

45
46 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and the Roll Call was conducted.

47 **Ethics Reminder**

48 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt read the Ethics Reminder for Board members and asked Board members if
49 there are any known conflicts of interest with respect to matters coming before the Board. Chair Mark
50 Kleinschmidt requested Board members state any known conflicts of interest.

51 There were no conflicts of interest stated by the Board members.

52 **Adjustments to the Agenda:**

53 There were adjustments to the agenda. There was a request to add a D-O LRT project update from
54 GoTriangle. The requested agenda item will be added after the consent agenda.

55 **Public Comments**

56 There were no comments from the public.

57 **Directives to Staff**

58 The Directives to Staff are attached for review.

59 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

60 **May 13, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes**

61 Ellen Reckhow would like to clarify two items in the May 13, 2015, MPO Board Meeting minutes as
62 follows: page 5, lines 118 about wanting to revisit the LRT routes and dusting off the plan. This would be in
63 reference to the 54 Corridor for the LRT. She would still like to educate the public; however, her comment
64 should be represented in the minutes as the MPO should educate the public on decisions that have been
65 made along the NC 54 corridor related to the D-O LRT. Ellen Reckhow stated that lines 210 and 211 on page
66 8 referenced that she would write a letter on behalf of the MPO Board in support of Grow America. Ellen
67 Reckhow clarified that the minutes should state that MPO LPA staff should write a letter of support for
68 Grow America on behalf of the MPO.

69 A motion was made by Ellen Reckhow and seconded by Vice-Chair Diane Catotti to approve the
70 May 13, 2015, MPO Board Meeting minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

71 **ACTION ITEMS:**

72 **D-O LRT DEIS Update**

73 **Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle**

74 Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle provided a presentation to the MPO Board about the status of the
75 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) project. Patrick McDonough expressed that he knows that
76 many of the people on the Board are getting a lot of emails and so are the people in his department about
77 the D-O LRT project. One of the key things that he wanted to share was regarding the preliminary locally
78 preferred alternatives (LPA) that was recently transmitted to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
79 Patrick McDonough brought along with him Katherine Eggleston, GoTriangle Engineer, and Tammy
80 Bouchelle, GoTriangle Assistant General Counsel, to help answer questions. Patrick McDonough stated that
81 he has also been working on trying to understand some legal issues surrounding the proposed Cornwallis
82 and Farrington ROMF site.

83 Patrick McDonough stated that he was instructed by Chair Mark Kleinschmidt to review older
84 project information as quickly as possible and to focus GoTriangle's time on presenting new information.
85 He will focus on the recommendations for Preliminary NEPA Preferred Alternative and the next steps for
86 the MPO Board and GoTriangle. Patrick McDonough elaborated that he has presented to the MPO Board
87 on the five key decisions before. The five key decisions are (1) Duke/VA Medical Center Station (2) New
88 Hope Creek Crossing (3) Little Creek Crossing (4) Rail Operations and Maintenance Facility Site and (5) Build
89 or No Build decision. The original location for the Duke Station was the Fulton location. However, Duke and
90 the VA Center asked that GoTriangle look at another location in order to keep down the traffic congestion.
91 The recommended alternative location is the Trent-Flowers location. This site is now the preliminary
92 alternative site and Duke and VA Center agree that this would be a superior location for traffic. The site

93 would dove- tail well with Duke’s plans for expansion. Duke and the VA Center intend to grow towards this
94 intersection and see this as an opportunity to have their land-use planning incorporate the transit station.
95 They are already working on a bike path from the area around Duke Chapel toward this location, so they
96 see a lot of opportunity and so does GoTriangle.

97 Patrick McDonough discussed the key decision for New Hope Creek Crossing alternatives. At the
98 request of the community and including members from the New Hope Creek advisory committee,
99 GoTriangle added NHC 1 alternative and NHC 2 alternative. The NHC LPA introduces a new transportation
100 corridor through NHC bottomlands. The NHC 1 costs more & impacts more businesses than NHC LPA and
101 NHC 2. The NHC 1 and NHC 2 impact fewer public park lands than NHC LPA. The NHC 2 has fewer
102 environmental impacts than NHC LPA and fewer business impacts than NHC 1. After analyzing the
103 alternatives, Patrick McDonough stated that the recommendation for Preliminary NEPA Preferred
104 Alternative recommendation was made for the NHC 2 alternative.

