



M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853
704-336-2205
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE

CORNELIUS

DAVIDSON

HUNTERSVILLE

INDIAN TRAIL

MATTHEWS

MECKLENBURG
COUNTY

MINT HILL

MONROE

NCDOT

PINEVILLE

STALLINGS

UNION
COUNTY

WAXHAW

WEDDINGTON

WESLEY CHAPEL

WINGATE

TO: TCC Members
FROM: Nicholas Polimeni
MUMPO Principal Planner
DATE: March 31, 2011
**SUBJECT: Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Agenda
April 2011 TCC Meeting—April 7, 2011**

The April 2011 TCC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, April 7 at 10:00 AM** in the **Uptown Conference Room** of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (600 East Fourth Street). Attached is a copy of the agenda.

Please call me at (704) 336-8309 if you have any questions.

MUMPO TCC
AGENDA
April 7, 2011

- 1. Consideration of March Meeting Minutes** Bill Coxe
ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented, or with amendments.

- 2. Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** (15 minutes) Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: Request that the MPO approve the release of the draft 2012-2018 TIP, draft 2035 LRTP amendment report and draft air quality conformity determination report for public comment.

BACKGROUND: All TIP issues have been resolved and the comment period is set to begin after the MPO's special meeting scheduled for Wednesday, April 27. A recommendation on a final TIP is tentatively scheduled for July.

ATTACHMENT: TIP Memorandum

- 3. MUMPO Conformity Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)** (5 minutes) Eldewins Haynes
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: This Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), or Conformity State Implementation Plan, describes the State's interagency consultation and transportation conformity procedures. The Clean Air Act requires these procedures to be documented. The MOA is between MUMPO, the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), the North Carolina Department Of Environment And Natural Resources (NCDENR), Mecklenburg County Air Quality (MCAQ), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). NCDENR has asked that MUMPO initiate its formal adoption process as soon as possible. This presentation is for information only, but a recommendation to the MPO for adoption of the MOA will be requested at a future meeting.

To view the MUMPO Conformity Memorandum of Agreement, click [here](#).

- 4. Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model Update** (10 minutes) Anna Gallup
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: The purpose of this item is to provide staff with an update on the progress of the Metrolina regional travel model. Emphasis will be placed on the development of both base year and projected population and employment.

- 5. Bicycle and Pedestrian Prioritization Process** (30 minutes) Lauren Blackburn
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: The TCC received a status update at its March meeting regarding the development of a methodology for ranking bicycle and pedestrian projects. The objective at the April TCC meeting will be to review the proposed criteria.

ATTACHMENT: Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Ranking Methodology; Scoring Matrix

6. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (10 minutes)

Robert Cook

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the status of the UPWP.

7. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) (5 minutes)

Anil Panicker

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the status of this project.

8. Adjourn

MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Summary Meeting Minutes
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 267
March 3, 2011

Voting Members: Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Danny Pleasant (CDOT), George Berger (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Ken Tippet (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Jonathan Wells – alt for Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe), David McDonald (CATS), Richard Hancock – alt for Barry Moose (NCDOT-Div. 10), Jack Flaherty (NCDOT-Public Transportation Branch), Anil Panicker (NCDOT-TPB), Lauren Blackburn (Davidson), Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Adam McLamb – alt for Scott Kaufhold (Indian Trail), Ralph Messera (Matthews), Kevin Icard (Pineville), Shannon Martel – alt. for Brian Matthews (Stallings), Greg Mahar (Waxhaw), Jordon Cook (Weddington), Amy Helms (Union County)

Staff: Stuart Basham (MUMPO), Robert Cook (MUMPO), Nick Polimeni (MUMPO), Andy Grzynski (CDOT), Tim Gibbs (CDOT), Anna Gallup (CDOT), Eldewins Haynes (CDOT), Norm Steinman (CDOT), Matt Magnasco (CDOT), John Mrzygod (Charlotte E&PM), Tonia Wimberly (Charlotte E&PM), Louis Mitchell (NCDOT-Div. 10), Zachary Gordon (Huntersville), Jim Loyd (Monroe), Tom Tasselli (Cornelius), Crissy Huffstickler (C-M Planning), Loretta Barren (FHWA) – phone,

Guests: Christy Shumate (NCTA) – phone, Todd Steiss (PB), Greg Boulanger (HNTB), Padam Singh (HNTB), Carl Gibilaro (PBS&J), Steve Blakley (Kimley-Horn), John Townsend (Davenport Transportation)

Bill Coxe opened the meeting at 10:05 AM.

