

Transportation Staff Meeting

October 13, 2010

2:00 PM

Room 601

AGENDA

1. NC Mobility Fund (Polimeni)

Description:

Comments in response to the release of a preliminary report on the NC Mobility Fund will be prepared. A copy of the report is attached.

2. SPOT 2.0 (Coxe)

Description:

NCDOT is working on how to improve the current Strategic Prioritization process, and “listening sessions” have been scheduled by the Department to solicit feedback and input from the stakeholders and the public on how to improve the current prioritization process. Attached is a flier that provides more information.

3. Complete Streets (Newsome)

Description:

An update on the status of NCDOT’s Complete Streets policy development will be provided.

Access number: 1-888-776-3766

Meeting number: *4211498*

**Don't forget to dial the asterisk before
and after the number**

NORTH CAROLINA'S MOBILITY FUND

Preliminary Report

October 1, 2010

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2010 the North Carolina General Assembly (Assembly) created the North Carolina Mobility Fund (Mobility Fund) to help relieve congestion and enhance mobility across the State. Specifically, the North Carolina 2009/2010 Appropriations Act was approved to fund transportation projects, selected by the North Carolina Department of Transportation (the Department), of statewide and regional significance that relieve congestion and enhance mobility across all modes of transportation.

As part of the legislation, the Assembly directed the Department to establish a selection process and project selection criteria for the Mobility Fund by involving the public and key stakeholders. Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the North Carolina Association of Municipal Planning Organizations, the North Carolina Association of Rural Planning Organizations, the North Carolina League of Municipalities, the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners, the North Carolina Metropolitan Mayors Coalition, and the North Carolina Council of Regional Governments.

The Assembly identified the I-85 Corridor Improvement Project's Phase II as the first project to be funded by the Mobility Fund. Subsequent Mobility Fund projects are to be advanced using the project criteria and selection process developed by the Department, in accordance with the Act. The legislation also requires preferential consideration be given to projects that meet the eligibility of the Congestion Relief and Intermodal Fund.

The legislation calls for a preliminary report to be provided to the Joint Legislative Oversight Transportation Committee (JLTOC) on October 1, 2010 and a final report on December 15, 2010. This preliminary report fulfills the first part of that requirement and provides a summary of progress to date on developing the project criteria and selection process.

The Department is conducting an extensive outreach effort to meet the ambitious December 15 reporting date. More than 70 citizens, organizations, and/or planning partners submitted comments through the initial public comment period (August 9-September 9). In addition, a formal Workgroup with members representing the organizations listed above along with Department staff has met twice to review the public comments and share their views on project criteria and a selection process. The Workgroup's discussions have been wide-ranging and substantive, and its feedback has significantly shaped the selection/criteria options that are presented in this preliminary report.

Based on these collaborative efforts, the Department proposes a set of minimum requirements for each candidate project and two potential scoring options, as described

below. These minimum requirements must be met before a project is eligible to be scored.

Minimum Project Requirements (these apply to both proposed options below):

- Projects should be associated with Statewide or Regional Tier facilities (highways, ferries, airports, railroads, busses, etc.).
- The Mobility Fund should be used for capital costs, not for maintenance or operations.
- Projects should be consistent with MPO/RPO transportation planning efforts and coordinated with local land-use plans where available.
- Projects should be able to be delivered in a relatively short amount of time.
- Proposed projects (in non-attainment areas) should have positive or neutral air quality effects and ensure transportation conformity with federal regulations.

Scoring Option One – Needs-Based Approach

Candidate projects are scored on levels of congestion, safety, condition of the infrastructure, economic impact, number of people per vehicle, ability to leverage non-DOT dollars and whether the project meets the criteria of the [Congestion and Intermodal Fund](#):

Projects are scored on a 0-to-100 scale for each weighted factor below.

Criterion	Weight
Congestion – measured by volume to capacity, which helps recognize how much demand the transportation infrastructure was designed to handle versus how much demand the transportation infrastructure has today	30%
Safety – measured by crash rates (for rail project this could be highway/rail crossings, for transit this could be collisions with other vehicles)	5%
Infrastructure Health – measured by condition of the service (or useful) life of pavement or vehicle fleet	5%
Economic Vitality / Attractiveness – measured by economic impact. The specific measure for this criterion has not been selected yet.	15%
Multi-modal – measured by the number of people per vehicle, reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled or improvement to more than one mode of transportation	10%
Funding leverage – measured by percent of non-DOT dollars used.	25%
Congestion and Intermodal Fund – measured by whether the project meets the requirements of that fund	10%

Scoring Option Two – Benefit-Cost Approach

Candidate projects are scored on travel-time savings, economic benefit and the cost of the project, whether the project is on the Statewide Tier/Strategic Highway Corridor (SHC) and whether the project meets the criteria of the Congestion and Intermodal Fund. Projects are scored on a 0-to-100 scale for each weighted factor below.

Criterion	Weight
<p>Benefit-Cost Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion relief benefits weighted 80% within this criterion – measured by travel-time savings and the number of users of the transportation infrastructure over a 30 year time period • Economic vitality weighted 20% within this criterion – measured by economic impact (specific approach to be determined) • The benefits listed above are added together and then divided by the total project cost minus non-DOT dollars 	80%
<p>Statewide Tier Facility/Strategic Highway Corridor – measured by whether the project has been identified as a Statewide Tier facility or Strategic Highway Corridor</p>	10%
<p>Congestion and Intermodal Fund – measured by whether the project meets the requirements of that fund</p>	10%

A selection process would consist of a period of time for candidate projects to be submitted sometime in the Spring of 2011. Department staff would evaluate and rank the candidate projects according to the final project criteria and share the results with the Workgroup. The Workgroup would provide their recommendations to the Department on which projects should be funded.

