

47	Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
48	Aaron Cain	DCHC MPO
49	Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO
50	Robert Jahn	DCHC MPO
51	Dale McKeel	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
52		
53	Tom Ten Eyck	Orange County Planning Department
54	Kathy Claspell	Sierra Club

55

56 Quorum Count: 9 of 10 Voting Members

57

58

59 Chair Wendy Jacobs called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A roll call was performed. The

60 Voting Members and Alternate Voting Members of the DCHC MPO Board were identified and are

61 indicated above. Chair Wendy Jacobs reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was

62 being circulated. Chair Wendy Jacobs stated that Ellen Reckhow and Vernetta Alston would not be in

63 attendance, and they arranged for their alternates to be present. Chair Wendy Jacobs stated that, per

64 state law, all MPO Board Members and Alternates are required to file a statement of economic interest

65 and real estate disclosure form by April 15.

66 **PRELIMINARIES:**

67 **2. Ethics Reminder**

68 Chair Wendy Jacobs read the Ethics Reminder and asked if there were any known conflicts of

69 interest with respect to matters coming before the MPO Board and requested that if there were any

70 identified during the meeting for them to be announced. There were no known conflicts identified by

71 the MPO Board Members.

72 **3. Adjustments to the Agenda**

73 There were no adjustments to the agenda.

74 **4. Public Comments**

75 There were no comments from the public.

76 **5. Directives to Staff**

77 Chair Wendy Jacobs and Damon Seils discussed that the forming of a committee was ongoing.

78 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

79 **6. January 15, 2020 MPO Board Meeting Minutes**

80 **7. Change to DCHC MPO Board Meeting Calendar**

81 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff**

82 Aaron Cain proposed that, due to a conflict with Veterans' Day, the MPO Board Meeting
83 originally scheduled for November 11 be moved to November 4. There was discussion that Mike Fox and
84 Nina Szlosberg-Landis would not be able to attend due to a scheduling conflict. After discussion, the
85 Board agreed to move forward with the changing of the November meeting date.

86 Vice Chair Jenn Weaver made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Damon Seils
87 seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

88 **ACTION ITEMS:**

89

90 **8. Draft FY2021 Unified Planning Work Program**

91 **Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

92 Felix Nwoko stated that the Draft FY2021 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was
93 released at the previous MPO Board Meeting for public comment and has received one comment.

94 Chair Wendy Jacobs opened and closed the public hearing with there being no one to comment from
95 the public.

96 Damon Seils made a motion to approve the Draft FY21 Unified Planning Work Program. Pam
97 Hemminger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

98 **9. Durham Transit Plan FY20 Amendment - Bus Stop Construction**

99 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff**

100 Aaron Cain stated that, in the FY20 Durham Transit Tax Annual Work Plan, \$500,000 was
101 programmed for design of 50 bus stop improvements for GoDurham. Aaron Cain continued that
102 progress on this work has proceeded at a pace that construction can be scheduled on 10 stops in
103 FY20 rather than FY21 as previously planned. Aaron Cain added that GoTriangle recommends

104 proceeding with procurement of amenities for all 50 stops in order to access better prices and
105 ensure amenities are in stock for installation as each stop is ready for construction. Aaron Cain
106 stated that GoTriangle, on behalf of GoDurham, is requesting an additional \$1,029,000 of funding
107 from the Durham Transit Tax Fund to be pulled forward from the future funding pipeline into FY20.

108 Aaron Cain stated that this is considered a material change to the plan per the existing
109 Interlocal Agreement (ILA) because the request is for more than \$500,000 towards bus service. Aaron
110 Cain continued that the request must be approved by the governing boards of the three parties to
111 the ILA: GoTriangle, DCHC MPO, and the Durham Board of County Commissioners. There was
112 discussion about the timing of approval of amendments. Chair Wendy Jacobs and Aaron Cain
113 discussed that the City of Durham has requested to be a part of the ILA.

114 Nina Szlosberg-Landis requested that there be more public engagement and a publicity plan
115 for this project and other similar projects. There was discussion that GoTriangle staff would
116 undertake public outreach. There were suggestions of video productions and a 'before and after'
117 social media campaign.

