milburnie Rd	0	4	Widening	1.31	\$12,314,016.00	Div	No	N/A
A403c	Hodge Rd	Auburn-Knightdale Rd	Poole Rd	2	4	Widening	1.9	\$14,247,948.00	Div	No	N/A
A406b	Amelia Ch Rd	US 70	East of NC 42	2	4	New Location	2	\$14,997,840.00	Div	No	N/A
A407b1	NC 42	Old Stage Rd	John Adams Rd	2	4	Widening	0.95	\$7,123,974.00	Reg	Yes	N/A
A410	Lake Pine Dr/Old Raleigh Rd	Cary Parkway	Apex Peakway	2	4	Widening	1.7	\$15,541,780.80	Div	No	N/A
A413	NC 54 (Chapel Hill Rd)	Corporate Center Dr	Hillsborough St	2	4	Widening	1.33	\$14,159,158.00	Reg	Yes	N/A
A418	NC 96 Bypass (Youngsville)	NC 96	US 1	0	4	New Location	2.99	\$30,411,959.76	Reg	Yes	N/A
A419	Knightdale Eagle Rock Rd	First Avenue	US 64/Knightdale Bypass	2	4	Widening	2.7	\$20,247,084.00	Div	No	N/A
A420	Intersection Realignment @ Mitchell Mill/Riley Hill/Old Milburnie/Rolesville	-	-	2	3	Intersection Realignment	1	\$6,592,950.00	Div	No	N/A
A426	NC 55 (Main St)	Holly Springs Rd	Technology Drive	2	4	Widening	2.79	\$25,506,804.96	Reg	Yes	N/A
A427c	Avent Ferry Rd	New Hill Holleman	Cass Holt	2	4	Widening	3.69	\$27,671,014.80	Div	No	N/A
A429b	Leesville-Westgate Connector	Leesville Rd	Carpenter Pond Rd	2	4	Widening	1.35	\$26,619,859.74	Div	No	N/A
A42a	Penny Rd	Ten Ten Rd	Kildaire Farm Rd	2	4	Widening	1.25	\$11,427,780.00	Div	No	N/A
A42b	Penny Rd	Kildaire Farm	Holly Springs Rd	2	4	Widening	1.62	\$14,810,402.88	Div	No	N/A
A43	Lake Wheeler Rd	Tryon Rd	I-40	2	4	Widening	1.3	\$17,884,891.00	Div	No	N/A
A433	Trawick Rd	Marsh Creek Rd	New Bern Avenue	2	3	Turn Lane	1.44	\$5,791,247.28	Div	No	N/A
A443a	Jenks Rd	NC55	Wimberly Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	2.17	\$7,836,568.74	Div	No	N/A
A443b	Jenks Rd	Wimberly Rd	US 64	2	4	Widening	0.51	\$1,841,774.22	Div	No	N/A
A445a	NC 50	NC 98	Beaver Creek Rec	2	4	Widening	3.9	\$32,016,441.60	Reg	Yes	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A445b	NC 50	Beaver Creek Rec	Old Weaver Trail	2	4	Widening	2	\$16,418,688.00	Reg	Yes	N/A
A4c	Rogers Lane	Daleview Dr	Southall Rd	3	4	Widening	1.06	\$10,021,989.78	Div	No	N/A
A510	Cass Holt Rd Widening	Avent Ferry	NC 42	2	4	Widening	7.13	\$28,674,717.44	Div	No	N/A
A52	Smithfield Rd	Bethlehem Rd	US 64 Bypass	2	4	Widening	1.8	\$16,456,003.20	Div	No	N/A
A520a	Pleasant Grove Church Rd	Nelson Rd	Airport Blvd	2	4	Turn Lane	2.4	\$21,941,337.60	Div	No	N/A
A520b	Pleasant Grove Church Rd	Airport Blvd	Aviation Parkway	0	2	New Location	1.11	\$11,855,442.69	Div	No	N/A
A531b	Purfoy Rd Widening	Holland Rd	Chalybeate Springs Rd	2	4	Widening	4.12	\$35,773,795.20	Div	No	N/A
A532a	Holland Widening	Purfoy Rd	NC 55	2	4	Widening	2.28	\$17,413,281.60	Div	No	N/A
A532b	Holland Rd Turn Lane	NC 55	Kennebec Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.08	\$3,218,220.72	Div	No	N/A
A533	Old Honeycutt Turn Lane	Judd Pkwy	Kennebec Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	2.74	\$8,164,745.16	Div	No	N/A
A535a	NC 42 Widening	Christian Light Rd	Coley Farm Rd	2	4	Widening	2.98	\$22,346,781.60	Reg	Yes	N/A
A536	Wilbon Rd Widening	Judd Pkwy	Piney Grove Wilbon	2	4	Widening	1.45	\$10,873,434.00	Div	No	N/A
A538	Bass Lake Rd Widening	Holly Springs Rd	Hilltop-Needmore Rd	2	4	Widening	2.77	\$21,069,441.53	Div	No	N/A
A539	Banks Rd Turn Lane	US 401	Fanny Brown Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.55	\$11,292,075.11	Div	No	N/A
A540a	Rock Service Station Turn Lane	Old Stage Rd	NC 42	2	3	Turn Lane	3.68	\$24,371,334.41	Div	No	N/A
A540b	Rock Service Station Turn Lane	NC 42	Mt Pleasant Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	2.56	\$16,747,061.76	Div	No	N/A
A541	Mt Pleasant Rd Widening	NC 42	Old Fairground Rd	2	4	Median	5.31	\$43,591,616.64	Div	No	N/A
A543a	Rex Rd Widening	New Hill Holleman	Avent Ferry Connector (NL)	2	4	Widening	2.15	\$18,668,364.00	Div	No	N/A
A549	Wimberley Rd	Jenks Rd	Green Level West Rd	2	3	Widening	1.97	\$7,114,304.34	Div	No	N/A
A554	Laura Duncan Widening	US 64	Old Apex Rd	2	4	Widening	1.04	\$7,798,876.80	Div	No	N/A
A563	Trinity Rd	NC 54	Chatham St	2	4	Widening	1	\$2,934,653.90	Div	No	N/A
A568	Kit Creek Turn Lane	Davis Dr	Green Level Ch Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.81	\$13,623,781.76	Div	No	N/A
A56c	NC 98	NC 98 Bypass	US 401	2	4	Widening	5.29	\$48,362,364.96	Reg	Yes	N/A
A570	Ebenezer Ch Rd Turn Lane	Ebenezer Ch Rd	Westgate Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.96	\$14,279,011.11	Div	No	N/A
A571	Slater Rd Turn Lane	Airport Blvd	West of NC 540	2	3	Turn Lane	1.4	\$10,530,525.99	Div	No	N/A
A574	Grovemont Rd Turn Lane	Old Stage Rd	Timber Dr	2	3	Turn Lane	0.86	\$6,265,280.39	Div	No	N/A
A575	Woodland Rd Turn Lane	Old Stage Rd	Vandora Springs Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.47	\$10,709,258.33	Div	No	N/A
A576	Buffaloe Rd Turn Lane	NC 50	Buffaloe Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.48	\$10,782,110.43	Div	No	N/A
A578	Auburn Ch Rd Turn Lane	Jones Sausage Rd	Garner Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	2.84	\$18,578,771.64	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A581	Bethlehem Rd Turn Lane	Old Faison Rd	Grasshopper Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	2.47	\$18,572,584.27	Div	No	N/A
A585	Industrial Drive	Wendell Blvd	Western Wendell Loop	2	3	Turn Lane	0.79	\$5,346,631.29	Div	No	N/A
A586	Landing View Drive Ext	Western Wendell Loop	Hollybrook Rd	0	2	New Location	1.64	\$13,121,728.62	Div	No	N/A
A588a	NC 96 Bypass	NC 96	NC 96	0	4	New Location	4.52	\$45,820,526.40	Reg	Yes	N/A
A590	Mark's Creek Widening	Knightdale-Eagle Rock Rd	Rolesville Rd	2	4	Widening	3.54	\$26,546,176.80	Div	No	N/A
A592	First St Widening	Smithfield Rd	Horton Rd	2	4	Widening	2.87	\$22,488,866.40	Div	No	N/A
A593	Horton Rd Turn Lane	Forestville Rd	Horton Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.79	\$11,709,859.59	Div	No	N/A
A594	Rolesville Rd	Kioti Dr	Mark's Creek Rd	2	4	Widening	2.54	\$21,426,721.80	Div	No	N/A
A596	NC 96 Widening	US 64/264	Ferrel Road	2	4	Widening	2.88	\$24,214,301.10	Reg	Yes	N/A
A599	Old Milburnie Rd Turn Lane	US 64	Milburnie Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.31	\$8,569,785.51	Div	No	N/A
A601	Old Wake Forest Rd	Falls of Neuse Rd	Atlantic Ave	2	3	Turn Lane	1.43	\$10,417,849.94	Div	No	N/A
A602	Fox Rd Turn Lane	Spring Forest Rd	Old Wake Forest Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	0.84	\$6,119,576.19	Div	No	N/A
A604	Peebles Road Ext.	US 401	US 401	0	2	New Location	2.81	\$14,972,185.80	Div	No	N/A
A605	Rogers Rd Widening	US 1A	W. of Heritage Branch Rd	2	4	Widening	0.44	\$4,022,578.56	Div	No	N/A
A607	Falls of Neuse Widening	New Falls of Neuse Blvd	NC 98 Bypass	2	4	Widening	3.14	\$26,516,575.80	Div	No	N/A
A608a	NC 98 Widening	Old NC 98	Ligon Mill Rd (future connector)	2	4	Widening	1.21	\$10,104,794.70	Reg	Yes	N/A
A611	NC 98 Turn Lane	NC 98 Bypass	Allen St.	2	3	Turn Lane	0.71	\$5,172,498.92	Reg	Yes	N/A
A612	White St Turn Lane	NC 98	Main St	2	3	Turn Lane	3.85	\$25,186,010.85	Div	No	N/A
A614	Pinecrest Dr Turn Lane	Fairbanks Dr	Tanglewild Dr	2	3	Turn Lane	1.2	\$8,742,251.70	Div	No	N/A
A617b	US 401 Bypass	NC 55	NC 210	0	6	New Location	4.25	\$113,834,820.00	Reg	Yes	N/A
A617c	US 401 Bypass	NC 210	US 401(South)	0	6	New Location	5.32	\$101,579,398.80	Reg	Yes	N/A
A618a	Gardner Rd	NC 210	Matthew Mill Pond Rd	0	3	New Location	0.48	\$3,779,455.68	Div	No	N/A
A618b	Gardner Rd	Matthew Mill Pond Rd	Old Buies Creek Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	0.81	\$4,795,362.00	Div	No	N/A
A618c	Gardner Rd	Old Buies Creek Rd	Ennis Rd	0	3	New Location	0.59	\$4,645,580.94	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A618d	Gardner Rd	Ennis Rd	NC 55	2	3	Turn Lane	0.6	\$3,552,120.00	Div	No	N/A
A618e	Gardner Rd	NC 55	Old Stage Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.27	\$9,999,809.82	Div	No	N/A
A623d1	Hilltop Needmore Extension	Bass Lake Road	Hilltop Needmore Road	2	4	Widening	0.75	\$6,263,302.50	Div	No	N/A
A623d4	Hilltop Needmore Extension	Hilltop Needmore Road	Wade Nash Rd	0	4	New Location	0.5	\$7,040,932.50	Div	No	N/A
A624c	Honeycutt Connector	Piney Grove Wilbon	Honeycutt Realignment	0	4	Widening	0.95	\$7,123,974.00	Div	No	N/A
A627	Old Buies Creek Rd Widening	NC 55	Matthew Mill Pond Rd	2	4	Widening	3.12	\$27,090,835.20	Div	No	N/A
A628	Piney Grove Rawls Rd Widening	Piney Grove Wilbon	US 401	2	4	Widening	1.16	\$10,072,233.60	Div	No	N/A
A631	Chalybeate Springs Widening	Future US 401 Bypass	Future Western Angier Bypass	2	4	Widening	3.51	\$33,663,441.24	Div	No	N/A
A632a	Angier Western Bypass	NC 55 (S of Angier)	Rawls Ch Rd	0	2	New Location	1.77	\$9,710,312.04	Div	No	N/A
A632b	Angier Western Bypass	Rawls Ch Rd	Kennebec Ch Realign	0	2	New Location	0.98	\$5,376,330.96	Div	No	N/A
A632c	Angier Western Bypass	NC 55 (S of Angier)	NC 210 (E of Angier)	0	2	New Location	1.14	\$6,254,099.28	Div	No	N/A
A633	Angier Rd Widening	Purfoy Rd	Rogers Rd	2	4	Widening	0.56	\$5,119,645.44	Div	No	N/A
A649	Jones Franklin Rd Extension	Hillsborough St	NC 54	0	2	New Location	0.2	\$26,000,000.00	St	No	N/A
A665	Perry Curtis Rd/Wake County Line Rd Access Management	S. Arendell Ave	NC-39	2	3	Turn Lane	2.6	\$10,456,418.70	Div	No	N/A
A667	Todd Lane Extension	Marshburn Road	Wendell Blvd / US-64 BUS	0	3	New Location	1.27	\$9,098,710.53	Div	No	N/A
A668	Liles Dean Ext	Liles Dean Road	Knightdale-Eagle Rock Road	0	2	New Location	1.07	\$6,537,129.69	Div	No	N/A
A670	Western Wendell Ext	Poole Road	Lake Glad Road	0	4	New Location	1.4	\$13,261,248.00	Div	No	N/A
A673	Watkins Road Widening	NC-54	Perimeter Park Drive	2	4	Widening	0.65	\$5,942,445.60	Div	No	N/A
A675a	Morrisville East Connector	Trans Air Dr (N/S segment) / Airport Blvd (E/W segment)	International Dr (N/S segment) / Nova Dr (E/W segment)	0	2	New Location	1.48	\$8,781,809.40	Div	No	N/A
A676	East Wake Drive Ext	Existing portion of East Wake Drive	Forestville Road	0	2	New Location	0.2	\$1,186,731.00	Div	No	N/A
A677	Marcom Dr Ext	Watkins Road	Sorrell Grove Church Road	0	2	New Location	1.13	\$6,903,697.71	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
A67a	Ferrell Rd	NC 96	Williams White Rd	0	3	New Location	2.82	\$18,141,860.88	Div	No	N/A
A67b	Ferrell-Dukes Lake Connector	Williams White Rd	NC 39	0	3	New Location	2.45	\$15,761,545.80	Div	No	N/A
A680a	Six Forks Road	I-540	Durant Road	2	4	Widening	0.9	\$8,228,001.60	Div	No	N/A
A688	Powell Drive Realignment	Powell Dr	Youth Center Dr	2	2	Grade Separation	0.35	\$44,000,000.00	St	No	N/A
A690	NC 231 (Southern Wendell) Bypass (pc) / Stott's Mill Road Widening	Eagle Rock Road	Wendell Road	0	4	Widening	2.5	\$20,523,360.00	Div	Yes	N/A
A691	Western Wendell Ext	Lake Glad Road	Stotts Mill Road	0	4	New Location	0.8	\$7,577,856.00	Div	No	N/A
A693	NC 231 (N. Selma Road)	Old Wilson Road	Stotts Mill Road	2	3	Widening	2.4	\$9,652,078.80	Div	No	N/A
A698	Gorman St Widening	Kaplan Drive	Western Blvd	2	3	Widening	0.95	\$3,820,614.53	Div	No	N/A
A72	Holly Springs Rd	Tryon Rd	SE Cary Parkway	2	4	Widening	0.61	\$5,576,756.64	Div	No	N/A
A73a	Jones Franklin Rd	Tryon Rd	Dillard Dr	2	4	Widening	0.67	\$6,125,290.08	Div	No	N/A
A74c	Piney Plains Rd	Dillard Dr	Walnut St	2	4	Widening	0.43	\$3,931,156.32	Div	No	N/A
A76	Optimist Farm Rd	Lake Wheeler Rd	Sunset Lake Rd	2	4	Widening	4.49	\$41,048,585.76	Div	No	N/A
A77a	West Lake Rd	Larboard Rd	Bells Lake Rd	0	2	New Location	1.25	\$7,417,068.75	Div	No	N/A
A80b	New Hope Rd	US 64 Bypass	New Bern Ave	2	4	Widening	1.19	\$19,210,479.00	Div	No	N/A
A81a	Western Blvd Ext	Existing Western Blvd	Cary Town Blvd	0	2	New Location	1.5	\$8,900,482.50	Div	No	N/A
A9	Strickland Rd	Leesville Rd	Creedmoor Rd	2	4	Widening	2.73	\$30,958,272.00	Div	No	N/A
A98c	Technology Drive Interchange	Technology Drive	NC-55 Bypass			Interchange	0	\$13,946,625.00	Reg	No	N/A
Frnk20a	Hicks Road Widening	Future Franklinton South Bypass	Bert Winston Rd	2	4	Widening	1.1	\$9,493,002.75	Div	No	N/A
Frnk20b	Hicks Road Widening	Bert Winston Rd	Cedar Creek Rd	2	4	Widening	2.4	\$20,414,478.00	Div	No	N/A
Frnk21	Sid Mitchell Rd Ext	Holden Rd	US 1/Wall Rd	0	2	New Location	1.1	\$16,708,056.75	Div	No	N/A
Frnk4a	NC 56	W. of West Sandling Rd	US 1	2	4	Widening	3.63	\$27,221,079.60	Reg	Yes	N/A
Frnk4b	NC 56	US 1	Peach Orchard Rd	2	4	Widening	6.76	\$50,692,699.20	Reg	Yes	N/A
Frnk9	Franklinton S Bypass	NC 56 (west)	NC 56 (east)	2	4	New Location	4.13	\$36,949,941.60	Reg	Yes	N/A
Grnv1	I-85	Durham co. line	Vance Co. Line	4	6	Widening	24	\$339,614,222.11	St	Yes	N/A
Grnv110	Brogden Rd Turn Lane	NC 56	Belltown Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	5.59	\$37,964,732.19	Div	No	N/A
Grnv113	Joe Peed Rd Turn Lane	US 15	WB Clark Rd	2	3	Turn Lane	1.34	\$8,766,040.14	Div	No	N/A
Grnv18	NC 50	Old Weaver Trail	Dove Rd	2	4	Widening	2.67	\$20,022,116.40	Reg	Yes	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
Grnv2	US 15	I-85	Gate #2 Rd	2	4	Widening	2.42	\$24,706,569.53	Reg	Yes	N/A
Grnv20	NC 56	I-85	US-15	2	4	Widening	2.56	\$19,197,235.20	Reg	Yes	N/A
Grnv21	NC 56	NC 50	Hayes Rd	2	4	Widening	2.6	\$23,769,782.40	Reg	Yes	N/A
Grnv22b	NC 56	Hester Rd	W of Wes Sandling Rd	2	4	Widening	4.18	\$31,345,485.60	Reg	Yes	N/A
Grnv32	Brassfield Rd	Creedmoor Loop	Hayes Rd	2	4	Widening	1.8	\$13,498,056.00	Div	No	N/A
Grnv33	Brassfield Rd	Hayes Rd	NC 96	2	4	Widening	4.07	\$30,520,604.40	Div	No	N/A
Grnv47	Creedmoor Loop A	NC 56	US 15	0	4	New Location	1.59	\$15,060,988.80	Div	No	N/A
Grnv48	Creedmoor Loop B	US-15	Relocated US 15	2	4	Widening	0.66	\$4,949,287.20	Reg	No	N/A
Grnv49	Creedmoor Loop C	Relocated US 15	Brassfield Rd	0	4	New Location	2.23	\$21,123,273.60	Div	No	N/A
Grnv65	Hester Rd	NC-56	Sanders Rd	2	4	Widening	4.18	\$31,345,485.60	Div	No	N/A
Grnv66	Hester Rd	Sanders Rd	New Ext Hester Rd	2	4	Widening	2.8	\$20,996,976.00	Div	No	N/A
Grnv81	Northside Rd Ext	Northside Rd	Old Weaver Rd	0	4	New Location	0.92	\$8,714,534.40	Div	No	N/A
Grnv81a	Old Weaver Trail	From NC 50 (Wake Co)	Northside Rd Ext	2	4	Widening	1.65	\$12,373,218.00	Div	No	N/A
Grnv82	Old Route 75 (SR-1004)	Durham Co.	Julian Daniel Rd	2	4	Widening	5.24	\$39,294,340.80	Div	No	N/A
Grnv84c	Sanders Rd Ext (South)	US 15	Hester Rd	0	2	New Location	1.28	\$7,426,298.88	Div	No	N/A
Grnv93	Cash Rd / Gate 2 Rd	Old Weaver Trail	West B St	2	4	Widening	4.93	\$36,969,675.60	Div	No	N/A
Hrnt3a	NC 210	NC 55	Old Stage Rd	2	4	Widening	3.01	\$22,571,749.20	Reg	Yes	N/A
Hrnt3b	NC 210	Old Stage Rd	NC 50	2	4	Widening	6.46	\$48,740,456.33	Reg	Yes	N/A
Hrnt3c	NC 210	NC 50	Lassiter Pond Rd	2	4	Widening	7.26	\$54,442,159.20	Reg	Yes	N/A
Hrnt4b	NC-55	Church St	Old Stage Rd	2	4	Widening	4.39	\$32,920,258.80	Reg	Yes	N/A
Hrnt5	US 401	Fuquay-Varina	Lillington UPD	2	4	Widening	7.5	\$56,241,900.00	Reg	Yes	R2609
Hrnt7	Harnett Central Rd Widening	US 401	Montague Rd	2	4	Median	4.17	\$36,207,943.20	Div	No	N/A
Jhns10	Cleveland Rd Widening	NC 50	Barber Mill Rd	2	4	Widening	7.253	\$66,639,783.02	Div	No	N/A
Jhns13b	NC 42 (Ranch Road & Partial New Location)	US 70 BUS / NC 42	US 70 Bypass	2	4	Widening	1.96	\$16,368,097.20	Reg	No	N/A
Jhns13c	NC 42 (East) / US 70 BUS Interchange	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	\$13,946,625.00	Reg	No	N/A
Jhns3	South Connector	Little Creek Church Rd	NC 42	0	2	New Location	2	\$10,972,104.00	Div	No	R-3618
Jhns4a2	North Connector	NC 42 East	Covered Bridge Rd	2	4	Widening	2.33	\$17,472,483.60	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
Jhns4b	Covered Bridge Rd Widening	North Connector	Shotwell Rd	2	4	Widening	2.13	\$15,972,699.60	Div	No	N/A
Jhns5	Covered Bridge Rd Widening	N. O'Neil St	Eagle Rock Rd	2	4	Widening	4.59	\$34,420,042.80	Div	No	N/A
Jhns6	Pritchard Rd/Smithfield Rd Widening	Covered Bridge Rd	Wake County line	2	4	Widening	2.4	\$19,702,425.60	Div	No	N/A
Jhns7	Guy Rd	US 70 BUS	NC 42	2	4	Widening	4.39	\$32,920,258.80	Div	No	R-3618
Jhns8	Cornwallis Rd Widening	NC 42	Old Drugstore Rd	2	4	Widening	5.46	\$41,538,969.45	Div	No	N/A
Jhns9	Old Drug Store Rd Wdng	NC 42	NC 50	2	4	Widening	2.57	\$19,272,224.40	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
2025 MTP											
316	Brier Creek Pkwy Extension	T.W. Alexander Dr	Andrew's Chapel Rd	-	4	New Location	0.4	\$3,990,000	Div	No	N/A
9	Carver St Ext	Armfield St	Old Oxford Rd	-	4	New Location	1.0	-	Div	No	N/A
15	East End Connector (EEC)	NC 147	US 70	-	4	New Location	3.6	\$35,175,000	St	Yes	U-0071
200	Eubanks Rd	MLK Blvd (NC 86)	Millhouse Rd	2	4	Widening	0.8	\$7,487,000	Div	No	N/A
23	Fayetteville Rd	Barbee Rd	Cornwallis Rd	2	4	Widening	1.0	\$3,374,000	Div	No	N/A
23.1	Fayetteville Rd	Woodcroft Pkwy	Barbee Rd	2	4	Widening	1.3	\$4,661,000	Div	No	U-6021
111	Fordham Blvd (US 15-501)	I-40	Franklin St	4	4	Modernization	1.6	\$2,052,000	St	Yes	U-5304B
379	Freeland Memorial Extension	S Churton St	New Collector Rd	-	2	New Location	0.5	\$3,203,000	Div	No	N/A
45.3	I-40 (westbound auxiliary lane)	NC 147	NC 55	6	7	Widening	1.2	\$3,850,000	St	No	I-5707
638	I-40/NC 86	Interchange	--	-	-	Upgrade	N/A	\$16,500,000	St	No	I-3306AC
223	Legion Rd Ext	Legion Rd	Fordham Blvd	-	2	New Location	0.1	\$1,500,000	Div	No	N/A
407	Lynn Rd/Pleasant Dr Connector	Lynn Rd	Pleasant Dr	-	2	New Location	0.6	\$3,651,000	Div	No	N/A
64.12	NC 147 (Operational Improvements)	East End Connector	Swift Av	4	4	Modernization	1.7	\$58,400,000	St	No	U-5937
64.13	NC 147 (possible Managed Lanes)	East End Conn	I-40	4	8	Widening	4.9	\$179,248,000	St	Yes	U-5934
428	NC 54	Old Fayetteville Rd	MPO Boundary	2	2	Modernization	2.9	\$14,457,000	Reg	No	R-5821A
75.2	NC 55 (Alston Ave)	Main St	NC 98	2	2	Modernization	0.5	-	Reg	No	U-3308
75.1	NC 55 (Alston Ave)	NC 147	Main St	2	4	Widening	0.4	-	Reg	No	U-3308
437	New Collector Rd	Orange Grove Rd Ext	Becketts Ridge Rd	-	2	New Location	0.8	\$7,232,000	Div	No	N/A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
89.3	Orange Grove Connector	Orange Grove Rd	US 70	-	2	New Location	0.4	\$5,299,000	Div	No	U-5848
220	Purefoy Rd Ext	Sandberg Ln	Weaver Dairy Rd	-	2	New Location	0.6	\$3,777,000	Div	No	N/A
221	S Elliot Rd Ext	Fordham Blvd	Ephesus Church Rd	-	2	New Location	0.3	\$4,230,000	Div	No	N/A
113.1	US 15-501/Garrett Rd	Interchange	--	-	-	New	N/A	\$71,200,000	St	Yes	U-5717
123.11	Woodcroft Pkwy Ext	Garrett Rd	Hope Valley Rd	-	2	New Location	0.2	\$2,219,000	Div	No	U-5823
2035 MTP											
346	Danziger Dr Extension	Mt Moriah Rd	E Lakewood Dr	-	2	New Location	0.4	\$5,127,000	Div	No	N/A
367	Erwin Rd	Cameron Blvd	W Main St	4	4	Modernization	1.8	\$12,025,000	Div	No	N/A
373	Falconbridge Rd Connector	Falconbridge Rd	Farrington Rd	-	2	New Location	0.2	\$1,227,000	Div	No	N/A
201	Falconbridge Rd Extension	Farrington Rd	NC 54	-	4	New Location	0.9	\$16,685,000	Div	No	N/A
240	Fordham Blvd (US 15-501)	NC 54	Franklin Street	4	4	Modernization	2.1	\$45,498,000	St	Yes	U-5304A
73	Fordham Blvd (US 15-501)	NC 54	US 15-501	4	4	Modernization	2.2	\$49,832,000	St	Yes	U-5304A
204	Fordham Blvd/Raleigh Rd	Interchange	--	-	-	Upgrade	N/A	\$14,800,000	St	Yes	U-5774A
626	Fordham Blvd/S Columbia St	Interchange	--	-	-	Upgrade	N/A	\$35,000,000	St	Yes	U-5304E
24.11	Garrett Rd	NC 751	Old Durham Rd	2	4	Widening	2.1	\$16,064,000	Div	No	N/A
36	Homestead Rd	Old NC 86	Rogers Rd	2	2	Modernization	2.1	\$10,234,000	Div	No	N/A
35	Homestead Rd	Rogers Rd	NC 86	2	2	Modernization	1.3	\$6,855,000	Div	No	N/A
77.1	Hope Valley Rd (NC 751)	S Roxboro St	Woodcroft Parkway	2	4	Widening	0.3	\$2,716,000	Reg	No	N/A
77.11	Hope Valley Rd (NC 751)	NC 54	Woodcroft Pkwy	4	4	Modernization	-	(see #77.1)	Reg	No	N/A
202	Hopson Rd	Davis Dr	S Miami Blvd (NC 54)	2	4	Widening	0.7	\$5,200,000	Div	No	N/A
44	I-40	NC 86	I-85	4	6	Widening	7.8	\$58,784,000	St	Yes	I-3306AA
43	I-40	US 15-501	NC 86	4	6	Widening	3.9	\$29,316,000	St	Yes	I-3306AB
45	I-40 Managed Lanes	Wake County Line	NC 147	8	10	Widening	7.0	\$446,464,000	St	Yes	I-5702B
70.4	I-40/ NC 54 ramp	Farrington Rd.	I-40	-	1	New Location	0.2	\$1,600,000	St	No	U-5517
646	I-85/NC 86	Interchange	--	-	-	Upgrade	N/A	\$16,488,000	St	No	I-5984
650	I-85/S Churton St	Interchange	--	-	-	Upgrade	N/A	\$20,700,000	St	No	I-5967
50.11	Jack Bennet Rd/Lystra Rd	US 15-501 South	Farrington Mill/Point Rd	2	2	Modernization	4.1	\$20,567,000	Div	No	N/A
51	Lake Hogan Farms Rd	Eubanks Rd	Legends Way	-	2	New Location	0.7	\$4,407,000	Div	No	N/A
410	Marriott Way	Friday Center Dr	Barbree Chapel Rd	-	2	New Location	0.2	\$682,000	Div	No	N/A
69.4	NC 54	Barbee	NC 55	2	4	Widening	1.3	\$46,400,000	Reg	No	U-5774J

