

**DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION DCHC MPO BOARD**

**February 10, 2016**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization DCHC MPO Board met on February 10, 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:

Steve Schewel (MPO Board Chair)	City of Durham
Damon Seils (MPO Board Vice Chair)	Town of Carrboro
Don Moffitt (Member)	City of Durham
Ellen Reckhow (Member)	Durham County
Bernadette Pelissier (Member)	GoTriangle
Barry Jacobs (Member)	Orange County
Brian Lowen (Member)	Town of Hillsborough
Pam Hemminger (Member)	Town of Chapel Hill
Ed Harrison (Alternate)	Town of Chapel Hill
Joey Hopkins	NCDOT, Division 5
Patrick Wilson	NCDOT, Division 7
Craig Benedict	Orange County
Tom Altieri	Orange County
Bergen Watterson	Town of Carrboro
Tina Moon	Town of Carrboro
David Bonk	Town of Chapel Hill
John Hodges-Copple	Triangle J Council of Governments
Patrick McDonough	GoTriangle
Geoff Green	GoTriangle
Ray King	GoTriangle
Mark Ahrendsen	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
Ellen Beckmann	City of Durham
Bryan Poole	City of Durham
Eddie Dancausse	Federal Highway Administration
Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
Lindsay Smart	DCHC MPO
Dale McKeel	DCHC MPO
Brian Rhodes	DCHC MPO

Quorum Count: 8 of 11 Voting Members

Chair Steve Schewel called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. A roll call was performed. The Voting Members and Alternate Voting Members of the DCHC MPO Board were identified and are indicated above. Chair Steve Schewel reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was being circulated.

#### **PRELIMINARIES:**

##### **Ethics Reminder**

Chair Steve Schewel read the Ethics Reminder and asked if there were any known conflicts of interest with respect to matters coming before the DCHC MPO Board, and requested that if there were any identified during the meeting for them to be announced.

Don Moffitt stated he was surprised to get an email from the State Ethics Commission (SEC) for his disclosure statement. The impression he got from the email was that he shouldn't be voting on matters until the SEC signs off on his disclosure statements. Lindsay Smart stated that Don Moffitt is correct. Lindsay Smart indicated that new DCHC MPO Board members that have not completed the Real Estate Disclosure (RED) and the Statement of Economic Interest (SEI) forms, and have not received letters of approval from the SEC cannot vote today. Chair Steve Schewel asked whether Don Moffitt still count as a part of the quorum. Lindsay Smart responded that Don Moffitt can be counted in the quorum.

Brian Lowen stated his situation is the same as Don Moffitt, meaning that he got an email too, and stated he will take care of it. Chair Steve Schewel stated he thinks all Board members need to do the same. The 2016 State Ethics Commission's requirements are due by April 15, 2016. Chair Steve Schewel concurred.

##### **Adjustments to the Agenda**

Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any adjustments to the agenda. Mark Ahrendsen stated that there are two things hand-outs in front of the Board members. One is the replacement for item #13; a handout that Lindsay Smart will address. The next one is information related to the SEC ethics requirements, available for review. Mark Ahrendsen stated that Lindsay Smart indicated that someone from the SEC may be available at the next meeting to go over the handout and any questions the DCHC MPO Board might have.

69           **Public Comments**

70           Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any members of the public signed up to speak. There were no  
71 members of the public signed up to speak during the meeting.

72           **Directives to Staff**

73           The Directives to Staff were included in the agenda packet for review. Ed Harrison stated at the last  
74 meeting, the DCHC MPO Board asked GoTriangle to provide regular updates on the Durham- Orange Light Rail  
75 Transit (D-O LRT) project. He mentioned that Chapel Hill may want updates from GoTriangle on D-O LRT project  
76 more frequently than quarterly, as the project is moving forward quickly. Chair Steve Schewel stated the DCHC  
77 MPO Board decided to have quarterly reports from GoTriangle. Chair Steve Schewel stated he thinks if Board  
78 members would like to hear GoTriangle on a more frequent basis, they should let the DCHC MPO Board,  
79 GoTriangle, and Patrick McDonough know their interest. Mark Ahrendsen stated, should something come up  
80 between quarterly reports, Go Triangle staff will bring it to the DCHC MPO Board's attention. Ed Harrison stated  
81 please do so.

82           Chair Steve Schewel asked if there was any discussion on the Directives to Staff. There was no further  
83 discussion.

84                                           **CONSENT AGENDA:**

85           **6. & 7. Approval of December 9, 2015 and January 13, 2016 Meetings Minutes**

86           Chair Steve Schewel asked if there was any discussion on the December 9, 2015, meeting minutes.  
87 Chair Steve Schewel and Vice Chair Damon Seils provided comments and suggested editorial revisions to the  
88 minutes. Chair Steve Schewel commented that on line 290 the word ethnicity should be replaced with  
89 specificity. Vice Chair Damon Seils stated that he has the same correction and sent Brian Rhodes and Lindsay  
90 Smart a few other corrections. Vice Chair Damon Seils asked if he needed to read the corrections. Chair Steve  
91 Schewel stated that the DCHC MPO Board probably prefers Vice Chair Damon Seils not to read them.

Pam Hemminger submitted an email correction to the MPO Staff for the January 13, 2016, meeting minutes that on line 250 remove Mark Ahrendsen's name and replace the name with Mark Kleinschmidt and add Damon Seils as attendants to a meeting.

Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to approve both sets of the minutes: December 9, 2015 DCHC MPO Board Meeting Minutes and January 13, 2016 DCHC MPO Board Meeting Minutes. A motion was made by Vice Chair Damon Seils and Ed Harrison seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**8. Proposed Transit Service Changes for the US 15/501 Corridor**  
**Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle**

Patrick McDonough represented Jon Dodson from GoTriangle. Patrick McDonough noted that the DCHC MPO Board requested quarterly updates. He stated GoTriangle will provide the DCHC MPO Board on March 9<sup>th</sup> their first quarterly report. He reiterated if there is anything that Board would like to hear specifically, to contact him or GoTriangle. He also indicated that GoTriangle is already working on the material for the report.

Patrick McDonough provided a website link to Our Transit Future that contains information about the public transit projects in Durham, Orange, and Wake counties bus and rail investment plans, and public involvement activities. Patrick McDonough stated that the website shows all the improvements that were made for Chapel Hill Transit, GoDurham, GoTriangle, and Orange Public Transportation services. Patrick McDonough stated that the website also shows the letters that have been sent to the city managers and county managers with each year detailing which funds are available. Patrick McDonough continued to explain that the website provides transparency of the money and the actual services that are rolling on the road as well as containe copies of the two annual reports for fiscal years 2013 and 2014, but not 2015. Patrick McDonough stated he has been working with GoTriangle staff in Public Involvement to update thea web pages. It now actually lists all of the projects. Patrick McDonough stated that the website links to the review public comments and project updates is as follows: [www.ourtransitfuture.com/projects/bus](http://www.ourtransitfuture.com/projects/bus).

Ed Harrison suggested that the website link be checked as he was unable to open the link, and Patrick McDonough repeated the website link name as above.

Patrick McDonough presented the Proposed Transit Service Changes for the US 15/501 Corridor. He elaborated on several elements of the proposal including the rationale for changes, the anticipated results, and recommendations. GoTriangle is trying to improve their efficiency. GoTriangle provides services in the corridor from US 15/501 Durham, all the way to Chapel Hill. GoTriangle is not proposing any changes to Chapel Hill Transit and routes, nor removing any service from Durham.