Mr. Coxe opened the meeting and stated that two items have been requested to be added to the agenda: 1) The Town of Weddington would like to propose an amendment to the 2009-2015 TIP and 2) The Town of Indian Trail would like to propose an amendment to the FY 11 UPWP. Mr. Coxe suggested that the TIP amendment request be taken as part of item 3 on the agenda, and that the UPWP amendment be taken as part of item 9 on the agenda. He asked if the TCC was amenable to adding the two items, to which the TCC consented.

1. Consideration of February Meeting Minutes

Mr. Coxe asked if there were any changes needed to the February minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Coxe noted the following changes, all under item 5 of the February TCC minutes (Draft Transportation Improvement Program):

- Under the first bullet point, change “eight lanes” to “four lanes”
- The second sub-bullet under the first bullet point is redundant and should be addressed under the first bullet point
- The wording under the first sub-bullet of the bullet point regarding Ms. Blackburn’s comments should be modified to state that a consultant has been procured specifically for project I-4750

Mr. Messera moved to approve the February minutes with the above noted corrections. Mr. Wells seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

2. Charlotte Streetcar Project

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook noted that the public comment period was extended to Monday, February 28 due to a problem with MUMPO's website. He also pointed out that information regarding the City of Charlotte paying the \$12 million matching funds for the project was added to the website. Mr. Cook stated that approximately 40 comments were received and that nine people attended the public meeting on February 16.

Mr. Coxe noted that there was a lot of similarity among the public comments, and that he would like a few items from the comments to be addressed:

- The funds take away the potential for other projects to be funded
 - Mr. McDonald, of CATS, responded that the funds were awarded as part of a Circulator Grant and that those particular funds can only be applied to a streetcar-type project;
- These funds complete a small segment of a larger streetcar project. In the long term, is there a plan to complete the project?
 - Mr. McDonald stated that the remainder of the streetcar project is in 2035 Horizon year of the LRTP, which was adopted by the MPO;
- These funds pay for construction of the project, what about operating and maintenance costs?
 - Mr. McDonald replied that operating and maintenance costs for the streetcar project will be included in the City of Charlotte's budget, and has been acknowledged as such by both the Charlotte City Council and the City Manager.

Motion:

Mr. Pleasant made a motion to recommend that the MPO take the following action:

- Amend the 2009-2015 TIP to place project funding for the 1.5 mile segment of the Charlotte Streetcar in FY 2011;
- Amend the 2035 LRTP to place the 1.5 mile segment of the Charlotte Streetcar in the 2015 Horizon Year; and
- Make a conformity determination on the amended 2009-2015 TIP and amended 2035 LRTP.

Mr. Messera seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

3. CATS 2009-2015 TIP Amendment

Presenter: David McDonald, CATS

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. McDonald informed the TCC about an amendment regarding TIP project number U-5210, described in the TIP as "Flex STP funding to CATS" to be used for a capital project – the replacement of the fuel tank farm at the N. Davidson Street bus garage. He stated that the \$1.5 million of funds is currently included in the 2012-2018 TIP, as agreed upon previously by the TCC and MPO, but the project is ahead of schedule and the funds are needed in fiscal year 2011 so an amendment to the current 2009-2015 TIP is required, which is what is being requested of the TCC and MPO. He also noted that a correction to the funding structure is necessary due to the fact that the city will contribute a 20 percent local match instead of the 10 percent local match and 10 percent state match identified in the resolution. Mr. McDonald stated that the resolution would be amended to reflect that change prior to the MPO meeting in March.