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
69.3	NC 54	Fayetteville	Barbee	2	4	Widening	1.0	\$46,800,000	Reg	No	U-5774I
70.3	NC 54	Fordham Blvd (US 15-501)	Barbee Chapel Rd	6	6	Modernization	1.2	\$32,106,000	Reg	Yes	U-5774B
69.21	NC 54	Highgate Dr	Fayetteville Rd	4	4	Modernization	1.5	(see #69.2)	Reg	No	U-5774H
69.1	NC 54	I-40 Interchange	NC 751	2	4	Widening	1.2	\$32,000,000	Reg	No	U-5774G
69.2	NC 54	NC 751	Highgate Dr	2	4	Widening	1.5	\$21,600,000	Reg	No	U-5774H
70	NC 54 (widening; superstreet)	I-40	Barbee Chapel Rd	4	6	Widening	1.6	\$9,100,000	Reg	Yes	U-5774C
75.3	NC 55 (Alston Ave)	Main St	NC 98	2	4	Modernization	0.5	\$1,000	Reg	No	U-3308
440	New Hope Commons Dr Extension	Eastowne Dr	New Hope Commons Dr	-	2	New Location	0.4	\$4,588,000	Div	No	N/A
94	Roxboro St	Cornwallis Rd	MLK Pkwy	-	4	New Location	1.2	\$12,063,000	Div	No	N/A
87	S Churton St	US 70 Business	I-40	2	4	Widening	2.4	\$31,825,000	Div	No	U-5845
230	Southwest Durham Dr	NC 54	I-40	-	2	New Location	2.0	\$12,402,000	Div	No	N/A
476	University Dr	MLK Parkway	Shannon Rd	5	4	Modernization	0.5	\$768,000	Div	No	N/A
113	US 15-501 (expressway conversion)	US 15-501 Bypass	I-40	6	6	Expressway	2.2	\$195,300,000	St	Yes	U-6067
485	US 70 (freeway conversion)	Pleasant Dr	S Miami Blvd	4	6	Freeway	1.6	\$111,020,000	St	Yes	U-5720A
116	US 70 (freeway conversion)	S Miami Blvd	Northern Durham Parkway	4	6	Freeway	2.5	\$173,469,000	St	Yes	U-5720C
116.1	US 70/Miami Blvd	Interchange	--	-	-	New	N/A	\$46,621,000	St	Yes	U-5720B
2045 MTP											
304.1	Angier Av Ext	US 70	Leesville Rd	-	2	New Location	0.8	\$4,784,000	Div	No	N/A
244	Angier/Glover Connector	Ellis Rd	Glover Rd	-	2	New Location	1.4	\$8,625,000	Div	No	N/A
343	Crown Pkwy/Roche Dr	Page Rd	T.W. Alexander Dr	-	2	New Location	2.7	\$11,041,000	Div	No	N/A
364	Eno Mountain Rd realignment	Mayo St	Eno Mountain Rd	-	2	New Location	0.3	\$2,015,000	Div	No	N/A
24.12	Garrett Rd	Old Durham Rd	US 15-501	2	4	Widening	1.0	\$7,761,000	Div	No	N/A
28.11	Glover Rd	Angier	US 70	-	2	New Location	0.6	\$3,714,000	Div	No	N/A
382	Hebron Rd Extension	Hebron Rd	Roxboro Rd (501 N)	-	2	New Location	0.5	\$3,612,000	Div	No	N/A
434	Holloway St (NC 98)	Miami Blvd	Nichols Farm Dr	4	4	Modernization	3.3	\$17,705,000	Reg	No	N/A
394	Hopson Rd	Louis Stephens Dr	Davis Dr	2	4	Widening	1.1	\$9,195,000	Div	No	N/A
45.21	I-40 Managed Lanes	NC 54	US 15-501	6	8	Widening	2.9	\$85,621,000	St	Yes	I-5702A
45.22	I-40 Managed Lanes	NC 147	NC 54	6	10	Widening	6.4	\$250,290,000	St	Yes	I-5702A

