

MINUTES  
ORANGE UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION BOARD  
AUGUST 21, 2013

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Paul Guthrie, Chapel Hill Township; Jeff Charles, Bicycle Advocate; Alex Castro, Bingham Township; Annette Jurgelski, Eno Township; Jeff Miles, Pedestrian Access & Safety Advocate; Andrea Rohrbacher, Planning Board Representative; Sam Lasris, Cedar Grove Township; Ted Triebel, Little River Township; Amy Cole, Transit Advocate; Gary Saunders, CFE Representative

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Susie Enoch, Cheeks Township; Hillsborough Township - Vacant; Economic Development Commission - Vacant

**STAFF PRESENT:** Abigaile Pittman, Transportation/Land Use Planner; Bret Martin, Transportation Planner; Tina Love, Administrative Assistant II

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Meredith Stewart, Orange County Health Dept.

**AGENDA ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

**AGENDA ITEM II: APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR JUNE 19, 2013**

The June 19, 2013 OUTBoard Minutes were approved with corrections by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM III: CONSIDERATIONS OF ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA**

**AGENDA ITEM IV: REGULAR AGENDA**

- a. State and MPO Project Prioritization.
  - i. Review effect of changes to State and MPO project prioritization methodology on County projects, and
  - ii. Consider and recommend new projects in the Burlington-Graham Metropolitan Organization (BGMPO) planning boundary for the 2016-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

**OUTBoard Action:** To receive the information from Orange County planning staff and provide comments and recommendations for new projects in the BGMPO planning area for the 2016-2022 TIP.

Bret Martin: We are setting the stage for the bi-annual prioritization for the state to go through the process of updating its Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. We are working on putting together projects for the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, to be adopted by the North Carolina Department of Transportation in July 2015, and approved by the Federal Highway Administration in October 2015. We will need to submit projects to each of the transportation planning organizations within Orange County to prioritize at a regional level so the projects that the OUTBoard and the BOCC want to be scored will be scored by the state using their new criteria, and then they will be considered for addition in the statewide transportation improvement program. (Bret reviewed the Abstract).

Alex Castro: DOT is divided up into divisions. What role do these divisions play in this planning process?

56 Bret Martin: The money that is being divided up throughout the state for divisions is 30% of the state's transportation  
57 money and will go to capital projects. There is a statewide scoring methodology that applies to all projects but all the  
58 division projects will be ranked at the division level and then the MPO/RPO level.

59  
60 Alex Castro: We are in division 7, Orange County, less the MPO, Durham is in Division 5 so you have cross-  
61 jurisdictional conflicts, how do you resolve that when the Chapel Hill Durham MPO is partially in Division 7 and  
62 partially in Division 5. Do they have to be coordinated by both divisions?  
63

64 Bret Martin: Yes, they will.  
65

66 Paul Guthrie: Why don't you go through the description because there are other questions?  
67

68 Bret Martin: (Continued presentation).  
69

70 Paul Guthrie: If you look at our previous materials from the Triangle Transit, you notice there is a commuter rail link  
71 that starts in Raleigh and stops in Durham County which is part of a longer plan. One of the motivations is because  
72 that is the line where the district ends. I think that is a manifestation of what we will see as we go along with the plan  
73 and we need strategy as to how we deal with that.  
74

75 Bret Martin: Some of the criticism regarding the equity formula will pop up with this. (Continued presentation).  
76

77 Jeff Charles: In this formula, decisions are made at the district level for some things and on a regional level for other  
78 things. At the district level, we are competing with Greensboro and Burlington/Graham. At the regional level, we are  
79 competing with Winston Salem and a whole list of towns down to Charlotte. Most of our contacts are now to the east,  
80 we are at a disadvantage in being able to fully incorporate ourselves in the Research Triangle under this formula.  
81

82 Bret Martin: That is a fair statement.  
83

84 Paul Guthrie: When were these divisions set up?  
85

86 Bret Martin: Many decades ago to coordinate with prison labor to deal with road maintenance. (Continued  
87 presentation).  
88

89 Jeff Charles: Do bicycle facilities fall under this?  
90

91 Bret Martin: Yes.  
92

93 Jeff Charles: The division needs the SR routes which are the regional ones where we want the bike lanes for the  
94 most part.  
95