Patrick McDonough stated that every morning in Chapel Hill two GoTriangle buses pull up to a bus stop at almost the same time and leave for Durham only moments apart. One bus takes 15 minutes longer to get to Durham because the bus goes out to a more obscure route in Durham, and this frustrates customers. Patrick McDonough stated that GoTriangle's goal is to provide faster Regional Service, which is to include 15 minutes at peak from Chapel Hill to Durham. It currently takes 30 minute at peak. GoTriangle would increase the frequency to give people more departure choices. Another part of the Orange County improvement investment plan is that GoTriangle would extend the peak service to Carrboro since it is an extension of the US 15/501 corridor. Carrboro currently does not have the service.

Patrick McDonough discussed GoTriangle's primary service along the US 15/501 corridor that was indicated in the presentation. Patrick McDonough explained route 405 (Durham and Patterson) sort of the light blue, and the route 400 (Durham and Chapel Hill) which has the deviation.

Patrick McDonough stated the Robertson Scholar Express Bus (RSX) is the yellow line that starts from Duke Chapel in Durham and goes to the Morehead Planetarium in Chapel Hill. As GoTriangle looks forward, the Robinson Scholar Express is not changing, but the accessing service is proposed for a change. For change, what GoTriangle is doing is streamlining the service. Patrick McDonough stated GoTriangle is removing service in the Route 400 deviation from SW Durham Drive, Old Chapel Hill Road, and University Drive on the Regional Service. Patrick McDonough stated GoTriangle will be adding back some of the service to GoDurham bus routes. Patrick

McDonough stated GoTriangle has been working on Park and Ride opportunity of Patterson Place. Patrick McDonough stated people were doing some parks and ride there already through the Durham Ordinance. Patrick McDonough stated Park-and-Rides served along route Durham Station (150 spaces) and Patterson Place (77 spaces) parking lots.

Patrick McDonough stated that the service and the current configuration of the 405 and 400 routes are much more different primarily because of the area, and it makes the travel time difference as described in the presentation. The services are closely identical with one route dipping in Patterson Place between Durham and Chapel Hill as one acting as Express Style. Also, Express Style during peak hours will begin in Carrboro and go on tracing the other route to Durham, as people arriving from Durham, it goes to the hospital first then goes back to 54 and resets in Carrboro.

Patrick McDonough stated riders will be able to ride the yellow line routes which has the Carrboro segment through Chapel Hill onto Durham. The scheduled travel time for weekday peaks is 35 to 59 minutes, Midday/Saturday is 55 to 60 minutes; and Night/Sunday is 50 to 55 minutes. GoTriangle built their schedules to acknowledge when traffic is heavier; they cut the corridor top end trip time down from 59 to about 50 minutes and about 9 minutes also off on midday and Saturday, and receive 9 minutes at night time.

Ed Harrison asked for clarification about the yellow line that starts at Jones Ferry Road Park and Ride. Patrick McDonough stated it is Jones Ferry Road at Abbey Court. Ed Harrison asked if it the only stops downtown Carrboro. Patrick McDonough stated there will be a stop discussion later in the presentation. GoTriangle does need to do some stop consolidation. The more the bus stops the slower the service is.

Patrick McDonough stated along East Franklin Street and Erwin Road, GoTriangle has to think about how many stops to continue to serve; this is an analyzed study. Also, when riding the 405 route, it will show today where three or four stops are having a heavy Boarding area. Ellen Reckhow stated the scheduled has a half an hour, but two routes leaving different half hours are staggered. Patrick McDonough stated at the upper end of

the travel time this little organization saves about 9 minutes between Durham and Chapel Hill most of the travel period.

Patrick McDonough stated the frequency is one of the big advances, and it is every 30 minutes and a few minutes ago it was uneven. In downtown Chapel Hill in the morning, there are two buses leaving for Durham at the same time, and one of them will get there 15 minutes slower than the other. The people traveling that direction may feel there are not many choices. The people are leaving Durham every 30 minutes from the Durham station. By one being slower, the people might not feel like there is a choice, and will need to get there the right time to leave on the bus if not 30 minutes before next bus. With the average departure, it will be every 15 minutes instead of every 30 minutes. It will not be exactly 15 minutes, even when the schedule pans out because of the stop at Patterson Place; it might be 12 minutes to 18 minutes.

Patrick McDonough stated the frequency existing for weekday peak is every 30 (uneven) minutes, Midday/Saturday is every 60 minutes; and Night/Sunday is every 60 minutes. He stated that GoTriangle team would like to go to the frequency existing; however, with the funding allocated this year, this is where the target hit.

Patrick McDonough asked for questions before he continued the presentation. Ellen Reckhow asked if there are any hidden or unintended consequences. There was a recent article a few days ago related to these changes in the Bull City buses and others. Patrick McDonough stated there are some consequences that we know of, and what they are. Patrick McDonough stated the area with University Drive, Patterson Place, and Garrett Road are the lowest ridership territory out there. As part of the GoTriangle improvement investment plan, this area is going to have a service eliminated. The improvements can be made along the US 15-501 corridor regionally. GoDurham will pick up most of the people who are affected by the change. There are some changes to Route 10 that is sort of a streamlining when getting on University Drive.

Chair Steve Schewel asked what the reduced travel time would be for travel from for Woodcroft to Duke? Mark Ahrendsen and Patrick McDonough agreed the reduce trip time should be 25 minutes to 30

minutes. Mark Ahrendsen stated the reduce trip time with two buses running an hour; it should be 30 minutes.

Patrick McDonough stated a trip today from Woodcroft to Duke travel time would be 45 minutes to an hour.

Ellen Reckhow asked if there will be a park and ride opportunity at the south end of the new Route 10A.

Patrick McDonough stated that there is a Park and Ride option at the Woodcroft Shopping Center. Mark

Ahrendsen stated the South Square area has parking spaces for Park and Ride. Patrick McDonough stated

GoTriangle would look at the areas if the right opportunity emerged. He recapped that new service from the

Woodcroft area, which is on the map as pink, purple for future routes, and up to Duke can be relined. A rider

can transfer anywhere on University Drive. GoTriangle has made more bus routes accessible and no longer as

isolated. There are routes with two buses that make it easier to transfer.

Ellen Reckhow asked how close the routes are to the low income housing areas on Shannon Road. Mark

Ahrendsen stated that some residents could walk up Shannon Road to University Drive. Chair Steve Schewel

stated that there is no sidewalk on Shannon Road. There was additional discussion about providing sidewalks

and improving connectivity of existing sidewalks on Shannon Road for access to a library and to bus transit.

Patrick McDonough stated he will get with the GoTriangle service team and bring back an answer.

Patrick McDonough presented the impacts of the US 15-501 service improvement to the customers. He

stated it is removing the Route 400 deviation along SW Durham Drive, Old Chapel Hill Road, and University

Drive. The people living in this section will not have direct bus access anymore and will walk further due to the

fact of the lowest ridership in the corridor. They will need to drive to Patterson Place for Park and Ride. In

addition, to keep the travel time down, stop consolidation is very important. GoTriangle lost seven minutes in

travel time between Durham and Chapel Hill in the last two years. This will be considered a way to streamline

the route, especially on East Franklin Street and Erwin Road where there is more urban stopping. Patrick

McDonough explained that the map shows the urban areas where the people need to be informed of the stop

consolidation, example on the map – stops at AB, ACE, or E rather than ABCDE area. This will help keep



210 everyone on time. There are ways to get to the Durham station via Route 10 through Duke/VA, the New  
211 Woodcroft, the South Square and Duke/VA.

212 Ed Harrison asked if the Blue Route will stop at all the existing stops on East Franklin Street. Patrick  
213 McDonough stated that GoTriangle had not made a determination yet. It will be analyzed to see if some or any  
214 will be eliminated.

215 Vice Chair Damon Seils asked about riders that travel to stops via bicycle. Vice Chair Damon Seils  
216 requested that if stops are consolidated, there should be a focus on providing adequate and secure bicycle  
217 parking. Some of the stops that were being discussed do not currently have adequate bicycle parking.