105 Patrick McDonough outlined alternatives and the recommendation for the Little Creek area near
106 the Orange County and Chapel Hill border. He heard concerns from the United States Army Corps of
107 Engineers (USACE) and the residents regarding the prior proposed alternatives C1 and C2. The USACE asked
108 if alternatives could be generated that did not touch their Federal-controlled land around Little Creek, so a
109 C1A alternative was created. Patrick McDonough also heard from residents requesting an alternative that
110 would not go through Meadowmont Lane, so a CA2 alternative was created. Patrick McDonough discussed
111 the alternatives as follows: C1 Eliminated – USACE will not authorize use of Federal property “given the
112 availability of less damaging alternatives.” C1A has (1) longest travel time and lowest ridership (2) most
113 expensive to build and operate (3) Impacts two public parks. C2 (1) carries 700 more daily riders than C1A.
114 (2) costs for C2 are similar to C2A and less than C1A. (3) requires more displacements than C1A and C2A.
115 The final alternative C2A has (1) fastest travel time and carries 1,000 more daily riders than C1A (2) cost

116 similar to C2 and less than C1A (3) the least impacts to public park land. Patrick McDonough stated that the
117 recommendations for Preliminary NEPA Preferred Alternative for Little Creek area will be C2A.

118 Patrick McDonough provided details on what to expect from the preliminary Rail Operations and
119 Maintenance Facility. He explained that the location would be used to store and maintain trains. The
120 facility would house operations and maintenance staff. The operations and maintenance staff would
121 include mechanics, operators, supervisors, dispatchers and administration. The facility would require
122 fifteen to twenty-five acres. Most of the work on the vehicles would be performed indoors. Any major
123 heavy maintenance activity would not be done onsite. The heavy work would be put on a truck and sent to
124 a body shop to be maintenance because it would be too much for work a small starter fleet to handle.

125 Patrick McDonough gave information on the five proposed ROMF sites. The first site is the Leigh Village
126 site, which is near Farrington Road and I-40. It has one historic resource. The second site is Patterson Place,
127 which only works with the NHC LPA. The third site is Alston Avenue. There are pros and cons for this site.
128 The pro is that it does not require amendments to Durham's Future Land Use Map. There are significant
129 cons. The cons are the acquisitions and displacements of two single-family residences, six
130 commercial/industrial businesses (including Brenntag Southeast and Eastern Carolina Organics), the
131 potential to displace existing jobs from neighborhood, two high risk HAZMAT sites and eight medium risk
132 HAZMAT sites and the additional authorization required from NCRR east of Alston Ave, which is not subject
133 to the current agreement on the alignment. The cost of the project would be \$96 - \$145 million dollars.

134 Patrick McDonough stated that there is some opposition from public and various stakeholders such as
135 Brenntag, NCRR, PAC 1 and the EPA. Patrick McDonough stated that GoTriangle is recommending that the
136 Alston Avenue site not be carried forward because of the concerns and challenges of displacement and
137 losses.

138 Patrick McDonough discussed the Cornwallis Road preliminary Rail Operations and Maintenance
139 Facility site. It is located near the Pepsi plant and the Jewish Community Center. The pros include that this

140 site would not require an amendment to Durham’s Future Land Use Map. The cons are that it precludes
141 JCC Expansion and perceived impacts to existing Federation facilities. It also has ongoing O&M issues with
142 aerial special track work and squeezed yard layout. There are issues to work through such as: (1)
143 acquisitions and displacements (2) One medium risk HAZMAT site (3) water resource mitigation (4)
144 coordination with NCDOT and City on relocation of Western Bypass (5) coordination with C/A Committee
145 on US 15-501 control of access. The cost range is \$74 - \$111 million.

