

MINUTES
ORANGE COUNTY OUTBOARD
AUGUST 19, 2020
REGULAR MEETING

(Due to current public health concerns, this meeting was held virtually.
Members of the OUTBoard, staff and public participated remotely)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Art Menius, At-Large Representative (Chair); Jenn Sykes, At-Large Representative; Ed Vaughn, Cedar Grove Township Representative; David Laudicina, Cheeks Township Representative; Eric Broo, At-Large Representative; Johanna Birckmayer, At-Large Representative; Heidi Perry, At-Large Representative; Brantley Wells (Vice Chair), Hillsborough Township Representative; Tony Blake, At-Large Representative; Roy Schonberg, Chapel Hill Township Representative; Todd Jones, At-Large Representative

MEMBERS ABSENT: Amy Cole, At-Large Representative; Randy Marshall, Bingham Township Representative; Vacant, Eno Township Representative;

STAFF PRESENT: Nish Trivedi, Transportation Planner; Tom Ten Eyck, Transportation/Land Use Planner;

OTHERS PRESENT: Matt Day, TARPO

AGENDA ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER, DETERMINATION OF QUORUM AND INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

Eric Broo called the meeting to order and roll call was taken

AGENDA ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Art Menius to approve the February 19, 2020, OUTBoard Minutes. Seconded by Heidi Perry.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

AGENDA ITEM 3: CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM 4: REGULAR OUTBOARD AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM 4A: ORANGE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (CTP) – (NISH TRIVEDI)

Nish presented the item and reminded Board members that no action is required at this time. Action will be requested at the September meeting. Key highlights from the presentation include the preliminary work started last year following the MTP amendment, subcommittee meeting with all jurisdictions, and forthcoming schedule. The focus of the amendment is highway projects in Orange County's portion of DCHC MPO.

Heidi Perry: Freight, does that mean rail? I have never seen it considered part of complete street or as part of multimodal. Maybe it should be reworded.

Nish Trivedi: No, US 70 is considered a strategic freight corridor. I've received pushback from NCDOT and MPO and they want to see multiple reasons and data to back up those reasons why these should be considered for multimodal. That is why I am requesting your assistance to get them considered. I am adding freight because we are experiencing lots of development around Hillsborough. The Planning Board is considering one major development tonight and there are economic development involving lots of freight along US-70.

Tony Blake: Regarding the consideration tonight, is this area being considered? I was wondering if this is being considered across other issues or is this going ahead.

Nish Trivedi: Yes, #9 is Old NC-86 around this new development proposal. It is an approved County Priority it as a County priority. We are also keeping an eye on Davis Road.

Heidi Perry: I am in favor of modernization but confused, are we seeking widening?

54
55 Nish Trivedi: No, the first 13 are seeking your approval for complete street consideration so that they can have the
56 option for any multimodal improvements like sidewalk, side paths, and transit stops paid by NCDOT. Later, I will need
57 you to recommend we study US-70.

58
59 Heidi Perry: Why wouldn't you say future projects should have Complete Street Policy applied?
60

61 Nish Trivedi: I am getting push back from MPO and NCDOT. They are considering it, but they are not pushing this
62 forward. Right now I'm trying to get local support, your support and BOCC support. If I can show local support,
63 perhaps they will push this forward. I am also showing you the data that goes with them. In your attachment, the first
64 13 sheets include that data that goes with these projects already in the CTP. I don't want them to go ahead with their
65 amendment and these projects not get Complete Street consideration.

66
67 Heidi Perry: Simply confused by the wording. If they will be considered for Complete Streets great, just use Complete
68 Streets.

69
70 Heidi Perry: Can LOS be removed?
71

72 Nish Trivedi: It is standard practice for NCDOT and MPO because it is used to measure capacity for a road. It is like
73 a letter grade on a road to see if it will fail in the future. It is simply the division of Future Volume over the total
74 Capacity of the road. Due to development, certain corridors in the County will fail in the future.

75
76 Heidi Perry: I understand NCDOT's use but if we are going to have more people or destinations, we should be
77 thinking more about how we move them without more vehicles on the road. It is tied to road widening.

78
79 Tony Blake: LOS is more about the quality of the road. It is also about how traffic backs up, delays, intersections,
80 signalization, it is used for lot of things.

81
82 Eric Broo: Downtown Chapel Hill took out a couple lanes and driving there was great. Even though LOS has gone
83 down, my enjoyment has gone up. I understand Heidi Perry's point on LOS and widening.

84
85 Nish Trivedi: Just to clarify. Staff is not recommending any widening. We are not using LOS to widen the road,
86 mainly to show the future failure of the road and something needs to be done about it.

87
88 Eric Broo: When they consider LOS do they consider other modes or just vehicles?
89

90 Nish Trivedi: NCDOT has gotten to use LOS to measure safety of the road. They are working on the data and
91 clarifying it but have not published it. It is supposed to include other users, not just vehicular.

92
93 Eric Broo: NC-86 from Caswell to Chatham cuts through the heart of Chapel Hill. Do they see freight going through
94 the area? I hope truckers don't take their freight through the campus.

95
96 Nish Trivedi: NC-86 is a strategic freight corridor and it does have some freight. The Chapel Hill has already
97 approved the Locally Preferred Alternative for the NS BRT.

