



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:** April 27, 2011  
**SUBJECT: Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Agenda  
May 2011 TCC Meeting—May 5, 2011**

The May 2011 TCC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, May 5 at 10:00 AM in Room 267** 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**  
**May 5, 2011**

---

- 1. Consideration of April Meeting Minutes** Bill Coxe  
*ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented, or with amendments.*
  
- 2. MUMPO Self Certification** (5 minutes) Robert Cook  
*ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend to the MPO that it adopt the attached resolution certifying MUMPO's compliance with all federal transportation planning laws, statutes, etc. during FY 11.*

*BACKGROUND: Federal regulations require MPOs to self-certify that they comply with all laws, statutes, etc. governing the transportation planning process.*

*ATTACHMENT: Draft resolution*
  
- 3. Centralina Council of Governments Sustainability Grant** (10 minutes) Bill Duston  
*ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO approve a Memorandum of Understanding with respect to a grant received by the Centralina COG from the NC Sustainable Communities Task Force, and to adopt a Resolution of Support for the Centralina COG to apply for a HUD Sustainability Grant in 2011.*

*BACKGROUND: The Centralina COG received a grant from the NC Sustainable Communities Task Force and is requesting approval of a MOA from the TCC and MPO. The Centralina COG is also seeking support to apply for a HUD Sustainability Grant later this year. Both grants will be used to complete work that would have been undertaken had the region received the national Sustainability Grant that was applied for last year; however, at a much smaller scale since the funding amount is significantly less.*
  
- 4. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** (15 minutes) Robert Cook  
*ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend to the MPO adoption of the FY 12 UPWP.*

*BACKGROUND: The UPWP is adopted annually and identifies the major transportation planning activities to be undertaken during the fiscal year.*

*ATTACHMENT: Spreadsheet (additional information will be provided under separate cover)*
  
- 5. Bicycle and Pedestrian Prioritization Process** (10 minutes) Lauren Blackburn  
*ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO endorse the proposed bicycle and pedestrian ranking criteria.*

*BACKGROUND: The TCC received a presentation at its April meeting outlining a methodology for ranking bicycle and pedestrian projects. The TCC is now being asked to endorse the criteria and recommend that the MPO do the same. The process of ranking bicycle and pedestrian projects will begin after the criteria are endorsed.*

*ATTACHMENT: Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Ranking Methodology; Scoring Matrix*

- 6. MUMPO Conformity Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)** (5 minutes) Eldewins Haynes  
*ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO endorse the Conformity Memorandum of Agreement*

*BACKGROUND: The Conformity Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which describes the State's interagency consultation and transportation conformity procedures, was presented at the April TCC meeting for information. The Clean Air Act requires these procedures to be documented, so the TCC is being asked to recommend that the MPO endorse the MOA between MUMPO, NCDOT, FHWA and several other state and federal agencies, as described at the April TCC meeting. To view the MUMPO Conformity Memorandum of Agreement, click [here](#).*

*ATTACHMENT: Significant Changes to 2011 Conformity MOA*

- 7. Fast Lanes Study Phase III** (10 minutes) Tim Gibbs  
*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: This will be the third in a series of studies to analyze area roadways to determine where High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes or other types of managed lanes should be implemented in the Charlotte region to help manage congestion during peak travel periods.*

- 8. Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** (10 minutes) Robert Cook  
*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: Update on the status of the draft TIP.*

- 9. NCDOT Complete Streets** (10 minutes) Tracy Newsome  
*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: Update on the development of NCDOT's Complete Streets Planning and Design Guidelines Framework.*

- 10. Davidson Parking Study** (20 minutes) Lauren Blackburn  
*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: The Town of Davidson was approved to receive \$20,000 from the MUMPO to match an additional \$15,000 in local funding to complete a Comprehensive Parking Study during the 2011 fiscal year. Davidson worked with Rich & Associates Consultants, Inc to evaluate parking in the downtown area and with SEPI Engineering to understand the traffic implications of changed parking policies and additional parking structures. Town staff and consultants worked closely with a broad stakeholder committee to discuss current parking needs, document existing supply, and determine future parking demand. Consultants prepared a report of their findings and recommendations to town staff in March 2011. Traffic engineers compared a build-out scenario incorporating a proposed parking structure in the downtown, built primarily for the benefit of future transit commuters and downtown business patrons, with a no-build scenario. Each scenario considered projected traffic volumes for the 2020 horizon and made recommendations for more efficient intersection movement.*