146 Patrick McDonough discussed the pros and cons of the proposed Farrington Road site in
147 comparison with the Cornwallis Road site. The pros related to the Farrington Road site are that there are
148 no Hazmat sites and that the site allows optimal operational track layout. The cons for the Farrington site
149 are as follows: (1) may require amendment to Durham’s Future Land Use Map (2) relocation of existing
150 sanitary sewer. Patrick McDonough also stated that there are some items that still need to be worked
151 through. GoTriangle would still have to work through acquisitions and displacements of 6 single-family
152 residences, one cell tower (coordination with utility may avoid displacement), water resource mitigation
153 and coordination with NCDOT on I-40 control of access. The cost ranges from \$62 – \$93 million. Analyzing
154 the summary of cost, schedule, risks and impacts, GoTriangle’s current recommendation would be for
155 either the Cornwallis or Farrington site.

156 Patrick McDonough discussed the ROMF next steps that include taking a tour of the Charlotte
157 facility with elected officials and staff. Patrick McDonough is working with Charlotte’s transit team to come
158 up with good dates to visit the Charlotte facility. He also discussed plans to meet with the citizens near the
159 Cornwallis and Farrington sites to answer questions and to share what the site would look like and how the
160 site would impact nearby residents. He said that GoTriangle is still coordinating with the Planning staff on
161 land use and zoning issues, coordinating with US Army Corps of Engineers on water resources impacts and
162 mitigation and coordinating with NCDOT for the Cornwallis and Farrington sites.

163 There was a question from the floor as to when did GoTriangle plan to meet with the citizens
164 located near the Cornwallis Road site? Partners from GoTriangle replied that the meeting is scheduled for
165 June 25, 2015 from 4:30pm - 6:00pm at the Jewish Judea Center. Another question from the floor was if
166 GoTriangle has met with the five folks that will be displaced. Patrick McDonough confirmed that all
167 property owners have been contact through a variety of means. A Board member requested that
168 GoTriangle invite members of the Chapel Hill Town Council to visit the Charlotte facility, a lot of residents
169 will ask the Council questions. A Board member asked why GoTriangle presented two ROMF sites when the
170 Farrington site would be the better of the two. Patrick McDonough explained that there are other issues
171 that impact their decisions. He gave the example of the USACE and other sources that are also working
172 behind the scenes and they may have reasons to deny the Farrington Site based on things that may be
173 unknown to the project team. That is why two sites were brought forward. Another question from the
174 Board was what process was used to notify citizens? Patrick McDonough stated that GoTriangle notified
175 citizens by using individual letters, water bills, advertising public meetings, webinars and the internet. The
176 next question asked was has anyone actually spoken to the six property owners at the Farrington site or
177 have they decided that this is just another government notice? Are they going to be surprised that
178 someone is coming around to develop their property? Patrick McDonough answered that he has not been
179 able to attend any of the property owners meetings, however he has been in contact with Curtis Booker.
180 Patrick McDonough stated that Curtis Booker is one of the significant land owners and that he has been
181 included in detailed conversations regarding the Farrington site. Patrick McDonough stated that Curtis
182 Booker has shared his cell tower lease with GoTriangle to help them understand the impact if the cell tower
183 has to be relocated. Patrick McDonough stated that in the Farrington Road site area there is a good on the
184 ground citizen network and one of the primary land owners have been in regular contact with GoTriangle
185 and he has attended almost every meeting. GoTriangle reiterated the ways that they are contacting the
186 citizens and parties involved in the project area. GoTriangle also stated that they would start hand

187 delivering notices door to door this week. A request came from the Board to provide a better map of the
188 project for the next meeting and for a video to be done of the Charlotte ROMF Facility to show to people as
189 to what to expect from this project.

190 Patrick McDonough discussed the next steps for Public Involvement. He stated that GoTriangle has
191 reached out and engaged over 5,500 people in meetings so far. Patrick McDonough stated that for the
192 most part, GoTriangle has been going to people's meetings rather than having standalone meetings, but
193 GoTriangle still has had several big public meetings. Patrick McDonough stated that the key is 45-day
194 public comment period on the Draft EIS in the early fall. GoTriangle will respond to all comments received
195 during this time. Responses to comments will be included in the Final EIS and will be evaluated for
196 responsiveness by the Federal Transit Administration. Responses to comments may include commitments
197 for mitigation measures and or further study during the Engineering phase. For example, with C2A there
198 would be further detailed study of safety, traffic, and access at intersections along NC 54 during the
199 Engineering phase to ensure design of crossings is as safe and convenient as possible.

