



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

TO: TCC Members
FROM: Nicholas Landa
MUMPO Principal Planner
DATE: October 25, 2012

**SUBJECT: Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Agenda
November 2012 TCC Meeting—November 1, 2012**

The November TCC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, November 1** 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

November 1, 2012

1. **Adoption of the Agenda** Danny Pleasant

2. **Consideration of October Meeting Minutes** Danny Pleasant
ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented, or with amendments.

3. **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments** (10 minutes) Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO approve the attached TIP amendments as presented.

BACKGROUND: See attached memorandum.

ATTACHMENTS: Memorandum; Draft Resolution

4. **Draft 2014-2020 Transportation Improvement Program** (10 minutes) Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: The Board of Transportation has released a draft 2014-2020 TIP. The processes used in the recent past to review and adopt a metropolitan TIP may need to be revised in light of the planning area expansion. [Click here](#) to view the draft document on MUMPO's website.

5. **TIP Amendment Guidelines** (10 minutes) Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: See attached memorandum.

ATTACHMENTS: Memorandum; Draft Amendment Guidelines.

6. **MPO Planning Area Boundary Expansion** (20 minutes) Robert Cook
 - a. **Memorandum of Understanding**
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the work of the MOU subcommittee.

 - b. **Regional Agreements**
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: The metropolitan planning process must be implemented in urbanized areas (UZA). The Charlotte UZA extends into five counties (Cabarrus, Catawba, Gaston, Lancaster and York) served by existing MPOs, or by MPOs that plan to expand their planning areas. Based upon direction provided at previous MPO and TCC meetings, MUMPO will enter into agreements with the region's other MPOs to transfer its planning responsibilities.

7. **Congestion Management Process** (15 minutes) Scott Kaufhold
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: 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 three times since the initiation of the CMP. The attached Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures have been developed by the Task Force to be presented to the TCC and MPO in November 2012 for information. Formal approval will be requested in January 2013.

ATTACHMENT: CMP Goals, Objectives & Performance Measures

8. Bicycle & Pedestrian Ranking Methodology (10 minutes)

Adam McLamb

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: In May 2011, the MPO approved a bicycle and pedestrian ranking methodology. Since that time, the original subcommittee tasked with developing the criteria has reviewed the criteria for possible revisions to improve the criteria, as well adopt an application to supplement the criteria. The revisions and application will be presented for information and comment.

ATTACHMENTS: Proposed MUMPO Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Ranking Process Revisions & Application

9. 2040 LRTP Update (10 minutes)

Nicholas Landa

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Information will be provided about the LRTP update process.

10. Upcoming Issues

11. Adjourn

MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Summary Meeting Minutes
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 280
October 4, 2012

Voting Members: *TCC Chair* – Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Danny Pleasant (CDOT), George Berger (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Norm Steinman – alt for Ken Tippette (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Jonathan Wells – alt for Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Jason Rayfield (LUESA-Air Quality), John Rose – alt for David McDonald (CATS), Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Ben McCrary (Davidson), Adam McLamb – alt for Scott Kaufhold (Indian Trail), Ralph Messera (Matthews), Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe), Shannon Martel (Stallings), Greg Mahar (Waxhaw), Jordan Cook (Weddington), Joshua Langen (Wesley Chapel), phone: Jamal Alavi (NCDOT-TPB)

Staff: Robert Cook (MUMPO), Stuart Basham (MUMPO), Andy Grzyski (CDOT), Carolyn Johnson (City of Charlotte Attorney’s Office), Pate Butler (NCDOT), Trisha Hartzell (NCDOT), Loretta Barren (FHWA), Keith Sorensen (Indian Trail), Jim Loyd (Monroe), phone: Rodger Rochelle (NCDOT), Virginia Mabry (NCDOT)

Guests: Todd Steiss (PB)

Bill Coxe opened the meeting at 10:00 AM.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Coxe asked if any modifications to the agenda are necessary. Hearing none, the agenda was adopted by acclamation.