**11. MUMPO Website** (5 minutes)

Nicholas Polimeni

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: Over the past several months, staff has been working on creating a new MUMPO website. The new website has been designed to incorporate a modified MUMPO logo, an updated look and more information. The website is being presented as a preview before the site goes live, which is expected to occur in June.*

**12. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)** (5 minutes)

Anil Panicker

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: Update on the status of this project.*

**13. Adjourn**

**MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE**  
**Summary Meeting Minutes**  
**Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center**  
**Uptown Conference Room**  
**April 7, 2011**

---

**Voting Members:** Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Norm Steinman – alt for Danny Pleasant (CDOT), George Berger (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Ken Tippette (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Jonathan Wells – alt for Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Jim Loyd – alt for Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe), Leslie Rhodes (LUESA – Air Quality), David McDonald (CATS), Barry Moose (NCDOT-Div. 10), 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), Jordon Cook (Weddington), Amy Helms (Union County)

**Staff:** Stuart Basham (MUMPO), Robert Cook (MUMPO), Nick Polimeni (MUMPO), Tim Gibbs (CDOT), Anna Gallup (CDOT), Eldewins Haynes (CDOT), Louis Mitchell (NCDOT-Div. 10), Pate Butler (NCDOT), Tom Tasselli (Cornelius), Justin Carroll (Huntersville), Doug Britt (Monroe), Keith Sorensen (Indian Trail), Crissy Huffstickler (C-M Planning)

**Guests:** Lynda Paxton (MPO Vice-chair), Todd Steiss (PB), Greg Boulanger (HNTB)

---

Bill Coxe opened the meeting at 10:00 AM.

**1. Consideration of March Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Coxe asked if there were any changes needed to the March minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Coxe called for the vote. The March minutes were approved unanimously.

Mr. Coxe then asked the TCC if it would like to add an item to the agenda regarding legislation to cap the North Carolina Gas Tax. Mr. Messera made a motion to add the Gas Tax Cap as item number eight on the agenda. Mr. Wells seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously to add the item.

**2. Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Requested Action:

Mr. Cook noted that an amendment to the 2009-2015 TIP was endorsed by the MPO at its March meeting to fund two projects in Weddington, based on a recommendation from NCDOT. He then stated that the TCC is being asked to recommend to the MPO that it approve and release for public comment the draft 2012-2018 TIP, the draft 2035 LRTP amendment report and the draft air quality conformity determination report at a special meeting on April 27. Mr. Cook noted that the public comment period will last for 30 days and two public meetings have been scheduled during the 30 day comment period – one on May 16 in Indian Trail and one on May 18 in Charlotte. The following specific TIP changes were then discussed:

**a. Rea Road**

Mr. Cook noted that the project was not endorsed by the MPO at its March meeting, but that it was determined that it be presented at the TCC meeting for a recommendation back to the MPO. He also stated

that a proposed motion had been prepared. Mr. Moose wondered how the language in the motion would be communicated to NCDOT and suggested that the project be listed in the TIP as participation by others to reflect the donation of right-of-way.

TCC Recommendation:

Mr. McDonald, modifying the language that was prepared prior to the meeting, made a motion to recommend that the MPO include TIP project U-3467 (Rea Road Extension) in fiscal year 2016 of the 2012-2018 TIP and in the 2025 horizon year of the LRTP as a two-lane roadway on a four-lane cross section from NC 16 to NC 84 (sections A and B) with significant right-of-way participation by others, including the following three provisions:

- 1) An environmental study begin as soon as possible;
- 2) The Town of Weddington not approve any further subdivision activity (especially final record plats) until a corridor is defined through the required environmental study;
- 3) All parties recognize that any landowner who has proffered right-of-way must be offered fair market value for that land and must decline that offer in accordance with federal and state laws.