200 Patrick McDonough stated that the next steps for the MPO Board are in September / October 2015.
201 The MPO may choose to receive public comment at Policy Board meetings in concert with GoTriangle
202 public hearings. GoTriangle would ask to the maximum degree possible that that period be concurrent
203 with the 45-day public comment period for the DEIS. MPO Board must vote to endorse the NEPA Preferred
204 Alternative no later than November 2015 Board meeting.

205 Patrick McDonough reviewed the C2A Alignment chart near Downing Creek with the Board. He
206 explained that the train would interact in the community environment. The train would not be going at its
207 highest speed. He also reviewed the selected traffic counts with the AM Peaks and LRT Alignment. The
208 trains are smaller trains and should move through quickly. Tammy Bouchelle stated that a website is
209 available to show the maps of general locations, the comments received, and responses that have been
210 logged and received to date. The public is able to interact in real time with the website.

211 Katherine Eggleston discussed the constraints related to the station that is located east of Alston
212 Avenue. GoTriangle evaluated options to keep station located to the east of Alston Avenue. The railroad
213 track requirement is the major driving factor for the changes but there other changes as well. The other
214 substantial site constraints that make the eastern station location infeasible include: the new station
215 Pettigrew Street Bridge (NCDOT constructing a new bridge), NC 147 interchange (close proximity to
216 Pettigrew Street limits ability to shift the LRT line south), the City Water Tower (Tower, pump house), and
217 new line Parking Deck (minimum deck size still doesn't fit operational constraints with single track). The
218 constraints of the eastern Alston Avenue station site made it clear that it would no longer be feasible for
219 the LRT Railroad Tracks requirements and that an alternative location would be needed. Katherine
220 Eggleston stated that an engineering study was conducted to find a feasible proposed location on the
221 western side of Alston Avenue near Murphy Street. The study that was done for the eastern station
222 location will be documented, as well as why a new location, west of Alston Avenue, was considered.

223 **7. FY2016-2017 CMAQ Call for Projects**

224 **Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff**

225
226 Lindsay Smart briefed the MPO Board on the MPO Technical Committee discussion about the
227 CMAQ Call for Projects for FY2016-2017. Lindsay stated that in 2011 the MPO Board approved priorities for
228 the NCDOT CMAQ Call for Projects for CMAQ Funding for FY2016-2017. The approved projects were
229 submitted to NCDOT but were never programmed into the STIP or TIP. She handed out attachments with
230 the agenda items. Lindsay Smart stated that when the draft FY2016-2025 STIP came out, the MPO Board
231 submitted a letter to the NCDOT in February 2015, requesting that the NCDOT rerelease a CMAQ Call for
232 Projects for FY2016-2017, because the projects that were submitted in 2011 were never programmed into
233 the STIP. Lindsay Smart referred to the handouts of the 2011 priorities and the funding amounts. The
234 handout includes the top nine priorities and the proposed funding schedule for each one. The MPO Board
235 had enough funding to fully or partially fund the first eight projects and project number nine (Carrboro High

236 School Multi-Use Path) remained an unfunded priority project. In 2011, the jurisdictions worked with the
237 MPO LPA to submit CMAQ project applications for the priority projects. The applications were submitted in
238 2011 after the resolutions were approved by the MPO Board. The funding amounts have changed since the
239 original 2011 estimates. Lindsay Smarted noted that she is not sure why there is a difference in the
240 estimates and she has no clarification from NCDOT. The Technical Committee reviewed the priorities that
241 were shown in the attachments and their recommendation is for the MPO Board to approve the priorities
242 and funding amounts as presented in the handouts. With that short of a timeline, the MPO TC stated that
243 the MPO should maintain the same priorities and process from 2011 and recommended approval of the
244 removal of the three City of Durham sidewalk projects because the projects are located near the D-O LRT
245 stations and portions of the sidewalk projects will be accomplished through the D-O LRT project. The City of
246 Durham Public Works Department also reviewed the cost of those projects and said that pursuing CMAQ
247 funds is not the most efficient way to get those projects done. So the three sidewalk projects were
248 removed. Lindsay Smart stated that the Technical Committee reviewed the priorities from 2011 and
249 recommended that the Carrboro Downtown Multi-use Path Project, the GoDurham bus replacement, the
250 Chapel Hill Transit bus replacement, and the Carrboro Jones Creek Greenway project receive funding. They
251 recommended that the Carrboro High School Multi-use Path project remain on the list of priorities as an
252 unfunded priority.