2. Consideration of September Meeting Minutes

Mr. Coxe asked if any changes to the minutes are necessary. Hearing none, he noted three minor corrections then asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Jonathan Wells made a motion to approve the September TCC minutes with the changes noted. Adam McLamb seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

3. State Ethics Act

Presenter: Carolyn Johnson, City of Charlotte

Summary/FYI:

Ms. Johnson highlighted the contents of a memo she prepared describing new state ethics requirements that apply to the TCC and MPO members. She stated that beginning January 1, 2013 TCC and MPO members will be subject to the state ethics act that was enacted several years ago, and beginning next year, will also apply to MPO members. She outlined some of the requirements of the act as follows:

- Any conflicts of interest must be monitored and disclosed;
- Financial disclosure;

- May not use position for public or private gain;
- Cannot accept or solicit gifts;
- Electronic statements of economic interest must be filed by April 15, 2013;
- Ethics training must be completed by June 30, 2012.

Ms. Johnson then noted where more resources could be found related to the ethics act. She stated that the only authorized agency that can interpret and enforce the act is the State Ethics Commission, and that there are penalties for not meeting the requirements stated. She indicated that some of the economic disclosures are public record. Mr. Cook noted that the State Ethics Commission is being invited to the next CRAFT meeting scheduled for October 16 to provide more information. Ms. Johnson stated that the training is good for two years once completed. She also reminded the TCC that the economic disclosure pertains to the entire household, not just the individual TCC or MPO member. The requirements apply to voting delegates and alternates. George Berger suggested that if possible, training should be offered at a single location in the Charlotte area so everyone has the opportunity to attend. Mr. Cook noted that this information will be included on the MUMPO website for reference, and Ms. Johnson indicated that she plans to attend the MPO meeting in November to inform that body about the new state ethics requirements.

4. I-77 HOT Lanes

Presenter: Bill Coxe, Town of Huntersville

Summary/Requested Action:

Mr. Coxe updated the TCC on recent activities of the I-77 Tech Team and NCDOT regarding the I-77 HOT Lanes project, as follows:

- The I-77 Tech Team has prepared a memo, which was distributed to the TCC the day prior to the October TCC meeting, to be sent to NCDOT, which contains formal comments regarding the environmental documents for two of the three proposed segments of the I-77 HOT lanes project;
- The environmental document (Categorical Exclusion) for the central section of the project (TIP No. I-5405) has been signed by the FHWA and NCDOT;
- The environmental document for the southern section (TIP #I-3311C) is proposed to be a Categorical Exclusion or an Environmental Assessment – the Tech Team believes it should be an Environmental Assessment based on the potential impacts;

He then addressed the comments included in the memo referenced above as follows:

- There is a desire for a unified vision for the entire corridor, which has resulted in questions about why 3 separate environmental documents are being prepared for the I-77 north corridor;
- A study was completed in 2001 that suggests the ultimate build out would be 4 general purpose lanes in each direction, including 2 HOV lanes, strengthening the median and outside shoulder for bus operations, and completing interchange improvements, among other improvements;
- There is a desire to know how the proposed project fits into that vision, as well as what will be the benefit of the HOT lanes;
- Questions remain regarding the restrictions implementing HOT lanes will place on the rest of the corridor, how vehicles will move across the general purpose lanes from a HOT lane to get on or off the freeway at an interchange, what measures of success have been identified for the project, and how success is measured by the private sector versus the public sector; and

- Reconciliation is sought regarding the discrepancies between the analysis years proposed for the current environmental documents – 2017 for southern section and 2015 for northern section – and the 20 year horizon that is analyzed for a typical NEPA document.