Motion:

Mr. Flaherty made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed 2009-2015 TIP amendment as presented. Mr. Pleasant seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3A. Weddington 2009-2015 TIP Amendment

Presenter: Richard Hancock, NCDOT Div. 10

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Hancock stated that NCDOT has been working with the Town of Weddington on improvements to access along the NC 16 corridor (TIP #U-2510A). As a result of that process, the town and the DOT have identified two projects they would like to construct – 1) Relocate the intersection of NC 16 and Weddington Church Rd so the road will no longer bisect the school and the church at that location, and 2) Construct a roundabout with dual lanes on Weddington-Matthews Rd where it intersects with NC 84. Mr. Hancock noted that a new TIP number will be needed instead of including the project with the current Hwy 16 TIP project (U-2510A). He stated that approximately \$1.3 million is currently programmed in the TIP for these improvements. Mr. Pleasant asked if action is necessary now. Mr. Coxe stated that he is uncomfortable taking action at this time. Mr. Hancock and Mr. Jordan Cook agreed that a recommendation from the TCC could be made at its April meeting.

4. ARRA Rail Improvements

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook noted that a grant for approximately \$8 billion was awarded to the state of North Carolina in 2009 to be applied to various rail projects throughout the state, including several in the Charlotte area. He noted that Congress recently discussed rescinding the funds and stated that this would be a good time for MUMPO to voice its opinion. Mr. Messera noted the importance of the rail projects, and emphasized his support for the funding. Mr. Coxe noted that adopting a resolution regarding the ARRA Rail Improvements would put the MPO in the arena of political decision making. Mr. Steinman suggested specifically including I-85 relief in the resolution, which was agreed upon by other TCC members.

Motion:

Mr. Messera made a motion to recommend that the MPO adopt a resolution of continued support for high speed rail, with the inclusion of relief to I-85. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

a. Draft TIP Status Update and Timeline

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook stated that the timeline for adopting the TIP was still on track and that the TCC would be asked to recommend release of the TIP-related documents for public review in April. He also stated that the MPO would be asked at its March meeting to add special meetings to its schedule for April and June, to ensure approval of the TIP stays on schedule. He then stated that specific issues regarding the TIP needed to be discussed and asked Mr. Coxe to start by discussing the I-77 HOT Lanes project.

b. I-77 Widening and HOT Lanes Conversion

Presenter: Bill Coxe, Town of Huntersville

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Coxe summarized a proposal made by NCDOT at the February TCC meeting to use funds currently programmed in the outer years of the TIP to widen I-77 to four lanes in each direction, including conversion of a HOV lane to a HOT lane, to exit 28, as well as the incorporation of TIP project I-3311E to widen substandard lanes on I-77 to the proper width, as part of this project. He also noted that several discussions had taken place since the February TCC meeting regarding this project. Mr. Cook noted that Mr. Moose, of NCDOT Division 10, suggested dividing the project into an A and B segment – A) The original project proposal, and B) The February TCC proposal as planning and design only. A discussion by the TCC resulted in the following:

- There is support for the originally proposed HOT lane project to Catawba Ave, which would be placed in the 2015 horizon year of the LRTP and the appropriate funding year in the TIP;
- There is no support for adding a general purpose lane to this project due to the anticipated adverse impact on the success of the HOT lane;
- There is support for extending the HOT lanes across the causeways (without widening the causeways) to the 6 lane section in Iredell County – the TCC endorsed placing this project in the 2025 horizon year.

Following the I-77 discussion, Mr. Cook noted these other changes to the TIP project list:

- I-485 widening from I-77 to Johnston Rd was accelerated from FY15 to FY13 which will require amendments to the TIP and LRTP;
- Highway 27 improvements from Edgewood Rd to Toddville Rd will be funded by the City of Charlotte but needs to be included in the TIP because it is classified as regionally significant;
- Airport Entrance Rd will be built by the Charlotte-Douglas Airport, but also needs to be in the TIP because it is classified as regionally significant as well;
- The City of Charlotte has requested that CMAQ funds for the Harburn Forest project be shifted from FY13 to FY14 – no CMAQ funds will be lost due to this change.