98
99 *Nish provided a summary of Environmental Justice Report focusing on County Level analysis.*
100

101 Nish Trivedi: When a block group meets multiple county thresholds, it is a Community of Concern. The highlighted
102 areas are the block groups that meet 4 or more overlapping criteria and Communities of Concerns. These are areas
103 that need special focus on transportation improvements. Just to remind everyone, staff is not recommending
104 widening, adding additional lanes or addressing substandard conditions. We are mainly recommending regional
105 corridors like NC and US and part of Orange Grove Road and New Hope Church Road because they are school
106 areas. Like the Access Management Plan, we are recommending these corridors be considered for multimodal.

107
108 Ed Vaughn: I have a question about ID 20 – 23 – NC-86 between Hillsborough and Chapel Hill. Is there any way to
109 add Shared Use Path? It would also get access to Blackwood Farm Park. It would be a great way to connect the two
110 areas.

111
112 Nish Trivedi: We can but if that is what the OUTBoard recommends. As staff, we are not recommending anything
113 specific complete street option, only that all options be available for these corridors. We would need you as the board
114 to make that specific recommendation for NC-86. If you have any specifics like where you want bike lanes or
115 sidewalks, we will need that support to hopefully get NCDOT and MPO to change their minds.

116
117 Eric Broo: It would be nice to be able to ride that corridor safely, in our next meeting would we just have to take a
118 vote on what we want for these corridors. Is that correct?

119
120 Nish Trivedi: In your attachment 2, you will see the overall project list map and each individual project sheets. You
121 will either recommend BOCC approve or not approve this project and provide comments. In the next meeting, I will
122 request you approve attachment 1. If there are any other recommendations you would like to make, I would need you
123 to vote on it as a board.

124
125 Eric Broo: Would these other recommendations be considered a hindrance, if we were to recommend a specific
126 improvement, would that be considered favorable or hindrance in trying to get it approved in the amendment.

127
128 Nish Trivedi: We as a local jurisdiction do not have final say in the amendment process. The MPO Board does. All
129 we can do is show support. I do not know what you want to see in these corridors, I would need those
130 recommendations from you. If you recommend more than what staff is recommending, MPO may see this as local
131 support and they may move them forward but I cannot speak for the MPO Board or NCDOT. Right now, they have
132 given me a no and I'm trying to change that no.

133
134 Eric Broo: If we blanked approve this, will we have opportunity to make specific recommendations later?

135
136 Nish Trivedi: Yes, until a project gets committed in the future STIP, we will have more time to make
137 recommendations. Right now the CTP is a visionary document and it is changing. Only after SPOT does design
138 actually get involved. We will have more opportunities than. Right now I'm just trying to get you involved in the
139 process to help me change their mind.

140
141 Heidi Perry: Will you give us a statement we can support or modify when we see this again? It would make this go
142 faster if we had it. I think when you include Safety, you should include NC is a Vision Zero state.

143
144 Nish Trivedi: You can email me a draft or I can put something together.

145
146 Ed Vaughn: Where does the I-40 and NC-86 interchange fit into this?

147
148 Nish Trivedi: This interchange improvement has been delayed due to NCDOT funding issues as part of the I-40
149 widening. It is split into 3 projects.

150
151 Eric Broo – Nish will you put a statement together and bring it before us at the next meeting.

152
153 Nish Trivedi: I'll put something together and get it to you for the next meeting. Reviewed the Cross Section, rural
154 areas will get the wide paved shoulder while urban areas like Hillsborough, Carrboro, Mebane, and Chapel Hill will
155 get curb and gutter.

156
157 Nish Trivedi: This item is for information and review tonight and will go back to the OUTBoard as part of the
158 September 16, 2020 OUTBoard/TAS meeting for recommendations

159

160 **AGENDA ITEM 5: STAFF REPORTS/UPDATES**

161
162 **AGENDA ITEM 5A: MPR/RPO AND NCDOT UPDATES (NISH TRIVEDI) -**

163 *Nish provided MPO, RPO and NCDOT update, with the disclaimer that NCDOT project schedule is subject to change*
164 *due to state funding issues.*

165
166 Heidi Perry: I'm confused by NC-54 Operation Improvements with bike/ped accommodations. Is this the project
167 before widening 54? What were the bike/ped accommodations? I think they put in trippers and signals.

168
169 Nish Trivedi: Yes, this is an old funded project in the previous STIP. This is adding traffic signals and improve the
170 function without widening. I don't have all the details but I think this project was completed last year. But we can see
171 if there is any more information on it.

172
173 **AGENDA ITEM 5B: BIKE SAFETY MATERIALS AND EVENTS (TOM TEN EYCK) -**

174 Tom T provided a presentation on the item.

175
176 Eric Broo: What about unanticipated costs?

177
178 Tom Ten Eyck: They are not part of the approved County Budget, they are on us separately. We may pursue County
179 budget in the future but right now, they are on us to pay. This includes ongoing maintenance.

180
181 **AGENDA ITEM 5C: MTSA STUDY ALONG ORANGE GROVE ROAD (TOM TEN EYCK) -**

182 *Tom T provided a presentation on the item, including schedule and process. Page 70, Orange County School Board*
183 *currently does not have any walkable schools zones in the district. Will provide the Grady Brown study to those*
184 *members who want it. Cedar Ridge Study is forthcoming.*

185
186 *Tom Ten Eyck will email the report to the Board via admin.*

187
188 **AGENDA ITEM 6: INFORMATION ITEMS**

189
190 **AGENDA ITEM 7: ADJOURNMENT**

191 OUTBoard meeting was adjourned

192
193
194

Erik Broo, Chair