

DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

September 28, 2016

MINUTES OF MEETING

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Committee met on September 28, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. in the City Council Committee Room, located on the second floor of Durham City Hall. The following people were in attendance:

David Bonk (TC Chair)	Chapel Hill Planning
Ellen Beckmann (TC Vice Chair)	City of Durham Transportation
Kumar Neppalli (Member)	Chapel Hill Engineering
Hannah Jacobson (Member)	City of Durham Planning
Pierre Osei-Owusu (Member)	City of Durham Transportation
Bergen Watterson (Member)	Carrboro Planning
Laura Woods (Member)	Durham County Planning
Sara Young (Alternate)	Durham County Planning
Peter Murphy (Member)	Orange Public Transportation
Tom Altieri (Member)	Orange County Planning
Max Bushell (Member)	Orange County Planning
Cara Coppola (Member)	Chatham County Planning
John Hodges-Copple (Member)	Triangle J Council of Governments
Lisa Jemison (Alternate)	Research Triangle Foundation
Julie Bollinger (Member)	NCDOT, TPB
Kelly Becker (Member)	NCDOT, Traffic Operations
David Keilson (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 5
Richard Hancock (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 5
Ed Lewis (Alternate)	NCDOT, Division 7
Kayla Seibel (Alternate)	Chapel Hill Planning
Geoff Green (Alternate)	GoTriangle
Kurt Stolka	The University of North Carolina
Terry Bellamy	City of Durham Transportation
Bryan Poole	City of Durham Transportation
Dale McKeel	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
Dale McKeel	DCHC MPO
Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO
Jenny Green	GoTriangle
Danny Rogers	GoTriangle
Tammy Bouchelle	GoTriangle
Thomas Henry	GoTriangle
Alpesh Patel	Cambridge Systematics

Quorum Count: 21 of 31 Voting Members

Chair David Bonk called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. A roll call was performed. The Voting Members and Alternate Voting Members of the DCHC MPO Technical Committee (TC) were identified and are indicated above. Chair David Bonk reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was being circulated.

PRELIMINARIES:

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

Chair David Bonk asked if there were any adjustments to the agenda. There were no adjustments to the agenda.

3. Public Comments

Chair David Bonk asked if there were any members of the public signed up to speak. There were no members of the public signed up to speak during the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA:

4. Approval of August 24, 2016 TC Meeting Minutes

Chair David Bonk asked if there was any discussion of the August 24, 2016 meeting minutes. There was no discussion of the minutes. Geoff Green moved to approve the August 24, 2016 meeting minutes, and Max Bushell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS:

5. Spot P4.0 Division Needs Tier Project Priorities and Local Input Points

Dale McKeel, LPA Staff

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) Board released the recommended assignment of Local Input Points for a public review and comment period at its September 14, 2016 meeting. No comments have been received.

72 Dale McKeel reported that he has been in touch with three North Carolina Department of
73 Transportation (NCDOT) divisions, and they are still working on their point assignments. The divisions
74 will submit their points to the Division Engineer's office in Raleigh by September 30, 2016, and the state
75 will have a public comment period from October 10-21, 2016.

76 Chair David Bonk suggested that a subcommittee meet and make recommendations about point
77 assignments to the MPO Board.

78 Ed Lewis, NCDOT Division 7, stated that point allocations at the division level will not change and
79 that this information is on the division's website. Ed Lewis stated that his division allocated points based
80 on what is supported by MPOs and Rural Transportation Planning Organizations (RPO), what projects
81 have a strong technical score, and what is in line with the division's methodology. Ed Lewis noted that
82 the division planned to have meetings with the MPOs to make sure they are supporting projects that will
83 move forward. The division will have 2500 points to allocate, and based on the division's methodology,
84 500 points will go to non-highway projects. Ed Lewis emphasized the role of the technical score and the
85 points from the MPOs and RPOs in scoring projects in a competitive field.

86 Chair David Bonk and Ed Lewis discussed the role that public comments will play in changing
87 point allocations.

88 Chair David Bonk inquired about other divisions. David Keilson, NCDOT Division 5, commented
89 that the division will be releasing scores for public comment shortly, and that the division anticipates
90 only a limited number of changes. David Keilson emphasized that Division 5 was interested in projects
91 that had a strong technical score and that are supported by planning partners and therefore have a
92 strong chance of being funded.

93 Chair David Bonk inquired whether it might make sense to gather information from the divisions
94 in order to update the MPO Board on where things stand at the October 12, 2016, MPO Board meeting.