Mr. Cook then stated that no decision had been made regarding the Rea Rd Extension project due to the fact that the MPO, at its January meeting, agreed to allow 60 days for the town and the property owner to work on a resolution. Jordan Cook, representing the Town of Weddington, stated that a letter from the property owner was received stating that he would donate the land if sewer capacity is allocated, and that the Union County Board of Commissioners is scheduled to meet March 7 to vote on this issue. Mr. Coxe noted that \$2.3 million is allocated for the project in the TIP, and Mr. Hancock, of NCDOT Division 10, stated that a cost estimate had been done for the proposed Rea Rd project that priced it at approximately \$7 million for a two-lane cross section. The TCC did not feel comfortable making a recommendation to the MPO based on the information provided.

c. Prosperity Church Rd/I-485 Interchange

Presenter: Matt Magnasco, CDOT

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Magnasco provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He summarized a request to shift STP-DA funds from the realignment of Little Rock Rd in Charlotte (TIP project U-5116) to the northwest arc of the Prosperity Church Rd interchange for the following reasons:

- Little Rock Rd is far enough along that using the DA funds would actually delay the project – the City of Charlotte is going to fund the project instead;
- Due to the acceleration of completing the I-485 loop, analysis of the Prosperity Church Rd interchange indicates that the northwest arc will have the highest traffic volume and must be completed prior to I-485 opening in order to ensure that traffic flows properly

- \$4.8 million is requested to be shifted from Little Rock Rd (FY15) to Prosperity Church northwest arc (FY13)
- The LRTP would also need to be amended to include the Prosperity Church project in the 2015 Horizon Year.

Mr. Coxe emphasized that DA dollars are federal funds, not a particular municipality's funds and that the TCC and MPO need to decide if this is the best use for the money. Ms. Helms asked if swapping DA funds had been done before by MUMPO and several examples were cited that it had been done before. It was suggested that this item be discussed at a transportation staff meeting prior to the March MPO meeting.

6. 601 South Connector Project

Presenter: Jim Loyd, City of Monroe

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Loyd stated that the City of Monroe hired a consultant to look at potential alignments for US 601 and introduced John Townsend to describe the possible alternatives. Mr. Townsend presented four possible alignments. He noted that alignments 1-3 were about the same cost but that alignment four would be significantly higher in cost due to restricted access and wider cross sections, along with grade separations. Mr. Coxe asked if any takings would be necessary. Mr. Townsend responded that alignment four would have significant right-of-way impacts but that alignments 1-3 were mostly rural. Ms. Helms noted that alignment one could impact an elementary school and that alignment three goes through park land. Mr. Coxe suggested that the item be discussed at a Wednesday staff meeting prior to the item coming back before the TCC at its May meeting.

7. Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model Update

Presenter: Anna Gallup, CDOT

Summary/FYI:

Ms. Gallup noted that UPWP funds had been previously allocated for modeling work. She stated that those funds have been applied to various tasks, including the following:

- The purchase of travel time data;
- Freight data is scheduled to be purchased this fiscal year, with help from NCDOT;
- The execution of a contract for a Household Travel Survey is in progress and will go before the Charlotte City Council on March 28 for approval;
- Vehicle classification counts are being done by NCDOT; and
- Work on regional counts will begin in early 2012.

8. Bicycle and Pedestrian Prioritization Process

Presenter: Lauren Blackburn, Town of Davidson

Summary/FYI:

Ms. Blackburn provided a summary of the progress of the bicycle and pedestrian ranking subcommittee and distributed preliminary criteria to the TCC to review. She stated that the next step will be to schedule the item for a Wednesday staff meeting to receive input and present the item for information at the March TCC meeting. The item will be on a future TCC and MPO agenda for approval of the criteria.

9. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook stated that there is no new information from FHWA to report regarding the status of FY 2012 UPWP funding. He noted some significant allocation request changes, and specifically asked Union County to report any updates on its project requests. Ms. Helms stated that the Union County Board would address the proposed project request(s) at its March 7 meeting, and she would have more information based on the outcome of that meeting. She also noted that some estimates have been received, and that they came in under bid.

9A. FY 11 UPWP Amendment Request

Presenter: Adam McLamb, Town of Indian Trail

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. McLamb stated that the Town of Indian Trail would like to request a change of use of the \$25,000 allocation of FY 2011 UPWP funds. Instead of using the funds for a joint local transportation plan previously planned with the towns of Matthews and Stallings, the Town of Indian Trail would like to use the funds for an intersection analysis, including looking at multi-modal options at intersections. He stated that the town would provide the match and that he does not foresee a problem with the town spending the funds in FY 2011, as required. Mr. Coxe asked if the towns of Matthews and Stallings would still be able to complete the local transportation plan without the participation of Indian Trail. Both towns indicated they would proceed with the project and Mr. Messera, of Matthews, indicated he did not have a problem taking action on the item.