218 Patrick McDonough stated that amenities will be considered as part of stop consolidation.

219 Patrick McDonough stated that the Park-and-Ride serves routes along Durham and Patterson Place. He  
220 stated GoTriangle is trying to finalize the proposal this month. The timeline for GoTriangle to finalize the  
221 proposal starting in March or April (Outreach the Surveying as well as stakeholder and public meetings); April or  
222 May is GoTriangle approval months; and August is the month for service implementation. Patrick McDonough  
223 stated Jon Dodson is the lead project manager for this project.

224 Ellen Reckhow asked if there will be bus shelters at the new consolidated stops. Patrick McDonough  
225 responded that this question is similar to the question that Vice Chair Damon Seils asked about bicycle parking.  
226 Patrick McDonough stated that GoTriangle considers existing amenities as part of the bus stop consolidation  
227 process. Patrick McDonough stated he is sure that GoTriangle staff will look at bus stops without shelters

228 Chair Steve Schewel thanked Patrick McDonough for his excellent presentation. Vice Chair Damon Seils  
229 thanked Patrick McDonough with his assistant on the Carrboro service extension. They had waited for years for  
230 it to be completed.

231 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the MPO DCHC MPO Board on  
232 the Proposed Transit Service Changes for the US 15/501 Corridor presentation. Chair Steve Schewel asked for a

233 motion to receive the Proposed Transit Service Changes for the US 15/501 Corridor presentation. A motion was  
234 made by Bernadette Pelissier and seconded by Vice Chair Damon Seils. The motion carried unanimously.

235  
236 **9. Proposed DCHC Methodology for Ranking Projects and Allocating Local Input Points (SPOT P4.0)**  
237 **Lindsay Smart, LPA staff**

238 Lindsay Smart presented the Proposed DCHC Methodology for Ranking Projects and Allocating Local  
239 Input Points (SPOT P4.0). Lindsay Smart stated this agenda item comes to the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board with  
240 the recommendation from the Technical Committee that the MPO Board to review the Methodology and  
241 approve the draft Methodology to be released for public review and comment. The Methodology will be sent to  
242 the NCDOT Review Committee and will come back in March for approval from the DCHC MPO Board.

243 Lindsay Smart stated that the Allocation of Local Input Points begins on page 15. The previous pages in  
244 in the Methodology describe the process the DCHC MPO Board has been going through since June 2015. These  
245 pages discuss how the priority lists of projects to be submitted to SPOT were developed. The project lists were  
246 brought to the DCHC MPO Board in August, September, and October for review and approval, and then the  
247 MPO Staff were approved to submit the final list of projects to the SPOT P4.0 online tool. These pages and this  
248 process does not have the same formal review requirement that the section on the Allocation of Local Input  
249 Points does for NCDOT.

250 As NCDOT begins to release the SPOT raw scores in late February or early March, project scores will  
251 available for each of the three funding tiers, Statewide, Regional, and Division. As the scores for the project and  
252 funding tiers are released, the DCHC MPO Board will have an opportunity to review the scores and determine  
253 which projects to assign Local Input Points. The DCHC MPO has 1,800 Local Input Points in the Regional  
254 category and the Divisional category, just like last time. There will be discussions with the Division and District  
255 Engineer to try to maximize all the points. The DCHC MPO Board can put points on a project and the hope is  
256 that Division and District Engineers from NCDOT will put points on the same project. If the project does not  
257 need those entire points to get it over the benchmark to receive funding, the MPO will not waste the points.

The minimum amount of points needed to get a project funded will be allocated to a project. This will maximize the number of projects that receive points and hopefully receive funding.

Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions. Chair Steve Schewel asked what does Transportation Management Area (TMA) means, what does it means to us here? TMAs are urbanized areas greater than 200,000 people. Chair Steve Schewel read from the handout Methodology for Identifying and Ranking New Transportation Improvement Program Project Requests (dated 2.10.16) page 1 – When the results of the SPOT Prioritization process are made available, the MPO will follow this Methodology to rank projects and assign Local Input Points to high priority projects. Chair Steve Schewel stated he thought our points were put on before the prioritization process, how does that work. Lindsay Smart stated the MPO Local Input Points have not been assigned to any projects yet, and as NCDOT starts to release the scores for projects we submitted this past fall, then we will have the opportunity to assign our Local Input Points. Chair Steve Schewel asked where does NCDOT prioritization comes from. Lindsay Smart stated the prioritization is the SPOT tool that evaluates projects based on quantifiable data. It is NCDOT data-driven quantitative scoring process. Chair Steve Schewel asked NCDOT is prioritizing based on what, before it comes to us for our level. Lindsay Smart stated NCDOT is just scoring projects based on their data evaluation. NCDOT is not prioritizing projects; they are just scoring projects. Lindsay Smart reminded everyone of the procedure the DCHC MPO Board used in the fall 2015 to review data and identify the projects for submission to NCDOT SPOT tool. Lindsay Smart explained the data sets were reviewed by NCDOT, MPOs, and local jurisdictions and agencies in late January. After receiving the data from NCDOT SPOT's office, DCHC MPO was allowed about a week to review projects and provide any updates and corrections to projects that were submitted to the SPOT online tool. Lindsay Smart shared some examples of information received from the NCDOT's SPOT office such as the cost estimate may not be right, and here is what it should be, or here is the feasibility study. Technical staff from all the jurisdictions provide assistance with reviewing and provided corrections to the projects. The updates were submitted to NCDOT's SPOT office on Friday, February 5, 2016. Chair Steve Schewel stated that's not a real prioritization or it is

282 informative. Lindsay Smart stated it is just evaluation of projects, not prioritization. Mark Ahrendsen stated it is  
283 the quantitative data-driven process up to that point. Vice Chair Damon Seils stated we assigned our points  
284 trying to piggyback on what the scores indicate, to get the best outcome for us. Lindsay Smart stated some  
285 projects do very well and we hope all our projects do well so that not as many projects need points to get  
286 funded in the TIP.

287 Chair Steve Schewel asked why the Board would put Local Input Points to projects and and it's required  
288 that we put them in the TIP. He read "participation in the STI process through submitting projects for  
289 evaluation and/or allocating Local Input Points to projects does not require the MPO to include these projects in  
290 the TIP." Chair Steve Schewel stated he wondered why we do that. Lindsay Smart stated that some projects  
291 arise through this process that the DCHC MPO may not support. The statement that Chair Schewel just read is a  
292 disclaimer for projects that go through STI that may not achieve the goals or may not be the desire of the DCHC  
293 MPO DCHC MPO Board. By federal legislation, we are allowed to not include certain projects if the Board so  
294 chooses.

295 Chair Steve Schewel referred to page 16 of the ranking processes for the Allocation of Local Input Points.  
296 He wanted to know do we have to lock in or if it would be possible just to retain total flexibility, or do we need  
297 to say that or methodology. He wanted to know are we putting "X" numbers of points on the various  
298 categories. He asked is it required or would you rather have more flexibility or just say that 1,800 points now or  
299 later. Ellen Beckmann stated she remembered that the last time we didn't have it in there, and then we  
300 submitted it for approval and NCDOT said the MPO shave to have something that says how the points will be  
301 distributed by modes. Ellen Beckmann stated I think it had to be written in it, and it is still in there about certain  
302 modes and some that are flexible, but you know with all of this where is the caveat that the DCHC MPO Board  
303 can do something different as long as it is for a reason, documented, and explained. Ellen Beckmann confirmed  
304 to Chair Steve Schewel that the DCHC MPO Board does have flexibility.