MTP ID	Highway Project	From	To	Existing Lanes	Proposed Lanes	Improvement Type	Length (miles)	Estimated Cost	STI	Reg. Sig.	TIP#
48.1	I-85	Sparger Rd	US 70	4	6	Widening	3.0	\$39,118,000	St	Yes	I-5983
48	I-85	US 70	I-40	4	6	Widening	7.1	\$197,378,000	St	Yes	I-5983
49	I-85	US 70	Red Mill Rd	4	6	Widening	8.2	\$215,940,000	St	Yes	N/A
53	Leesville Rd Ext	US 70/Page Rd Ext	Leesville Rd	-	2	New Location	0.4	\$2,644,000	Div	No	N/A
57	Lynn Rd Extension	US 70	Existing Lynn Rd	-	2	New Location	1.1	\$6,862,000	Div	No	N/A
242	Mt Carmel Ch Rd	US 15-501	Bennett Rd	2	2	Modernization	0.4	\$1,997,000	Div	No	N/A
14.1	N Duke St (501 N)	I-85	N Roxboro split	5	4	Modernization	2.5	\$13,279,000	Reg	Yes	N/A
76	NC 751	Martha's Chapel Rd	O'Kelly Ch. Rd	2	4	Widening	5.4	\$43,232,000	Reg	No	N/A
77.2	NC 751	NC 54	Renaissance Pkwy	2	4	Widening	1.2	\$5,290,000	Reg	No	N/A
77.3	NC 751	Renaissance Pkwy	O'Kelly Chapel Rd	2	4	Widening	2.7	\$21,697,000	Reg	No	N/A
80	NC 86	Old NC 10	US 70 Business	2	4	Widening	0.9	\$7,259,000	Reg	No	N/A
81	NC 86 (and US 70 intersection)	US 70 Bypass	NC 57	2	4	Widening	0.3	\$4,742,000	Reg	No	I-5984
84	Northern Durham Pkwy	I 85 North	Old Oxford Hwy	-	4	New Location	2.7	\$23,291,000	Div	No	N/A
83.1	Northern Durham Pkwy	Sherron Rd	NC 98	-	4	New Location	4.3	\$13,600,000	Div	Yes	N/A
83.11	Northern Durham Pkwy	US 70 E	Sherron Rd	-	4	New Location	2.7	\$23,500,000	Div	Yes	N/A
502	Patriot Dr Extension	S Miami Blvd	Page Rd	-	2	New Location	1.9	\$13,086,000	Div	No	N/A
92	Roxboro Rd (501 N)	Duke St	Goodwin Rd	4	4	Modernization	2.7	\$14,574,000	Reg	Yes	N/A
96.1	Sherron Rd	S Mineral Springs Rd	Stallings Rd	2	4	Widening	3.1	\$25,003,000	Div	No	N/A
106.1	Southwest Durham Dr	US 15-501 Business	Mt Moriah Rd	-	4	New Location	0.4	\$3,667,000	Div	No	N/A
104	Southwest Durham Dr	Sawyer Dr	Old Chapel Hill Rd	2	4	Widening	0.7	\$5,432,000	Div	No	N/A
479	US 15-501	Smith Level Rd	MPO Boundary	4	4	Modernization	4.9	\$25,673,000	St	No	N/A
114	US 15-501 Bypass	MLK Parkway	I-85	4	6	Widening	4.8	\$80,734,000	St	Yes	N/A
81.1	Wake Forest Hwy (NC 98)	Nichols Farm Dr	Wake County Line	2	4	Widening	6.0	\$48,474,000	Reg	Yes	N/A
501	Yates Store Rd Extension	Yates Store Rd	Wake Rd	-	2	New Location	1.4	\$11,519,000	Div	No	N/A

Appendix 3. Transit Project List – CAMPO

Each row in the table is a separate route or service. The attribute information for each project is presented in columns, and includes the following:

- Route Name – This name provides information on the local route identification and/or the destination points of the route.
- Mode – The type of service (e.g., bus, bus rapid transit, commuter (regional) rail)
- Headway – The time between each bus or train on the route, both during peak commute periods and “off-peak” periods during the mid-day and evening.

