

Section III		
Commentor	Comments	Response
Nish Trivedi	The normalization procedure allocates at least 90% of funds that come through the state to highway projects- Is this RFF focused on the 10% non-highway? Please keep in mind the non-highway is split between 6% transit and 4% all other non-highway	Yes, and noted.
Nish Trivedi	Capital Projects versus Local Area Planning and Feasibility Studies- What about transit? TDM below is transit. Transit is non-highway and part of NCDOT's 10% normalization practice+	Cannot use this type of money for operating projects, only for capital projects.
Nish Trivedi	Bicycle and pedestrian- What about transit? TDM below is Transit	Cannot use this type of money for operating projects, only for capital projects.
Nish Trivedi	By applying for a project through the RFF program, the applicant is committing to locally managing that project - Recommend this be clarified, not just submitting a project but actually doing the project.	Agreed
Eric Vitale	Why are safety projects not considered as eligible projects? They support ongoing initiatives such as Vision Zero and SS4A. Projects such as intersection improvements, roundabout construction, medians, and other safety enhancing infrastructure should be considered as viable projects. Typically include multi-modal facilities as well	With stipulations, Safety has been added.
Eric Vitale	Local versus Regional Plans and Projects - Can we get some clarification on this entire section and it's meaning?	With the processess for the Call and UPWP being streamlined this year, this section differentiates the appropriate submittal location
Eric Vitale	Transit agencies typically flex funds to the Federal Transit Administration, which requires less coordination with NCDOT - Should this be written more generically to encourage all agencies to flex where possible?	It is not encouraged for all agencies to flex funds to FTA due to the time the process takes.
Meg Scully	My only comment on this proposal is to ensure that the addition of safety projects to eligible projects are safety projects specifically for bike/ped/transit safely and that roadway projects are still not allowed as eligible projects under this funding stream.	Text has been revised for clarity.
Aaron Cain	Under "3)", adding "ly adopted" seems redundant as later in the sentence it refers to plans having to be adopted by a local governing body. If you ad "ly adopted", you can probably get rid of the later clause in that sentence.	I agree that it does sound redundant, but I would prefer to leave it in so that readers are crystal clear.

Section IV		
Commentor	Comments	Response
Nish Trivedi	Transportation Demand Management - When did MPO start getting TDM funds? I thought this was the COG's funding source, not MPOs.	Correct, Central Pines is the administrator of this program.
Nish Trivedi	CMAQ funds will be requested for DCHC MPO's share of the TDM program - TDM is state (link) funded to COGs and Transit agencies, and separate from CMAQ. Is it really a good idea to mix the two together?	The two are not together. A note referencing this has been added.
Nish Trivedi	NCDOT makes the final funding determination for CMAQ project submittals - Hence CMAQ and TDM are unique. Regional Council has better control of TDM as does NCDOT.	Noted.
Eric Vitale	Transportation Demand Management - How is the TDM program prioritized for funding in relation to other projects and programs? It is not clearly outlined in the policy.	The TDM program is on equal footing with other projects and programs. Projects from this program are often chosen due to the goals of the program aligning with goals of the MPO.

Section V		
Commentor	Comments	Response
Nish Trivedi	Previously it was agreed that shovel ready projects would be prioritized, shortfall is vague. This funding resources should not be treated as a bailout or cover contingencies for locally administered projects.	Agreed that it should not be treated as a bailout. Projects that move forward in their schedule will be prioritized.
Nish Trivedi	What is that number, and is this a means of establishing some form of geographic equity?	The number is in the chart below that section and comes from the UPWP local match cost sharing.
Nish Trivedi	Why would jurisdictions be allowed projects over the cap? If each jurisdiction gets one project then there shouldn't be anyone going over that number unless other jurisdictions do not have any to submit. With Orange County getting into the bike/ped business, we would like to start submitting projects during next call for projects.	With projects becoming active/inactive, it is possible to exceed 20 projects.
Eric Vitale	What defines a "Substantial change in scope"?	Examples have been added to the policy.
Eric Vitale	Request to modify to 300k receiving 30 projects	Request is noted.
Aaron Cain	This comment is more substantive, and one that may warrant some discussion during the TC meeting. I'm concerned about the last bullet point in the second paragraph. I think requiring a new application for any cost increase over 10% is going to catch just about every project that has a cost increase. How many projects have had a cost increase of less than 10% in recent years? I suggest that you consider either increasing that threshold or removing that criteria. What we don't want are projects that have been funded, gotten started, and then have a cost increase. But, because they have a cost increase of greater than 10%, they then need to apply as a new project and don't score as well, so they don't get the funding. What do we do then with a partially funded project?	Thank you for explaining your reasoning with this comment. I agree with wanting to avoid having partially funded projects. The threshold has been increased to 100%.