Mr. Wells seconded the motion. The motion passed with one vote, from the Town of Stallings, in opposition.

**b. I-77 Widening and HOT Lanes Conversion**

Mr. Cook summarized the proposed new TIP project that was endorsed by the TCC and MPO at their March meetings to widen I-77 to four lanes in each direction, including conversion of a HOV lane to a HOT lane, to exit 28. Ms. Blackburn inquired about the progress of the environmental document for TIP project I-4750, to widen I-77 from NC 73 to I-40 in Statesville. Mr. Moose responded by stating that a consultant was hired to look at different concepts in which private dollars could possibly be included to help broaden the scope of the project, but that more information would not be available for some time. He also noted that he would keep the TCC updated on the status of the project.

Following the I-77 discussion, Mr. Coxe asked Mr. Gibbs to make an announcement. Mr. Gibbs announced that a Congestion Pricing workshop would be held in Charlotte on April 20 and that spots were still available if anyone is interested in attending.

**c. Old Monroe Road**

Mr. Cook discussed the desire of the towns of Indian Trail and Stallings to shift funds from two existing projects in each respective town (Indian Trail Road widening – TIP #U-3809, and Stallings Road widening – TIP #U-3825) to Old Monroe Road improvements, which both towns view as a higher priority. He noted that NCDOT encourages moving the funds at this time, as opposed to moving them after the TIP is approved. Mr. Moose stated that the Old Monroe Road project is the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest sub-regional mobility project in the state, making it a very high priority for NCDOT to complete. He also stated that NCDOT would pay the match and that Section B of the project should be funded first, but that an environmental document would be prepared that encompasses all three sections of the project (sections A, B & C). Mr. Cook added that the Indian Trail Road and Stallings Road projects would be removed from the LRTP.

TCC Recommendation:

Mr. McLamb made a motion to recommend that the MPO transfer the funds from Indian Trail Road (TIP project U-3809) and Stallings Road (TIP project U-3825) to the Old Monroe Road project with funding programmed in FY 2017, and that the LRTP be updated to include the project in the 2025 HY. Ms. Martel seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**d. Prosperity Church Northwest Arc**

Mr. Cook stated that at its March meeting the MPO endorsed shifting STP-DA funds from Little Rock Road to the Prosperity Church Northwest Arc to help with the completion of the I-485 interchange at that location.

Motion:

Mr. McDonald made a motion to recommend that the MPO release for public review the following TIP-related documents:

- 2012-2018 Transportation Improvement Program
- 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan amendments
- Conformity Determination Report

Mr. Tasselli seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**3. MUMPO Conformity Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)**

Presenter: Eldewins Haynes, CDOT

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Haynes provided a brief description of the MOA and its purpose, emphasizing the fact that the MPO had previously approved a similar MOA in 2003 and this is simply an updated version. He stated the document contains provisions that the MPO is already doing. Mr. McDonald asked if the major changes to this MOA compared with the 2003 MOA could be provided at the next TCC meeting, and Mr. Haynes said that it could.

**4. Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model Update**

Presenter: Anna Gallup, CDOT

Summary/FYI:

Ms. Gallup stated the Household Travel Survey was approved by City Council and that a contract is in the process of being executed with the chosen firm – ETC. She also noted that a RFP is in the process of being released to acquire regional population employment data. She said that a land use subcommittee will be necessary to review the data, after it's acquired, and that she will be contacting local jurisdictions for participation at the appropriate time. Mr. Steinman requested that Ms. Gallup and Mr. McLelland, of CDOT, provide a presentation at the next TCC meeting regarding census data that compares the projected population levels with the actual population numbers recently released.