118 Pam Hemminger made a motion to adopt the resolution to amend the FY20 Durham Transit
119 Tax Annual Work Plan to add \$1,029,000 for construction of bus stop improvements for GoDurham.

120 Damon Seils seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

121 **10. Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Update**

122 **Katharine Eggleston, GoTriangle**

123 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff**

124 Katharine Eggleston stated that the purpose of this presentation is to update MPO Board
125 Members, to describe the amendment for the FY20 Work Plan to support further study of the
126 Commuter Rail, and to describe the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Katharine Eggleston
127 described information from the Commuter Rail Transit (CRT) study, which included the distance of
128 the proposed CRT and that an additional rail line would need to be added to existing infrastructure.

129 Katharine Eggleston explained that there were eight scenarios that were studied, and how each
130 related to such topics as capital costs, operating costs, ridership, geographic areas, and service
131 levels. Katharine Eggleston stated that the CRT scenario from Durham to Garner is expected to reach
132 \$1.4-1.8B in capital costs. Katharine Eggleston added that 7,500 to 10,000 riders are forecasted for
133 2030. Katharine Eggleston discussed scoring for federal funding. Katharine Eggleston stated that
134 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding is based on four kinds of risk: requirements, design,
135 market, and construction. Katharine Eggleston stated that county boards and MPO boards will also
136 be briefed on this material before the MOU is signed, which is scheduled for the first week of April.

137 Katharine Eggleston and Michael Parker discussed risk associated with designing and adding
138 infrastructure for downtown Durham. Katharine Eggleston stated that conversations with North
139 Carolina Railroad (NCRR) are ongoing to resolve infrastructure needs. Katharine Eggleston discussed
140 proposed FTA evaluation metrics. Michael Parker and Katharine Eggleston discussed that
141 representatives from local jurisdictions are able to express concerns to GoTriangle. There was
142 discussion that cities and municipalities would not be included in the MOU. Katharine Eggleston
143 described the public engagement process, including local engagement and feedback from
144 stakeholders. Charlie Reece and Katharine Eggleston discussed the response to City of Durham
145 Transportation Director Sean Egan's letter to GoTriangle to address issues with the CRT project.
146 Charlie Reece and Katharine Eggleston discussed that the MOU addresses how the railroad will
147 address freight versus passenger issues. There was discussion that NCRR owns the rail corridor.

148 Marc Marcoplos stated that, due to the projected high cost and low amount of ridership in
149 their jurisdiction, Orange County will not be a part of the continuing study phase, although there is
150 interested in a potential for a phase two extension. There was discussion about that the two time
151 horizons used for data purposes in the FTA submission are 2020 and 2040. Michael Parker and

152 Katharine Eggleston discussed the differences between the MOU and the concurrence process. Mike
153 Fox and Katharine Eggleston discussed the coordination of NCDOT projects with the CRT project.

154 Chair Wendy Jacobs stated that lessons have been learned from the Durham-Orange Light
155 Rail Transit (DOLRT) project. Chair Wendy Jacobs added that there is potential for major economic
156 development in Durham, specifically RTP, which would further increase the need for alternative
157 modes of transportation. Charlie Reece and Katharine Eggleston discussed cost-sharing agreements
158 between Wake and Durham counties. Charlie Reece added that further conversations between the
159 City of Durham and GoTriangle will be vital for the success of the CRT. Charlie Reece discussed the
160 opportunity cost of funding the CRT, and reminded the MPO Board that choosing to fund CRT would
161 impact the funding of other transportation projects. Charlie Reece discussed that the findings of
162 American Public Transportation Association (APTA) cautioned against another billion dollar project,
163 and warned that GoTriangle did not have the resources to for such a project. Katharine Eggleston
164 responded that GoTriangle is working with stakeholders to ensure that the necessary frameworks are
165 in place to the project is delivered on time and on budget.

166 Nina Szlosberg-Landis stated that the structure of how the railroad is owned and operated in
167 North Carolina is different than any other state. Chair Wendy Jacobs stated that the APTA study is
168 being considered as the CRT moves forward. Chair Wendy Jacobs requested that public engagement
169 be better publicized for critical stakeholders to be included in ongoing project planning.