253 Damon Seils made motion to approve the project list described in the handouts including the
254 approval of the request from GoDurham and Chapel Hill Transit to purchase three diesel buses instead of
255 the two hybrid buses each. Vice-Chair Diane Catotti seconded the motion to approve. The motion carried
256 unanimously.

257
258 **8. FY2016-2025 TIP Development**
259 **Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff**

260 Lindsay Smart briefed the MPO Board on the MPO Technical Committee discussion about the
261 NCDOT draft FY2016-2025 TIP. The NCDOT BOT approved the STIP on June 4, 2015. Lindsay Smart stated
262 that there were changes made to the STIP between the draft STIP and the adopted STIP. The MPO's draft
263 TIP has been updated to reflect those changes. The 2016 and 2017 CMAQ projects were not included in the
264 draft TIP, but they will be added now that the MPO Board has approved them. The MPO Technical
265 Committee was able to review the draft FY2016-2025 TIP and discuss project schedules and descriptions.
266 Revisions were provided to the MPO LPA staff. The MPO TC recommended that the MPO Board review the
267 draft FY 2016-2025 TIP and approve the TIP to be released for public review and comment. Questions from
268 the Technical Committee on several projects and consistency between the TIP and STIP have been
269 submitted to NCDOT and FHWA for clarification. Updates may be made to the draft FY2016-2025 TIP once
270 responses from NCDOT and FHWA have been received.

271 Vice-Chair Diane Catotti made motion to approve the draft TIP be released for public comment
272 until July 31, 2015. Steve Schewel seconded the motion to approve. The motion carried unanimously.

273
274 **9. 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Amendment and Conformity Determination Report**
275 **Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff**

276 Lindsay Smart briefed the MPO Board on the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)
277 Amendment and Conformity Determination Report. The Technical Committee recommended that the
278 Board release the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Amendment and Conformity
279 Determination Report for a public comment period that will last until July 31, 2015 and then conduct a
280 public hearing at the August MPO Board Meeting. Lindsay Smart stated that the FY2016-2025
281 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) must be a subset of the 2040 Metropolitan
282 Transportation Plan (MTP). In order to maintain this relationship, some MTIP projects will need to be added
283 to the 2040 MTP and several 2040 MTIP projects will need to have the air quality threshold year, cost,

284 project length or other data adjusted to match the FY2016-2025 MTIP. The proposed additions and
 285 changes to the 2040 MTP are listed in the attachment.

286 Lindsay Smart stated that federal regulations require that the MPO to approve a Conformity
 287 Determination Report (CDR) for the amended 2040 MTP and the FY 2016-2025 MTIP. The CDR will be a
 288 short form because the MPO is not required to complete a corresponding regional emission analysis.

289 Damon Seils made motion to release the 2040 MTP Amendment and CDR for public review and
 290 comment. Vice-Chair Diane Catotti seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

291 **REPORTS:**

292 **10. Report from the Board Chair Mark Kleinschmidt, Board Chair**

293 There were no reports from the MPO Board Chair.

294 **11. Report from the Technical Committee Chair Mark Ahrendsen, TC Chair**

295 Technical Committee Chair Mark Ahrendsen wanted to publicly recognize the excellent summary of
 296 findings from the recent FHWA and FTA Certification Review of the MPO. The preliminary summary of
 297 findings were very positive and a huge improvement over previous Certification Reviews. Mark Ahrendsen
 298 stated that Felix would discuss the Review in more detail.

