



600 East Fourth Street  
Charlotte, NC 28202  
704-336-2205  
www.mumpo.org

TO: Mecklenburg-Union MPO Members  
FROM: Robert W. Cook, AICP  
MUMPO Secretary  
DATE: January 11, 2013

**SUBJECT: January 2013 Mecklenburg-Union MPO Meeting  
Wednesday, January 16, 7:00 PM**

The January meeting of the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) is scheduled for Wednesday, January 16, 2013. The meeting will begin at 7:00 PM and will be held in **Room 267** of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, 600 E. Fourth St., Charlotte.

#### **6:00 PM Education Session**

An education session will be held at 6:00 PM in Room 267. The focus will be on what an MPO member should expect in 2013, and will cover the basics associated with participating in the MPO, some of the major issues to be faced in the upcoming year, resources available to make participation easier, etc. A light meal will be provided.

#### ***PLEASE NOTE: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center Access Changes\****

*The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center is located at 600 E. Fourth St. (corner of Fourth and Davidson streets) in uptown Charlotte. Parking is available in the Government Center parking deck located on Davidson St. between Third and Fourth streets; on-street parking is also available.*

*\*There are two ways to enter the Government Center. Enter via the large staircase on the Davidson St. side or through the plaza entrance facing E. Fourth St. (This is a handicapped accessible entrance.) Once inside the building, security staff will assist you to Room 267. Security measures have been improved recently, so please allow more time for entering the building.*

# Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization

January 16, 2013

Room 267-Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center

---

## 6:00 PM Education Session

### Topic

MUMPO 2013

*A review of what to expect as an MPO delegate or alternate in 2013*

## 7:00 PM Meeting Agenda

1. **Call to Order** Ted Biggers

2. **Election of Officers** Ted Biggers

*ACTION REQUESTED: Elect Chairman and Vice-Chairman.*

*BACKGROUND: The MPO's bylaws require that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman be elected annually at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the calendar year. The bylaws also require that the Chairman must have served as an MPO member (delegate or alternate) for one year immediately prior to the election.*

3. **Approval of Minutes** Chairman

*ACTION REQUESTED: Approve November 2012 meeting minutes as presented.*

4. **Citizen Comment Period**

5. **February Special Meeting** Robert Cook

*ACTION REQUESTED: Schedule a special February meeting of the MPO.*

*BACKGROUND: A special February meeting is necessary for the following reasons:*

- *the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has established a deadline of February 28, 2013 for the completion of the Congestion Management Process;*
- *action is likely to be needed to approve the start of a public involvement effort for potential Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Long Range Transportation Improvement Program (LRTP) amendments and an air quality conformity determination for I-77 projects; and*
- *further discussion and possible action related to revisions to the Memorandum of Understanding and other MPO expansion matters.*

6. **2040 Long Range Transportation Plan**

**a. County-Level Population & Employment Projections** Anna Gallup

*ACTION REQUESTED: Endorse county-level population and employment projections as presented.*

*TCC RECOMMENDATION: The TCC unanimously recommended that the MPO endorse the county-level population and employment projections.*

*BACKGROUND: The development of population and employment projections is an important step in the development of the LRTP. The MPO is being asked to endorse county- projections for Mecklenburg and Union counties for the years 2020, 2030 and 2040. These will be the horizon years for the 2040 LRTP.*

*ATTACHMENT: Recommended regional and county-level population and employment projections.*

**b. LRTP Development Update**

Nicholas Landa

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: An Advisory Committee and Steering Committee have been formed to work on updating the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), including the LRTP Goals & Objectives and the highway ranking methodology. Information regarding the LRTP update process will be provided.*

**7. Transportation Improvement Program**

Robert Cook

**a. Potter Road TIP Amendment (TIP #U-5112)**

*ACTION REQUESTED: Approve the proposed TIP amendment as presented.*

*TCC RECOMMENDATION: The TCC unanimously recommended that the MPO approve the TIP amendment.*

*BACKGROUND: TIP project U-5112 is programmed for STP-DA funding in the current TIP for intersection improvements at Potter Road and Pleasant Plains Road in Stallings. This is a request to amend the project scope to include right-of-way acquisition and utility relocation (the project is currently programmed only for construction dollars).*