Ed Harrison referred to the Summary Table: Ranking Processes for the Allocation of Local Input Points on page 1. He referenced to the mode/project type column for bicycle and pedestrian on page 16 that the note in the funding category/regional column reads: No. The STI legislation does not allow any bike/ped to be considered for regional funding. He stated the continuing problem for him is that we have all these bi-divisional projects that need to happen, in particular, the Old Durham, Chapel Hill Road project. Lindsay Smart stated STI does not allow us to submit bike/ped projects in the regional funding category,.

Don Moffitt asked about the word “cascades” on page 16 which is under the table in the statement of “if a Statewide project cascades down to the regional category, it will be scored according to the Regional Methodology.” Lindsay Smart stated highway projects that are eligible to be scored and funded in the statewide category, they will be scored as Statewide, Regional, and Division category. This is the way a project cascades down. Lindsay Smart stated a local road that is a Division project or Regional project cannot also be scored at the Statewide tier, it is not eligible. So if it is eligible in the highest tier, the project is then eligible in the lowest tier, as well. Don Moffitt stated thank you.

Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any other comments for Lindsay Smart.

Don Mofitt stated there was a reference to RPO’s. Lindsay Smart stated that RPOs have Local Input Points just like MPOs.

Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the Proposed DCHC Methodology for Ranking Projects and Allocating Local Input Points (SPOT P4.0). Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to approve the draft Methodology and be released for public comments review and comment period, with any comments from the DCHC MPO Board incorporated as necessary of the Proposed DCHC Methodology for Ranking Projects and Allocating Local Input Points (SPOT P4.0). A motion was made by Vice Chair Damon Seils and seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried unanimously.

**10. Draft FY2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**  
**Meg Scully, LPA Staff**

330 Meg Scully presented the Draft FY2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Meg Scully provided  
331 background and an update on the changes that have been made since the DCHC MPO Board last reviewed of  
332 the FY2017 draft UPWP. The DCHC MPO is required by federal regulations to prepare an annual UPWP that  
333 details and guides the urban area transportation activities.

334 Meg Scully stated attachments have been provided to explain each UPWP change.

335 Meg Scully provided a summary of the list of changes in general category that have occurred: (1) minor  
336 edits identified during the review process; (2) re-allocation of City of Durham funds among various task codes to  
337 better reflect work to be performed in FY17; (3) addition of funds by Chapel Hill for the two-year Transportation  
338 and Connectivity Study (unused funds from FY16 will be de-obligated with the next FY16 amendment); and (4)  
339 addition of four regional studies with local match (funds were unused and de-obligated from FY16 UPWP).

340 Meg Scully stated that the Technical Committee (TC) recommended that the DCHC MPO Board hold a  
341 public hearing and approve the FY2017 UPWP including the resolution, self-certification process, and local  
342 match.

343 Ellen Reckhow asked about the study of the interaction between the NC 54 corridor and the D-O LRT.  
344 The DCHC MPO Board discussed merging planning for the D-O-LRT.

345 Mark Ahrendsen indicated that the integration of the NC 54 corridor and the D-O LRT project will be  
346 studied through the environmental process.

347 Ellen Reckhow stated the only thing is that at the last Durham-Chapel Hill workgroup meeting they had a  
348 discussion of might wanting to revisit the NC 54 corridor study. There are some interest in it, possibly  
349 massaging is not, it is less highway like and more multimodal friendly. That will require some revisiting and  
350 planning. There was additional discussion about concerns that Ellen Reckhow had regarding the corridor  
351 becoming more multi-modal to support the future D-O LRT.

352 Joey Hopkins (NCDOT Division 5) stated he agrees with Mark Ahrendsen, multi-modal connections  
353 would be considered during environmental. Chair Steve Schewel asked if the considerations that Ellen Reckhow

354 raises would be able to be incorporated in the process we have ongoing. Joey Hopkins stated that any comment  
355 like that, from the MPO Staff to our project team, is that project starts the project development process. Joey  
356 Hopkins stated we got the study that would certainly inform that project development process for NC 54. If  
357 there are any additional comments or concerns, they should be transmitted to NCDOT. Ellen Reckhow stated  
358 Chapel Hill has expressed some concerns about it. Ed Harrison stated Barbee Chapel Road and Ellen Reckhow  
359 agreed. Ellen Reckhow stated I think assuming that light rail does not end up in the corridor making sure that  
360 the corridor is very pedestrian and bike friendly will be critical.

361 Ellen Reckhow stated that perhaps a separate agenda item is needed to review and remember the NC  
362 54 corridor study. The future agenda item would revisit outcomes from the corridor study and provide DCHC  
363 MPO Board members an opportunity to comment and feel confident that their concerns are being heard.  
364 Especially because the D-O LRT project alignment has changed, the NC 54 corridor study was prepared since  
365 then. Mark Ahrendsen stated that the NC 54 corridor study is available for review online and staff could provide  
366 a summary presentation in the spring. He stated it has been a while since the NC 54 corridor study was  
367 completed. In addition to a summary, it might be helpful to have the presentation explain what the expected  
368 process would be for the NC 54 corridor project, and the light rail project and how they interface and capture if  
369 there is an opportunity to do that. Mark Ahrendsen stated go back and revisit the corridor study and simply  
370 take the concerns expressed and insure they are addressed in the next step for both of those projects.

371 Ellen Reckhow stated major changes have occurred since the NC 54 corridor study.

372 Chair Steve Schewel thanked Joey Hopkins and stated it sounds like NCDOT would need formal input.

373 Joey Hopkins stated yes, and to Mark Ahrendsen's comment about providing input, there are certainly  
374 opportunities throughout that process to do it. The MPO staff will be involved directly with the project  
375 development process, also opportunities for the public to comment too in both the development side and the  
376 design side.

Barry Jacob asked about the Carrboro Town Hall meeting minutes or notes from the NC 54 west in Orange County that was held in the fall. He asked the MPO staff for a summary. Lindsay Smart stated that a meeting summary was prepared and circulated. She stated it was sent to the town of Carrboro for distribution. Lindsay Smart agreed to circulate the meeting summary again.

Felix Nwoko commented he has met again to flush out the a scope for a planning study for the corridor. He stated the MPO Staff met with Orange County and Carrboro staff.

Chair Steve Schewel requested Lindsay Smart send the DCHC MPO Board a copy of the meeting summary.

Meg Scully suggested the MPO Board open the public hearing for comments on the UPWP.

Chair Steve Schewel opened the public hearing for the comments on the Draft FY2017 UPWP.

Chair Steve Schewel asked for comments from the DCHC MPO Board.

Don Moffitt asked about page 32 task 3c5 – safety and drug control planning, and asked for clarification.

Felix Nwoko responded that it is regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) safety activities as conducting a drug control environment under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) program for operators of transit agencies, such as GoDurham, GoTriangle, and Chapel Hill Transit.

Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the Draft FY2017 UPWP. Chair Steve Schewel closed the public hearing. Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to approve the Draft FY2017 UPWP and including the resolution, self-certification process, and local match. A motion was made by Ellen Reckhow and seconded by Barry Jacob. The motion carried unanimously.

## **11. Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures**

**Andy Henry, LPA Staff**

Andy Henry presented the Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures presentation. He stated the goal for today is to approve the document to be released for the public review and comment period, with any comments from the DCHC MPO Board incorporated as needed. Andy Henry stated a public hearing will be held



in March. The MPO Staff will return in April for DCHC MPO Board's approval. Andy Henry stated he would like to get the information out to the public today.

Andy Henry stated that a workshop took place and was conducted by the MPO staff for the DCHC MPO Board members to draft the Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures for the 2045 MTP on January 13, 2016. He stated they did not get to the performance measures, but based on input from the workshop, staff modified the Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures based on workshop input. Andy Henry provided an overview of the MPO DCHC MPO Board workshop and described the two attachments to the agenda. Andy Henry described the changes to the Goals and Objectives that have been made as a result of input received from the DCHC MPO Board members during the workshop.