96 Bret Martin: I will get to that in a moment. There are specific changes that apply to that.  
97

98 Paul Guthrie: 25% of the 50% is local input and the other 25% is DOT Engineer input. The 50% is really 25%.  
99

100 Bret Martin: 25% is the division rank and 25% is the local input. The division rank means, how did the project score  
101 according to the same criteria within the division as opposed to against. (Continued presentation).  
102

103 Jeff Charles: If DOT is going to have 100% statewide; 50% plus the division DOT Engineer's 25%, that is 75%  
104 regional control and then in the sub regional they get 50% plus another 25%. It seems the MPO/RPO rank is 0 at the  
105 statewide region and 25% at the sub-regional.  
106

107 Ted Triebel: Minimal influence.  
108

109 Bret Martin: This is what we worked off of before. At the division level, the MPO/RPO rank has always been a hefty  
110 40% which is profound. For quantitative data, this is the scoring criteria.

111  
112 Ted Triebel: I appreciate your excellent presentation. Regarding the economic competitiveness under the Statewide  
113 Mobility Formula, I understand they are pushing to make that 15% to 20% instead of 10%, have you heard that? The  
114 Board of Transportation chair wanted to get that 15% to 20% and this has not yet been approved on Jones Street.

115  
116 Bret Martin: I didn't know that.

117  
118 Paul Guthrie: It occurs to me that since so many of the projects will require federal involvement and a fairly  
119 significant financial investment, has anyone determined if this will pass the environmental impact test?

120  
121 Bret Martin: The NEPA process is project level. One of the things I was concerned about was that the original  
122 proposal was to do 40/40/20 instead of 40/40/30, and I stated I don't think it is legally possible to do that under  
123 federal laws governing what could be done with the portions provided to the states from the federal highway trust  
124 fund. That was changed at the division level because a large part of the money they get from the federal government  
125 must be divided up by population. They changed it from 40/40/20 to 40/30/30. I don't know how the NEPA process  
126 would impact any of this.

127  
128 Paul Guthrie: Obviously on a project by project basis.

129  
130 Bret Martin: Part of the NEPA process requires for a need and purpose to be established for each project and there  
131 has to be a case made before you can use federal money.

132  
133 Paul Guthrie: I have a map produced on the daily traffic volumes of US interstate highway systems across the United  
134 States and the highest travel routes that I would like to share. I-40/85 from Durham to Winston-Salem is one of the  
135 highest peak highway interstate traffic problems in the country from the standpoint of this map. I don't think we are  
136 dividing up the money on this formula with that in mind.

137  
138 Jeff Miles: How often are the division rank and the MPO/RPO that different?

139  
140 Bret Martin: Every MPO/RPO has an internal ranking process. Typically, they have tried to make their scoring  
141 methodology similar to that of the state because they don't want to have criterion that works against the state. The  
142 division rank is the same criteria as what you see here. (Continued presentation).

143  
144 Jeff Charles: DOT controls 75% and the division rank of 25%. The MPO/RPO had 35% before and now it has only  
145 25%. From my perspective we have less input under the new system.

146  
147 Bret Martin: The division ranking criteria can change. Regions and divisions can devise their own methods.

148  
149 Jeff Charles: How do we get our division to do this?

150  
151 Bret Martin: We need to get all the MPOs and RPOs in our division to agree to it. You can adopt a variation of  
152 scoring factors.

153  
154 Abigail Pittman: Do we have to wait until 2015?

155  
156 Jeff Charles: Because we didn't do it soon enough we have to wait until 2015.

157  
158 Paul Guthrie: We are not be able to change it now but if we wish to get it changed and make an argument at that  
159 time that these are the factors we should be using to score the projects we should be funding and be loud enough, it  
160 might be effective.

161  
162 Bret Martin: Scoring criteria have to be approved by the Board of Transportation. Part of the reason they set a  
163 deadline is because they tried to say these are the rules, no more changing. (Continued presentation).

164  
165 Jeff Miles: Does the 'no right-of-way rule only apply to projects that cost less than a million dollars or for all bike and  
ped projects?