**5. Bicycle and Pedestrian Prioritization Process**

Presenter: Lauren Blackburn, Town of Davidson

Summary/FYI:

Ms. Blackburn provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). She noted that a subcommittee had convened for two meetings earlier this year to come up with some preliminary ranking criteria to rank bicycle and pedestrian projects. She highlighted the major components, and the basis, of the criteria during her Power Point presentation. Mr. Icard asked how the criterion fits in with what NCDOT is doing regarding bicycle and pedestrian ranking. Mr. Polimeni responded that the Prioritization 2.0, being undertaken by NCDOT, will rank non-highway modes including bicycle and pedestrian, and that MPOs will be allowed to submit up to five bicycle and pedestrian projects. He noted that NCDOT's criteria was taken into account during the development of MUMPO's bicycle and pedestrian ranking criteria, but that MUMPO's criteria would be used to produce its own list of priority projects that could be used for multiple purposes, including the submission of five projects to NCDOT for Prioritization 2.0. Ms. Blackburn stated that the next steps will be to present the draft criteria to the MPO in April and then come back before the TCC and MPO, possibly in May, for endorsement of the criteria.

## **6. 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 that work is being done on the UPWP and that information will be provided via email in the next couple of weeks, and a more thorough update will be provided at the next TCC meeting.

## **7. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)**

Presenter: Anil Panicker, NCDOT

### Summary/FYI:

Mr. Panicker told the TCC that a meeting with Mike Bruff and Jamal Alavi, of NCDOT, and the TCC Chair and Vice-chair took place in March to discuss how to move forward with the CTP and if Complete Streets would be included in any way. He also stated that he will continue working with the municipalities in MUMPO to complete the base map of the CTP.

## **8. North Carolina Gas Tax Cap**

Presenter: Bill Coxe, TCC Chair

### Summary/FYI:

Mr. Coxe noted that the Gas Tax was discussed at the April 6 transportation staff meeting, and that the purpose for including it on the TCC agenda is to determine if the TCC would like to take a stance on the issue, and if the TCC would like to recommend that the MPO take a stance on the issue. Mr. Coxe briefly outlined the history and purpose of the Gas Tax, concluding that ultimately by capping the tax Mecklenburg County would essentially lose approximately \$34 million per year in revenue. Mr. Messera noted that the tax had been capped one time previously and money was lost. He also stated that because there is a high demand for transportation projects to be completed, the issue should be heard by the MPO. Mr. Steinman suggested that information be presented to the MPO for them to react to, but a recommendation from the TCC is not necessary. Mr. Wells suggested that if the Gas Tax is presented then an update on the Equity Formula legislation would also be appropriate. There was a consensus that a legislative update be provided to the MPO at its special meeting in April, including information related to the Gas Tax, Equity Formula and High Speed Rail.

**9. Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 AM.



## RESOLUTION

### CERTIFYING THE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS OF THE MECKLENBURG-UNION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION FOR FY 2011

WHEREAS, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization has found that it is conducting transportation planning in a continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive manner in accordance with 23 USC 134 and 49 USC 1607; and

WHEREAS, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization has found the transportation planning process to be in compliance with Sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act (42 USC 7504, 7506 (c) and (d)); and

WHEREAS, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization has found the transportation planning process to be in full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI Assurance executed by each State under 23 USC 324 and 29 USC 794; and

WHEREAS, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization has considered how the transportation planning process will affect the involvement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Section 105(f), Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2100, 49 CFR part 23); and

WHEREAS, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization has considered how the transportation planning process will affect the elderly and disabled per the provision of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327, as amended) and the US DOT implementing regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program is a subset of the currently conforming 2035 Long-Range Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the 2035 Long-Range Transportation Plan has a planning horizon year of 2035 and meets all the requirements of an adequate Transportation Plan.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization certifies its transportation planning process on this the 18th day of May, 2011.

\*\*\*\*\*

I, Ted Biggers, MUMPO Chairman, 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 the 18th day of May, 2011.