No.	Route_Name	Mode	Peak Headway	Off-Peak Headway
1	Apex Raleigh	Bus	30	60
2	Apx_HS_Peak	Bus	60	0
3	APX_RTP	Bus	60	0
4	Atlantic	Bus	60	60
5	Blue Ridge	Bus	15	15
6	Capital BRT	Bus Rapid Transit	10	15
7	Clark_DixieTrail	Bus	30	30
8	Clayton_to_Garner_Extension_BRT	Bus Rapid Transit	10	15
9	Creedmoor	Bus	30	60
10	CTRAN Apex to Angier	Bus	30	60
11	CTRAN Cary Parkway	Bus	30	60
12	CTRAN Holly Trolly	Bus	60	60
13	Durham 540 Express	Bus	60	0
14	Edwards Mill	Bus	30	30
15	Falls of Neuse	Bus	30	30
16	Fayetteville	Bus	60	0
17	FON_Durant	Bus	60	60
18	Fuquay_WT_Ex	Bus	60	0
19	Garner Loop	Bus	60	60
20	Garner Rd	Bus	30	30
21	Glascokk	Bus	15	15
22	Glenwood	Bus	15	15
23	Glenwood Outer	Bus	60	60
24	Glenwood_Peak_Overlay	Bus	60	0
25	Harrison	Bus	30	30
26	High House	Bus	30	30
27	Hills_Buck Jones	Bus	30	30
28	Hillsborough	Bus	15	15
29	I-40 Ex Airport Pattern	Bus	30	30
30	Kit Creek Loop	Bus	30	60
31	Lake Wheeler	Bus	30	30
32	Lynn	Bus	60	60
33	Maynard Loop	Bus	60	60
34	Millbrook	Bus	60	60
35	MLK	Bus	15	15
36	Morrisville / Clayton BRT	Bus Rapid Transit	10	15
37	NCSU 1:AventF&Gorman-DHLibrar	Bus	12	12
38	NCSU 11:VillageLink	Bus	15	30
39	NCSU 2 Reverse Wolfink Shuttle	Bus	15	15
40	NCSU 3:Engineering	Bus	15	15
41	NCSU 4:Westgrove-DHLibrary	Bus	30	30
42	NCSU 5:VarsityPL-DHLibrary	Bus	15	15
43	NCSU 6:CarterFinley-ScottHall	Bus	15	15
44	NCSU 7:WolfVillage-BrooksHall	Bus	10	10
45	NCSU 8:SoutheastLoop	Bus	12	18
46	NCSU 8a:Mid-Day Textiles	Bus	0	26
47	NCSU 9:GreekVillage	Bus	12	12
48	New Bern Knightdale	Bus	60	60
49	New Hope	Bus	60	60
50	Oberlin	Bus	15	15
51	Poole Rd	Bus	60	60
52	Poole_SL	Bus	60	0
53	Rail CR CP	Commuter Rail Transit	30	180
54	Raleigh Mid-Town BRT	Bus Rapid Transit	10	15
55	Raleigh_Blvd	Bus	30	30
56	R-LINE	Bus	15	15

57	Rock Quarry	Bus	60	60
58	Rolesville Peak Express	Bus	60	0
59	SAS-Regency	Bus Rapid Transit	10	15
60	Six Forks	Bus	15	15
61	Six Forks Outer	Bus	30	30
62	South Saunders	Bus	60	60
63	St. Albans	Bus	15	15
64	State	Bus	15	15
65	Triangle Commons Loop	Bus	30	60
66	Trinity	Bus	30	30
67	Tryon	Bus	30	30
68	TT 102 OB:Moore Sq-Garner	Bus	60	0
69	TT Circ Research Triangle EB	Bus	30	60
70	TT Green EB	Bus	30	0
71	TT Purple NB	Bus	15	0
72	Wake Med to RTP	Bus Rapid Transit	10	15
73	Wake Tech Feeder	Bus	30	30
74	Wendell Zebulon Exp	Bus	60	0
75	WF to Raleigh CR	Commuter Rail Transit	30	180
76	WF via FON	Bus	60	60
77	WF-EXP	Bus	60	0

*Table will be updated upon completion of the *Wake Transit Bus Implementation Plan*

Appendix 4. Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Background

The 2045 MTP does not specifically list the bicycle and pedestrian projects. The local jurisdictions and counties have identified, and in many cases prioritized these projects and have coordinated their interaction in the jurisdiction boundary areas through the DCHC MPO. As a result, the 2045 MTP defers to those local governments.

Exempt Projects

All the bicycle and pedestrian projects are deemed exempt from the air quality conformity determination according to Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), PART 93.126. The most important implication of this exemption is that the projects may proceed toward implementation in the absence of a conforming transportation plan or Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO Regional and Statewide Bicycle Routes

A major objective of the 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan is to identify regional bicycle routes in the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO region. Regional bicycle routes have several characteristics, as follows:

- Provide links between major destinations and between urban centers.
- Facilitate primarily utilitarian bicycle trips, though the routes can also serve recreational cycling.
- Serve as a backbone to a finer grained system of local bicycle routes in each jurisdiction.

The regional bicycle route map identifies a variety of corridors in need of improved bicycle facilities. The map primarily identifies on-road routes, but off-road routes are also identified. The regional routes will be evaluated from time-to-time, including future updates of the long-range transportation plan.

DCHC MPO Regional Routes

In planning the regional bicycle routes, twelve specific zones of connections were targeted. The following listing shows the identified regional routes within each zone of connection:

Connections between Carrboro and Chapel Hill

- Homestead Road
- Homestead Road / Weaver Dairy Road
- Morgan Creek Trail (off-road) / Columbia Street
- Bolin Creek Trail (off-road)
- The Campus to Campus Connector (on and off-road connecting UNC-CH main campus to Carolina North)

Connections between Carrboro-Chapel Hill and Hillsborough

- Columbia Street / NC 86

Connections between Carrboro-Chapel Hill and Chatham County

- Smith Level Road / US 15-501
- US 15-501
- NCDOT Mountains-to-Sea Bicycle Route (see description below)

Connections between Hillsborough and Chatham County

- Orange Grove Road / Dodson's Crossroads Road

Connections between Durham and Chatham County

- Roxboro Road / Hope Valley Road / NC 751
- American Tobacco Trail (off-road)

Connections between Durham and Hillsborough

- Morreene Road / Neal Road / Bennett Memorial Road / Old NC 10 / NC 86
- Cornwallis Road / Erwin Road / NC 751 / Old NC 10 / NC 86

Connections between Durham and Carrboro-Chapel Hill

- Cornwallis Road / Erwin Road
- Pickett Road / Erwin Road
- University Drive / Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road
- Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road / Farrington Road / Ephesus Church Road

Connections between Carrboro-Chapel Hill and Research Triangle Park

- NC 54
- NC 54 / Barbee Chapel Road / Farrington Road / Stage Coach Road / NC 751 / Massey Chapel Road / Barbee Road / NC 54
- NC 54 / Barbee Chapel Road / Farrington Road / Stage Coach Road / NC 751 / Fayetteville Road / Scott King Road / Grandale Road / Sedwick Road
- NC 54 / Barbee Chapel Road / Farrington Road / Stage Coach Road / NC 751 / O'Kelly Chapel Road
- NC 54 / Hope Valley Road / Woodcroft Parkway / Carpenter Fletcher Road

Connections between Durham and Research Triangle Park

- Martin Luther King Jr. Parkway / Cornwallis Road
- American Tobacco Trail / Cornwallis Road / Miami Boulevard / Davis Drive
- Cornwallis Road / Alston Avenue
- Northeast Creek Parkway / Briggs Avenue

Connections between Treyburn-North Durham and Durham

- Northern Durham Parkway / Miami Boulevard
- North-South Greenway (off-road) / Milton Road / Tom Wilkinson Road / US 501
- Midland Terrace / Lynn Road / Miami Boulevard

Connections between Treyburn-North Durham and Hillsborough

- Northern Durham Parkway / Mason Road / St. Mary's Road

Connections between Research Triangle Park and Briar Creek area (Wake County)

- Chin Page Road

- T.W. Alexander Drive

DCHC MPO Statewide Routes

In addition to the regional bicycle routes, two statewide bicycle routes are identified in the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO region:

- NCDOT Mountains-to-Sea Bicycle Route in Orange and Chatham counties (uses Old Greensboro Highway, Jones Ferry Road, Greensboro Street, Smith Level Road, Culbreth Road, Mount Carmel Church Road, and Farrington Road)
- East Coast Greenway in Durham and Chatham counties (uses the American Tobacco Trail, the Downtown Trail, and a portion of the North-South Greenway Trail).

Appendix 6. Complete Streets

The Capital Area MPO and Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO support street cross-section designs and safety counter measures with the objective to create roadways that are multi-modal, sensitive to the local context (e.g., land use, non-automotive trips), and safe. This support is evident not only in the funding that the MPOs direct to multimodal projects but also in the multimodal design guidelines and safety countermeasures referenced in this section.

Street Cross Sections and Guidelines

The 2045 MTP includes the following guidelines by reference:

1. **Complete Streets** - The street cross sections and guidelines in Chapter 4 of the North Carolina Department of Transportation's Complete Streets Planning and Design Guidelines. The illustrations show the intended spatial relationships of the various street components, and serve as a diagram of one or more possible street configurations. The guidelines provide ranges that allow the design team the flexibility to respond to particular conditions.

The cross-sections should not be used in isolation. Consideration of the context and other elements must be brought into the decision making process. The final cross-section and design of a road depends on many operational, planimetric, contour and land use factors, and thus design decisions must be made on a case-by-case basis.

2. **Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)** - All pavement markings and placement of pavement markings should follow the guidelines specified in the current edition.
3. **NACTO Design references** – The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) has prepared the following guidelines specifically for urban settings:
 - a. NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
 - b. NACTO Urban Street Design Guide
 - c. NACTO Transit Street Design Guide
 - d. NACTO Urban Street Storm water Guide

Safety Countermeasures

Improving safety is a top priority for both the Capital Area MPO and Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO, which are committed to reducing transportation fatalities and serious injuries on and along our region's roadways. In September 2017, FHWA issued a "Guidance Memorandum on Promoting the Implementation of Proven Safety Countermeasures." This guidance takes into consideration the latest safety research to advance a group of countermeasures that have shown great effectiveness in improving safety for motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists.

Safety practitioners are encouraged to consider this set of countermeasures that are research-proven, but not widely applied on a national basis. As both the Capital Area MPO and Durham-Chapel Hill-

Carrboro MPO develop plans to address mobility and safety challenges, they are to consider the benefits and use of these proven roadway safety tools and techniques.

1. **Safety Edge** – The Safety Edge asphalt paving technique minimizes vertical drop-off safety hazards and has a minimal impact on project cost. NCDOT has implemented pilot projects to evaluate the benefits of a safety edge. CAMPO and DCHC MPO will work with NCDOT to use the technique where appropriate.
2. **Roundabouts** – A roundabout is a circular intersection where entering traffic yields to vehicles on the circulatory roadway. Roundabouts substantially improve safety and operations. There are local governments in both MPOs that have ordinance provisions for roundabouts; and both MPOs will encourage their use as needed for transportation system measures.
3. **Corridor Access Management** – Access management is a set of techniques that State and local governments use to control access to highways, major arterials, and other roadways. The benefits of access management include improved movement of traffic, reduced crashes, and fewer vehicle conflicts. Successful access management seeks to simultaneously enhance safety, preserve capacity, and provide for pedestrian and bicycle needs.
4. **Backplates with Retroreflective Borders** – Backplates are added to a traffic signal indication in order to improve the visibility of the illuminated face of the signal and thereby reduce unintentional red-light running crashes.
5. **Longitudinal Rumble Strips and Stripes on 2-Lane Roads** – Longitudinal rumble strips are milled or raised elements on the pavement intended to alert inattentive drivers through vibration and sound that their vehicles have left the travel lane. As discussed in Chapter 9 of the Chapter 4 of the North Carolina Department of Transportation's Complete Streets Planning and Design Guidelines, when rumble stripes are used, they should be designed to lessen the impacts on other users, specifically bicyclists.
6. **Enhanced Delineation and Friction for Horizontal Curves** – Implementing the recently published curve treatments included in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) should improve curve safety over past practices by providing consistency. Treatments include signs, retro reflectivity, flashing lights and surface friction.
7. **Medians and Pedestrian Crossing Islands in Urban and Suburban Areas** – Medians reduce traffic conflicts and increase safety by providing a buffer area between opposing lanes of traffic. Both the Capital Area MPO and Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO will support the efforts to apply medians and pedestrian refuge areas where needed to support safety and reduce conflict between motor vehicles and pedestrians.
8. **Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon** – The pedestrian hybrid beacon (also known as the High intensity Activated crossWALK (or HAWK)) is a pedestrian-activated warning device located on the roadside or on mast arms over midblock pedestrian crossings.
9. **Road Diets (Roadway Reconfiguration)** – The classic roadway reconfiguration, commonly referred to as a "road diet," involves converting an undivided four lane roadway into three lanes made up of two through lanes and a center two-way left turn lane. The reduction of lanes allows the roadway to

be reallocated for other uses such as bike lanes, pedestrian crossing islands, and/or parking. Road diets have multiple safety and operational benefits for vehicles as well as pedestrians.