Mr. Coxe then noted that the Tech Team concluded that HOT lanes are a viable approach for the corridor, and that the TCC is being asked to adopt the comments to be sent to NCDOT. Norm Steinman noted that the underlying key of the letter is that MUMPO would like to be treated as a partner in the process due to the fact that this is such an important decision that the MPO will make. Danny Pleasant asked when the MPO board will be informed about the recent progress on this proposed project, to which Mr. Coxe responded that the board will receive an update at its November meeting.

Motion:

Mr. Pleasant made a motion that the TCC provide formal comments to NCDOT for the environmental documents for I-4750 and I-3311C. Andrew Grant seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Following the motion and vote, there was a discussion about the required conformity determination associated with the I-77 HOT lanes project. Mr. Cook read into the record the action from the October 3rd I-77 Tech Team meeting as follows: “Proceed with scenarios 1 and 5 for traffic operational analysis for a 2035 horizon year which will provide operational benefits – this should be complete by October 31; consider moving forward with 2 scenarios for conformity determination following a consultation with NCDOT officials.” Mr. Steinman then highlighted the two scenarios as follows:

- Scenario 5 consists of 2 HOT lanes in each direction from Brookshire Freeway to Catawba Avenue – including a direct connect flyover to and from the Brookshire Freeway into the HOT lanes – and 1 HOT lane in each direction north of Catawba Avenue;
- Scenario 1 is a less costly, less complicated scenario which consists of converting the existing HOV lanes on I-77 to HOT lanes, and construct 1 HOT lane in each direction north of I-485 – with no direct connection to the Brookshire Freeway;
- Scenarios 1 and 5 represent the potential maximum and minimum project scenarios, and the scenarios would be run for horizon year 2035 – which is not specifically what NCDOT requested.

Mr. Rochelle stated that the intent of the conformity is to end up with one scenario that is reflected in the RFP and that bids come in for only that one scenario. Mr. Coxe asked when NCDOT will feel comfortable with one project scenario, to which Mr. Rochelle responded that work is being done in consultation with project teams to make sure that a financially feasible project is reached. It was noted that the adoption of an updated TIP in 2013 will also require an additional conformity determination, which could include amendments to the proposed I-77 project scenario. Ms. Barren stated that the earliest that a conformity determination could be made for the updated TIP would be October 1, 2013.

5. Draft 2014-2020 Transportation Improvement Program

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook noted that the draft TIP was discussed at the transportation staff meeting on Wednesday, October 3rd and that the TIP will likely need to be endorsed by the MPO in late summer 2013 due to the implementation of a new emissions model and the emissions budgets associated with the new model. He indicated that several projects were discussed at the staff meeting, and highlighted the following:

- Idlewild Road widening in Stallings (TIP #U-4913) is a funded project in the current TIP in FY 2018, but the project is not included in the draft 2014-2020 TIP;
- Idlewild Road was identified as a priority project submitted to NCDOT for Prioritization 1.0, and because it received funding in the current TIP was not again identified in Prioritization 2.0;
- Shannon Martel indicated that the Town of Stallings is attempting to schedule a meeting with the NCDOT Division Office to determine the options available to reestablish funding for the project;
- Independence Boulevard (TIP #U-209B) is programmed in the draft TIP, but there is a question about which type of funds are applied to the project – Mobility Fund versus GARVEE Bonds;
- The next phase of the Independence Boulevard project (TIP #U-2509) was programmed for funding for right-of-way and some construction in the current TIP, which is no longer programmed in the draft TIP;
- Division 12 projects in Lincoln and Iredell counties were not discussed, but it will need to be determined which of those projects programmed in the draft TIP are in the MPO’s future planning area boundary;
- MUMPO staff will work with the RPO staff currently representing those areas of Division 12 to determine what those projects are, and whether there are any issues associated with them;
- Two future meetings will be set up to discuss locally administered projects: 1) Determine which of those projects are still viable, and 2) Determine what to do about allocating funds that are available to the MPO but not currently programmed for specific projects.