*ATTACHMENT: Draft resolution.*

**b. Miscellaneous 2012-2018 TIP Amendments**

*ACTION REQUESTED: Approve the proposed TIP amendments as presented.*

*TCC RECOMMENDATION: The TCC unanimously recommended that the MPO approve the TIP amendments.*

*BACKGROUND: See attached memorandum.*

*ATTACHMENT: Memorandum and draft resolution.*

**c. Draft 2015-2021 TIP**

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: See attached memorandum.*

**8. Bicycle & Pedestrian Ranking Methodology**

Adam McLamb

*ACTION REQUESTED: Approve the Bicycle & Pedestrian Ranking Methodology as amended, and adopt the Bicycle & Pedestrian project application form.*

*TCC RECOMMENDATION: The TCC unanimously recommended that the MPO approve the ranking methodology and project application form.*

*BACKGROUND: In May 2011, the MPO approved a bicycle and pedestrian ranking methodology. Since that time, the subcommittee tasked with creating the original methodology has reviewed it, proposed amendments, and developed a project application. Several opportunities have been provided to request feedback on the proposed amendments and application. The attached methodology and project application reflect the proposed amendments, including comments that were received.*

*ATTACHMENT: Amended MUMPO Bicycle & Pedestrian Ranking Methodology and Project Application Form.*

- 9. Congestion Management Process** Scott Kaufhold & Radha Swayampakala  
*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: A draft version of the Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures was presented to the TCC and MPO in November 2012 for information. Based on comments received from various members of the Task Force, TCC, and MPO, these Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures have been consolidated and simplified as shown in the attached document. The MPO will be asked to approve the CMP in February.*

*ATTACHMENT: CMP Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures.*

- 10. Unified Planning Work Program** Robert Cook  
**a. FY 2013 UPWP Amendments**  
*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: Several UPWP projects may not proceed as planned. Funds allocated to support the projects will need to be reallocated.*

*ATTACHMENT: Potential UPWP amendments.*

- b. FY 2014 UPWP**  
*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: Update on the development of the FY 2014 UPWP.*

- 11. I-77 HOT Lanes Project** Bill Coxe  
*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: Update on the status of the I-77 public-private partnership (P3) project.*

- 12. Memorandum of Understanding Subcommittee** Robert Cook  
*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: Update on the work of the subcommittee.*

- 13. Adjourn**

## Regional and County Level Population and Employment

### Regional Population

Year	Recommended	Absolute Growth per Decade	% Growth (change) per Decade
2010	<b>2,647,800</b> (Census)	514,200	24%
2020	<b>3,058,100</b>	410,300	15%
2030	<b>3,506,400</b>	448,300	15%
2040	<b>3,990,300</b>	483,900	14%

### Mecklenburg County Population

Year	Recommended	Absolute Growth per Decade	% Growth (change) per Decade
2010	<b>919,600</b> (Census) (35% of Region)	222,600	32%
2020	<b>1,112,300</b> (36% of Region)	189,200	21%
2030	<b>1,300,900</b> (37% of Region)	188,600	17%
2040	<b>1,492,100</b> (37% of Region)	191,200	15%

### Union County Population

Year	Recommended	Absolute Growth per Decade	% Growth (change) per Decade
2010	<b>201,300</b> (Census) (9% of Region)	75,700	60%
2020	<b>251,600</b> (8% of Region)	50,300	25%
2030	<b>295,900</b> (8% of Region)	44,300	18%
2040	<b>339,800</b> (9% of Region)	43,900	13%

### Regional Employment

Year	Recommended	Absolute Growth per Decade	% Growth (change) per Decade
2010	<b>1,452,000</b> (BEA)	99,000	7%
2020	<b>1,682,100</b>	230,100	16%
2030	<b>1,851,400</b>	169,300	10%
2040	<b>2,073,300</b>	221,900	12%

### Mecklenburg County Employment

Year	Recommended	Absolute Growth per Decade	% Growth (change) per Decade
2010	<b>692,900</b> (BEA) (48% of Region)	84,100	14%
2020	<b>843,500</b> (50% of Region)	150,600	22%
2030	<b>951,600</b> (51% of Region)	108,100	13%
2040	<b>1,080,500</b> (52% of Region)	128,900	14%