Chair Steve Schewel stated that the new draft is a tremendous improvement and appreciated the workshop and the opportunity to provide input in the workshop setting. He felt the MPO Staff had captured what the DCHC MPO Board talked about regarding goals. Chair Steve Schewel stated these are the goals he can get behind.

Vice Chair Damon Seils provided a suggestion for performance measures for Equity. Vice Chair Damon Seils said that at the December 9, 2015, meeting he was interested particularly in the Environmental Justice category and how the staff would think about specifying ,some of it because it may be a more a difficult category in a sense of design and performance measures. He said that maybe it would be clearer in his mind if he saw the performance measures of the category. He suggested connecting (item D) the measure of the number of participants in public meetings to the first performance measure of increasing participation from Environmental Justice communities (item A). Vice Chair Damon Seils stated that in other words, communities looking to prioritizing investment and doing a better job in servicing their participation specifically called out as one to measure and to improve.

Andy Henry agreed with the Vice Chair Damon Seils' suggestion for the performance measures for the Ensure Equity category. He stated we will add that. Andy Henry stated MPO LPA Staff tried to keep the

426 performance measures quantitative as possible. Andy Henry stated I think the MPO LPA Staff can come up with  
427 something.

428 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated it was great and thanked Andy Henry.

429 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any comments.

430 Ellen Reckhow commended the MPO LPA Staff on how well it was organized and very productive. She  
431 felt a lot had been accomplished in a short period of time.

432 Ed Harrison asked how they publicize the Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures document release.

433 Chair Steve Schewel asked Andy Henry how the Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures would be  
434 advertised.

435 Ed Harrison asked what type and level of public participation is expected at this stage in the process.

436 Andy Henry described the public engagement process for this stage of the planning process, newspaper,  
437 survey mailing, mailing list from different jurisdictions, and DCHC MPO website. Andy Henry stated that most  
438 often, the DCHC MPO receives the most feedback once lines that represent propose projects are drawn on  
439 maps.

440 Chair Steve Schewel stated Lauren Horsh from The Herald- Sun newspaper may want to run a story on  
441 the DCHC MPO Board's goals.

442 Don Moffitt suggested that each jurisdiction has its own public relations office. Perhaps this could be  
443 distributed through each jurisdiction's Public Relations office. Don Moffitt stated he is keeping with Vice Chair  
444 Damon Seils' suggestion on linking up to like increasing percent in Environmental Justice (Ensure Equity  
445 category) population on what can we change and what can we add, what groups might we reach out too, that  
446 might increase that percentage.

447 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated perhaps change where you hold a public hearing and who is attracted to  
448 the event.

449 Ellen Reckhow stated some details are needed in the narrative that directly links the fact that these  
450 Goals and Objectives drive the MPO DCHC MPO Board planning process, and try to have the people understand  
451 the contents.

452 Chair Steve Schewel stated these are good ideas and asked if there were any other thoughts.

453 Andy Henry stated on the second page there are performance measures that are linked to the  
454 objectives. He stated the MPO LPA Staff is trying to keep the performance measures qualifiable and  
455 understandable. The goals and objectives for the performance measures on the second page will probably  
456 change the most because LPA Staff will work on those. Andy Henry stated that after the data is checked, the  
457 LPA Staff will come back with some suggestions and may have some repetitive the goals and objectives  
458 performance measures.

459 Andy Henry stated the second thing is that the MPO LPA staff and CAMPO in Raleigh, NC are working  
460 together on their set of goals and objectives. Each MPO can have different goals and objectives from working  
461 together, but staff is trying to keep them as close as possible together.

462 Don Moffitt stated when tempting to get certain kinds of participation making sure that it goes to  
463 Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Commission of Durham for example Environmental Affairs. Don Moffitt asked if a  
464 public event can be held at the Durham Station.

465 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there be a public hearing associated with the goals and objectives  
466 performance measures.

467 Andy Henry stated the public hearing meeting is scheduled for the March DCHC MPO Board Meeting.  
468 There was further discussion about DCHC MPO staff facilitating a public input opportunity in the afternoon peak  
469 time at Durham Station.

470 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the  
471 Goals/Objectives/Performance Measures. Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to approve the document be  
472 released for public review and comment period, with any comments from the DCHC MPO Board incorporated as

473 needed. A motion was made by Bernadette Pelissier and seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried  
474 unanimously.

475 Don Moffitt asked does the MPO DCHC MPO Board need to schedule the public hearing meeting or will  
476 the MPO LPA Staff do it.

477 Chair Steve Schewel and Meg Scully stated the public hearing is during the regular MPO Board meeting.

478 **12. Draft Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP**

479 **Lindsay Smart, LPA staff**

480  
481 Lindsay Smart presented the Draft Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. This is the first proposed  
482 amendment to the FY2016-2025 TIP. Lindsay Smart stated Draft Amendment # 1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP comes  
483 from the Technical Committee to review and release for public comments. She stated that there will be a public  
484 hearing in March and an adoption of the amendment approval in April.

485 Lindsay Smart provided a brief overview on the projects included in the amendment.

486 There was a discussion about the location of the Carrboro (Downtown Multi-Use Path) project for the  
487 Town of Carrboro.

488 Chair Steve Schewel commented he liked the format of the two amendments. You are able to see the  
489 original information and the changes to the project.

490 Lindsay Smart stated that the project information sheets were directly from the DCHC MPO Funding  
491 Database website.

492 Don Moffitt stated that the City of Durham (#C-5183 Sidwalks in Durham) project for Alston Avenue  
493 seemed to be shortening based on the reduced cost. What drove the decision to reduce the scope of the  
494 project for Alston Avenue?

495 Dale McKeel stated that the plan was to originally do sidewalks on two sections of Alston Ave. The  
496 Public Works Department did cost estimate. It would cost more money to do both sections of Alston Avenue;

therefore, the project was scaled back and the remaining funds transferred to City of Durham (#C-5572 West Ellerbe Creek Greenway) trail project.

Lindsay Smart stated the funds for Alston Avenue that were not needed are being applied to or programmed to the West Ellerbe Creek Greenway trail project. The amendment to the West Ellerbe Creek Greenway project is listed in the summary sheets.

Ed Harrison asked about NCDOT (#I-5707 I-40 Auxiliary Lane) -- what is an auxiliary lane? Lindsay Smart stated it is an additional outside lane in between exits. There was additional discussion on existing auxiliary lanes examples.

Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments on the Draft Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP.

Ed Harrison asked that the Old Chapel Hill Road only address Durham City's part. Vice Chair Damon Seils stated the Old Chapel Hill Road's part for Chapel Hill has been programmed. Lindsay Smart stated the new STP-DA funding that Chapel Hill received for the project has not been programmed because information is needed from Chapel Hill to prepare the amendment. The previous funding for the Chapel Hill portion has been programmed.

Vice Chair Damon Seils asked if that will be a future amendment for Chapel Hill.

Lindsay Smart responded that if Chapel Hill provides information for the changes to the project before the March Board meeting agenda, she can include the changes in amendment #1. Otherwise, a new or future amendment will be needed.

Ed Harrison asked what the status of the Chapel Hill portion is. He thinks the answers will need to come from NCDOT.

David Bonk stated that the Chapel Hill portion of the project is about a year behind the Durham portion. The Durham portion has finished the right-of-way acquisition. His understanding Chapel Hill is about to start it and part of the issue is negotiating or contacting the new owners of the Blue Cross Blue Shield property and

521 State Employee's Credit Union to let them know there will be a need for some their of land for right-of-way,  
522 easement, etc. for the project. During the transition period, Chapel Hill has had difficulty contacting them.  
523 David Bonk stated the good news is his understanding the actual right-of-way cost for Durham side is lower than  
524 it had been projected and is hoping this will occur for Chapel Hill.

