



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

TO: TCC Members
FROM: Nicholas Landa
MUMPO Principal Planner
DATE: January 4, 2013
**SUBJECT: Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Agenda
January 2013 TCC Meeting—January 10, 2013**

The January TCC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, January 10 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

January 10, 2013

1. **Election of Officers** Bill Coxe
ACTION REQUESTED: Elect officers for 2013.

BACKGROUND: The TCC bylaws require the election of officers at the first meeting of the calendar year. The bylaws also require the Chair to have served as a TCC member for one full year immediately prior to being elected.

2. **Adoption of the Agenda** TCC Chair

3. **Consideration of December Meeting Minutes** TCC Chair
ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented, or with amendments.

4. **MPO Census-Related Activities**
 - a. **County Level Population and Employment Projections** (10 minutes) Anna Gallup
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO endorse the county level population and employment projections as presented.

BACKGROUND: Staff presented this item as information to the TCC at their December meeting. At that time, Union County numbers were still being reviewed. Union County staff has completed additional review since then and has recommended that staff move forward with the projections as presented at the December TCC meeting. Staff is now asking for the TCC to recommend that the MPO endorse the attached county level 2010, 2020, 2030, and 2040 population and employment numbers at its January 16th meeting.

ATTACHMENT: Recommended Regional and County Level Population & Employment Projections

 - b. **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Revisions** (10 minutes) Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the work of the MOU subcommittee.

5. **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** (15 minutes) Robert Cook
 - a. **2012-2018 TIP Amendments**
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO approve the attached TIP amendments as presented.

BACKGROUND: See attached memorandum.

ATTACHMENTS: Memorandum; draft resolution

 - b. **Draft 2015-2021 TIP**
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: See attached memorandum.

ATTACHMENTS: Memorandum

- 6. Bicycle & Pedestrian Ranking Methodology** (10 minutes) Adam McLamb
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO approve the Bicycle & Pedestrian ranking methodology as amended, and adopt the Bicycle & Pedestrian project application

BACKGROUND: In May 2011, the MPO approved a bicycle and pedestrian ranking methodology. Since that time, the subcommittee tasked with creating the original criterion has reviewed it, proposed amendments, and developed a project application. Several opportunities have been provided to request feedback on the proposed amendments and application, including the November 2012 TCC meeting and a December 2012 staff meeting. The attached methodology and project application reflect the proposed amendments, including comments that were received. The TCC is being asked to recommend that the MPO approve the amended methodology, and application, at its January 18 meeting.

ATTACHMENTS: Amended MUMPO Bicycle/Pedestrian Ranking Methodology & Project Application

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

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

ATTACHMENT: CMP Goals, Objectives & Performance Measures

- 8. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** (15 minutes) Robert Cook
a. FY 2013 UPWP Amendments
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Several UPWP projects may not proceed as planned. Funds allocated to support the projects will need to be reallocated. More detailed information will be provided under separate cover.

b. FY 2014 UPWP
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the development of the FY 14 UPWP.

- 9. I-277/I-77 Loop Study** (20 minutes) Norm Steinman
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: The purpose of the I-277/I-77 Loop Study is to evaluate the future capacity, operational, and safety conditions of the Loop in order to define projects for the 2040 Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). This presentation will provide an overview of the study, including overall conclusions and recommendations.

- 10. I-77 HOT Lanes Project** (10 minutes) Bill Coxe
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

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

11. 2040 LRTP Update (5 minutes)

Nicholas Landa

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

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

12. Upcoming Issues

13. Adjourn

MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Summary Meeting Minutes
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 280
December 6, 2012

Voting Members: *TCC Chair* – Bill Coxe (Huntersville), *TCC Vice Chair* – Danny Pleasant (CDOT), George Berger (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Tim Gibbs – alt for Ken Tippet (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Jonathan Wells – alt for Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Jason Rayfield (LUESA-Air Quality), David McDonald (CATS), Louis Mitchell (NCDOT-Div. 10), Anil Panicker (NCDOT-TPB), Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Adam McLamb – alt for Scott Kaufhold (Indian Trail), Ralph Messera (Matthews), Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe), Travis Morgan (Pineville), Brian Matthews (Stallings), Joe Lesch (Union County)