Several road diets have been implemented in the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO and Capital Area MPO areas, and the MPOs will continue to work with NCDOT and local government partners to review potential locations for road diets.

10. **Roadside Design Improvement at Curves** – These design treatments target the high-risk, outside roadside curves by giving vehicles the opportunity to recover safely and by reducing crash severity. Treatments include clear zones, slope flattening, shoulder widening, and roadside barriers.
11. **Reduce Left-Turn Conflict Intersections** – These treatments are geometric designs that alter how left-turn movements occur in order to simplify decisions and minimize the conflict points. They are often referred to as “superstreets” or “synchronized streets,” and move left-turns to median U-turns.
12. **Systemic Application of Multiple Low-Cost Countermeasures at Stop-Controlled Intersections** – This systemic approach to intersection safety involves deploying a group of multiple low-cost countermeasures, such as enhanced signing and pavement markings, at a large number of stop-controlled intersections within an area or jurisdiction. It is designed to increase driver awareness and recognition of the intersections and potential conflicts.
13. **Leading Pedestrian Intervals** – A leading pedestrian interval (LPI) gives pedestrians the opportunity to enter an intersection 3-7 seconds before vehicles are given a green indication. This head start results in increased pedestrian visibility, reduced conflicts with vehicles, more motorists yielding to pedestrians and additional crossing time for slower pedestrians.
14. **Local Road Safety Plan** – A local road safety plan (LRSP) provides a framework for identifying, analyzing, and prioritizing roadway safety improvements on local roads. While local roads are less traveled than State highways, they have a much higher rate of fatal and serious injury crashes.
15. **USLIMITS2** – This is a free, web-based tool designed to help practitioners assess and establish safe, reasonable, and consistent speed limits for specific segments of roadway.
16. **Dedicated Right- and Left-Turn Lanes at Intersection** – Auxiliary turn lanes—either for left turns or right turns—provide physical separation between turning traffic that is slowing or stopped and adjacent through traffic at approaches to intersections. Pedestrian and bicyclist safety and convenience should receive considerable weight in the decision and design of adding turn lanes at an intersection.
17. **Yellow Change Intervals** – Since red-light running is a leading cause of severe crashes at signalized intersections, it is imperative that the yellow change interval be appropriately timed. Agencies should institute regular evaluation and adjustment protocols for existing traffic signal timing, and refer to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for basic requirements and further recommendations.
18. **Walkways** – A walkway is any type of defined space or pathway for use by a person traveling by foot or using a wheelchair. These may be pedestrian walkways, shared use paths, sidewalks, or roadway

shoulders, and are critical for encouraging non-motorized travel and reducing crashes. Transportation agencies should work towards incorporating pedestrian facilities into all roadway projects unless exceptional circumstances exist

19. **Road Safety Audit** – These audits are unique. They are performed by a multidisciplinary team, which is independent of the project, and consider all road users. Agencies are encouraged to conduct an RSA at the earliest stage possible, as all roadway design options and alternatives are being explored.
20. **Median Barriers** – Median barriers are longitudinal barriers that separate opposing traffic on a divided highway. They significantly reduce the severity of cross-median crashes -- approximately 8 percent of all fatalities on divided highways are due to head-on crashes.

Appendix 8. Public Comments

Introduction

The Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization began a final phase of public outreach in the fall of 2017 to inform and receive feedback from members of the community. The comments received are included towards the end of this Appendix.

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) released the Preferred Option of the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for public comment from November 1, 2017 through December 12, 2017. The public comments that the MPO received for the Preferred Option are compiled in the section below called “Comments by Email.”

DCHC MPO | Additional Comments

A compilation or summary of public comments that were received at key steps of the 2045 MTP development process are available:

Goals and Objectives – The DCHC MPO conducted an online survey to assist with the creation of the Goals and Objectives and received almost 800 responses. A summary and analysis of the responses is available on the 2045 MTP – Goals Web page:

www.bit.ly/DCHC-MTP-Goals

Alternatives Analysis – The DCHC MPO received comments by email and at the many public workshops that were conducted for the Alternatives Analysis stage of the 2045 MTP. A compilation of those comments is available on the 2045 MTP Alternatives Web page: www.bit.ly/DCHC-MTP-Alternatives

Preferred Option -- The DCHC MPO released the Preferred Option of the 2045 MTP for public comment from November 1, 2017 through December 12, 2017. The MPO has not yet officially published the comments received for the Preferred Option and therefore a compilation of those comments are presented in the following section.

DCHC MPO | Comments by Email for the Preferred Option

11/01/17

I have the following comments on the 2045 MTP:

* I would like to see the project to widen US 15-501 Bypass between MLK and I-85 advanced from the 2045 MTP to an earlier date, or at least have interim safety improvements added at the Cameron Blvd and Cornwallis Rd interchanges to extend the merge lanes for safety. I see regular and growing congestion on this route on my daily commute.

* I would like to see improvements to the Durham Freeway (NC 147) through downtown advanced to address current and growing congestion.

* I would like to see widening of I-85 from Sparger Rd to I-40 advanced from the 2045 MTP to an earlier date.

* I would like to see the Wake-Durham CRT (2035 version) extended to LaSalle St. or Neal Rd rather than ending at Fulton St. to better serve west Durham.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Todd Patton

11/04/17

Hi, please provide rail access directly to RDU airport and RTP work areas from Carrboro, Chapel Hill, and Durham. Other sprawling cities do this, we can to!

Thanks

Matthew Barton

11/07/17

To whom it may concern.

Thank you for your willingness to hear from the public. I applaud much of your aims and goals. It seems you are working to do what is best for Durham and surrounding areas. I have only a few comments, which I hope will be received in the best possible light.

My main comment: stop prioritizing cars. For over half of a century, cars have dominated our landscape. So much of our local and state budget is spent on cars and infrastructure for cars -- hundreds of millions of dollars, if I am not mistaken. Yet car-culture never brings a good return on its investment. It contributes to pollution and hurts the environment, it allows people to sit in their cars and get sicker and fatter, it prevents people from being in public together by keeping us separated in our little tin boxes, and so many other terrible things. It is now time to turn things around, to make cities for people

not cars. The reason why idealized cities like Paris, Amsterdam, NY, San Francisco, Barcelona, etc. are ideal is because they do not prioritize cars but people. But it all started with the will to put people first, machines last.

I am writing to encourage you to prioritize walking, biking, and public transit, especially trains. The highways in NC are packed. As more and more people come here, they are just going to be stuffed more and more. And they cannot get much bigger. How much space is wasted by roads and parking lots? Car-culture is far too expensive and unsustainable. The way to make cities sustainable, diverse, and democratic cities is to prioritize sustainable, diverse, and democratic forms of transit. Again, this means walking, biking, and public transit. Want to know why I never go to Raleigh? Because there is no reliable, easy transit running from early in the morning to late at night? The drive into Raleigh feels like a death trap. I avoid it at all costs. But I would love to see the NC Symphony, attend the Art museum (by the way, there is NO public transit to the state art museum; what an embarrassment!), and visit restaurants and shops. A solution: a commuter train.

I know much of this is in the long term plans for the area. But why is this long term? You have been spending billions on roads for cars for decades. How about other people get a chance for a while? How about we stuff funding entitled drivers and give hardworking people who cannot afford or do not want to use cars? How about a fair and equal transit system in 5 years, not 45 years. The will is there. We want trains, better buses, more walking and biking paths (and that means separated cycle-tracks, not deadly sharrows or painted lanes).

If you have any questions or responses, please let me know. The Triangle can be a beautiful place, but there is much that needs to happen. Let's not wait 45 years. Let's start this tomorrow.

Sincerely,
Dr. Ryan J. Johnson

11/07/17

The Triangle Area RPO has the following comments on the draft DCHC MPO 2045 MTP, with regard to projects that touch the MPO/RPO boundary:

* In Orange County, TARPO staff supports the idea of improvements on NC 54 approaching the DCHC/TARPO boundary west of Carrboro, and we would expect these improvements to ultimately be based on the recommendations of the currently-ongoing NC 54 corridor study. The 2013 Orange County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (RPO portion) shows a need for future improvements in this corridor extending west from the MPO/RPO boundary to Orange Grove Road (outside the DCHC boundary). Our current CTP shows a recommended four-lane facility in this corridor, but there is a good possibility this could change based on the results of the corridor study analysis. Even though the recommendation in the draft MTP would not match the recommendation shown in TARPO's adopted

CTP, this recommendation does appear to be consistent with more recent thinking about the NC 54 corridor if it primarily serves as a placeholder for the future recommendations that arise from the corridor study.

* In Chatham County, TARPO staff supports the idea of improvements on NC 751 approaching the DCHC/TARPO boundary. Please note that the 2016 Chatham County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (RPO portion) recommends a future four-lane cross-section for NC 751 from the MPO/RPO boundary southward to US 64. This is in contrast to the three-lane modernization improvements recommended in the draft MTP. While TARPO staff recognizes the fiscal constraints of the MTP process and the impact this has on the ability to include desired projects in the current plan, we would request that you continue to consider a four-lane widening possibility on this road in future planning and project development decisions, in order to match up with the desired intentions on the RPO side of the boundary.

* In Chatham County, the recommended improvements on US 15-501 appear to be consistent with the improvements recommended on the RPO side of the boundary, and TARPO staff supports their inclusion in the MTP.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Matt Day, AICP CTP
Principal Planner
Triangle Area Rural Planning Organization
Triangle J Council of Governments

11/27/17

Hi. I'm 42, and a Raleigh native. Do I read this map correctly that there are NO plans to widen Hopson Rd between 54/Miami to Davis Dr from 2 to 4 lanes (with center turn lane) between now and 2045?? Or will this fall on Town of Morrisville and is out of scope for CAMPO? If there are no plans to widen Hopson, I highly protest! This (I think less than 1/2 mile) stretch of road is a MAJOR bottleneck to traffic flow.

thank you,
David

Hi Andy. I get it that this road segment is in the plan, but how I read it suggests Hopson will not be widened until closer to 2045... the END of this planning date range. That's potentially 28 years away. In what year does this widening of Hopson actually take place?? How about the year on widening of 70 out to 540? That's already way way overdue.

Yes I'm very aware of the grade separation on this road and others and I am a big fan... if only we actually used rail here for passengers (outside of the 3 daily Amtrak trains between Raleigh and Charlotte). I'm thankful for the added safety.

The attempts to get light rail by the TTA since 1993 have been a curse and a sad state of affairs in this region. To watch Charlotte (working and expanding) and now Dur/Ch (plans approved?) get a light rail and our capital city still does not infuriates me. Even worse is not having that light rail Phase 1 to RDU bc the RDUAA thinks they are better than having rail... they lose their parking revenue... suggesting to me CAMPO and RDUAA haven't been aligned or even communicating.

This is why mass transit exists, to connect and interconnect. Someone or some group is conceding far too much to only do commuter rail and buses. Sorry folks, I feel CAMPO needs to step it up a notch. There have been some planning holes since the early 1990s in my opinion or the mass transit plan would be much more aligned and RDU would be on board with light rail phase 1... and we might have even have it running by now!

Nothing in your response related to why New Hill gets widened in this time frame? What traffic bottlenecks exist on that road? I've only ever seen a tiny bit of congestion at the US 1 interchange bc of it being an old bridge and stop signs...

Who participates in making these plans? Is it a contracted 3rd party with click counters on the roads or real people driving real road segments who understand transit? I don't mean that to insult, I ask out of curiosity.

Thank you,
David

DRAFT MTP 2045

Verbal Comments Received at Outreach Events - Fall 2017



EVENT: Advance Apex

10/24/2017 *Staff: Bonnie Parker, Chris Lukasina, Paul Black*
Widen Davis Drive sooner than outlined in draft MTP
Strong support for commuter rail to Apex
Support for additional bus service in and around Apex, along with better marketing of existing bus locations
Encourage students to ride the community buses
Support for Greenways
Interest in the future of 540 and whether the entire, pre-existing roadway, will ever be tolled

EVENT: NCDOT's Raleigh Area Projects Fair

16-Nov *Staff: Bonnie Parker, Alex Rickard, Kenneth Withrow*
Support for Wake Transit Plan and expanding transit options
Falls of the Neuse project concerns
Interest in future of 540 and whether it would be tolled or not
Interest in autonomous vehicles and how forecasting for the MTP works. Staff explained that is one of the reasons to update the MTP every 4-5 years.
Protect Umstead park and local watersheds when planning improvements and during construction

EVENT: North CAC

Staff: Paul Black
General informational presentation. Many attendees interested in sharing with their homeowner or civic associations.