Mr. Coxe noted that the funds used for locally administered projects are funds that the MPO has control over, so it is important that those funds are spent responsibly and that they are all programmed by the MPO so they are not rescinded at some point in the future.

6. MPO Planning Area Boundary Expansion

a. Draft Planning Area Boundary

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook informed the TCC that the MPO approved a draft boundary at its September meeting, which includes a small portion of Gaston’s urbanized area located in Lincoln County.

b. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook noted that progress is being made on revisions to the MPO’s MOU, and that a list of issues has been identified and prioritized. He stated that two of the highest priority issues include voting and fees, and indicated that staff has conducted research on those issues. He indicated that a meeting will be held in Huntersville on October 15 to discuss the fees issue. Mr. Coxe and Mr. Steinman noted the importance of determining what the MPO hopes to accomplish, and that will help inform the MPO what fees and resources will be necessary. Mr. Cook noted that the TCC will need to be consulted after the October MOU subcommittee meeting in order to ensure that the TCC members are included in the process and providing the appropriate feedback to inform some of the subcommittee’s recommendations. Finally, he noted that the issue of TIP amendment guidelines was raised by the subcommittee and that it was determined that TIP amendment guidelines are outside the scope of the MOU, and should be handled through the normal TCC and MPO approval process.

7. 2040 LRTP Update

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook reminded the TCC that an Advisory Committee and Steering Committee have been formed to guide the LRTP update process, and that an important topic of discussion at the next Advisory Committee meeting will be reviewing MUMPO's highway project ranking criteria and begin the process of determining what revisions to the criteria might be necessary. He stated that a consultant is assisting the MPO with the process and encouraged any TCC members that are available to attend the Advisory Committee meeting on October 8 to engage in the process. Mr. Cook also reminded the TCC that a request for LRTP candidate projects will soon be sent out, and that only projects included in the current Thoroughfare Plan, or proposed Comprehensive Transportation Plan, will be considered.

8. Upcoming Issues

Mr. Coxe made the following announcements:

- A CTP meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 10 to begin the discussion about which fields will be included in the GIS database underlying the CTP maps;
- MUMPO staff will be sending several surveys in the near future to acquire information from the TCC members regarding several initiatives that are currently ongoing, and request that the surveys be completed in a timely manner.

Mr. Steinman reminded the MPO that a land use subcommittee is currently working on developing population projections, which is an important factor in the work accomplished by the MPO.

9. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 AM.



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

TO: TCC Members
 FROM: Robert Cook, AICP
 MUMPO Secretary
 DATE: October 23, 2012
 SUBJECT: **2012-2018 TIP Amendments**

REQUEST

The TCC is requested to recommend to the MPO that it amend the TIP as noted in the table below.

BACKGROUND

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

TIP #	Description	Proposed Amendment	Reason
I-3803BA	I-85: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)for widening project	Delay Construction from FY 14 to FY 15.	To better coincide with completion of widening project.
R-2248EA	I-485: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS); NC 115 to I-85	Delay Construction from FY 14 to FY 15.	To better coincide with completion of construction project.
C-5540	Sidewalk construction: Nevin Road; Gibbon Road; W. Sugar Creek Road	Delay Construction from FY 13 to FY 15.	Delay requested by CDOT to meet scheduling needs.
C-5542	Sidewalk construction: S. Tryon St.	Delay Construction from FY 13 to FY 15.	Delay requested by CDOT to meet scheduling needs.
E-4954	Torrence Creek Greenway	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for planning and design.

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:

TIP #	Description	Proposed Amendment	Reason
I-3803BA	I-85: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)for widening project	Delay Construction from FY 14 to FY 15.	To better coincide with completion of widening project.
R-2248EA	I-485: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS); NC 115 to I-85	Delay Construction from FY 14 to FY 15.	To better coincide with completion of construction project.
C-5540	Sidewalk construction: Nevin Road; Gibbon Road; W. Sugar Creek Road	Delay Construction from FY 13 to FY 15.	Delay requested by CDOT to meet scheduling needs.
C-5542	Sidewalk construction: S. Tryon St.	Delay Construction from FY 13 to FY 15.	Delay requested by CDOT to meet scheduling needs.
E-4954	Torrence Creek Greenway	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for planning and design.