Staff: Robert Cook (MUMPO), Nick Landa (MUMPO), Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Norm Steinman (CDOT), Anna Gallup (CDOT), Andy Grzymiski (CDOT), John Rose (CATS), Loretta Barren (FHWA), Zachary Gordon (Huntersville), Adam McLamb (Indian Trail), Elinor Hiltz (Iredell County), Andrew Bryant (Lincoln County), Jim Loyd (Monroe), Shannon Martel (Stallings), Pate Butler (NCDOT)

Guests: Mayor Lynda Paxton (Stallings)

Bill Coxe opened the meeting at 10:00 AM.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Coxe suggested that Item 11 on the agenda, the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) update, be removed due to the fact that a CTP workshop would be held directly following the TCC meeting. He then asked if any other modifications to the agenda are necessary. Hearing none, the agenda was adopted by acclamation.

2. Consideration of November Meeting Minutes

Mr. Coxe asked if any changes to the minutes are necessary. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Danny Pleasant made a motion to approve the October TCC minutes. George Berger seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

3. January TCC Meeting Date

Presenter: Bill Coxe, TCC Chair

Summary/Requested Action:

Mr. Coxe stated that the January TCC meeting date falls two days after a holiday, and in order to give staff time to prepare the agenda, and to give TCC members time to review the agenda materials, it is recommended that the meeting date be moved back one week to Thursday, January 10, 2013.

Motion:

Tim Gibbs made a motion to move the January TCC meeting date to Thursday, January 10. Jonathan

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

4. Draft 2014-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook provided an update to the TCC about the draft 2014-2020 TIP by first stating that NCODT has indicated that the draft TIP might be delayed due to the fact that new transportation legislation was recently approved (MAP-21) and North Carolina will have a new governor. Due to the possible delay, Mr. Cook noted that some amendments to the current 2012-2018 TIP may be necessary. He also indicated that it could provide more time to review locally administered projects (i.e. STP-DA, CMAQ, etc.), including the following two in which status changes have been identified:

- Wilgrove-Mint Hill road widening project is no longer being pursued by the Town of Mint Hill;
- Funding originally proposed for a parking deck by the Town of Davidson is now being requested to fund the Potts-Sloan Connector project in Davidson.

Louis Mitchell, with NCDOT, inquired about the timing of the MPO's adoption of a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), noting that the expansion of the MPO will impact the amount of STP-DA funding allocated to the MPO. Mr. Coxe noted that the MOU is expected to be approved in March of 2013, and also noted that the MPO will be responsible for a plan that demonstrates fiscal constrain of the TIP. Mr. Cook indicated that the plan will be due prior to the adoption of the new TIP.

5. Potter Road TIP Amendment (TIP #U-5112)

Presenter: Brian Matthews, Town of Stallings

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Matthews informed the TCC that TIP project U-5112, currently funded in the TIP to improve the intersection of Potter Road and Pleasant Plains Road in the Town of Stallings, is changing slightly and will require a TIP amendment. He stated that there is currently only funding programed for construction in the TIP, but that the project will require additional right-of-way for the relocation of utilities. He requested that the TCC amend the TIP to account for the change in funding, but noted that the total amount of funding for the project will not change. He suggested that \$500,000 be programed for right-of-way, and the remaining \$1.5 million programed for construction (which would include \$300,000 of local match).

Motion:

Joe Lesch made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve an amendment to the 2012-2020 TIP to program \$500,000 (of the total \$2 million) for right-of-way for project U-5112. David McDonald seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

6. MPO Planning Area Boundary Expansion

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are

incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He started by highlighting several issues that have been discussed by the MOU subcommittee, including voting issues, the population calculation used by the MPO to determine each member jurisdiction's population, and the possibility of creating a consent agenda. The discussion focused on the voting issues and a question regarding the status of the North Carolina Turnpike Authority (NCTA) as a non-voting member was raised. Mr. Mitchell noted that approximately 2/3 of the NCTA is now part of NCDOT so it might not make sense to include them as a member of the MPO. Mr. Coxe noted that he would like to know specifically what the function of the NCTA is before making a determination about its MPO membership status. Loretta Barren asked if the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) currently has non-voting status on the MPO, to which Mr. Cook responded it does.