### Union County Employment

Year	Recommended	Absolute Growth per Decade	% Growth (change) per Decade
2010	<b>74,100</b> (BEA) (5% of Region)	16,000	28%
2020	<b>91,800</b> (5% of Region)	17,700	24%
2030	<b>103,400</b> (6% of Region)	11,600	13%
2040	<b>116,700</b> (6% of Region)	13,300	13%

**RESOLUTION**  
**ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE MECKLENBURG-UNION URBAN AREA**  
**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**  
**FOR FY 2012- FY 2018**

A motion was made by \_\_\_\_\_ and seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ for the adoption of the resolution and upon being put to a vote was duly adopted.

**WHEREAS**, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) has reviewed the current FY 2012-FY 2018 Transportation Improvement Program and found the need to amend it; and

**WHEREAS**, the following amendment to the North Carolina Transportation Improvement Program has been proposed:

TIP #	Description	Proposed Amendment	Reason
U-5112	Intersection improvements at Potter Road and Pleasant Plains Road in Stallings.	Allow programmed funds to be used for right-of-way acquisition and utility relocation, in addition to construction.	The project is currently allocated funds for construction only.

**WHEREAS**, the Technical Coordinating Committee voted to recommend that the MPO approve the TIP amendment; and

**WHEREAS**, the MPO finds that the proposed amendment conforms to the purpose of the North Carolina State Implementation Plan for maintaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards in accordance with 40 CFR 51 and 93; and

**WHEREAS**, the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan has a planning horizon year of 2035 and meets all requirements of 23 CFR 450.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization that the FY 2012-FY 2018 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Mecklenburg-Union Urban Area be amended as listed above on this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*

I, \_\_\_\_\_, Chairman of the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from the minutes of a meeting of the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization, duly held on this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Robert W. Cook, Secretary



600 East Fourth Street  
 Charlotte, NC 28202  
 704-336-2205  
 www.mumpo.org

TO: MPO Delegates & Alternates  
 FROM: Robert Cook, AICP  
 MUMPO Secretary  
 DATE: January 10, 2013  
 SUBJECT: **2012-2018 TIP Amendments**

**REQUEST**

The MPO is requested to amend the TIP for the projects listed in the table below. At its January 2013 meeting, the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) unanimously recommended that the MPO amend the TIP.

**BACKGROUND**

NCDOT's Program Development Branch has requested that MUMPO amend its TIP for the projects listed below.

TIP Project P-5002 is the project that will result in the construction of a grade-separation between the Norfolk Southern Railroad and the CSX Railroad in Uptown Charlotte's Fourth Ward neighborhood. The requested action is for the TIP to reflect the project being broken down in to smaller components.

TIP #	Description	Proposed Amendment	Reason
C-4957A	Construct sidewalks at Sun Valley HS and Sun Valley MS	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for design
C-4957B	Construct sidewalks on Unionville-Indian Trail Road and Sardis Road	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for design
C-5537	Barton Creek Greenway; construct connector between Clark's Creek and Mallard Creek greenways	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for design
P-5002A	N. Church St. railroad crossing grade crossing closure	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 13	Not previously programmed
P-5002B	NC Music Factory Boulevard and Maxwell Court extension	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 13	Not previously programmed
P-5002C	CSX Railroad detour (related to CSX/NS grade separation project)	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 14	Not previously programmed
P-5002D	Norfolk Southern bridges, track and signals	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 14	Not previously programmed

P-5002E	CSX Railroad signals	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 14	Not previously programmed
---------	----------------------	--	---------------------------

**ATTACHMENTS**

A draft resolution is included in the agenda packet.



**RESOLUTION**  
**ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE MECKLENBURG-UNION URBAN AREA**  
**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**  
**FOR FY 2012- FY 2018**

A motion was made by \_\_\_\_\_ and seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ for the adoption of the resolution and upon being put to a vote was duly adopted.