Motion:

Mr. McDonald made a motion to recommend that the MPO amend the FY 2011 UPWP to change the use of the \$25,000 allocated to Indian Trail from a joint local area transportation plan with the towns of Matthews and Stallings to an intersection analysis project in the Town of Indian Trail. Ms. Helms seconded the motion. Upon being put a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

10. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)

Presenter: Anil Panicker, NCDOT

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Panicker stated that a meeting was scheduled for the following week with representatives from NCDOT to discuss Complete Streets and how it relates to the CTP.

11. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM.



M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853
704-336-2205
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE
CORNELIUS
DAVIDSON
HUNTERSVILLE
INDIAN TRAIL
MATTHEWS
MECKLENBURG
COUNTY
MINT HILL
MONROE
NCDOT
PINEVILLE
STALLINGS
UNION
COUNTY
WAXHAW
WEDDINGTON
WESLEY CHAPEL
WINGATE

TO: Technical Coordinating Committee
FROM: Robert W. Cook, AICP
MUMPO Secretary
DATE: March 31, 2011
SUBJECT: **Draft 2012-2018 Transportation Improvement Program**

BACKGROUND & STAFF REQUEST

All outstanding TIP-related issues appear to have been resolved. The attached spreadsheet lists all project changes that have been discussed over the past several months. It also lists information related to LRTP amendments necessitated by project schedule changes.

Staff will request that the TCC recommend to the MPO that it release the following TIP-related documents for public review:

1. draft 2012-2018 TIP
2. draft 2035 LRTP amendments report
3. draft air quality conformity determination report

The MPO has scheduled a special meeting on April 27 at 9:00 AM to take action on releasing the draft documents for public review.

PROJECTS

1. I-77 Managed Lanes

The MPO endorsed the HOV lanes conversion project at its March meeting. Therefore the project to be programmed in the TIP will consist of the conversion of the existing HOV lanes to HOT lanes and extending them to exit 28. The project, now identified as I-5405, will be programmed in FY 2015 and placed in the LRTP's 2025 horizon year.

Also proposed is an amendment to the LRTP that calls for extending the HOT lanes to exit 33 in Iredell County. This project will not be programmed in the TIP, but will be placed in the LRTP's 2025 horizon year.

2. Rea Road Extension, U-3467

The project is proposed to be programmed for ROW acquisition in FY 2015 and construction in FY 2016; the proposed LRTP horizon year is 2025. The MPO endorsed including this project in the TIP at its March meeting.

3. Old Monroe Road, U-4714

The towns of Indian Trail and Stallings have stated that improvements to Old Monroe Road are a higher priority than two currently funded TIP projects: U-3809, Indian Trail Road, and U-3825, Stallings Road. The original plan was to transfer the funding from these two projects to U-4714 via TIP and LRTP amendments after the adoption of the TIP; however, NCDOT has indicated a strong desire to make the changes at this time.

4. TIP Project U-5116

STP-DA funds were originally applied to this project to realign Little Rock Road in northwest Charlotte. The City of Charlotte, which is administering the project, has proposed to use the funds to construct a portion of the I-485/Prosperity Church Road interchange in northeast Charlotte. The MPO endorsed using the funds for the interchange project at its March meeting.

TRANSPORTATION STAFF MEETING DISCUSSION

The draft TIP will be discussed at the April 6 Transportation Staff meeting. This will provide the TCC with an opportunity to discuss issues and concerns before action is requested at the April TCC meeting.