525 Ed Harrison stated the main question is when it will be built.

526 Dale McKeel stated that construction is scheduled to start on the Durham side in the fall of this year.  
527 Duke Energy is in the process of relocating utilities, then it will go out for bids in the fall.

528 Ed Harrison asked if this would take care of the Poe Road roundabout.

529 Dale McKeel responded yes.

530 Vice Chair Damon Seils asked about three projects in Carrboro for amendment clarification.

531 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated first one is the Downtown Multi-Use Path project. He stated that the amendment  
532 says it is a new project being added to TIP. It will be designed and constructed in FY2017 and FY2018. He stated  
533 the second amendment is filling the gap between the two existing Greenways in northern Carrboro and Morris  
534 Grove Elementary School. The amendment is accelerating the project schedule for that, and what is the  
535 change? Lindsay Smart answered additional STP-DA funding is being added in FY 2017, and updated the project  
536 schedule from prior year FY2016 to FY2017. The schedule is being updated. Damon Seils stated the third  
537 project is the same which is the Homestead Road to Chapel Hill High School extension of the Bolin Creek  
538 Greenway taking their previous approved funds. Lindsay Smart answered that the project looks like it is on the  
539 same schedule for FY16 and FY17. Vice Damon Seils stated they both use similar language, and really is about  
540 moving funds that have not been obligated yet. Lindsay Smart responded yes, the amendment brings the  
541 phases of projects to be current and adds additional funding. Vice Chair Damon Seils thanked Lindsay Smart.

542 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the MPO DCHC MPO Board on  
543 the Draft Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to review proposed  
544 TIP amendment #1 and approve the proposed amendment to be released for the public review and comment

period, with any comments from the MPO DCHC MPO Board incorporated as necessary to the Draft Amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. A motion was made by Vice Chair Damon Seils and seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried unanimously.

**13. Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP**  
**Lindsay Smart, LPA staff**

Lindsay Smart presented the Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. This is the second proposed amendment to the FY2016-2025 TIP. Lindsay Smart stated the Draft amendment #2 added new projects: a. #P-5706 East Durham Siding and b. Nine new projects as one the #P-5710 Grade Separations at Blackwell Street and Mangum Street; b. Make changes to projects U-5717 US 15/501 (at Garrett Road), I-3306A I-40, TE-5205 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit; and c. Changes to five Breaks of project U-5774 NC 54. The new projects and the changes to the existing projects are described in detail in the attachments to this agenda item.

Don Moffitt asked if all the ones listed in the memo are included in the package. Lindsay Smart stated the projects should be included in the package and was there any particular one he was looking for? Don Moffitt stated the first two projects he found, but not the third one. He located the third one and then indicated that the projects were listed in a different order.

Chair Steve Schewel asked for information the recommendation from the Technical Committee (TC). Lindsay Smart stated the TC reviewed the proposed TIP amendment #2, provided comments, recommended that project #C-5178 be transferred to draft amendment #1 to the FY2016-2025 TIP and that the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board provide guidance to the MPO staff and the MPO Technical Committee on the appropriate public outreach and engagement strategy to be conducted for draft amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP. Lindsay Smart stated there are some very big changes being proposed and large projects.

Chair Steve Schewel stated some we like better than others.

Mark Ahrendsen stated the reason for two sets of amendments proceeding at the same time they really have different backgrounds on both of those. He stated the first set the DCHC MPO Board initiated the

570 amendments to add the allocation of STP-DA funds. He stated the second one is that NCDOT initiated as the  
571 result of the some actions of the General Assembly that certain projects in generally providing additional  
572 funding that allows other projects to be accelerated, and include some funds appropriate without passing  
573 judgment on either one to allow them to proceed as separate tracks. That is why the amendments are brought  
574 forward in that way.

575 Chair Steve Schewel thanked Mark Ahrendsen for the information.

576 Chair Steve Schewel asked Mark Ahrendsen did he have any recommendations on how the DCHC MPO  
577 Board might would like to proceed with public input and timing. He asked is there are any ways the MPO Staff  
578 would like to propose to the DCHC MPO Board that they should be acting or thinking about.

579 Mark Ahrendsen stated they are asking that both amendments be available for public comments and  
580 hold public hearings in March to officially receive input. He stated both amendments could be brought back to  
581 the DCHC MPO Board for consideration at the April meeting; however, it is the DCHC MPO Board choice to how  
582 they will handle it.

583 Chair Steve Schewel asked does it fit with the DCHC MPO Board's goals and timing with the D-O LRT  
584 decision.

585 Lindsay Smart stated yes.

586 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the  
587 Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP.

588 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated that setting the public hearing is no committing to a decision about either  
589 amendment.

590 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments.

591 Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the MPO DCHC MPO Board on  
592 the Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP.



Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to review proposed TIP amendment #2, approve project #C-5178 be transferred to draft amendment #1 to the FY2016-2015 TIP and included as part of the amendment process for draft amendment #1. Provide guidance to the MPO staff and the MPO Technical Committee on the appropriate public outreach and engagement strategy to be conducted for amendment #2 to the FY2015-2025 TIP, and approve the proposed amendment to be released for the public review and comment period. A motion was made by Vice Chair Damon Seils and seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried unanimously.

Ellen Reckhow asked when the DCHC MPO Board did their 2040 MTP plan was the D-O LRT project included in the modeling for our community . Did the DCHC MPO Board have any sense or curiosity of the impact of removing or if this reduction for light rail would hold and the project did not go forward, can we access what that does to the community in terms of congestion in the corridor. Ellen Reckhow stated she thinks it is interesting information to have. She stated perhaps look to get the cap changed in the spring.

Lindsay Smart stated there have been MPO Staff conversations about it, in terms of what would the model say for the 2045 MTP. Lindsay Smart did not know if the MPO staff can run the model and have the numbers by the next meeting, but she can bounce it around with Felix Nwoko.

Ellen Reckhow stated the DCHC MPO Board should have the information by the meeting in April because they are trying to make an important decision.

Felix Nwoko stated that the MPO would be able to tell the MPO Board in March if the model could be run this spring to analyze these impacts. Felix Nwoko suggested that the D-O LRT No Build Scenario might be another good resource to look at for this information.

Don Moffitt stated two large projects were sort of glossed over. He stated the grade separation project and the East Durham Siding project are vast projects; these projects have vast impacts on the of citizens in the City of Durham. He feels the grade separations should be looked at carefully before any steps are made forward. He stated there has been enormous amounts of decisions and debates within the City among several different parties about the wisdom of various grade separation strategies or any grade separation strategies and

617 when NCRR told GoTriangle to move the D-O LRT somewhere else, the City lost all sorts of energy for during any  
618 grade separations. We have a handful of freight trains and the impact of grade separation will be separating the  
619 City or dividing the City. He asked where did these projects come from, what is driving them, how do we have  
620 only \$500,000 to spend on light rail and coming up with hundreds of millions of dollars to build the great wall of  
621 Durham?

622 Lindsay Smart stated the funding from the light rail project would go to the next projects that scored  
623 highly in SPOT 3.0. These two projects and a project in Wake County and a project in Greensboro would have  
624 been the next ones to receive funding.

625 Mark Ahrendsen stated this is just following the process and that's where we are moving now.

626 Don Moffitt stated these are dollars that where going to be spent in the communities and still spent in  
627 the communities. If the legislation changed, will the dollars still be spent in the communities for projects?