299 **12. Report from LPA Staff (Attachment 2015-06-10 LPA Staff) = Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

300 **Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff**

301 Felix Nwoko reported that the MPO had a successful Certification Review on Thursday, May 21,
 302 2015, and Friday, May 22, 2015. The Review followed the usual process and had a closeout session. There
 303 were no corrective actions (first for the DCHC MPO and very rare nationwide). He summarized the
 304 recommendations and commendations that were noted by FHWA and FTA during the preliminary report.
 305 There were five commendations. They were as followings: (1) Environmental Justice (EJ) Report. (2)
 306 Interactive Website & funding database (project tracking) – “very impressive” (3) Great relationship and

307 collaboration between the MPO and transit operators. (4) Increased cooperation with NCDOT (improved
308 from last certification). (5) Statewide and inter-agency coordination on air quality process. There were ten
309 recommendations. They were as follows: (1) Freight Advisory Committee – involve freight community and
310 providers in the MPO planning process. (2) Provide linkage between freight and economic development.
311 Need national attention on freight. (3) Focus on efficient movement of people and Freight - Interstate
312 Highways are important for the movement of people and good –“don’t forget highways.” (4) Engage
313 Environmental Justice (EJ) community leaders. (5) Consider mapping and evaluating specific minority races
314 individually in future EJ reports. (6) Consider including two additional EJ analyses (performance targets and
315 Benefits/burdens by project types). (7) Make Title VI more conspicuous. (8) MPO and NCDOT work to
316 resolve project selection issues with STI process. (9) Develop an enhanced methodology for measuring the
317 effectiveness of the MPO public involvement. (10) Improve lack of on-going coordination in development of
318 environmental documents.

319 Felix Nwoko stated that based on the overall findings, the FHWA and FTA jointly certify that the
320 transportation planning process of the DCHC MPO TMA substantially meets the Federal planning
321 requirements in 23 CFR 450 Subpart C. This certification will remain in effect until May 2019.

322 In summary, the DCHC MPO staff, TC staff members, and Board members were commended for
323 their commitment in working together to ensure that the products of the transportation planning process
324 are serving the citizens of the urbanized area. Overall, it was a successful review.

325 **13. NCDOT Report (Attachment 2015-06-10 NCDOT Progress Report.pdf)**

326 Joey Hopkins (Brandon Jones) Division 5 –NCDOT stated that the SPOT 4.0 workgroup
327 recommendations have been approved by NCDOT. The workgroup consists of twenty four appointed
328 representatives from around the state. The workgroup took no official vote on any of the recommended

329 changes to the SPOT process. Instead, they reach a consensus. One recommendation is that the weight of
330 local input points should stay 50/50 with the Division and MPOs or RPOs. NCDOT SPOT office has decided
331 to reduce projects in the database by 25%. There are three Division 5 projects to report on. 1) The U-3308
332 (Alston Avenue) road widening will be delayed due to design change and utility issues. The delay will
333 change from July 2015 to February 2016. 2) Project U-0071 (East End Connector) is 10% complete. 3) U-
334 4716 (Hopson Road) Grade Separation is almost complete. It is 95% complete. The NCDOT is on track to get
335 the reimbursement from the Railroad.

336 Ed Lewis, NCDOT Division 7, stated that there were not updates from Division 7 and asked the
337 MPO Board if the Board had any questions on specific projects.

338 Darius Sturdivant, NCDOT Division 8, stated that projects are moving along and asked the MPO
339 Board if the Board had any questions on specific projects.

340 Julie Bollinger, NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch – No report was provided.

341 Kelly Becker, NCDOT Traffic Operations – No report was provided.

342

343 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

344 **14. Letter from Resident of Downing Creek Neighborhood about the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit**
345 **Project Alternatives. (Dated May 17, 2015)**

346

347 The letter is attached for review.

348 **15. Recent News Articles and Updates**

349 The letter is attached for review.

350 **Adjournment**

351 There being no further business before the MPO Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

352 The next meeting is scheduled for August 12, 2015 at 9 a.m. in the Committee Conference Room.

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364