TIP Changes/Decisions
March 23, 2011

TIP #	Project	TIP		LRTP		Reason for FY or HY Change	Issues/Comments
		Current 09-15 TIP FY	Prop 12-18 TIP FY	Current HY	Proposed HY		
R-211 EC	I-485/Weddington Road interchange	2011	Unfunded	2015	2025	Delayed to Unfunded status	Ranking resulted in 15 points; LRTP rank 128; NO to applying equity funds
U-5110	McKee Road grade separation	2014	2014	Not in plan	2015	N/A	Change project limits: Independence Blvd to Stevens Mill Road
U-3850	Belk Freeway/I-77 interchange	2012	2012	2015	2015	N/A	Revert to 09-15 TIP desc: Add westbound lane through I-77 interchange
U-209B	Independence Boulevard widening	2011	2012	2015	2015	To assist in balancing funds	No need to change LRTP horizon year
I-5405	I-77, HOV conversion to HOT and extend to exit 28	N/A	2015	Not in plan	2025	New project	
I-4750	I-77 widening (NC 73 to I-40)	Unfunded	Unfunded	Not in plan	2025	Project accelerated to FY 2020	FHWA recommends 2025 HY
I-4733	I-77/Catawba Ave interchange	Unfunded	2011	2025	2015	Project accelerated to FY 2013	Project can be completed before end of 2015
U-3467	Rea Road Extension	2013 (partial)	2016	Not in plan	2025	Project scope has changed	
TBD	Freedom Dr widening, Edgewood Dr to Toddville Road	N/A	2013	2015	2015	See next column	FHWA states that project must be in TIP due to being regionally significant
U-5112	Potter Road improvements	2014	2014	Not in plan	2015	FHWA requires project to be in LRTP	Change project desc to note intersection improvements only
R-2420A	City Boulevard Extension	Unfunded	2013	2015	2025	Project is regionally significant	
I-5126	I-77 widening (Augustalee)	2013	Drop	2015	Drop	Project replaced by new TIP mgd lanes project	
I-5127	I-77/Westmoreland Road interchange (Augustalee)	2013	Drop	2015	2025	Delayed due to delay in Augustalee project	Cornelius is OK with dropping project from TIP
U-5128	Statesville Road widening (Augustalee)	2013	Drop	2015	2025	Delayed due to delay in Augustalee project	TCC & MPO endorsed dropping from TIP in November 2010
U-5129	Westmoreland Road widening (Augustalee)	2013	Drop	2015	2025	Delayed due to delay in Augustalee project	TCC & MPO endorsed dropping from TIP in November 2010
U-5130	Jim Cooke Road (Augustalee)	2013	Drop	2015	2025	Delayed due to delay in Augustalee project	TCC & MPO endorsed dropping from TIP in November 2010
U-5131	Northcross Drive Extension (Augustalee)	2013	Drop	2015	Drop	Delayed due to delay in Augustalee project	TCC & MPO endorsed dropping from TIP in November 2010-replace w/ U-5108
U-2547	Charles St. widening	2011	Unfunded	2015	2035	Delayed to Unfunded status	
U-3809	Indian Trail Road widening	2012	Drop	2015	Remove from plan	Shift funds to Old Monroe Road	Indian Trail and Stallings have determined that Old Monroe Road is a higher priority. U-3809 and U-3825 will be dropped from the TIP and LRTP.
U-3825	Stallings Road widening	2011	Drop	2015	Remove from plan	Shift funds to Old Monroe Road	
U-4714B	Old Monroe Road widening, I-485 to Indian Trail Road	Unfunded	2017	2025 (B section)	2025 (B section)	See U-3809 and U-3825	A section (Trade St. to I-485) and C section (Indian Trail Road to Wesley Chapel-Stouts Road) are Unfunded and wil not be placed in the Plan
R-2555B	W. Catawba Ave widening	Unfunded	2018	2035	2025	Project accelerated to FY 2018	
U-4913	Idlewild Road (Stallings)	Unfunded	2018	Not in plan	2025	Project accelerated to FY 2018	
I-3311E	I-77 SB lane widening, I-85 to Brookshire Frwy	2013	2016	Not in plan	2025	Project omitted from original 2035 LRTP list	This will correct error in 2035 LRTP
U-203	Airport Entrance Road	Unfunded	2012	Not in plan	2015	City has committed to build project	Project is regionally significant
U-5325	Roundabout-NC 84 & Wedd-Matt Road; NC 16 & Wedd Church Road-relocate intersection	N/A	2011	Not in plan	2015	New project	
TE-5103	Charlotte Streetcar	N/A	2011	2035	2015	Project accelerated due to receipt of grant	This affects only a 1.5 mile segment
R-4902	I-485, I-77 to Johnston Road	2015	2013	2025	2015	Project accelerated to 2013	
U-5116	Little Rock Road relocation	2015	2015	Not in plan	2015	FHWA requires project to be in LRTP	Change project desc to: cons NW arc of Prosperity Church Road/I-485 xhange
U-4024A	US 601 widening & US 74 interchange improvements	2014	Unfunded	Not in plan	Not in plan	To assist in balancing funds	
U-2507A	Mallard Creek Road-Sugar Creek Road	2011	2012	2015	2015	To assist in balancing funds	
U-2509	Independence Blvd, Idlewild Road to I-485	Unfunded	2018 (ROW only)	2025 & 2035	2025 & 2035		Project in plan to NC 51 only



Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Bike/Pedestrian Project Ranking Process

APPROVED BY THE MPO:

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.

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 statement of justification: Proved a written **transportation purpose** statement for the project. Appropriate map exhibits and photographs must be submitted to describe proposed facility, destinations, and surrounding land uses.

1. **Connectivity and Access (50 points possible):** Points will be awarded based on described strengths in design, location and function of facility per the following attributes:
 - a. **Length to destination:** For this category determine if your project's greater need is bike or pedestrian. If the facility is part of a greater bicycle or pedestrian system which connects to a 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 unbuilt facility to the described destination. (Only use one category pedestrian or bike)

Pedestrian (miles to destination)	Bike (mile to destination)	Points
0.0-.25	0.0-1	10
0.26-0.5	1.1-3.0	8
0.6-1.0	3.1-5.0	6
1.1-3.0	5.1-7.5	4
3.1-5.0	7.6-10.0	2
5.1>	10.0>	0

- b. Directness of facility:** Is the path of the facility the most direct feasible from location to location (i.e.-shortest distance from origin to destination)?
- i. Yes = 5 points
 - ii. No = 0 points
- c. Accessibility of facility design:** Is the facility designed above a minimum accessible manner (slope, materials, ADA, ect.)? *Applicant must detail and show references to be granted points.*
- i. Yes = 5 points
 - ii. No = 0 points
- d. Quality and perceived interest in getting to existing destination:** The following are examples of destinations of high interest: town center, TOD's, major employment center and mixed use commercial. Each high interest location is worth five (5) points. The following are examples of destinations of moderate interest: multi family residential developments, schools, parks, bus stops and park-n-rides. Each moderate interest location is worth three (3) points. The following are examples of destinations of lower interest: low-density residential or privately accessible property. Each low interest location is worth one (1) point. 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.
- e. 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
- f. 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 (25 points possible):** Points will be awarded based on described cost/benefit balance and progress made to date on part of applicant based on the following attributes:
- a. Right of Way or easement acquired or dedicated:**
- i. 100%-76% = 10 points
 - ii. 75%-51% = 5 points
 - iii. 50% 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. Design:** Project design that would reduce a demonstrated hazard (may be demonstrated through 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 encourages a reduction in vehicular speeds (i.e. - traffic calming devices, narrowed travel lanes, lower speeds).
 - 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.
 - i. Physical barrier = 10 points
 - ii. Defined space = 5 points
 - iii. No reduced exposure = 0 points



Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Bike/Pedestrian Project Ranking Process

Project Name: _____
Submitted By: _____

1. Project Narrative (0 points possible):

2. Connectivity and Access (50 points possible):

ITEM	POINT(S)
a. Length to destination:	
b. Directness of facility:	
c. Accessibility of facility design:	
d. Quality and perceived interest in getting to destination:	
e. Regional nature of facility and destinations:	
f. Shown Path:	
TOTAL	0

3. Feasibility and Cost of Implementation (25 points possible):

ITEM	POINT(S)
a. Right of Way acquired of dedicated:	
b. Preliminary construction plans in hand:	
c. Limited environmental impacts:	
d. Financial Partnership:	
TOTAL	0

4. Safety (25 possible points):

ITEM	POINT(S)
a. Design:	
b. Vehicular speed:	
c. Reduce exposure:	
TOTAL	0

Project Point Total	
Section 2	0
Section 3	0
Section 4	0
Total	0