**WHEREAS**, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) has reviewed the current FY 2012-FY 2018 Transportation Improvement Program and found the need to amend it; and

**WHEREAS**, the following amendments to the North Carolina Transportation Improvement Program have been proposed:

<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>	<b>Reason</b>
C-4957A	Construct sidewalks at Sun Valley HS and Sun Valley MS	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for design
C-4957B	Construct sidewalks on Unionville-Indian Trail Road and Sardis Road	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for design
C-5537	Barton Creek Greenway; construct connector between Clark's Creek and Mallard Creek greenways	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for design
P-5002A	N. Church St. railroad crossing grade crossing closure	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 13	Not previously programmed
P-5002B	NC Music Factory Boulevard and Maxwell Court extension	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 13	Not previously programmed
P-5002C	CSX Railroad detour (related to CSX/NS grade separation project)	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 14	Not previously programmed
P-5002D	Norfolk Southern bridges, track and signals	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 14	Not previously programmed
P-5002E	CSX Railroad signals	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 14	Not previously programmed

**WHEREAS**, the Technical Coordinating Committee voted to recommend that the MPO approve the TIP amendments; and

**WHEREAS**, the MPO finds that the proposed amendment conforms to the purpose of the North Carolina State Implementation Plan for maintaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards in accordance with 40 CFR 51 and 93; and

**WHEREAS**, the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan has a planning horizon year of 2035 and meets all requirements of 23 CFR 450.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization that the FY 2012-FY 2018 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Mecklenburg-Union Urban Area be amended as listed above on this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*

I, \_\_\_\_\_, Chairman of the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from the minutes of a meeting of the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization, duly held on this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Robert W. Cook, Secretary



## **Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Ranking Methodology**

**APPROVED BY THE MPO:** May 18, 2011

**BACKGROUND:** The MPO assigned a Bike/Pedestrian subcommittee in May 2010 with the task of developing criteria to recommend projects to the MUMPO based on a comprehensive and technically-oriented project ranking process. Since the total value of proposed projects often significantly exceeds available funds, an objective evaluation of proposals is necessary to determine the best use of Bike/Pedestrian funds.

The following project ranking criteria process is the result of research and discussions by transportation professionals from the MUMPO region. The committee considered specific quantitative criteria for each of the categories, although this did not always prove to be feasible. The overarching goal was to create a thorough assessment that did not place undue burdens upon the applicant. When a quantitative measure of the absolute effectiveness of the project was not possible or reasonable, criteria based on a yes/no answer was created.

The scoring list below contains work discussed over the course of four subcommittee meetings in July 2010, January 2011, February 2011 and March 2011. The criterion was originally approved by the MPO on May 18, 2011, and has since been revised.

**FINAL PRODUCT:** The MUMPO will have a process available that allows a wide variety of eligible projects to be evaluated for funding, without creating undue burdens on applicants.

### **PROJECT RANKING CRITERIA**

#### **Minimum Requirement**

**Project application and statement of justification:** Provide a MUMPO bicycle and pedestrian project application, to include a **transportation purpose** statement for the project, appropriate map exhibits and photographs that describe the proposed facility, destinations, and surrounding land uses, as well as project scores for each category.

(The application can be found on the MUMPO website)

- 1. Connectivity and Access (45 points possible):** Points will be awarded based on described strengths in design, location and function of facility based on the attributes below. The following definitions shall be used for reference in this section:

Origin – refers to the beginning of the proposed bicycle or pedestrian facility.

Destination – refers to the end point of the trip at an existing location of interest.

- a. Length to destination:** For this category determine if your project’s greater need is bicycle or pedestrian. If the project serves both modes of travel, then the applicant may choose either category (i.e. greenways and multi-modal paths). If the specific project is not directly adjacent to the noted destination, the project must be part of a greater bicycle or pedestrian system which connects to the destination, then the applicant may count that already built portion of the length to destination. Distance should be measured from the shortest distance of the un-built facility to the described destination.