95 Chair David Bonk also suggested asking the MPO Board to endorse changes to point allocations

recommended by the Technical Committee (TC). Geoff Green requested that the Lead Planning Agency (LPA) Staff identify projects where the MPO and the divisions have proposed allocating points so that the TC could intelligently evaluate competitive projects.

Ed Lewis and Chair David Bonk discussed the impact of regional projects that did not qualify for funding.

Felix Nwoko suggested that the TC authorize a subcommittee to make recommendations to the MPO Board. Vice Chair Ellen Beckman moved to authorize the subcommittee, and Tom Altieri seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dale McKeel mentioned that Ed Lewis was interested in receiving feedback on Orange County projects, and was particularly interested in a list of priorities from Chapel Hill and Carrboro. Ed Lewis stressed how competitive the field was and noted that a priorities list would be very useful given the 500-point limit for non-highway projects. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann, Ed Lewis, and Chair David Bonk discussed the merits of the 500 point allocation for non-highway projects and whether the bicycle and pedestrian projects that were submitted were competitive.

Geoff Green moved to recommend that the MPO Board hold a public hearing to approve the Local Input Points Assignment, and Max Bushell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

John Hodges-Copple asked for and received clarification about the scheduling of the Local Input Points vote.

6. 2040 MTP Amendment #2 – Chapel Hill BRT

Andy Henry, LPA Staff

The MPO Board released Amendment #2 at their August meeting and conducted a public hearing at their September meeting. The Amendment changes references to the Chapel Hill Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) to make it clear that the route extends to Southern Village. The public comment period closed on September 26, 2016, and no comments were received.

Chair David Bonk asked whether the edits that appeared in the documents in the packet pertaining to this agenda item were intentional and was told by Andy Henry that they were.

John Hodges-Copple expressed concern about the timeline and financial feasibility of the proposed changes to BRT, and about the impact that funding for this project might have on Light Rail Transit (LRT). There was continued discussion about the timeline and progress of the project. Andy Henry and Geoff Green clarified that the project was moving forward quickly in order to be eligible for federal funding.

Max Bushell asked about the amended project's impact on the fiscal constraint of the Metropolitan Transit Plan (MTP) and Andy Henry responded that there would be no additional information about the source of funding unless the financial model is completely rerun. Chair David Bonk mentioned that there was a collaborative funding group trying to find alternative funding for the LRT, and that additional funding for the LRT would free up funding for other projects.

John Hodges-Copple stressed the need for more detailed financial and ridership information moving forward. Chair David Bonk and John Hodges-Copple discussed the best way to convey financial and ridership information to the MPO Board. John Hodges-Copple, Andy Henry, and Chair David Bonk discussed this project in relation to the MTP. There was discussion of the timeline for the MTP. Danny Rogers discussed the funding group's work on the LRT. Danny Rogers also discussed the reasons, primarily related to securing federal funding, for getting that project to the engineering phase. There was some discussion of the relationship between the BRT and LRT projects.

John Hodges-Copple and Geoff Green discussed the phrasing that should be used in recommending Amendment #2 to the MPO Board.

Cara Coppola stated that the line was blurred between the BRT and LRT and that it was important to clarify the relationship between these two projects moving forward.

Andy Henry stated that he would clarify that the Amendment was for the purpose of a federal program and more clearly discuss the financial aspects of this project when this Amendment goes before the MPO Board.

John Hodges-Copple moved to recommend that the MPO Board approve Amendment #2 to the 2040 MTP, and Kumar Neppalli seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. 2040 MTP Amendment #3 –D-O LRT Extension to NCCU

Andy Henry, LPA Staff

Danny Rogers, GoTriangle

GoTriangle conducted preliminary engineering and ridership forecasts for a proposed light rail station at North Carolina Central University (NCCU) and found the station to be feasible and capable of generating very high ridership. GoTriangle has requested that the MPO amend the definition of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) project and amend the 2040 MTP to include the NCCU station for the D-O LRT project.

Danny Rogers discussed the decision to extend the line to NCCU, the feasibility of the project from an engineering perspective, and sources of funding for this project. Danny Rogers reported that the extension to NCCU was well-supported by the City of Durham and that there were plans to take this matter before the Durham County Commissioners.

Pierre Osei-Owusu and Danny Rogers discussed whether there would be collaboration with local bus systems on this project.

John Hodges-Copple commented that he was excited about this extension, as the original line did not extend to East Durham.

Andy Henry and Chair David Bonk discussed the timeline for public input on this project and for taking this project before the MPO Board.