7. FY 2013 UPWP Amendments

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook informed the TCC that this item is on the agenda to provide a status update about the current Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) of the MPO, noting that there are some projects currently programmed in the plan that will not advance. He specifically noted that the freight study being led by the Centralina Council of Governments will not be moving forward this fiscal year, which will free up \$50,000. He also noted that there are projects programmed in the current UPWP that could require additional funding (e.g. Fast Lanes Study Phase III, LRTP project ranking). He indicated that a staff meeting would be held prior to the January TCC meeting in order to discuss a recommendation for how to redistribute funds in the plan.

Mr. Cook also provided a brief update about the UPWP for FY 2014, stating that the project solicitation process is complete and that the projects submitted will have to be evaluated in order to determine how to allocate the minimum \$836,000 available. Mr. Coxe asked if the project solicitation included the jurisdictions within the expanded MPO boundary area, to which Mr. Cook indicated that it did.

8. CONNECT Consortium Program Forum Update

Presenter: Jonathan Wells, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Wells provided the TCC with an update on the status of the CONNECT Consortium initiative being led by the Centralina COG. He reminded the TCC that he is the appointed MUMPO staff member of the Program Forum based on the Consortium agreement that was approved by the MPO in May of 2012. He noted that the Consortium is an oversight body to the Connect Our Future initiative with the purpose of developing a regional framework for growth. A regional kickoff meeting was held on October 30, in which the following goal for the Consortium effort was provided:

The Policy Forum is responsible for ensuring that recommendations developed from individual work teams meet the stated process goals. The Program Forum may provide feedback to work teams regarding work consistency with public or stakeholder input received, integration of one team's work with that of another, or other content and technical matters to ensure the team's work is responsive to, and valuable to, the needs of the communities of the region. The program teams may also identify policy questions regarding input from the Policy Forum and may affirm or recommend changes to the work team recommendations and sending them to the Policy Forum for review.

He continued by stating that 30 sub-regions have been developed in the 14-county, bi-state region identified for the study, and that workshops and public forums are being held to gather information. Based on the workshops, models will be developed to determine a preferred growth scenario. Ultimately, the Consortium is in place to bring all these various components together to determine the growth framework. He concluded by noting the Sarah McAulay, from the Town of Huntersville, is the MPO's Policy Forum representative.

9. County Level Population and Employment Projections

Presenter: Anna Gallup, Charlotte DOT

Summary/FYI:

Ms. Gallup provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). She noted that the county level population and employment projections were presented at the December 5 staff meeting, and then provided the TCC with a brief overview about the numbers and indicated that they are used for many of the MPO's activities, including the LRTP update that is currently underway. She outlined the top down and bottom up approaches that were used to derive the projections, and indicated that collaboration with the Lake Norman RPO will be necessary due to the fact that several areas currently in the RPO's jurisdiction will be planned for by the MPO beginning next year.

Ms. Gallup also noted that generally, the long term trends that have been projected previously are assumed to continue. She then showed the TCC specific population and employment projections for three horizon years (2020, 2030 & 2040). She informed the TCC that Ruchi Agarwal, with the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department, would be leading the process to determine the final numbers for Mecklenburg County, and that Joe Lesch would be the lead for determining the Union County numbers. Action will be requested from the TCC and MPO in January. She concluded by reminding the TCC members that it is important for each jurisdiction to be involved with determining final numbers, and that the process needs to be well documented. Mr. Wells asked when the final disaggregated numbers would be available. Ms. Gallup responded that they would not be ready until after the air quality conformity process. It was also noted that the projection numbers for Lincoln and Iredell counties were approved in November, and that the MPO should also adopt those numbers along with the Mecklenburg and Union county numbers.

10. 2040 LRTP Update

Presenter: Nicholas Landa

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Landa provided the TCC with an update of the 2040 LRTP process by highlighting the following:

- Goals and objectives were the primary discussion of the November Advisory Committee meeting, and it was determined that they will be sent to identified stakeholders in the region in draft form for review and comment;
- Project ranking continues to be discussed and evaluated
- A survey was sent out to get feedback from the TCC about the ranking methodology, and the results of the survey, as well as continued discussion about the methodology will be the primary topic on the December Advisory Committee agenda, scheduled for December 12; and

- LRTP Candidate projects are due January 18, 2013.

11. Comprehensive Transportation Plan

This item was removed from the agenda.

12. Upcoming Issues

Ms. Barren announced that the Transportation Alternatives funding, outlined in the new MAP-21 legislation, has been obligated, and that they will be awarded through a competitive process to be determined by the MPOs and NCDOT. Mr. McDonald asked if the funds would be distributed to the MPOs, to which Ms. Barren indicated they would.