EVENT: Clayton Christmas Village

30-Nov *Staff: Bonnie Parker, Alex Rickard*
Lots of questions regarding transit, and whether Clayton will get commuter rail service. Desire additional transit service.
Questions about improvements to 40/42, timeline

EVENT: RTP Food Trucks

1-Dec *Staff: Bonnie Parker, Kenneth Withrow, Chris Lukasina*
Desire for additional bicycle greenways, paths, separated lanes, etc.
Like the Expressway
Support for improvements to I40
Desire for improvements to Davis Drive

Event: Wendell Wonderland

1-Dec *Staff: Bonnie Parker, Chris Lukasina*
Desire improvements to Wendell Falls Parkway at Poole Road and 64/87
Desire coordination of transportation plans with emergency preparedness plans and future siting of emergency facilities like Fire/EMS stations.

EVENT: Angier Christmas Parade

2-Dec *Staff: Bonnie Parker, Chris Lukasina*
Support for transit to get everywhere, reduce reliance on cars; support for Uber/on-demand transit service
Questions about autonomous vehicles and impact on forecasts
Desire for Fuquay-Varina transportation improvements, especially 401
Interest in the future of 540 and whether the entire, pre-existing roadway, will ever be tolled

EVENT: NCDOT Public Meeting - Morrisville

7-Dec *Staff: Bonnie Parker, Chris Lukasina, Paul Black*
3-5 People actively shared with CAMPO their opposition to the Crabtree Crossing Extension, including members of the Morrisville Council. One person expressed support.

DRAFT MTP 2045
Verbal Comments Received at Outreach Events - Fall 2017



EVENT: Wake Forest Parade - Cancelled table, Weather

9-Dec Staff: Bonnie Parker, CAMPO Teammate

EVENT: Tree of Hope Lighting (Arbolito)

9-Dec Staff: Bonnie Parker, Paul Black
Most conversations were about transit service or bicycle and pedestrian trails.
Desire for increased shuttle and uber like transit service to facilitate more, short
trips to activities beyond work commute during peak hours.

Event: Holiday Express

10-Dec Staff: Bonnie Parker, Gretchen Vetter
Support for transit service across the region, interested in timing for delivery of
new service and rail service.
Also interested in tolling of 540 and whether it could be extended to pre-existing
roadway that is not currently tolled.

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017



	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
1	Jamie	Gerhart		Wake Forest	Interested in learning more about the future of US 1, timeline, and would like to know how to participate. Specific locations are Thornton Road, Raleigh, and 564 US-1 in Youngsville.	25-Aug	Email	CAMPO staff explained that open houses should occur in early 2018, and how to sign up for the mailing list for the US 1 Council of Planning. Also shared contact for project team with NCDOT	jgerhart@sheetz.com
2	Tom	Colwell	Apex		Toll all of 540, including existing north and northeast of Raleigh; Widen Davis Drive from Cary line to 64 (top priority), Widen 55 at the railroad bridge; Fix error in lane shift on 55 in front of Beaver Creek	24-Oct	Advance Apex	Legislative, legal barriers to tolling; study re: strategic tolling	tcowle@gmail.com
3	Audra	Killingsworth	Apex		Apex needs to expand roads, increase buses, and expand into light rail.	24-Oct	Advance Apex	Spoke to in-person	audra4apex@gmail.com
4	Robert	Whitehead	Preston Neighborhood, Cary		Opposed to Crabtree Crossing Parkway extension in Morrisville being included in MTP	14-Nov	Email	This element has been removed from Draft 2045 MTP	rwhitehead@greenarrowlabs.com
5	Nanette	Strother	Morrisville		Opposed to Crabtree Crossing Parkway extension in Morrisville being included in MTP	15-Nov	Email	This element has been removed from Draft 2045 MTP	n.strother@icloud.com
6	Christine	Hollinger	Raleigh		The end to end process is complex and unclear from project inception to implementation. There seem to be multiple opportunities to decide stop or move forward but where, when and how. Also, does CAMPO really care about citizen input once funding is allocated? There is a grotesque disconnect in preserving Raleigh and environment with out of control development that causes traffic issues, road widenings, and loss of property and impact to quality of life. Opposed to widening of Falls of Neuse Rd.	16-Nov and 12-Dec	NCDOT Raleigh Projects Fair and Email	See #32 below.	christine_hollinger@yahoo.com
7	Jeannien	Engelbrecht	Wake Forest		Definitely support public transportation and highly favor clean energy means to supply it.	16-Nov	NCDOT Raleigh Projects Fair	Reference to Wake Transit Plan and Transit Element of draft MTP	jeannien.engelbrecht@gmail.com
8	Lisa	Austin	Raleigh		Willing to pay more for roads and transportation infrastructure. Would support increase in property, income, sales, motor fuel tax, fees, tolls or user fees, and more bonds.	16-Nov	NCDOT Raleigh Projects Fair	Spoke to in-person	generalmail.lisa@gmail.com
9	Todd	Brooks	27604	27607	To pay for more local roads and other transportation improvements, he would support an increase in the sales tax, tolls or user fees, and more bonds.	16-Nov	NCDOT Raleigh Projects Fair	Spoke to in-person	tbrooks@dewberry.com
10	Joe	Burmester	Renter in 27612	27610	To pay for more local roads and other transportation improvements, he would support an increase in the motor fuel tax and more bonds.	16-Nov	NCDOT Raleigh Projects Fair	Spoke to in-person	joe.burmester@mindspring.com

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017



	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
11	TaQuon	Williams	Renter and student in Raleigh	27577	To pay for more local roads and other transportation improvements, he would support tolls or user fees.	16-Nov	NCDOT Raleigh Projects Fair	Spoke to in-person	twill@theworthyprogram.org
12	Anonymous		27608	27603	To pay for more local roads and other transportation improvements, commenter would support increase in sales and motor fuel tax, as well as an increase in fees, tolls or user fees, and more bonds.	16-Nov	NCDOT Raleigh Projects Fair	Spoke to in-person	
13	Tom	Mitchell	27610	27617	To pay for more local roads and other transportation improvements, he would support more bonds.	16-Nov	NCDOT Raleigh Projects Fair	Spoke to in-person	
14	Anonymous		Raleigh		To pay for more local roads and other transportation improvements, commenter would support increase in sales and motor fuel tax, and more bonds.	16-Nov	NCDOT Raleigh Projects Fair	Spoke to in-person	
15	Paul	Kuhn	Holly Springs		Re: Bass Lake Road. Question regarding MTP designating Bass Lake for four lane road in future. Thinks Hilltop Neimore extension to NC 55 should be a higher priority.	20-Nov	Phone call	Holly Springs plans and Draftdo not conflict; Bass Lake is not identified as 4-lane until 3rd decade (post 2036).	pkuhn1975@gmail.com
16	David	McDowell	Raleigh		Desires widening of Hopson Road between 54/Miami to David Dr. Also supports widening of 70 from Lumley/Westgate to Duraleigh/Millbrook. New Hill Hollemon Rd. widening should not be a priority	27-Nov	Email	CAMPO staff replied that yes, in the DCHC portion of the MTP it does show Hopson Road widening. Also, 70 is being widened in the first half of the MTP timespan. Several analyses warrant project on New Hill Hollemon but this is something that will also be analyzed further through SWAS.	turnpike420@gmail.com
17	Benjamin	Marsh	Apex	Cary Alliance Church, Pastor	Requesting widening of Ten-Ten, Holly Springs and Kildaire FarmRoads, just north of the new 540 interchange, in the MTP.	29-Nov	Email	CAMPO is aware of the congestion and safety issues along these corridors. Over the past three NCDOT prioritization cycle, CAMPO has submitted several projects to improve these corridors. CAMPO has submitted three separate projects to widen Ten Ten Road from US 1 to Holly Springs Road with additional intersection improvements at West Lake Road. CAMPO has submitted a project to widen Kildaire Farm Road from Ten Ten Road to Holly Springs Road to four lanes. CAMPO has also submitted a project along Holly Springs Road to improve intersections at Ten Ten Road, Penny Road, and Cary Parkway. If these projects are scored high enough in NCDOT's prioritization system they would likely be constructed prior to 2030. CAMPO will continue to look for ways to fund these improvements beyond the NCDOT prioritization system.	marsh.benjamin@gmail.com
18	Flora	Pinkham	Garner		Intersection of 70 and 401 in Garner is unsafe, needs to be addressed, as well as the widening of 401 north of 70 into Raleigh.	29-Nov	Email	Hot Spots Study between Jan-June 2018	Pinkham@gmail.com

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017

	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
19	Rick	Hadsall			Not enough rail in 2045 draft plan, need light rail and airport connections.	30-Nov	Facebook		
20	Jordan	Miller	unknown, in Triangle region		Desires metrorail system similar to DC or NYC for the region.	30-Nov	Email	Wake Transit Plan & Transit Element of 2045 MTP	jordanm7@vt.eud
21	Nicholas	Borisow	Cary		Development in Cary and to the west is too much like sprawl, without sustainable planning for necessary infrastructure or amenities. Widenings will decrease safety and home values, especially on Carpenter Fire Road.	1-Dec	Email	Understand the concern, this is what we are all working to balance with the MTP. The process is often reactive in order to justify expense of projects.	ngborisow@gmail.com
22	unknown		Raleigh	RTP	Takes the 100 bus from Raleigh and bikes to The Frontier in RTP. He is pleased with the transit plan but wants more dedicated bike options and better road crossings (curb cuts)	1-Dec	RTP Food Trucks Rodeo	Will also share his comments with RTP and DCHC.	
23	unknown		Clayton		Supports improvements on 42 between Clayton and Fuquay-Varina.	1-Dec	RTP Food Trucks Rodeo	Spoke to in-person	
24	unknown				RCRX Crossings support; West Street GS/Ext - timeline?; CRT & BRT - supports; Capital Blvd. inside the Beltline needs to be improved.	1-Dec	RTP Food Trucks Rodeo	Spoke to in-person	
25	unknown			RTP	Attention needs to be focused on peak travel. Hwy 55 south of Durham is getting worse, congestion bleeds into side streets. Supports improvements to 147. Supports improvements to 40, especially because it is bleeding into 54.	1-Dec	RTP Food Trucks Rodeo	Spoke to in-person	
26	April	Rush	Cary		Desires improvements to Ten Ten Road at Holly Springs Road, as well as Kildaire Farm Road. Ten Ten is really bad at rush hour.	1-Dec	Email	See #17 above	rushapril@gmail.com
27	John	Tousley	Cary		Expand Ten-Ten Road between Kildaire Farm and Holly Springs Roads. Widen Kildaire Farm Road and Holly Springs Road leading down to 540.	1-Dec	Email	See #17 above	johntousley@gmail.com
28	Jan	Yarborough			Request widening of roadway and intersection improvements in front of Cary Alliance Church (Ten-Ten Road between Kildaire Farm and Holly Springs Roads).	1-Dec	Email	See #17 above	jan.yarborough@avconusa.com
29	John	Sloan	Raleigh	RTP	Bicycle improvements needed around RTP and roads and pathways leading to it.	2-Dec	Email	Will also share his comments with RTP and DCHC.	morningzephyr@yahoo.com
30	Elizabeth	Asbill	Cary		Expand Ten-Ten Road between Kildaire Farm and Holly Springs Roads. Widen Kildaire Farm Road and Holly Springs Road leading down to 540.	2-Dec	Email	See #17 above	ehasbill@gmail.com
31	Benny	Doyle			Need more roadway maintenance	3-Dec	Facebook		

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017



	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
32	Leslie	Ratliff	Muirfield, Raleigh		Opposed to the widening of Falls of Neuse Road at Litchford. If proceeds, take the land for the widening from the east side of Falls Road.	3-Dec	Email	The project to widen Falls of the Neuse is included in the Draft 2045 MTP for a few reasons. It was previously approved by the Raleigh City Council as one of their priority projects for funding. It meets merit standards in the transportation models for assisting with regional, and corridor-specific congestion. It has also been included and approved by the CAMPO Board for inclusion in the past two MTPs (2035 and 2040), and the current and previous Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP). Public comments received in recent months have identified a few design elements that have been shared with the design team for consideration. The Executive Board asked for a project update once U-5826 had reached the preferred alternative stage. We have recently been informed by NCDOT that they have reached the preferred alternative stage for the project. We have requested NCDOT provide a formal project update at our January Executive Board meeting (1/17/2018). A date for consideration of any specific action by the Executive Board has not yet been set as it was largely dependent on the project schedule to reach the Preferred Alternative stage.	carrfamily55@gmail.com
33	unknown		Wake Forest	Morrisville	Supports widening of US 1 north of 540 - U5307	7-Dec	NCDOT Louis Stephens Rd mtg	This project is in the first decade of MTP and has committed funding.	
34	Will	Letchworth			Consider a roundabout at Eagle Rock & Poole Roads. Preferred over Richardson Road extension.	8-Dec	Email		letchworth@yahoo.com
35	unknown		Raleigh		Supports completion of mountain bike trails at the Airport. Would like to know when the Raleigh to RTP transit connection will occur.	9-Dec	Arbolito Event - Cary	CAMPO staff shared an update on the mountain bike trails - that certain segments are still being planned but that the project generally is moving forward. Raleigh to RTP - In the 2045 draft plan, there will be commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and increased bus service between Raleigh and RTP.	male, 40s-50s
36	unknown		Cary		Support for growing transit and would like to see more transit going to the airport from Cary and Raleigh. Would prefer to see the region invest in "busetas", smaller shuttle type buses rather than large buses, in order to run more routes, more frequently, to get down into communities. Also would like to see buses running to community events at public places like Pullen Park Holiday Express and Arbolito at Herbert Young CC.	9-Dec	Arbolito Event - Cary	CAMPO staff relayed that multiple analyses have been conducted to run BRT or rail service to RDU but that it isn't viable at this time. Additional bus service, including the 100, is included in the MTP, just not BRT or rail.	female, 50s