John Hodges-Copple and Danny Rogers discussed how this extension would affect funding for the Durham Center City Station. Danny Rogers clarified that the Durham Center City Station was not as costly

as adding an extension to the line and that the station would most likely be added. Danny Rogers stated that the cost of the Center City Station is considered part of the plan. Chair David Bonk inquired whether this extension might affect the possibility of other extensions on the line and was told that this extension does not preclude other extensions from an engineering perspective.

Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann moved to recommend that the MPO Board set a public hearing and set a public comment period on this proposed modification, and Pierre Osei-Owusu seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. 2045 MTP –Socioeconomic Data – Guide Totals

John Hodges-Copple, TJCOG

John Hodges-Copple presented the socio-economic guide totals to the TC. John Hodges-Copple stated that his team was particularly interested in university growth assumptions, especially in Orange County. John Hodges-Copple stated that university growth assumptions will have a large impact on the employment that needs to be accommodated and he would not get to a final recommended guide total until he could get to the university employment estimates. John Hodges-Copple promised to bring this item back to the TC at the October 2016 meeting along with a learning scenario.

Felix Nwoko and John Hodges-Copple discussed whether they should share numbers that had not been vetted by technical staff with the MPO Board.

Chair David Bonk questioned whether it would be useful to convey to the MPO Board that the work was still in process, but stated that an update on the learning scenarios might be helpful.

John Hodges-Copple described the three types of scenarios and stated that the learning scenario would be based on community plans information. John Hodges-Copple discussed the benefits of sharing the learning scenarios with decision makers.

Terry Bellamy, Andy Henry, and John Hodges-Copple discussed how Nash County's declining population will impact the model. John Hodges-Copple clarified that possibly half of North Carolina's counties are not growing, but that there are plans to consult with Nash County's planning department

about whether they were seeing growth. John Hodges-Copple noted that his growth-allocation tool does not allocate loss, and loss may have to be manually accounted for.

John Hodges-Copple and Laura Woods discussed the relationship between community and aspirational plans. John Hodges-Copple clarified that he was particularly interested in doing the community plans scenario well and getting feedback on it.

Max Bushell stated that he was happy that time was being set aside to look at the learning scenario. Max Bushell inquired about differences in the single and multi-family split in the Summary 1 and Summary 2 reports, and was told that these were designed to be examples only. Differences were due to the source of the data for each report.

Vice Chair Ellen Beckman and John Hodges-Copple discussed multi-family projections for Durham, Orange, and Wake counties. John Hodges-Copple used the example of Wake County to describe how he previously arrived at a good estimate of the split. John Hodges-Copple stated that the learning scenario should indicate whether there would be issues with estimating the split as there had been in the past.

This item was informational and did not require any action.

9. Goals/Objective/Performance Measures

Andy Henry, LPA Staff

The TC Staff worked with the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) and local planners from the DCHC MPO to reduce the number of Performance Measures from 72 to 41.

Andy Henry noted that forecasts can be created for most performance measures because the measures are primarily based on data from the Triangle Regional Model.

Chair David Bonk asked when these measures would be adopted by the MPO Board and was told that these measures would not be adopted until the very end. Andy Henry stated that these measures are usually taken to the MPO Board to get a go ahead to use them for evaluating different scenarios. Andy Henry stated that scenarios will not be available until January, and that these scenarios

will come along with a base and a target. These performance measures will be used to evaluate different scenarios at that point.

This item was informational and did not require any action.

10. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update

Andy Henry, LPA Staff

Julie Bollinger, NCDOT

The draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) was submitted to the NCDOT for their internal review which should be completed by the first week of October. The CTP and its format were presented at the September MPO Board meeting.

Andy Henry reviewed the differences between the CTP and the MTP. Chair David Bonk stated that he thought the differences were not necessarily just about duration and fiscal constraint, but about the fact that old data was used for the CTP and new data was being used for the MTP. Andy Henry added that he would emphasize these differences in the future. Andy Henry noted that the CTP contains all projects and all study segments. Andy Henry also reviewed the CTP schedule.

Andy Henry stated that the CTP would replace thoroughfare plans and presented a list of counties with thoroughfare plans. Chair David Bonk and Felix Nwoko discussed the transition from state-sponsored thoroughfare plans, to multi-modal Long Range Transportation Plans, and federally required CTPs. Andy Henry stated that the CTP matches pretty well with thoroughfare plans but that he would like to get together with local jurisdictions to go over changes between thoroughfare plans and CTPs. He clarified that there was no adopted CTP for the region, although there was a draft four years ago that went along with the MTP process. Andy Henry noted that Durham would be most impacted by this issue, followed by Chapel Hill and Orange County. This issue will have little effect on Carrboro and Hillsborough.