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 14th day of November, 2012.

I, Ted Biggers, 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 14th day of November, 2012.

Ted Biggers, Chairman

Robert W. Cook, Secretary



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

TO: TCC Members
FROM: Robert Cook, AICP
MUMPO Secretary
DATE: October 23, 2012

SUBJECT: TIP Amendment & Modification Guidelines

BACKGROUND

The Board of Transportation adopted State TIP amendment and modification guidelines in April. Due to new FHWA procedures that have resulted in a large number of TIP amendments, the guidelines may serve as a model for an updated MPO process to streamline amending the TIP.

MOU SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION

This issue had been identified as a potential component of the current effort to revise the MOU. When the guidelines were presented at a staff meeting, those in attendance believed the matter was not an MOU issue, and recommended that the guidelines topic be removed from the MOU revision process. This recommendation was presented to the MOU Subcommittee at its September 2012 meeting, at which time the subcommittee determined that the customary MPO review process was the appropriate method for evaluating the guidelines and referred them to the TCC for consideration.

FUTURE ACTION

Implementation of the TIP amendment guidelines will require an amendment to the Public Involvement Plan. Revisions to the amendment process may also be reflected in updated MPO bylaws, specifically, in reference to the inclusion of a Consent Agenda component.

TIP AMENDMENT AND MODIFICATION GUIDELINES

Revised 9-13-12

Changes may be made to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) by either formal amendment or administrative modification.

Amendments

Amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program must be approved by the MPO and must appear on the regular agenda as an action item. Two or more requests for amendments may be addressed by the MPO as a single agenda item.

The amendment process is required when changes:

- a. cause the addition or deletion of a project;
- b. cause the addition or deletion of a state-funded regionally significant project;
- c. trigger the need for an air quality conformity determination;
- d. shift a project across horizon years of the Long Range Transportation Plan;
- e. result in project cost changes in highway projects that exceed both \$2 million and 25% of the original cost and may affect fiscal constraint;
- f. cause increases or decreases in transit project costs that exceed either \$1 million or 25% of the original project cost;
- g. to project phase initiation dates move a project into or out of the TIP;
- h. result from changes in funding sources involving non-traditional funding sources*; or
- i. in design concept or scope significantly change the project termini or type, number of through lanes on a non-exempt project, or significantly alters the proposed transit coverage area.

Traditional sources of revenue include federal, state, or local government tax revenues; non-traditional sources include state bonding and/or private participation.

Administrative Modifications

Administrative modifications to the Transportation Improvement Program must be made by the MPO, however the required action can be taken as part of a Consent Agenda. Administrative modifications must be consistent with the definition of Administrative Modification as found in 23 CFR 450.104.

Changes to the TIP can be made through the administrative modification process when:

- a. the project in question is not being added to or deleted from the TIP;
- b. a change in project costs are below the predetermined thresholds (as noted in the Amendment section);
- c. the project utilizes State funds only and is not deemed to be regionally significant;
- d. the proposed changes are deemed to be minor changes (as determined by the Technical Coordinating Committee) to project scope or description and do not significantly diminish the ability to achieve the original project intent; and
- e. changes in traditional funding sources occur.

Examples of Administrative Modifications:

- Minor cost increases in highway projects that do not exceed both \$ 2 million and 25% of the original project cost;

- Minor cost change (increase or decrease) in transit projects that do not exceed either \$1 million or 25% of the original project cost;
- Funding source changes between traditional funding sources (e.g. substituting available Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for FTA section 5307 formula transit funds);
- Projects approved for Emergency Relief funds do not generally have to be included in the STIP, so any changes made for emergency projects may be considered minor modifications.