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017



	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
37	unknown		Johnston County	Raleigh	Looking forward to commuter rail - wants it as soon as possible between Johnston County and Raleigh.	10-Dec	Holiday Express - Pullen Park, Raleigh	CAMPO staff shared the roadways and transit draft maps for 2045 and discussed them with him.	male, 40s and female, 40s
38	unknown		Morrisville	Chapel Hill	Traffic congestion is starting to impact economic development and the willingness of individuals to work in certain parts of the region. He lives in Morrisville, but finds traffic to be so bad that he would not take a job on the other side of Morrisville (close to RTP) due to how long it would take to get to work. Would like to see improvements and widening along Chapel Hill Road and Morrisville Parkway and McKrimmon. On McKrimmon, the designated widening in the MTP should extend further or the bottleneck when it goes back down to fewer lanes will simply make traffic worse.	10-Dec	Holiday Express - Pullen Park, Raleigh	CAMPO staff shared the roadways draft map for 2045 and discussed them with him.	male, 30s-40s
39	Lisa	Riegel	Morrisville		Need to update draft MTP to show the 147 extension off 540 going to Davis Drive instead of to Town Hall Drive.	11-Dec	Email	CAMPO staff responded that, the MPO is trying (along with NCDOT) to broker something that works for Morrisville, RTP, and the regional commuters. Unlike Crabtree Crossing (a local level project with agreement from both Cary and Morrisville not to include), this one is regional and there are other players besides Morrisville that would have to agree to any changes (and why it's still shown the same way on our maps).	diazriegel@gmail.com
40	David	Cox	Raleigh		Opposed to project A13d, widening of Falls of Neuse from Durant to New Falls of Neuse Blvd. from 4 to 6 lanes. In second email, has questions about how modelling for the 2045 MTP was done. Interested in obtaining copies of the technical details that have gone into the modelling that was performed. In third email: Emailed Nancy McFarlane and spoke with Sig Hutchinson asking them to not vote for this project to give the community time to explore alternative transportation options for the area.	12-Dec for first two emails and 13-Dec for third	Email x3	See #32 above. Also, CAMPO staff have offered to discuss modelling methodology, technical details, and share a copy of the model.	dcox1776@gmail.com
41	David	Bland	Raleigh		Opposed to widening of Falls of Neuse Road. Suggest widening NC 98 to Durham instead.	12-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	
42	Chuck	Till	Creedmor		Opposed to widening of Creedmoor Road between Strickland and Glenwood.	12-Dec	Email	This corridor is forecast to be over capacity during the MTP timespan out to 2045 based on growth in population and employment in the area. Specific property impacts or impacts to the existing median would be handled as any project moves through the development process.	
43	Catharine	Christopherson	NC citizen - likely Raleigh		Opposed to Falls of Neuse widening.	12-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	ccatsoon@yahoo.com

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017



	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
44	Barbara	Salvia			Opposed to Falls of Neuse widening. Just repaving is needed.	12-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	salviabarbara1@gmail.com
45	Lillian	Overton	Raleigh		Received a postcard from NCDOT dated 12/07/2017 for project U-5826, widening Fall of Neuse between Durant Road and I-540. When will this project be placed on the calendar for vote by NC CAMPO? Hopes it will be defeated, as it is unnecessary. Will there be time allotted for comment? Second email: Photos of roadway conditions on Falls of Neuse between 11/03/17 and 12/11/17 between 9am-4pm, and 6:30pm-7am during weekdays and weekends. Traffic is flowing nicely. Only congested between 7-9am and 4-6:30pm M-F. The number of lanes on FON can handle additional traffic as well, no need to destroy trees, business parking or add to congestion by adding lanes.	12-Dec for both emails	Emails - two emails	The CAMPO Executive Board has asked for an update on the project from NCDOT once a preferred alternative has been identified, likely in the spring of 2018.	overton.lillian@gmail.com
46	Randy	Overton	Raleigh		Opposed to widening of Falls of Neuse. 540 West is the bottleneck causing problems two hours in the morning. Do something about 540 west instead of making FON a 2 hour parking lot. Accidents that come from this plan - the Board should be held liable. Muirfield neighborhood, if any property values drop the City and Board should be held accountable.	12-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	overton.ro@gmail.com
47	Chad	Overton	Raleigh		Supports widening Falls of Neuse up to Durant, just not north of Durant. Bottleneck is at 540, once you cross Durant traffic flows. Priority should be the Raven Ridge Intersection. Widen 540 between Capital and Creedmore instead. Six Forks, Creedmore, Capital should be widened to 4 lanes before FON is widened to 6. Widen NC98 instead. Beautiful natural area - this would significantly impact it. Safety - shouldn't be a major road through a dense area of neighborhoods.	12-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	chad.weeks@gmail.com
48	Michelle	Patton	Raleigh		Opposes widening the entire Falls of Neuse Road. Other commercial streets like Capital are appropriate for widening, not FON.	12-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	michelle.patton@sanofi.com
49	Laura	Perry	Raleigh	Wake Forest	Opposed to widening of Falls of Neuse corridor. Attachments from when the road was widened from 2 to 4 lanes. Expand Capital, which is commercial instead of Falls of Neuse, which is residential and a watershed area.	12-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	lauraperry360@gmail.com

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017



	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
50	Everett	Adams	Fuquay-Varina?		Re: Hwy 40` Bypass/Fuquay Parkway plans (#A619a): For people traveling from RTP taking future 540 (Freeway) to Highway 401 Bypass/Fuquay Parkway (Freeway) the only connection planned is to exit onto Highway 401 (Boulevard). That specific route would be a freeway, to Boulevard, to freeway plan. Wouldn't it make more sense to have the 401 Bypass/Fuquay Parkway planned as an exit off future 540 so there would be a freeway to freeway connection instead of traffic exiting, off 540, and increasing congestion onto Highway 401 (a Boulevard) in order to get to Highway 401 Bypass/Fuquay Parkway?	12-Dec	Email		
51	Jean	Hedges	Raleigh	Raleigh	Opposed to the widening of Falls of Neuse Rd. Focus resources to overpasses off Capital. FON is an overflow valve for Capital Blvd. traffic to 540.	12-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	jhedges@southerntrust.com
52	Jean	Spooner		Raleigh	The Umstead Coalition recommends funding for WK1 - Triangle I-40 Bikeway, which is included in the Bicycle/Pedestrian Map for the 2045 MTP. Missing link would enable connections from Raleigh, Cary, Morrisville to RTP as well as major greenways and regional/national bike routes	12-Dec	Email	Confirmed, in Draft 2045 MTP for approval.	umsteadcoalition@gmail.com
53	Joanne	Sullivan	Raleigh		The 2045 MTP should stay on track for the future of North Raleigh regarding Six Forks Road and Falls of the Neuse Road.	12-Dec	Email	For Falls of Neuse, see #32 above.	jdsullivan2014@gmail.com
54	Travis	Bailey	Raleigh		Public transportation is one of the leading reasons we're told large opportunities like Amazon's HQ2 won't come to the triangle area, traffic during rush hour. The 2045 MTP update represents the best approach, applauds the update to insure roadways, public transportation, and alternate transportation needs are met. Supports rail for commuters, environment, and new jobs.	12-Dec	Email		tjbailey10@gmail.com
55	John	Toller	Raleigh		Concern about the plan to widen Falls of Neuse Rd. Plan and action is unnecessary, wasteful, and will put higher priority items at risk. Already have major commercial roads nearby (Capital Blvd and Route 98). Another is a waste of resources. Alternative travel options to the Raleigh core, such as light rail using the current electricity rights of way are much better options for the future.	12-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	jmtoller@yahoo.com
56	Laura	Rhodes	Raleigh		Looking forward to improvements to Durant Road in Raleigh.	12-Dec	Email		
57	Christina	Jones			Raleigh desperately needs rail, bus, and bike lanes! Even if we don't get Amazon, we need to prepare for growth!	12-Dec	Email		Coll_christina@yahoo.com

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017



	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
58	David	Willers	Raleigh		Just found out there is a comment period. Requests that comment period be extended to the end of January and opposes the widening of Falls of Neuse to six lanes between I540 and Wake Forest, and widen Hwy 98. Widening Hwy 98 would ease congestion on I-540, and provide another entrance into Research Triangle area therefore also easing congestion on I40.	13-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	david.willers@raymondllc.com
59	Melissa	Bailey	Raleigh		Supports the 2045 MTP Update. If we continue to grow, we will need infrastructure to support development and population. Supports bringing rail transportation t the Triangle.	13-Dec	Email		wms.mel@gmail.com
60	Rachael	Lundin	Raleigh		Support for Falls of Neuse project to add more lanes. Drives it daily and traffic is terrible for most of the day. Widening would reduce travel time and improve safety. Helpful for the communities that live north of this area and drive Falls of Neuse Road.	13-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	rachaellundin@gmail.com
61	Jeannette	Brown	Raleigh		Yes, please widen Falls of Neuse. Lives in neighborhood off of Falls of Neuse between Durant and Bedfor and this should have been done years ago when widened to 4 lanes.	13-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	jennybbrown@gmail.com
62	Rynal	Stephenson			Expressing full support for U-5826 to widen Falls of Neuse Rd. Travels FON corridor everyday. The section between I-540 and Durant Road is very congested. Additional lanes will provide capacity to reduce congestion.	13-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	rynal.stephenson@gmail.com
63	Battle	Whitley	Raleigh		Expressing support for Falls of Neuse widening (U-5826). Experienced first-hand the need for relief of growing traffic congestion along FON. The sooner this is done, the sooner we can improve our travel between Raleigh and Wakefield.	13-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	b4ncs92@gmail.com
64	Kristy	Stephenson	Raleigh		Support for Falls of Neuse widening project. Drives road multiple times per day and traffic is frequently bumper to bumper. Lives in Wakefield north of 540 off Falls and commute always takes longer than anticipated. Project is necessary considering growth.	13-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	weathergirl810@gmail.com
65	Suzanne	Botts			Supports the 2045 MTP Update. If we continue to grow, we will need infrastructure to support development and population. Supports bringing rail transportation t the Triangle.	13-Dec	Email		sbotts1@yahoo.com
66	Zaid	Alemam			Completely supports the MTP. We continue to grow every year, and traffic will only get worse if we don't start planning for the future now.	13-Dec	Email		zalemam@gmail.com
67	Julia	Hardcastle			Submitting updated petition opposing the Falls of Neuse widening. Anything past signature #273 is new - post the October 2017 CAMPO Executive Board Meeting.	13-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	jehlsb@gmail.com