---

Ted Biggers, Chairman

---

Robert W. Cook, Secretary

Mecklenburg-Union Urban Area  
 FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program  
 Funding Sources and Projects

TASK CODE	TASK DESCRIPTION	SPR Highway		SEC. 104(f) PL Highway/Transit		SECTION 5303 Transit/Highway			STP-DA		LOCAL	TASK FUNDING SUMMARY			TOTAL
		NCDOT	FHWA	LOCAL	FHWA	LOCAL	NCDOT	FTA	LOCAL	FHWA	LOCAL	STATE	FEDERAL		
		20%	80%	20%	80%	10%	10%	80%	20%	80%					
<b>II. CONTINUING TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</b>		\$0	\$0	\$44,500	\$178,000	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$12,000	\$67,500	\$270,000	\$0	\$113,500	\$1,500	\$460,000	<b>\$575,000</b>
II-1	Traffic Volume Counts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$37,500	\$150,000	\$0	\$37,500	\$0	\$150,000	\$187,500
II-4	Traffic Accidents	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,500	\$70,000	\$0	\$17,500	\$0	\$70,000	\$87,500
II-6	Dwelling Unit, Population & Employment Change	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,500	\$50,000	\$0	\$12,500	\$0	\$50,000	\$62,500
II-9	Travel Time Studies	\$0	\$0	\$3,000	\$12,000	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,500	\$1,500	\$24,000	\$30,000
II-10	GIS Analysis & Mapping	\$0	\$0	\$41,500	\$166,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$41,500	\$0	\$166,000	\$207,500
II-12	Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>III. TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL</b>		\$0	\$0	\$66,300	\$265,200	\$23,359	\$23,359	\$186,872	\$21,750	\$87,000	\$0	\$111,409	\$23,359	\$539,072	<b>\$673,840</b>
III-1	Collection of Base Year Data	\$0	\$0	\$36,050	\$144,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,050	\$0	\$144,200	\$180,250
III-2	Collection of Network Data	\$0	\$0	\$7,000	\$28,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,000	\$0	\$28,000	\$35,000
III-3	Travel Model Updates	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,709	\$16,709	\$133,672	\$21,750	\$87,000	\$0	\$38,459	\$16,709	\$220,672	\$275,840
III-4	Travel Surveys	\$0	\$0	\$5,750	\$23,000	\$2,900	\$2,900	\$23,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,650	\$2,900	\$46,200	\$57,750
III-5	Forecast of Data to Horizon Years	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$16,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$16,000	\$20,000
III-6	Forecasts of Future Travel Patterns	\$0	\$0	\$13,500	\$54,000	\$3,750	\$3,750	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,250	\$3,750	\$84,000	\$105,000
<b>IV. LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</b>		\$0	\$0	\$18,000	\$72,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$120,000	\$31,250	\$125,000	\$0	\$64,250	\$15,000	\$317,000	<b>\$396,250</b>
IV-1	Community Goals & Objectives	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$31,250	\$125,000	\$0	\$31,250	\$0	\$125,000	\$156,250
IV-2	Highway Element of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$40,000	\$50,000
IV-3	Transit Element of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$120,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$120,000	\$150,000
IV-7	Rail Element of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
IV-8	Freight Movement/Mobility Element of LRTP	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$16,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$16,000	\$20,000
IV-9	Financial Planning	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$16,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$16,000	\$20,000
<b>V. CONTINUING PROGRAMS</b>		\$0	\$0	\$12,450	\$49,800	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$10,000	\$45,000	\$180,000	\$0	\$58,700	\$1,250	\$239,800	<b>\$299,750</b>
V-1	Congestion Management Strategies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45,000	\$180,000	\$0	\$45,000	\$0	\$180,000	\$225,000
V-2	Air Quality/Conformity Analysis	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$0	\$10,000	\$12,500
V-3	Planning Work Program	\$0	\$0	\$1,250	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,250	\$0	\$5,000	\$6,250
V-4	Transportation Improvement Program	\$0	\$0	\$8,700	\$34,800	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,950	\$1,250	\$44,800	\$56,000
<b>VI. ADMINISTRATION</b>		\$0	\$0	\$40,000	\$160,000	\$2,103	\$2,103	\$16,824	\$34,500	\$138,000	\$0	\$76,603	\$2,103	\$314,824	<b>\$393,530</b>
VI-2	Environmental Justice	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
VI-6	Public Involvement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
VI-9	Environ. Analysis & Pre-TIP Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
VI-10	Corridor Protection and Special Studies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$34,500	\$138,000	\$0	\$34,500	\$0	\$138,000	\$172,500
VI-11	Regional or Statewide Planning	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$0	\$10,000	\$12,500
VI-12	Management and Operations	\$0	\$0	\$37,500	\$150,000	\$2,103	\$2,103	\$16,824	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$39,603	\$2,103	\$166,824	\$208,530
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$181,250</b>	<b>\$725,000</b>	<b>\$43,212</b>	<b>\$43,212</b>	<b>\$345,696</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$800,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$424,462</b>	<b>\$43,212</b>	<b>\$1,870,696</b>	<b>\$2,338,370</b>