Andy Henry discussed plans to comply with complete streets for the CTP. Andy Henry and Chair David Bonk discussed the schedule for obtaining public input for the CTP and for releasing the CTP to the

MPO Board. Cara Coppola asked whether a schedule of commissioner meetings and Transportation Advisory Committee meetings would be helpful and was told that it would. Terry Bellamy, Julie Bollinger, and Andy Henry discussed whether NCDOT had a complete streets policy. Vice Chair Ellen Beckman, Chair David Bonk, and Terry Bellamy discussed how the inclusion of complete streets affects funding for sidewalk projects.

Andy Henry reminded the TC that NCDOT would only approve the maps, not the report that goes along with the maps. Chair David Bonk and Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann discussed the impact that the CTP and MTP might have on local governments.

Cara Coppola noted it might be easier to make amendments once the maps are adopted.

Vice Chair Ellen Beckman, Chair David Bonk, and Max Bushell considered hypothetical scenarios in order to clarify how the MTP and CTP would be used.

Geoff Green noted that roads were either existing, needs improvement, or recommended. Geoff Green stated that it is possible to improve a road without changing its footprint if it is only the maps that are being adopted.

Terry Bellamy and Andy Henry discussed the possibility of adding a complete streets policy statement to the report in light of national trends and local demand for better bicycle and sidewalk facilities.

Andy Henry stated that he would change his October presentation to the MPO Board based on feedback he received from the TC.

John Hodges-Copple stated that it might be helpful for the MPO Board to know when the NCDOT staff would use the CTP to make decisions. Chair David Bonk cited a project on US 15-501 to show how the CTP might be used for feasibility studies.

This item was informational and did not require any action.

11. Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Funding Distribution for FY18

271 Meg Scully, LPA Staff

272 On October 14, 2015, the MPO Board approved the formula and policy to distribute Surface
273 Transportation Program Direct Attribution (STP-DA) and Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds
274 to sub-recipients for FY2017 through FY2025 with the expectation that each year, prior to development
275 of the next year's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), the actual STP-DA and TAP allocation to
276 DCHC MPO would be entered into the formula as would the most recent certified National Transit
277 Database (NTD) data to be used in calculating the distribution to transit agencies. In December, 2015,
278 the approved formula was included as an attachment to provide background on an item addressing STP-
279 DA and TAP Funding for DCHC MPO Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects. At that time, the Board
280 expressed interest in reviewing the STP-DA/TAP distribution formula when it was again time to allocate
281 funds to sub-recipients for UPWP planning and other purposes.

282 Meg Scully stated that the Staff has plugged in the new FY18 STP-DA and TAP expected
283 allocation, and new NTD data in conjunction with local transit agencies, and was bringing this back to
284 the TC for review. This matter will also be presented to the MPO Board at its October 2016 meeting.
285 Meg Scully stated that the LPA routine planning and extra-planning budgets were decreased from last
286 year to better reflect what will be used in FY18, and noted that in FY19, they will increase again based
287 on expected needs in the UPWP.

288 Chair David Bonk and Meg Scully discussed how the FY18 STP-DA totals compared to last year's
289 estimates. Chair David Bonk asked for and received clarification about the \$570,000 that was put in
290 reserve.

291 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann stressed the need for oversight and noted that there are incentives
292 for looking at what is being proposed and potential tradeoffs. Meg Scully stated that Planning (PL) funds
293 are another piece of the formula and that they may also fluctuate. Chair David Bonk emphasized that
294 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann's point about oversight was well-made and noted that it makes sense for the

295 MPO Board to get a better idea of what they plan on spending in FY18. Chair David Bonk suggested that
296 it may be wise to get the oversight group together to better understand and assess how STP-DA funds
297 are being used. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann discussed the formula for determining the local discretionary
298 budget and cautioned that it varies. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann commented on the merits of making the
299 unobligated balance more transparent. Meg Scully discussed how the failure to implement projects
300 affects unobligated funds.

301 Chair David Bonk commented that the \$874,000 of combined STP-DA and TAP funds for regional
302 bicycle and pedestrian projects might be used for the Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road project. Chair David
303 Bonk highlighted a part of the program that stipulates that projects have to be regional in nature,
304 meaning they must span two jurisdictions. There was continued discussion of the regional stipulation of
305 this program and of the schedule for the Old Durham-Chapel Hill Road project. Vice Chair Ellen
306 Beckmann listed several projects that might benefit from this type of funding. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann
307 suggested holding a call for regional bicycle and pedestrian projects when the draft Transportation
308 Improvement Program (TIP) is released, and folding selected projects in the final TIP when it is adopted
309 in June 2017.