Federal Definitions according to 23 CFR 450.104

Administrative modification means a minor revision to a long-range statewide or, metropolitan transportation plan, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); or Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that includes minor changes to project/project phase costs, minor changes to funding sources of previously-included projects, and minor changes to project/project phase initiation dates. An administrative modification is a revision that does not require public review and comment, re-demonstration of fiscal constraint, or a conformity determination (in nonattainment and maintenance areas).

Amendment means a revision to a long-range statewide or metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, or STIP that involves a major change to a project included in a metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, or STIP, including the addition or deletion of a project or a major change in project cost, project/project phase initiation dates, or a major change in design concept or design scope (e.g., changing project termini or the number of through traffic lanes). Change to projects that are included only for illustrative purposes do not require an amendment. An amendment is a revision that requires public review and comment, re-demonstration of fiscal constraint, or a conformity determination (for metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs involving "non-exempt" projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas). In the context of a long-range statewide transportation plan, an amendment is a revision approved by the State in accordance with its public involvement process.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

October 25, 2012

Goals and Objectives

Performance Measures

➤ **Manage congestion**

- Develop congestion management measures
- Consider full range of Congestion Management Strategies

% of Roadway Miles at a TTI (1.2 to 1.49 Heavy Congestion; 1.5 or more Significant Congestion)
 Were all reasonable techniques and strategies considered --- Yes / No?

➤ **Provide a safe and efficient transportation system**

- Reduce crash rates (reduce number and severity to reduce non-recurring congestion)
- Reduce crash severity to reduce non-recurring congestion
- Improve the resiliency of the transportation network
- Reduce non-recurring congestion duration

No. of Crashes per 100 MVMT - relate it to statewide average
 Hold for future CMP
 Hold for future CMP
 Extract from Inrix - Buffer, or other indices

➤ **Improve the quality of the transportation system for the MUMPO area**

- Achieve an acceptable level of travel delay
- Encourage landuse strategies to enhance mobility and accessibility

% of vehicles/persons at a TTI
 per capita VMT
 % of households within a certain distance of employment



Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO)

Bike/Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Ranking Process 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 written MUMPO bicycle and pedestrian project application, to include a transportation purpose statement for the project. Appropriate map exhibits and photographs must be submitted to 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)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

1. **Connectivity and Access (5045 points possible):** Points will be awarded based on described strengths in design, location and function of facility per-based on the following-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.

- a.** (Only use one category from the table below – pedestrian or bicycle.)

<u>Pedestrian</u> (miles to destination)	<u>Bike</u> (mile to destination)	<u>Points</u>
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

iii.

- c. Accessibility of facility design:** Is the facility designed above a minimum accessible manner (slope, materials, ADA, etc)? *Applicant must detail and show references to be granted points.*

i. Yes = 5 points

ii. No = 0 points

- c. 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-

Formatted: Underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", First line: 0.25"

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

~~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. 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:

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

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

~~e.~~

~~e.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

~~ii.~~

~~f.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 (2530 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 ~~following~~ 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 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.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", No bullets or numbering

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Italic

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Italic

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Italic

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Italic

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

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

a. Right of Way or easement acquired or dedicated:

- i. ~~100~~76%-76100% = 105 points
- ii. ~~75~~51%-5175% = 510 points
- iii. ~~21~~1%-50% = 5 points
- iv. ~~5~~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).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

i. Yes = 5 points

ii. No = 0 points

iii.

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

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.13"

DRAFT

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.

Project Sponsor Information	
Agency:	
Contact Name :	
Address:	
Telephone :	
E-Mail:	
Project Type (check the appropriate box)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle Facility	<input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian Facility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenway?	
Project Information	
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*

Pedestrian (miles to destination)	Bike (mile to destination)	Points
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*

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)
- Land Use Plan or Comprehensive Plan

Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization

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