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017



	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
68	Stephanie	Lormand			Concerns for Title VI & Environmental Justice with 2045 MTP development process. Executive Board Membership does not include residents that actively rely on public transportation. Under Goals and Objectives, Objective 4 - Public meetings scheduled for 4pm in downtown Raleigh cannot hope to capture the public's perspective on public transportation. Without multiple, community-based meetings, there is little authenticity in this outreach. Objective 6 - Ensure Environmental Justice in Planning Activities - Why define target areas through the use of Census Block Group data from the 2010 Census? Downtown Raleigh in 2017 looks nothing like it did during the 2010 census. P.S. Why extend Six Forks Rd to Capital Blvd when the BRT line from North Hills and/or the existing greenway includes the folks that can pay \$1200 for a 1 bedroom apartment?	13-Dec	Email	In theory, voters of all user types, including transit riders, select their local elected officials, who are then appointed to our board. The MPO does not get to choose which officials each local government or agency appoints. In an ideal world, officials on our board are representing all their constituents, including their transit riders and in some cases like Raleigh, Cary, and GoTriangle the transit agencies themselves. When North Carolina implemented MPOs around the state in the late 1980 and early 1990s, having a board seat for transit agencies like GoTriangle was intended to represent transit interests. The CAMPO staff had additional outreach events, generally as part of some other event that would allow us to set up a small table or booth which were held at 10 locations across the region in November and December of 2017, following release of the Preferred Scenarios. In addition, recent Wake Transit outreach, which feeds into the MTP development, over the past 18 months and the past 4 months in particular has included online and in-person surveys of riders for short-term and long-term goals, as well as multiple meetings across Wake County in the evenings and during the daytime, use of social media, presentations to neighborhood and civic groups, etc. Regarding the use of census data, This had to do with our old public involvement plan requiring the use of Census Block data, which is not updated in the American Community Survey(ACS) and only available for the latest full census (thus 2010). While not perfect, we did update the plan to use only block group data, and the analysis we used to define target areas used the 2009-2013 ACS data. The data tend to lag by about a year, and that was the most recent data set available when we updated our Title VI Outreach Plan that feeds this plan. The 2016 data that includes the entire	SJLormand@gmail.com
69	Barbara	Bays			Making Capital Blvd./Rt 1 into a freeway is a very good idea. The truck traffic, with stoplights, is frustratingly slow.	13-Dec	Email		bmbays@icloud.com
70	Howard	Shapiro			Opposes widening of Falls of Neuse Rd. Only if a light-rail or other public transit option is installed would he agree to widening. By 2045, foresees a reduction in cars.	13-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	hshapiro1@nc.rr.com
71	Renee	Arion			Opposes widening of Falls of Neuse Rd.	13-Dec	Email	See #32 above.	rarion2@gmail.com
72	Dwight	Otwell			opposes widening highways - no strong evidence that widenings reduce congestion and encourage patterns of growth that are detrimental to financial and environmental sustainability. Would like to see more pedestrian priority projects in the list.	13-Dec	Email		dwight.otwell@gmail.com

Draft 2045 MTP Public Comments - Fall 2017

	First Name	Last Name	Home Location	Work Location	Comments	Date	Event	Staff Response	Email
73	William	Wheeler	Willow Spring		The 401 bypass labeled A617b from Fuquay to Lillington has Lillington has a significant portion that runs through the water supply watershed. This project is very close to Neil's Creek which runs into the Cape Fear River near the water supply intake. This water supply is a very important natural resource to our area. This watershed provides drinking water to all of Harnett County, Holly Springs, Fuquay-Varina and Fort Bragg. I am very concerned that direct, secondary and cumulative impacts from this major freeway could impair the water supply watershed. Please consider shifting this alignment east to avoid impacts to the drinking water supply watershed.	13-Dec	Email		wheeler9272@gmail.com

Appendix 9. Acronyms

AV:	Autonomous Vehicle
BG MPO:	Burlington-Graham Metropolitan Planning Organization
CAAA:	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (United States)
CAMPO:	Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
CFR:	Code of Federal Regulations
CHT:	Chapel Hill Transit
CMAQ:	Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality
CO:	Carbon Monoxide
CTP:	Comprehensive Transportation Plan
DAQ:	Division of Air Quality (North Carolina)
DCHC MPO:	Durham-Chapel Hill –Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization
DEQ:	Department of Environmental Quality (North Carolina)
DMV:	Division of Motor Vehicles
DOT:	Department of Transportation (North Carolina)
EPA:	Environmental Protection Agency (United States)
FAST Act:	Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (most recent federal transportation law)
FHWA:	Federal Highway Administration
FRA:	Federal Railroad Administration
FTA:	Federal Transit Administration
HBO:	Home Based Other (trip purpose)
HBS:	Home Based Shopping (trip purpose)
HBW:	Home Based Work (trip purpose)
HOT:	High Occupancy Toll
HOV:	High Occupancy Vehicle
HPMS:	Highway Performance Management System
HTF:	Highway Trust Fund
I/M:	Inspection/Maintenance
ITRE:	Institute for Transportation Research and Education
ITS:	Intelligent Transportation Systems
KT RPO:	Kerr-Tar Rural Transportation Planning Organization
MAP-21:	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21 st Century (federal law prior to the FAST Act)
MPO:	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MTIP:	Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program
MTP:	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAAQS:	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NCDOT:	North Carolina Department of Transportation
NHB:	Non Home Based (trip purpose)
NO _x :	Nitrogen Oxides
RPO:	Rural Transportation Planning Organization
RTAC:	Rural Transportation Advisory Committee
RTCC:	Rural Technical Coordinating Committee
RVP:	Reid Vapor Pressure
SIP:	State Implementation Plan (for air quality)
SPOT:	Strategic Prioritization Office - Transportation

STAC:	Special Transit Advisory Commission
STBGP:	Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (federal funding category)
STI:	Strategic Transportation Investments (NC transportation legislation)
STP-DA	Surface Transportation Program-Direct Allocation (recently transformed to STBGP)
TAC:	Transportation Advisory Committee
TAP:	Transportation Alternatives Program (federal funding program)
TAZ:	Traffic Analysis Zone
TARPO:	Triangle Area Rural Transportation Planning Organization
TCC:	Technical Coordination Committee
TCM:	Transportation Control Measure
TIFIA:	Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act
TDM:	Transportation Demand Management
TRM:	Triangle Regional Model
TIP:	Transportation Improvement Program
TRM:	Triangle Regional Model
UCPRPO:	Upper Coastal Plain Rural Transportation Planning Organization
UPWP:	Urban Planning Work Program
USEPA:	United States Environmental Protection Agency
V/C:	Volume to Capacity Ratio (measure of congestion on a road segment)
VKT:	Vehicle Kilometers of Travel
VMT:	Vehicle Miles of Travel
VOC:	Volatile Organic Compounds

Appendix 11. Year of Expenditure (YOE) Financial Plan

Federal regulations require Metropolitan Transportation Plans to provide financial data in the year of expenditure (YOE). The tables in this appendix provide the same information as the tables in the Financial Plan (Section 8) except that current dollar values have been translated into year of expenditure values. This has been done by assuming a 3.5% annual inflation rate and calculating dollar values based on the mid-point year of each funding decade (2021 for the 2018-2025 decade; 2030 for the 2026-2035 decade; and 2040 for the 2036-2045 decade).

Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO

Cost Category (millions \$)		DCHC Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Roadways & Alternative Transportation					
Roadways (STI Statewide)		\$ 4,756	\$ 570	\$ 1,697	\$ 2,489
Roadways (STI Regional)		\$ 739	\$ 28	\$ 308	\$ 402
Roadways (STI Division)		\$ 843	\$ 63	\$ 271	\$ 509
Maintenance & Operations (Highway Fund)		\$ 6,266	\$ 1,037	\$ 2,011	\$ 3,218
Bicycle & Pedestrian (STI Division)		\$ 512	\$ 74	\$ 210	\$ 228
Transportation Demand Management (STI Division)		\$ 77	\$ 11	\$ 33	\$ 34
Intelligent Transportation Systems (STI Statewide)		\$ 130	\$ 17	\$ 56	\$ 57
Transportation System Management (All Categories)		\$ 230	\$ 32	\$ 97	\$ 102
Roadways & Alternative Transportation Cost Total		\$ 13,553	\$ 1,832	\$ 4,682	\$ 7,039
Revenue Category (millions \$)		DCHC Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Roadways & Alternative Transportation					
STI Statewide Funds		\$ 4,337	\$ 643	\$ 1,454	\$ 2,240
STI Regional Funds		\$ 1,298	\$ 44	\$ 448	\$ 806
STI Division Funds		\$ 1,099	\$ 145	\$ 369	\$ 585
STI Transition Project Funds		\$ 42	\$ 42	\$ -	\$ -
Highway Fund (Maintenance & Operations)		\$ 6,266	\$ 1,037	\$ 2,011	\$ 3,218
Toll Revenue Bonds		\$ 317	\$ 0.1	\$ 317	\$ -
Local Funding - Bicycle & Pedestrian		\$ 120	\$ 42	\$ 32	\$ 46
Local Funding - Roadways		\$ 127	\$ 30	\$ 40	\$ 57
Private Funds		\$ 135	\$ 32	\$ 49	\$ 55
CMAQ Funding		\$ 82	\$ 20	\$ 29	\$ 33
Roadways & Alternative Transportation Revenue Total		\$ 13,823	\$ 2,035	\$ 4,748	\$ 7,040
Difference		\$ 270	\$ 204	\$ 66	\$ 1
Cost Category (millions \$)		DCHC Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Transit					
Continued Funding for Existing Services		\$ 2,340	\$ 458	\$ 781	\$ 1,101
Funding for New/Expanded Services in County Plans		\$ 4,794	\$ 1,611	\$ 2,109	\$ 1,075
CRT Extension from West Durham to Hillsborough		\$ 365	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 365
LRT Extension from Chapel Hill to Carrboro		\$ 274	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 274
Transit Cost Total		\$ 7,773	\$ 2,069	\$ 2,890	\$ 2,815
Revenue Category (millions \$)		DCHC Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Transit					
State/Federal - to support existing service		\$ 450	\$ 88	\$ 150	\$ 212
Local - to support existing service		\$ 1,182	\$ 231	\$ 394	\$ 556
Fares - existing service		\$ 237	\$ 46	\$ 79	\$ 111
Other Sources - to support existing service		\$ 471	\$ 92	\$ 157	\$ 222
Local - new/expanded service (from county plans)		\$ 2,050	\$ 380	\$ 667	\$ 1,003
Federal New Starts/Small Starts		\$ 1,815	\$ 571	\$ 776	\$ 468
Joint Development		\$ 71	\$ 0	\$ 70	\$ -
Borrowing/Debt		\$ 997	\$ 546	\$ 440	\$ 10
Additional local for CRT/LRT extensions		\$ 73	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 73
STI Regional Funds		\$ 428	\$ 113	\$ 155	\$ 160
Transit Revenue Total		\$ 7,773	\$ 2,069	\$ 2,890	\$ 2,815
Difference		\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -

Capital Area MPO

Cost Category (millions \$)		CAMPO Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Roadways & Alternative Transportation					
	Roadways (Statewide)	\$ 8,894	\$ 2,830	\$ 4,742	\$ 1,322
	Roadways (Regional)	\$ 5,452	\$ 955	\$ 1,821	\$ 2,676
	Roadways (Division)	\$ 10,267	\$ 441	\$ 3,286	\$ 6,540
	Maintenance & Operations (Highway Fund)	\$ 16,681	\$ 2,675	\$ 5,316	\$ 8,690
	Bicycle & Pedestrian	\$ 1,692	\$ 206	\$ 562	\$ 923
	System Optimization (TDM/TSM/CSM/ITS) All Categories	\$ 615	\$ 75	\$ 204	\$ 336
Roadways & Alternative Transportation Cost Total		\$ 43,601	\$ 7,181	\$ 15,932	\$ 20,488
Revenue Category (millions \$)		CAMPO Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Roadways & Alternative Transportation					
	STI Statewide Funds	\$ 14,445	\$ 2,077	\$ 4,752	\$ 7,616
	STI Regional Funds	\$ 5,453	\$ 954	\$ 1,822	\$ 2,677
	STI Division Funds	\$ 9,250	\$ 440	\$ 2,827	\$ 5,983
	STI Transition Project Funds	\$ 42	\$ 42	\$ -	\$ -
	Highway Fund (Maintenance & Operations)	\$ 16,680	\$ 2,675	\$ 5,315	\$ 8,690
	Toll Revenue Bonds	\$ 1,637	\$ 687	\$ 950	\$ -
	Local/Development Funding	\$ 1,911	\$ 612	\$ 715	\$ 584
	CMAQ Funding	\$ 219	\$ 53	\$ 77	\$ 89
Roadways & Alternative Transportation Revenue Total		\$ 49,636	\$ 7,540	\$ 16,457	\$ 25,640
Difference		\$ 6,035	\$ 359	\$ 525	\$ 5,151

Cost Category (millions \$)		CAMPO Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Transit					
	Continued Funding for Existing Services	\$ 2,637	\$ 516	\$ 880	\$ 1,241
	Funding for New/Expanded Services	\$ 8,948	\$ 1,976	\$ 1,912	\$ 5,060
Transit Cost Total		\$ 11,585	\$ 2,493	\$ 2,791	\$ 6,301
Revenue Category (millions \$)		CAMPO Total	TIP/'18 to '25	'26 to '35	'36 to '45
Transit					
	State/Federal - to support existing service	\$ 455	\$ 89	\$ 152	\$ 214
	Local - to support existing service	\$ 1,481	\$ 290	\$ 494	\$ 697
	Fares - existing service	\$ 403	\$ 79	\$ 135	\$ 190
	Other Sources - to support existing service	\$ 298	\$ 58	\$ 99	\$ 140
	Local - new/expanded service	\$ 4,286	\$ 811	\$ 1,416	\$ 2,059
	Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$ 2,494	\$ 605	\$ 58	\$ 1,831
	Fares, State/Federal Operating Grants for new service	\$ 789	\$ 48	\$ 316	\$ 425
	Borrowing/Debt	\$ 1,380	\$ 513	\$ 122	\$ 746
Transit Revenue Total		\$ 11,586	\$ 2,493	\$ 2,792	\$ 6,302
Difference		\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 1