170 This item was for informational purposes only, and no further action was required.

171 **11. SPOT 6 Candidate Project List for Public Review**

172 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff**

173 Aaron Cain stated that, on January 22, 2020, the Technical Committee (TC) reviewed the list of
174 candidate projects for submittal for Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) 6. Aaron Cain
175 stated that the submission deadline for projects is May 1, 2020, and decisions for application of local
176 input points will be in late fall of 2020 or early winter of 2021. Aaron Cain added that DCHC MPO is able

177 to submit 24 projects for each mode, including; highway, bike/ped, transit, and rail. Though the number
178 of bicycle/pedestrian (bike/ped) projects is above the limit of 24, Divisions 5 and 7 have in the past
179 agreed to submit a few projects on behalf of DCHC, but Division 7 staff has stated recently that there
180 may not be support for bicycle/pedestrian or any other projects in Orange County due to the
181 disagreement over the widening of NC 54 west of Carrboro.

182 Mike Fox discussed the SPOT process, and the different philosophical approaches to assigning
183 points. Mike Fox discussed congestion issues in and around Carrboro and Chapel Hill. Mike Fox discussed
184 the need for partnership within the region. Lydia Lavelle stated that she and Damon Seils have discussed
185 the issue with Mike Fox.

186 Vice Chair Jenn Weaver stated that there is still some confusion about if Division 7 will support
187 local projects in Orange County if the DCHC MPO continues to support Carrboro's stance on NC 54. Marc
188 Marcoplos requested that an Orange County representative be present in further discussions between
189 Carrboro and Mike Fox or representatives from Division 7.

190 Mike Fox stated that it is more difficult for bike/ped projects to receive funding because of the
191 relatively small amount of state funding able to be allocated to these projects due to legislative
192 restraints. Mike Fox asked if there were any bike/ped projects funded in Orange County in SPOT 5.
193 Aaron Cain responded that two bike/ped projects were funded despite Division 7 not contributing any
194 points. Mike Fox stated that Division 7 looks at each project strategically when allocating points.

195 Mike Fox discussed his preference for maximizing the allocation of points. Renee Price asked if it
196 would be possible for NC 54 to be widened if DCHC MPO did not add points. Mike Fox responded that it
197 is possible if the project scores highly enough to be funded without the DCHC MPO support. Mike Fox
198 discussed past instances of working with local jurisdictions when conflict occurred. Mike Fox added that
199 he respected Carrboro's right and ability to control the nature of their community, but transportation
200 could be negatively impacted if NC 54 is not widened.

201 Nish Trivedi stated that Burlington-Graham Metropolitan Planning Organization (BGMPO) has
202 added NC 54 widening into the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Nish Trivedi added that
203 continuing vehicle traffic is an increasing trend.

204 Pam Hemminger discussed issues regarding traffic coming into Chapel Hill and how it impacts
205 major employers such as University of North Carolina (UNC) and UNC Hospital. Pam Hemminger added
206 that multimodal transportation and transit options would be a preferred topic of conversation in future
207 discussion of NC 54 widening. Pam Hemminger suggested that representatives from Chapel Hill and UNC
208 also be present during further negotiations. Pam Hemminger and Aaron Cain discussed that the motion
209 to release include an amended list of the Chapel Hill bike/ped projects.

210 Mike Fox stated that data supported NC 54 widening due to traffic volumes. Nina Szlosberg-
211 Landis stated that the recent Complete Streets policy allows for transit and bike/ped facilities to be
212 incorporated into highway projects. Damon Seils stated that the Complete Streets policy allows for an
213 opportunity to fund transit and bike/ped facilities, but there is not a requirement to fund alternative
214 modes of transportation. There was discussion about the scope of the NC 54 widening project.

215 Nina Szlosberg-Landis and Aaron Cain discussed the at-grade improvements of a rail project on
216 Blackwell Street. There was discussion about how the Commuter Rail Transit (CRT) project would impact
217 the goals of the Blackwell Street rail project.

218 Mike Fox stated that James Trogon would be stepping down as the Secretary of
219 Transportation, and Eric Boyette is presumed to take Trogon's place but will first need to be confirmed
220 by the North Carolina State Senate. Chair Wendy Jacobs requested that the High Capacity Transit (HCT)
221 acronym be defined within the SPOT 6 list for public review.