Only use one category from the table below – pedestrian or bicycle:

<b>Pedestrian</b> (miles to destination)	<b>Bicycle</b> (miles to destination)	<b>Points</b>
0.0-.25	0.0-1.0	10
0.26-0.5	1.01-3.0	8
0.51-1.0	3.01-5.0	6
1.01-3.0	5.01-7.5	4
3.01-5.0	7.51-10.0	2
5.01>	10.01>	0

- b. Directness of facility:** Is the path of the facility the most direct feasible route from origin to destination (i.e.-shortest distance from origin to destination)?
- i. Yes = 5 points
  - ii. No = 0 points
- c. Quality and perceived interest in getting to existing destination:** A maximum of **20 points** can be earned for this section. This total is accumulated by adding each item of interest that is a destination for the project. A destination that provides more than one use may only be awarded points for the use of highest interest (e.g. a school with a ball park would receive 5 points for the school use, but would not receive additional points for the ball park).

The following table outlines possible uses and the points associated with each:

<b>High Interest</b> (5 points)	<b>Moderate Interest</b> (3 points)	<b>Low Interest</b> (1 point)
Town Center (proportional to town size)	Multi-Family Residential Development	Low-Density/Single Family Residential Development
Mixed Use Development Center	Park-n-Ride Lot	Privately Accessible Property
Major Employment Center	Light Rail Stop	Bus Stop
Transit Station	Park	
School	Greenway	
	Bus Stop (higher trips and activity)*	

\*Higher trips and activity is defined as 50+ trips and 25+ boardings/alightings (see application for more information).

*Uses not specifically listed in the table, but considered relevant, will be evaluated by the committee tasked with reviewing projects, and may be allocated points if deemed appropriate.*

- d. Regional nature of facility and destinations:** Has the proposed project been identified through a previous planning effort or policy?
- i. Identified in current adopted plan = 5 points
    - o Transportation (LRTP, TIP, CTP, Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Plan or other locally adopted transportation plan or list for community)
    - o Land Use or Comprehensive Plan
    - o Recreation Plan
    - o Economic Development Plan
  - ii. Not identified in current adopted plan = 0 points
- e. Shown path:** A shown path illustrates a known need. This can be an actual shown path on the side of the road, a high volume of observed cyclists along a roadway, etc.
- i. Yes = 5 points
  - ii. No = 0 points

- 2. Feasibility and Cost of Implementation (30 points possible):** Points will be awarded based on described cost/benefit balance and progress made to date on the part of applicant based on the attributes below. The following definitions shall be used for reference for this section:

Right-of-Way or easement acquired or dedicated – refers to r/w or an easement that has been acquired or dedicated through the appropriate process, specifically for use by the proposed project.

Financial Commitment – refers to funding that has been authorized by the decision making body of the jurisdiction proposing the project.

Partial – refers to a minimum of 30% work complete.

**a. Right of Way or easement acquired or dedicated:**

- i. 76%-100% = 15 points
- ii. 51%-75% = 10 points
- iii. 21%-50% = 5 points
- iv. 20% or less = 0 points

**b. Preliminary construction plans in hand:** Has design work taken place for the proposed project?

- i. Completed = 5 points
- ii. Partial = 3 points
- iii. No Work = 0 points

**c. Limited environmental impacts:** To what extent does the proposed project impact the environment?

- i. CE Type I & II = 5 points
- ii. EA = 2 points
- iii. EIS = 0 points

**d. Applicant Financial Commitment:** Does the applicant have a significant financial stake in the project? Are they contributing a significant amount of their own resources towards the total project cost? If so, then they will receive more points than those who may only contribute the minimum amount necessary. The range of percent match of total project cost, and corresponding points, are as follows:

- i. 50% or more = 5 points
- ii. 21-49% = 2 points
- iii. 0-20% = 0 points

**3. Safety (25 points possible):** Project must demonstrate a safer condition for bicyclists and/or pedestrians traveling between origins and destinations in the same general corridor or planning area. Qualities of a project improving bicycle/pedestrian safety including the following attributes:

**a. Existing conditions:** Conditions must demonstrate a safety hazard to cyclists and/or pedestrians as currently designed. Examples of demonstrated safety hazards may include recorded crash data or a posted speed limit over 30 miles per hour.

- i. Yes = 10 points
- ii. No = 0 points

**b. Vehicular speed:** Proposed project design encourages a reduction in vehicular speeds (i.e. - traffic calming devices, narrowed travel lanes, or lower speed limits).