310 Dale McKeel asked whether there would be another Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Grant
311 Program (CMAQ) call for projects, and Meg Scully responded that she has been looking into this and
312 NCDOT reported that there is no plan to do so at this point.

313 Geoff Green asked for and received clarification about the source for vehicle data.

314 Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann clarified that she wanted to see the unobligated balance and the
315 local discretionary balance as an informational item at the next TC meeting. Felix Nwoko agreed to these
316 requests. Felix Nwoko and Meg Scully discussed some of the complications associated with figuring out
317 the unobligated balance. Vice Chair Ellen Beckman stated that knowing even the straight unobligated
318 balance might be helpful as these dollars would be at risk if there is a rescission.

Max Bushell and Felix Nwoko discussed the call for projects that would be a part of the TIP and whether projects needed to be on the regional map. Felix Nwoko clarified that projects would receive extra points if they are on the regional map. Meg Scully and Vice Chair Ellen Beckman briefly discussed the policy for selecting TAP projects.

Chair David Bonk asked why the TC was being asked to authorize the implementation of a policy that was already approved. Meg Scully stated that it was important to have the TC's recommendation before approaching the MPO Board. Meg Scully clarified that she was asking the TC to reaffirm its support of a previously approved distribution policy and reiterated that the policy has already been adopted.

Laura Woods moved to recommend that the board approve this FY18 STP-DA TAP distribution based on the previously approved formula but using actual STP-DA TAP allocation to the MPO, the most current certified NTD data, the 2010 census population data as that was the data used to allocate funds to the MPO, and the expected LPA routine and special planning budget for FY18 UPWP; and Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

12. Approval of Amendment #5 to the FY2016-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Meg Scully, LPA Staff

Amendment #5 to the DCHC MPO FY2016-2025 TIP proposes the addition of Section 5310 projects as approved in the Program of Projects on June 8, 2016 by the MPO Board, a modification to the funding year for a GoDurham CMAQ project, and requests from NCDOT including two modifications to schedules and the addition of a right-of-way project.

Dale McKeel noted that one of the amendments is for reimbursements for local divisions to review right of way certifications and new agreements for projects allow NCDOT to charge up to 10% for reviewing these projects. Dale McKeel stated that the relationship between the money that is approved for right-of-way certification and the money that NCDOT is charging needs to be understood. Dale McKeel stated that he would look into this issue and that it should not preclude adopting the

amendment. Vice Chair Ellen Beckman stated that it would be nice if each of these fees were treated the same as NCDOT is being paid 10% for each individual project. Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann stated that treating fees the same way would give local jurisdictions more certainty about project costs.

Geoff Green moved to recommend that the MPO Board approve Amendment #5 to the FY2016-2025 TIP, Vice Chair Ellen Beckmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

13. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) FY18 Development Schedule

Meg Scully, LPA Staff

The DCHC MPO is required by federal regulation to prepare a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) each year that details and guides the urban area transportation planning activities. Funding for the UPWP is provided on an annual basis by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The Lead Planning Agency (LPA) and jurisdictions that receive FHWA or FTA planning funds participate in the UPWP development process.

Meg Scully stated that the process is similar to last year and described the schedule for this process. Meg Scully asked TC members to do as much work as possible by the November deadline so that issues can be addressed ahead of time and changes are as minimal as possible.

Chair David Bonk stated that the oversight committee needs to meet and discuss their proposed program for next year with the MPO. Chair David Bonk stated that the local bodies need to get input from the MPO on the direction of next year's planning work.

Meg Scully added that the packet will include a list of activities for the LPA Staff produced by Felix Nwoko. Chair David Bonk suggested that it might be wise to discuss highlights of these activities at the October meeting and Felix Nwoko agreed.

No action was required by the TC for this item.

REPORTS:

14. Reports from the LPA Staff

Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff

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

15. Report from the DCHC MPO TC Chair

David Bonk, DCHC MPO TC Chair

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

16. NCDOT Reports

There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 5.

There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 7.

There was no additional report from NCDOT Division 8.

Julie Bollinger, NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch, stated that Chatham County and Siler City adopted a CTP on September 9, 2016. Goldston will adopt the CTP on October 3, 2016, and Triangle Area Rural Transportation Planning Organization (TARPO) is scheduled to approve the CTP on October 13.

Chair David Bonk and Julie Bollinger discussed whether the MPO would approve the CTP for the county, since it is part of the county. Julie Bollinger stated that the MPO area is not included, as it is in NCDOT's CTP, not the county's.

There was no additional report from NCDOT Traffic Operations.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

There were no informational items.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Technical Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 11:19 a.m.