222 Damon Seils made a motion to approve of submitting the project candidate lists for SPOT 6 for
223 public review, including the amended bike/ped list from the Town of Chapel Hill, and hold a public

224 hearing at the March 2020 DCHC MPO Board meeting. Pam Hemminger seconded the motion. The
225 motion passed unanimously.

226 **12. Letter to NCDOT Secretary Trogdon regarding Prioritization of Removal of Projects from the**
227 **Suspension List**

228 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff**

229 Aaron Cain stated that NCDOT has recently begun to remove projects from that suspension list
230 that was enacted in fall 2019, but there has been no explanation as to how or why projects are chosen
231 to be removed from that list. Aaron Cain added that locally managed projects are included in the
232 suspension list with no date given for reinstatement of reimbursements.

233 Aaron Cain stated that the DCHC MPO TC instructed MPO staff, on January 22, to draft a letter
234 for the MPO Board Chair's signature regarding the prioritization of removal of projects from NCDOT's
235 suspension list. Aaron Cain added that the TC recommended that the MPO Board formally request an
236 explanation on the methodology of removing projects from the suspension list, and to also state
237 formally that reinstatement of reimbursements to local governments for locally managed projects
238 should be the top priority.

239 Chair Wendy Jacobs asked if there were options to contact NCDOT representatives before
240 sending a letter to the Secretary of Transportation. Richard Hancock stated that priority has been given
241 to certain projects that use time-sensitive funding sources. There was discussion that the Chief Engineer
242 at the NCDOT Division level would be the most appropriate avenue to pursue questions about
243 prioritization of projects released for the suspension list. Nina Szlosberg-Landis stated that she would
244 facilitate these conversations. Chair Wendy Jacobs requested that this item be added to the MPO Board
245 meeting on March 10.

246 No formal action was taken by the MPO Board at this time.

247 **13. Discussion of Joint Board Meeting**

248 **Wendy Jacobs, Chair**

249 **Aaron Cain, LPA Staff**

250 Chair Wendy Jacobs stated that there was discussion at the Joint DCHC MPO and CAMPO Board
 251 meeting about there being increased interest from jurisdictions and requests to be a part of a regional
 252 multimodal transit system. Chair Wendy Jacobs and Nina Szlosberg-Landis discussed that state-level
 253 transportation policy changes are needed, and a coalition of MPOs and RPOs is needed in order to bring
 254 about change. Nina Szlosberg-Landis requested to have a work session at the next Joint meeting
 255 regarding planning for state-level transportation policy change.

256 Chair Wendy Jacobs stated that she noticed on one of the slides presented at the Joint Meeting
 257 that there were gaps in service between proposed BRT routes. Damon Seils added that the North-South
 258 BRT project in Chapel Hill was awarded a rating by the FTA that makes it eligible for federal funding.
 259 Chair Wendy Jacobs added that other BRT projects in Raleigh are not also eligible for federal funding.

260 No action is necessary for this item; it is for discussion and informational purposes only.

261 **REPORTS:**

262 **14. Report from the MPO Board Chair**
 263 **Wendy Jacobs, Board Chair**

264 There was no additional report from Chair Wendy Jacobs.

265 **15. Report from the Technical Committee Chair**
 266 **Nish Trivedi, TC Chair**

267 There was no additional report from Nish Trivedi.

268 **16. Report from LPA Staff**
 269 **Felix Nwoko, Andy Henry, LPA Staff**

270 There was no additional report from LPA staff.

271 **16. NCDOT Report**

272 Richard Hancock, Division 5, stated that there was no additional report.

273 Pat Wilson, Division 7, stated that there was no additional report.

274 Bryan Kluchar, Division 8, stated that there was no additional report.

275 Julie Bogle, Transportation Planning Division, stated that information regarding the Complete
276 Streets Policy has been added to connect.ncdot.gov. Chair Wendy Jacobs requested that the MPO
277 Board be sent a link for the Complete Streets information.

278 John Grant stated that there was no further report from NCDOT Traffic Operations.

279 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

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

281 There was no discussion of informational items.

282 **ADJOURNMENT:**

283 There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Board, the meeting was adjourned at
284 11:26 a.m.