- i. Yes = 5 points
- ii. No = 0 points

**c. Reduced exposure:** Proposed project reduces the exposure between the motor vehicles, bicyclists and/or pedestrians. Examples of a physical barrier may include an off-road greenway, pedestrian refuge island, or a bike boulevard separated by a vertical structure. Examples of a defined space include striped bike lanes, sidewalks adjacent to the curb, crosswalks, and signed bike routes. The applicant should recognize any new safety risks introduced by the project design, such as placing a multi-modal side-path separate from the roadway but crossing multiple driveways or conflict points.

- i. Physical barrier = 10 points
- ii. Defined space = 5 points
- iii. No reduced exposure = 0 points

# Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization

## Bicycle & Pedestrian Projects Application Form

*Please use this form to submit your request for Bicycle & Pedestrian candidate projects. In addition to the application, appropriate map exhibits and photographs must be submitted to describe proposed facility, destinations, and surrounding land uses.*

<b>Project Sponsor Information</b>
Agency:
Contact Name :
Address:
Telephone :
E-Mail:
<b>Project Type (check the appropriate box)</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle Facility <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian Facility
<b>Project Information</b>
Title:
Description – provide a written transportation purpose statement for the project:

# Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization

## 1. Connectivity and Access (45 points possible)

- a. Length to destination:** If the specific project is not directly adjacent to the noted destination, the project must be part of a greater bicycle or pedestrian system which connects to the destination, then the applicant may count that already built portion of the length to destination. Distance should be measured from the shortest distance of the un-built facility to the described destination. *Only use one category pedestrian or bike*

<b>Pedestrian</b> (miles to destination)	<b>Bike</b> (mile to destination)	<b>Points</b>
0.0-.25	0.0-1.0	10
0.26-0.5	1.01-3.0	8
0.51-1.0	3.01-5.0	6
1.01-3.0	5.01-7.5	4
3.01-5.0	7.51-10.0	2
5.01>	10.01>	0

**Miles to Destination:**

**Points:**

- b. Directness of facility:** Is the path to the facility the most direct feasible route from origin to destination (i.e. shortest route from origin to destination)?

Yes = 5 points

No = 0 points

**Origin:**

**Destination:**

**Points:**

- c. Quality and perceived interest in getting to existing destination:** See ranking criteria for examples of high interest, moderate interest and low interest locations.  
*For higher trip and activity bus stop information, contact CATS staff (staff member TBD).*

High interest location = 5 points each

Moderate interest location = 3 points each

Low interest location = 1 point each

**List each location, and its associated points**

**Total Points** (maximum of 20 points possible):

- d. Regional nature of facility and destination:** Has the proposed project been identified through a previous planning effort or policy?

Identified in current adopted plan = 5 points

- Transportation (LRTP, TIP, CTP, Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Plan or other locally adopted transportation plan or list for community)



# Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land Use Plan or Comprehensive Plan</li><li>• Recreation Plan</li><li>• Economic Development Plan</li></ul> <p>Not identified in current adopted plan = 0 points</p> <p><b>Plan:</b></p> <p><b>Points:</b></p>
<p><b>e. Shown path:</b> A shown path illustrates a known need. This can be an actual shown path on the side of the road, a high volume of observed cyclists along a roadway, etc. <i>Provide evidence of shown path – visual, pedestrian counts, etc.</i></p> <p>Yes = 5 points No = 0 points</p> <p><b>Points:</b></p>
<b>2. Feasibility and Cost of Implementation (30 points possible)</b>
<p><b>a. Right of Way or easement acquired or dedicated:</b></p> <p>76-100% = 15 points 51-75% = 10 points 21-50% = 5 points 20% or less = 0 points</p> <p><b>Percentage of right of way:</b></p> <p><b>Points:</b></p>
<p><b>b. Preliminary construction plans in hand:</b> Has design work taken place for the proposed project?</p> <p>Completed = 5 points Partial = 3 points No work = 0 points</p> <p><b>Points:</b></p>
<p><b>c. Limited environmental impacts:</b> To what extent does the proposed project impact the environment?</p> <p>CE Type I &amp; II = 5 points Environmental Assessment = 2 points Environmental Impact Statement = 0 points</p> <p><b>Type of environmental document:</b></p> <p><b>Points:</b></p>

# Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization

**d. Applicant financial commitment:** Does the applicant have a significant financial stake in the project? Are they contributing a significant amount of their own resources towards the total project cost? The range of percent match of total project cost, and corresponding points, are as follows:

50% or more = 5 points

21-59% = 2 points

0-20% = 0 points

**Percentage of contribution:**

**Points:**

### 3. Safety (25 points possible)

**a. Existing conditions:** Conditions must demonstrate a safety hazard to cyclists and/or pedestrians as currently designed. *Examples of demonstrated safety hazards may include recorded crash data or a posted speed limit over 30 miles per hour*

Yes = 10 points

No = 0 points

**Safety hazard:**

**Points:**

**b. Vehicular speed:** Proposed project design encourages a reduction in vehicular speeds (i.e. traffic calming devices, narrowed travel lanes or lower speeds).

Yes = 5 points

No = 0 points

**Design feature:**

**Points:**

**c. Reduced exposure:** Proposed project reduces the exposure between the motor vehicles, bicyclists and/or pedestrians with the use of a physical barrier or a defined space. *The applicant should recognize any new safety risks introduced by the project design, such as placing a multi-modal side path separate from the roadway but crossing multiple driveways or conflict points.*

Physical barrier = 10 points

Defined space = 5 points

No reduced exposure = 0 points

**Device or design feature reducing exposure:**

**Points:**

January 4, 2013

## **Congestion Management Process**

Federal regulations require that MPOs with a population over 200,000 have a process for managing congestion within the area. This Congestion Management Process (CMP) must provide recommendations for the effective management of congested facilities and efficient mobility.

MUMPO is currently developing a CMP, and expects to seek adoption from the MPO in February 2013, in order to meet the FHWA's required approval deadline. A Task Force was formed to oversee this process which has met four times since the initiation of the CMP.

A draft version of the Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures were presented to the TCC and MPO in November 2012 for information. Based on comments received from various members of Task Force, TCC, and MPO, these Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures have been consolidated and simplified as shown below.

At the January, 2013 meeting, we will present this revised information along with a summary of the data collection and analysis to TCC and MUMPO for information. Formal approval and adoption will be requested in February 2013.

### **Goals and Objectives**

#### ➤ **Manage congestion**

- Develop congestion management measures
- Consider full range of Congestion Management Strategies
- Improve the resiliency, redundancy, and reliability of the transportation network
- Reduce non-recurring congestion duration

### **Performance Measures**

- % of Roadway Miles at a Travel Time Index (TTI)/Level of Service (1.2 to 1.49 TTI/Level of Service E - Moderate Congestion; 1.5 or more TTI/Level of Service F - Heavy Congestion)
- Were all reasonable techniques and strategies considered --- Yes / No?
- Extract from Inrix - Buffer, or other indices
- No. of Crashes per 100 MVMT - relate it to statewide average

**Potential FY 2013 UPWP Amendments**

January 10, 2013

<b>Task Code</b>	<b>Task Description</b>	<b>Original Funding Amount</b>	<b>Proposed Funding Amount</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>	<b>Reason for Change</b>
II-10	GIS Analysis & Mapping	\$80,000	\$30,000	\$50,000	Delay in hiring temporary employee
IV-1	Community Goals & Objectives	\$125,000	\$25,000	\$100,000	Decision made not to pursue operational scenario assessment tool
IV-8	Freight Element of LRTP	\$50,000	\$15,000	\$35,000	Regional freight study will not be pursued this year; remaining funds needed for freight-related analysis
IV-2	Highway Element of LRTP	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	Delay Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) ordinance review until FY 14
		\$355,000	\$120,000	<b>\$235,000</b>	
<b>Task Code</b>	<b>Task Description</b>	<b>Original Funding Amount</b>	<b>Proposed Funding Amount</b>	<b>Proposed Additional Funding</b>	<b>Reason for Change</b>
V-1	Congestion Management Strategies	\$225,000	\$426,656	\$201,656	Additional funding needed for Congestion Management Process (CMP) and ranking methodology
VI-10	Corridor Protection & Special Studies	\$228,000	\$261,344	\$33,344	Ensure adequate funding for on-call services
				<b>\$235,000</b>	