## 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 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 unbuilt 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

- 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. 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, transit stations, 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. 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 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:	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>

### 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:	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>

### 4. Safety (25 possible points):

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

Project Point Total	
Section 2	0
Section 3	0
Section 4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>

# Significant Changes to the 2011 MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

This brief compilation of changes is presented as those being most significant to MUMPO. In addition to the significant changes below, there are also a number of minor changes, not specified in this summary, regarding:

- references to appropriate regulations
- edits for clarity
- spelling corrections

The most significant changes (in order of appearance in the MOA) include:

## **1.0 DEFINITIONS**

Expansion of the MOA's purpose from

- o "...satisfy 40 CFR 93.105 of the transportation conformity rule, which requires states to develop detailed procedures for how they will engage in consultation." To
- o "...satisfy the requirement in Clean Air Act ... to create a state conformity SIP containing the following three requirements of the Federal Transportation Conformity Rule, ...: (1) ..., which addresses consultation procedures; (2) ..., which states that conformity SIPs must require written commitments to control measures to be obtained prior to a conformity determination if the control measures are not included in an Metropolitan Planning Organization's transportation plan and transportation improvement program, and that such commitments be fulfilled; and (3) ..., which states that conformity SIPs must require written commitments to mitigation measures to be obtained prior to a project-level conformity determination, and that project sponsors comply with such commitments."

A definition for "Interagency Consultation Conformity Determination Meeting"

Removal of MTIP, and using TIP in its place

## **2.0 DUTIES OF THE PARTIES**

Responsibility for all parties to "choose its representative(s) and at least one alternate staff person for interagency consultation and provide their names and contact information to NCDENR" and to notify NCDENR of changes to the appointed designate(s) or contact(s).

Responsibility of all parties to "review and provide comments to the MPO on draft LRTPs, TIPs, and conformity analyses. ... to NCDENR on draft SIP submissions. ... to NCDOT and/or local project sponsors on project-level conformity determination prepared during the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process for FHWA/FTA projects located [within MUMPO]."

Generally, comments must be provided "within twenty-one (21) days of receipt of draft documents. Responses must be in writing in the subsequent version of the document to explain how comments were addressed or why they were not addressed.

### **2.1 MPO DUTIES**

The MPO sponsoring an interagency consultation meeting is responsible for preparing the meeting summaries.

“The MPO shall consult with the Parties on the development process for LRTPs, TIPs and amendments thereto [and conformity analyses and determinations]. This process will begin no later than one year prior to when the conformity determination is needed.”

The MPO must “submit a written request for emission factors required for conformity determination from NCDENR or its designee.”

Language has been added to ensure enforceability of design concept and scope and project-level mitigation and control measures.

## **5.0 INITIATING CONFORMITY DETERMINATIONS OR ANALYSIS**

This section was largely simplified to “The Parties shall make conformity determinations and consultations consistent with this Agreement and in accordance with the conditions described in 40 CFR Part 93 as applied to for LRTPs, TIPs and FHWA/FTA projects.” (Thus, the MOA does not become outdated every time the Conformity Rules get amended.)

## **11.0 TERMINATION OF AGREEMENT**

### **11.1 TERMINATION AND RENEWAL**

The term of the MOA has been reduced from 10 years to 5 years.

There are also changes in the MOA relevant to NCDENR, NCDOT, EPA, FHWA, FTA, and MCAQ. These changes are not included in this summary, but most are complementary to the changes relevant to MUMPO and other MPOs. The other MPOs in the nonattainment region have to adopt and sign an MOA for the first time.