166  
167 Bret Martin: It is for bike/ped projects. Those over a million dollars, that doesn't apply. Those that are over a million  
168 dollars are submitted as highway projects, and they will not score well enough to be funded.  
169  
170 Jeff Charles: Unless we change regionally the way we rank projects in the system.  
171  
172 Alex Castro: The costs that will no longer be borne by the DOT, what percentage are we talking of a contract?  
173  
174 Bret Martin: That depends on the projects.  
175  
176 Alex Castro: 5% to 10% might be a good figure.  
177  
178 Bret Martin: (Continued presentation).  
179  
180 Paul Guthrie: Do you have an opinion of how the NC 86 North project would rank?  
181  
182 Bret Martin: I don't think that is in their system. I know it is a strategic highway.  
183  
184 Abigail Pittman: I don't believe it was every scored.  
185  
186 Bret Martin: There is a widening project that has been submitted for NC 86 at the intersection of NC 57. That project  
187 will actually rank a little lower. Next month we will come to you with other projects from TARPO and DCHC, and  
188 TARPO has already indicated that if we do not have a local match for bike/ped projects under one million dollars that  
189 we are not to submit those projects.  
190  
191 Jeff Charles: Basically the BOCC has to put a new line item in the budget specifically for bike/ped matching funds?  
192  
193 Bret Martin: Yes. Some local government in Orange County has to pay.  
194  
195 Jeff Charles: Basically rural Orange County projects will go by the wayside.  
196  
197 Jeff Miles: How does transit fit into this?  
198  
199 Bret Martin: Our transit system will not be that affected by this.  
200  
201 Paul Guthrie: Numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 are basically correlations with the interstate highway access and to the east the  
202 future industrial zone which has Orange County implications. My personal opinion is that I see no problem with  
203 particular projects. If they don't make this on any state list, at least three could be justified on necessary  
204 improvements to the interstate highway system.  
205  
206 Bret Martin: The last project on Lebanon Road is to construct four foot bicycle lanes, that is likely over a million  
207 dollars so it would need to be submitted as a highway project.  
208  
209 Jeff Charles: Take if off the list.  
210  
211 Abigail Pittman: There is a potential new elementary school site related to this project.  
212  
213 Jeff Charles: That is fine.  
214  
215 **Motion** made to approve the recommended projects in the Burlington-Graham Metropolitan Planning Area as listed  
216 and proposed by staff. Seconded by Jeff Charles.  
217  
218 Vote: Unanimous  
219  
220 **AGENDA ITEM V: STAFF UPDATES**

- 221 a. OUTBoard Appointments and Reappointments
- 222 b. OCBRIP public outreach for bus planning
- 223 **OUTBoard Action:** Receive updates

224  
 225 Abigaile Pittman: I have handouts. The first is from the TARPO meeting. NCDOT passed out a list of active projects  
 226 in Orange County. Reviewed handout. The next topic is OUTBoard appointments and reappointments. We still  
 227 have two vacant positions. We need a representative from the Economic Development commission and Hillsborough  
 228 Township.

229  
 230 **AGENDA ITEM VI: UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS OF INTEREST ON OTHER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION RELATED**  
 231 **BOARD AGENDAS**  
 232 **OUTBoard Action:** Receive information as a handout

233  
 234 Abigaile Pittman: Reviewed information in the handout.

235  
 236 **AGENDA ITEM VII: MEETING SCHEDULE -Next meeting will be September 18, 2013**  
 237 a. Continuation of State and MPO Project Prioritization  
 238 b. Discussion with Dale McKeel, Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator, Department of  
 239 Transportation, City of Durham/DCHC MPO regarding regional bicycle routes, and the  
 240 designation of St. Mary's Road as a regional bicycle route.

241  
 242 Abigaile Pittman: Chuck Edwards did agree to meet with the OUTBoard but he will need an agenda of questions.

243  
 244 Jeff Charles: One of the key things with Dale McKee should be to address the issues we have talked about with the  
 245 new transportation prioritization and funding formula. How will he help us address so that we become more like  
 246 regions one and four. That is high priority. Another question should be, what does he view is the future of  
 247 recreational cycling under this new rule versus as commuter based cycling. This is a very important issue.

248  
 249 Abigaile Pittman: On the agenda next month, I have the Eno Economic Development Access Management Plan to  
 250 show the recommendations I am making for access criteria. The BOCC would like the OUTBoard's feedback on it.

251  
 252 **AGENDA ITEM VIII: BOARD COMMENTS**  
 253 **OUTBoard Action:** Receive comments

254  
 255  
 256 **AGENDA ITEM IX: ADJOURNMENT**

257  
 258 The meeting was adjourned by consensus.  
 259

---

Paul Guthrie, Chair