Section VI		
Commentor	Comments	Response
Eric Vitale	Due to the high administrative burden associated with RFF projects, the total project cost is required to be at least \$100,000 - Consider increase in amount. Match w USDOT standards of \$250k?	Project cost has been increased to \$250k.
Eric Vitale	Individual projects – 40% of federal funding available - What is the rationale behind the 40%?	Percentages are based on population
Eric Vitale	All projects submitted by an agency – 65% of federal funding available - Although previously expressed, the City of Durham still has some concerns regarding the 65% cap set on agencies for federal funding availability? What is the basis for the 65% cap? Is this something we can discuss modifying? Shouldn't the distribution of funding for projects and plans reach the residents who need it the most? We can pull data to support this if this is a realistic consideration for revisions to be made	Request is noted.
Eric Vitale	MPO's Discretion meaning what exactly? MPO staff? MPO Board?	MPO Staff
Aaron Cain	Under “Multi-Year Funding”, I don’t understand what the new last sentence in the first paragraph is referring to. Can you clarify?	This sentence was created to account for projects that require additional funding outside of the call. With inflation this is occurring more often as I’m sure you could imagine.

Section VII		
Commentor	Comments	Response
Eric Vitale	Should a universal cost estimator be identified as the main source for cost estimate generation?	Agreed, but one has not been agreed upon at this time.
Eric Vitale	Why do just CMAQ projects require a 5% inflation cost to be built in? And how are we going to know to build that in when the MPO selects the funding source post-submittal?	To count for this, all projects will be requiring a 5% inflation cost.
Aaron Cain	Under "Cost Estimates" I suggest adding the word "annual", so it reads "All RFF projects require a 5% annual inflation cost built in."	Request is noted.

Section VIII		
Commentor	Comments	Response
Eric Vitale	We would like to request a preview of the draft scores prior to being voted on in the Board agenda	We will work with our members to accommodate this request.

Section X		
Commentor	Comments	Response
Eric Vitale	Public Involvement - If conducted in this manner, what is the purpose of the 21 day comment period?	It is conducted this way to avoid excessive delays to the process.
	Note: Projects that are recommended for CMAQ funds will first need to be approved by NCDOT before being added to the STIP. Delays are also possible pending the STIP adoption timeline. Sounds like it would make more sense to have a separate CMAQ Call For Projects? OR could we potentially identify projects that need to move in a more timely manner to not be included in consideration of CMAQ funds? OR can we identify CMAQ funded project potentials first?	The two are separate. The text has been modified for clarity.

Appendices		
Commentor	Comments	Response
Eric Vitale	1/4 of a mile is low and inconsistent with the federal standard of 1/2 or 3/4 of a mile	A range of lengths has been provided.
Eric Vitale	Could we get some clarification as to what would go into a monthly schedule? Seems a bit much for a project that may still be at the planning level.	Sentence has been updated for clarity. A schedule of what is happening every month is not what is being asked for, but rather what month and year are milestones in the project such as obtaining ROW or bids opening.
Eric Vitale	Percent Increase in Request Over First Budget - Is "first budget" really a fair criteria to grade on? It is stated above that there is an emphasis on getting existing projects completed and out the door prior to starting new projects, but this dampers the scoring on some projects such as Morreene and Hillandale that have been in the pipeline for a while, received multiple pots of funding, but have had some unexpected complications. If this does stay as is, it is highly recommended that "Previously Received Shortfall Funds" is eliminated because it is indicating almost the same thing.	Noted, the MPO will proceed as is.