628 Chair Steve Schewel referred to Joey Hopkins for information.

629 Joey Hopkins stated his understanding there are five total projects that the funding that cannot be spent  
630 on the light rail is being spent on. He stated two projects are in Durham, maybe two in CAMPO, and one in  
631 Greensboro. These projects are like Lindsay Smart stated they are further down the priority list on the other  
632 modes that are eligible for that funding, but because the law now restricts the limits amounts that can go to  
633 light rail NCDOT has to go down the list and fund the next projects. Joey Hopkins stated he does think that the  
634 two in Durham and two in CAMPO from what he recalls would have to be re-scored in the future because of  
635 where the schedule falls. Joey Hopkins stated if the law is changed and the cap is lifted, then the light rail will  
636 be the highest scoring project again and it will be able to pull the funds back out. Vice Chair Damon Seils stated  
637 it is already scored. Joey Hopkins stated it has already been scored; it is capped. It has to be re-scored and the  
638 score will change in SPOT.4.0. He does not know what the rescoring will be, but the scoring formula has  
639 changed. He believes maybe there is a project in Greensboro that does not need to be re-scored. He thinks the  
640 project falls in the first years of the STIP and it will receive the funding and stay there. He stated again it will be

641 further down the list and does not mean the light rail project would not get funded, but it may push it further  
642 back if the cap is lifted.

643           There were several discussions on the public hearing scheduling. Lindsay Smart stated the DCHC MPO  
644 Board can schedule a public hearing whenever the Board would like to have one. Lindsay Smart stated the  
645 original plan was to have the public hearing in March and along with amendment # 1, but there are a lot of  
646 changes made between the two amendments. Lindsay Smart stated the DCHC MPO Board can have a public  
647 hearing in April to separate the two amendments so the public would have a more clearer understanding of  
648 what is happening; however, that is the DCHC MPO Board's decision. Lindsay Smart stated another public  
649 engagement can be done at a night meeting if the MPO Board would like that.

650           Chair Steve Schewel stated he would like the MPO Staff's recommendation. Do you care about March,  
651 April or May?

652           Lindsay Smart stated the MPO Staff recommends April.

653           There was a discussion on public hearing schedule. The public hearing meeting will be in April to receive  
654 the input additional information and it aligns with the legislation calendar.

655           Don Moffitt stated this is a moving target and holding a public hearing it will be hard to have the people  
656 to give back. They can only give feedback to what's been offered, but not to what might be offered. Don Moffitt  
657 stated if time is not the factor then I would urge not to not have a vote today, but moving the date or come back  
658 to discuss it later, because it is a moving target.

659           Chair Steve Schewel referred to Lindsay Smart regarding the date for the public hearing.

660           Lindsay Smart stated that having the public hearing in April and hearing public comments gives more  
661 opportunities to advertise for that hearing and possibly generate some public excitement about it. At that  
662 point, the decision is if up to the DCHC MPO Board in May for adoption. There is also the STIP amendment that  
663 has to be done. Even if the schedule is being pushed out more and more that is fine, but NCDOT has to amend

664 their STIP as well. Lindsay Smart stated there are different processes going on and the processes for amendment  
665 # 1 and amendment # 2 should probably be separated.

666 The DCHC MPO Board continued to discuss the public hearing date recommendation and the delay of  
667 other projects.

668 Joey Hopkins commented on the three projects. He stated two of the projects are amendments that are  
669 due to new projected revenue. These two projects are not related to the light rail project. The one that is  
670 related to light rail is the NC 54 project. It would be the third one, and it was delayed a year for construction to  
671 allow time to require right-of-way. He does not believe it is a major issue of putting the public hearing off a  
672 month or two with STIP not matching the TIP, but if the light rail is questioned it will delay things longer. He  
673 stated his preference would be to have the documents match and go forward with the project development  
674 process on the projects. He stated they both are outside the four year window; therefore, it is okay. It is not a  
675 huge issue.

676 Chair Steve Schewel asked Joey Hopkins to recommend a date for the public hearing.

677 Joey Hopkins stated he thinks April is fine. The only reason he mention the light rail question because it  
678 delays things. He would have concerns having NCDOT moving forward with any project development even with  
679 the projects outside the four year window if the two documents did not match. Joey Hopkins stated in the short  
680 term it is okay. Joey Hopkins stated he wanted it noted in the records. Even though they are in amendment # 2,  
681 are really a separate question than the light rail question and the rail project that is listed. He mentions NCDOT  
682 amendment has already been approved. He stated NCDOT BOT does their part for the STIP. Then it is sent to  
683 the MPO's to concur. Joey Hopkins stated for clarification he does not think it is a big deal. He stated he thinks  
684 it would be a different question if any of the projects were inside the four year window then it would not  
685 conform. He stated NCDOT official STIP right now has approved amendments and the DCHC MPO Board has  
686 not, officially they would have to go back to the document both have approved, back in October. He stated that

is the official document, but that one is not conforming to the State law at this time, even though those match we would not move forward with that project because of the State budget.

Don Moffitt asked could the two light rail projects be removed of amendment #2 and move them to amendment #3 and move amendment # 2 forward.

Lindsay Smart stated, yes.

Mark Ahrendsen stated you could, but you could also do it later after gathering public input. He stated seeming you might need to gather more information or there may be a reason for the delay and separate them at that time. He does not think it precluded you from it doing at that time if you determine it is helpful to do it. Mark Ahrendsen stated if it is not, keep the projects on the same track.

Barry Jacob stated he had the same question on putting the projects in one amendment. He stated the DCHC MPO Board should review after the public hearing and decide to separate them or leave them, and assume at this point the MPO Staff understands what the ramification of any delay or do not consider them significant, but the further the DCHC MPO Board goes it maybe more pertinent.

Vice Chair Damon Seils stated that the DCHC MPO Board has flexibilities with what we do with either of the amendments.

Chair Steve Schewel asked if there were any questions or comments from the DCHC MPO Board on the Draft Amendment #2 to the FY2016-2025 TIP for a public hearing date.

Chair Steve Schewel asked for a motion to set the public hearing for April and review proposed TIP amendment #2, approve project #C-5178 be transferred to draft amendment #1 to the FY2016-2015 TIP and included as part of the amendment process for draft amendment #1, and approve the proposed amendment to be released for the public review and comment period. A motion was made by Vice Chair Damon Seils and seconded by Ellen Reckhow. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **REPORTS:**

#### **14. Report from the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board Chair**

**Steve Schewel, DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board Chair**

There was no report from the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board Chair.

**15. Report from the DCHC MPO Technical Committee Chair**

**Mark Ahrendsen, DCHC MPO TC Chair**

There was no report from the DCHC MPO Technical Committee Chair.

**16. Reports from LPA Staff**

**Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

There was no report from the LPA Staff.

**17. NCDOT Reports:**

Joey Hopkins, NCDOT Division 5, provided an update that Alston Avenue (Project U-3308) will be letting and opening for bids in the month of June. He stated that the traffic signals planned for Gregson, Peabody, and Roxboro on the low bridges of the foundations are finished. The footings are dug at Gregson Street and Roxboro Road; the contractors are on site and hope to finish with the steel and concrete today. Joey Hopkins stated the Triangle Connector, known as the East End Connector U-0071 project, has a press release that went out yesterday, February 9, 2016, about NCDOT's plans on the traffic shift into the median of NC 147 if you're heading southbound on the Durham Freeway, which will occur on February 12, 2016. The contractor has the paving done and a lot of stripping down except for the tie end points. That's to allow construction on the southbound direction for the ramp to tie in as heading to Research Triangle Park (RTP).

Joey Hopkins stated that the contractor, Dragados, is still continuing to have some issues. Their progress is good and doing a good job, but there are some issues with a number of shutdowns of erosion controls (5 times). Joey Hopkins stated NCDOT Division 5 is trying not to receive a notice of violation from North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR).