Mr. Coxe reminded the TCC members that regular attendance at the TCC meetings is required in order to maintain voting status, and that currently the following member agencies have missed at least three consecutive meetings and will not be eligible to vote at the next TCC meeting:

- NCDOT Public Transportation Division;
- Mecklenburg County Land and Water Resources;
- Airport;
- Town of Mint Hill; and
- Town of Wingate.

Mr. Coxe also reminded the TCC members that new Ethics Act requirements have been enacted which require all MPO members, including TCC delegates and alternates, to complete an economic disclosure form and ethics training.

Mr. Gibbs announced that the final workshop for Phase III of the Fast Lanes study will be held on December 13.

13. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 AM.

Regional and County Level Recommended Population and Employment

Regional Population

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

Mecklenburg County Population

Year	Recommended	Absolute Growth per Decade	% Growth (change) per Decade
2010	923,100 (Census) (35% of Region)	222,600	32%
2020	1,112,300 (36% of Region)	189,200	20%
2030	1,300,900 (37% of Region)	188,600	17%
2040	1,492,100 (37% of Region)	191,200	15%

Union County Population

Year	Recommended	Absolute Growth per Decade	% Growth (change) per Decade
2010	202,200 (Census) (9% of Region)	76,600	61%
2020	251,600 (8% of Region)	49,400	24%
2030	295,900 (8% of Region)	44,300	18%
2040	339,800 (9% of Region)	43,900	13%

Regional Employment

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

Mecklenburg County Employment

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

Union County Employment

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



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

TO: TCC Members
 FROM: Robert Cook, AICP
 MUMPO Secretary
 DATE: December 31, 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
C-4957A	Construct sidewalks at Sun Valley HS and Sun Valley MS	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for design
C-4957B	Construct sidewalks on Unionville-Indian Trail Road and Sardis Road	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for design
C-5537	Barton Creek Greenway; construct connector between Clark's Creek and Mallard Creek greenways	Delay Construction from FY 12 to FY 13.	Allow additional time for design
P-5002A	N. Church St. railroad crossing grade crossing closure	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 13	Not previously programmed
P-5002B	NC Music Factory Boulevard and Maxwell Court extension	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 13	Not previously programmed
P-5002C	CSX Railroad detour (related to CSX/NS grade separation project)	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 14	Not previously programmed
P-5002D	Norfolk Southern bridges, track and signals	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 14	Not previously programmed
P-5002E	CSX Railroad signals	Split project P-5002 into separate projects; add Construction in FY 14	Not previously programmed

ATTACHMENTS

A draft resolution is included in the agenda packet.

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

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

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

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

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

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 16th day of January, 2013.

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

_____, 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: January 3, 2013

SUBJECT: 2015-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

BACKGROUND

NCDOT released a draft 2014-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in September 2012. In December 2012, NCDOT announced that it was withdrawing that document. Several reasons were offered for the decision, including:

1. uncertainties related to the implementation of MAP-21;
2. revenue forecasts indicating lower revenues than what was used to develop the draft; and
3. major project uncertainties (legal, financial and public support).

The updated schedule for TIP development is as follows:

- Fall 2013: revised draft TIP released
- Late spring/early summer 2014: MPO adoption of the TIP
- October 2014: federal approval of State TIP

The new schedule will result in the TIP being identified as the 2015-2021 TIP.

IMPACT

The current effort to determine the status of locally-administered projects (LAPs) was timed to coordinate with the original TIP schedule. The revised schedule will allow for additional time to work on the LAPs; however it will be important to continue with reasonable progress on this project.



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>	
	<u>Bus Stop</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.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

~~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 through the appropriate process, specifically for use by the proposed 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"

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

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

a. Right of Way or easement acquired or dedicated:

i. ~~100~~76%-76100% = 105 points

ii. ~~75~~51%-5175% = 510 points

~~iii.~~ 21%-50% = 5 points

iv. ~~5~~20% or less = 0 points

~~iii.~~

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

~~iii.~~

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

~~iii.~~

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:

~~3.~~

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

~~iii.~~

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

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

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: 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"

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
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:

January 4, 2013

Congestion Management Process

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

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

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

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

Goals and Objectives

➤ **Manage congestion**

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

Performance Measures

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