Joey Hopkins stated the contractor, Dragados, is having issues with the railroads (RR) on Highway 70. Joey Hopkins stated this could potentially delay the project because the railroad bridge project is really the controlling operations. Joey Hopkins stated this is getting railroaded flaggers to allow them to work in the

739 railroad right-of-way in a safe manner. Also, having problems getting submittal reviews back in a timely matter  
740 from the NC Railroad Company. Joey Hopkins stated they are trying to work through the issues and mediate it.

741 Joey Hopkins commented on the performance measure about the removal of the delivery project goal.  
742 He believed it should still be a stand alone goal. He does not have statistics for the DCHC MPO Board, but does  
743 have the Statewide statistics. He stated NCDOT is working on a project that looks at the local delivery project and  
744 local administer projects. The statewide delivery rate is 37% of these projects and its very low.

745 Chair Steve Schewel asked the delivery rate of the DCHC MPO Board. Joey Hopkins stated he did not  
746 know the number, but will report back to the DCHC MPO Board with an answer. He stated Division 5 has their  
747 problems with Alston Avenue and Old Chapel Hill Road, but their delivery rate is over 80%. He stated they have  
748 certainly room for improvement. Joey Hopkin stated he would like to see NCDOT and Division 5 both rates get  
749 closer together than where they are.

750 Joey Hopkins stated the improved infrastructure condition goal is good. Since the first of the year,  
751 NCDOT has a two-day response and repair time for potholes, ten days on safety items, and 15 days on others.  
752 Joey Hopkins stated there is an online system to submit and track responses to work requests or continue to call  
753 NCDOT Division 5 to report a problem. Joey Hopkins stated since January, they have received over 1,300  
754 problems reported. Wake County has the highest reported problems over 900. He stated the other problems  
755 can be divided over the other counties. Joey Hopkins stated these numbers can be high in the tracking system  
756 online due to overlapping of reporting and repairing time. Joey Hopkins provided instruction on entering  
757 information on the website NCDOT.gov to report potholes and getting the information in the right hand. It can  
758 be used to locate information on NCDOT.

759 Joey Hopkins stated they do have a project in SPOT for the southern side of NC-147 from the East End  
760 Connector project to I-40. In the MTP, it is listed six lanes, it is being scored as eight lanes. This is being done for  
761 two reasons: 1) the cost difference between six and eight are not that great that's because to build a six lane out  
762 there you got to widen it to manage the traffic during construction and if you are building six you will tear the

763 widen out which may not make sense and 2) the traffic numbers are showing there is a need for eight lanes. Joey  
764 Hopkins stated he does not know what will come out of project development of that project but he stated that  
765 wants the MPO Board to be aware of this change. Joey Hopkins stated the recommendation is eight lanes and  
766 NCDOT will come back to the Technical Committee and the DCHC MPO Board to change the MTP.

767 Ellen Reckhow asked when you say the south side are you talking about taking the side going towards  
768 Raleigh from Durham from two to four lanes and leaving the others. Joey Hopkins stated no, I mean the south  
769 end. He stated the northbound and southbound directions, both four lanes so it will be eight lanes total. It will  
770 be the East End Connector to I-40.

771 Ellen Reckhow asked if about it was going to six lanes right around the East End Connector.

772 Joey Hopkins stated the project is in the MTP and scored in SPOT. We are now evaluating for an eight  
773 lanes because the cost is not that different, and there is a need for it. Ellen Reckhow agreed with Joey Hopkins.

774 Mark Ahrendsen stated he does not disagree with the forecast on NC I47 between the East End  
775 Connector and I-40 is significant, but probably the greatest challenge is the number of lanes in there and what  
776 will be done with I-40. There will be four lanes going southbound; but if I-40 is not fixed, then the four lanes will  
777 not do any good. Mark Ahrendsen stated the key will be dealing with the interchange too. Mark Ahrendsen  
778 stated most of the congestion is particularly between Alston Avenue and Chapel Hill Street where the  
779 interchanges are. He stated maybe auxiliary lanes or even ramp metering some of these we see where ramps  
780 coming on has the delays. Once you past Alston Avenue chokes point, it starts to pick up again. Mark Ahrendsen  
781 stated it is really in that most congestion area where you got closely spaced interchanges, which may be a need  
782 to do some modernization, may be the short term best fit.

783 Ellen Reckhow stated she hopes when the East End Connector opens, the traffic will be diverted 70 to 85  
784 going to RTP and not come down on that part of NC I47 to go east.



785           Joey Hopkins stated he thinks that might be the reason there is not one in the MTP now, because of the  
786 model shows when the through traffic of the northern Durham traffic get off the East End Connector; therefore,  
787 you will not need to come up Duke or Gregson Street to get back and forth.

788           Chair Steve Schewel thanked Joey Hopkins for his report.

789           Ed Harrison asked about the status of the Old Durham Chapel Hill Road project. He stated Mike Kneis is  
790 the contact person. Ed Harrison and Joey Hopkins agreed Mike Kneis is the contact person for the project.

791           Patrick Wilson stated he did not have any additional updates beyond what has been distributed in the  
792 report.

793           Vice Chair Damon Seils stated letters have gone out from NCDOT to people along Greensboro Street,  
794 Estes Drive, and Carrboro for project U-5846 which is a placeholder for a roundabout at the intersection. We do  
795 not know what the project will actually be. Vice Chair Damom Seils stated he has heard from people about a  
796 letter. The letter states this is to notify you that the above project has been identified for construction which  
797 makes it sound like we know what is going on there and things are full steam ahead. Vice Chair Damon Seils  
798 stated he thinks they can use some clarity around what the plans are and when will the people be notified of  
799 the design of the project. He stated the letter implies the project is further along.

800           Patrick Wilson apologized for the confusion of the letter. He stated typically when NCDOT sends letters  
801 out letting people know a survey is being done, NCDOT tries to eliminate a lot of uncertainty when they go out  
802 and it did not happen in this case. This one is further out in the future than some of the other ones, we are  
803 working on so we are presently working with a private engineering firm to negotiate our quantities to make the  
804 design ready for the project. We have not skipped the process. There are still public meetings that will be  
805 scheduled as part of the process. We are trying to get ahead as part of project delivery. We are trying as much  
806 as we can on the front end. Therefore, we are conducting surveys now then there will be ample time for public  
807 input once the project gets going and we have a design firm on staff under contract, the firm can start doing the

808 work for us. Vice Chair Damon stated he wanted to give Patrick Wilson a heads up because people are asking  
809 questions.

810 Patrick Wilson stated he will bring that to his staff attention.

811 Chair Steve Schewel ask if there were any questions.

812 Ed Harrison asked about East Main/East Franklin Street four-lane roundabout project. Ed Harrison  
813 stated it is a problem place. He asked what is the action plan. Patrick Wilson stated that is in the report as well  
814 and has the same status as the project in Carrboro. The project is a few years out and in the process of  
815 negotiating with a project engineering firm to provide with a grade. NCDOT are not quite underway with the  
816 design firm. Once NCDOT gets the firm underway, NCDOT will be scheduling public meetings along the way until  
817 we bring that project to letting.

818 Vice Chair Damon Seils stated Jones Ferry Road is looking amazing.

819 Patrick Wilson stated he will pass that on.

820 There was no report additional from the NCDOT Division 8.

821 There was no report from the NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch.

822 There was no report from the NCDOT Traffic Operations.

823 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

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

825 All handouts are available on the website.

826 **ADJOURNMENT:**

827 There being no further business before the DCHC MPO DCHC MPO Board, the meeting was adjourned at  
828 11:14 a.m.