These minimum requirements and options are the subject of a second public comment period from October 1-29. An analysis of the public comments on these options, plus input from the Workgroup will help shape the final project criteria and selection process that will be recommended to the Board of Transportation for approval on December 2. The final report will then be presented to the JLTOC on December 15.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
Timeline	5
COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS UNDERWAY TO DEVELOP THE PROJECT CRITERIA AND SELECTION PROCESS	6
Workgroup Involvement and Feedback	6
Workgroup Meeting # 1 Summary.....	6
Workgroup Meeting # 2 Summary.....	8
Minimum Requirements for Mobility Fund projects.....	8
Public Involvement Process.....	10
Summary of Comments	10
Types of Projects.....	11
Scoring Related	11
Other Considerations.....	11
PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS FOR PROJECT SELECTION	13
Scoring Option One – Needs-Based Approach	13
Scoring Option Two – Benefit-Cost Approach	15
NEXT STEPS.....	17
APPENDICES.....	18
A – Public Comments (in their entirety)	18
B – Mobility Fund Legislation.....	29
C – Congestion Relief & Intermodal 21 st Century Transportation Fund	34
D – Workgroup Members.....	39

INTRODUCTION

The North Carolina Assembly approved the 2009/2010 Appropriations Act to create a new fund referred to as the North Carolina Mobility Fund. The Mobility Fund provides an opportunity to address a growing list of congestion relief and mobility needs. The Mobility Fund is not subject to the equity formula.

According to § 136-188 of the Appropriations Act:

(a) The Department of Transportation shall use the Mobility Fund to fund transportation projects, selected by the Department, of statewide and regional significance that relieve congestion and enhance mobility across all modes of transportation. The Department of Transportation shall establish project selection criteria based on the provisions of this Article.

When developing the project criteria and selection process, the Department shall involve the public and other stakeholders, including, but not limited to, the North Carolina Association of Municipal Planning Organizations, the North Carolina Association of Rural Planning Organizations, the North Carolina League of Municipalities, the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners, the North Carolina Metropolitan Mayors Coalition, and the North Carolina Council of Regional Governments.

When developing the project criteria and selection process, the Department shall give preferential consideration to projects qualified to receive State grants from the Congestion Relief and Intermodal Transportation 21st Century Fund under Article 19 of Chapter 136 of the General Statutes.

The first project to be funded is I-85 Corridor Improvement Project's Phase II. Subsequent projects will be funded after project criteria and a selection process are established in accordance with the above provisions.

A preliminary report on the project selection criteria is due to the JLTOC by October 1, 2010. A final report is due to the JLTOC by December 15, 2010. This is the preliminary report.

Timeline

- August 9 – September 9: Initial round of public input
- September 13 – September 30: Preliminary report is prepared.
- October 1 – October 29: Preliminary report is released. Second round of public input
- November 1 – November 30: Final report is prepared.
- December 2: Final report presented to Board of Transportation (BOT).
- December 15: Final report presented to JLTOC

COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS UNDERWAY TO DEVELOP THE PROJECT CRITERIA AND SELECTION PROCESS

The Department has initiated a two-prong process to develop project criteria and a selection process in accordance with the provisions of the Act. First, the Department is working closely with a group of stakeholders listed in the Act to develop the selection process and criteria. This work will be amplified in the next two months by conducting additional outreach efforts with the broader membership of those stakeholder groups. The Department is also actively reaching out to the public and soliciting their thoughts on the project criteria and selection process. This extensive coordination and involvement, along with a summary of the input received, is provided on the following pages.

Workgroup Involvement and Feedback

In August, the Department organized a 24-member Workgroup of stakeholders to assist in developing project criteria and a selection process. The Workgroup consists of representatives of the following organizations:

- The North Carolina Metropolitan Planning Organization
- The North Carolina Rural Planning Organization
- The North Carolina League of Municipalities
- The North Carolina Association of County Commissioners
- The North Carolina Metropolitan Mayors Coalition
- The North Carolina Council of Regional Governments

In addition, Internal Department staff includes:

- Division Engineers
- Strategic Planning Office
- Transportation Planning Branch
- Program Development Unit
- Rail Division
- Public Transportation Division
- Aviation Division
- Ferry Division
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Division
- Information Technology Unit
- Federal Highway Administration (Advisory)

See Appendix D for a list of Workgroup members.

Workgroup Meeting # 1 Summary

The Workgroup held an “organizational meeting” on August 24 and agreed to meet monthly. In this first meeting, the Workgroup identified and discussed several major

topics and issues that should be considered as the project criteria and selection process develop. Those topics and issues included:

- Leveraging other funds - should leveraging of other funds towards Mobility Funds be a consideration? What else could a region free up to deliver key Mobility Fund projects? (i.e., Are regions willing to leverage funds from other projects?)
- Rural and urban issues - the process should avoid pitting “rural” and “urban” regions against each other.
- All modes are important – the process should not be biased towards highway-only projects.
- Adhere to the statute and solve other problems like the I-85 Corridor Bridge issue. Each Division probably has a few high profile, expensive but necessary projects.
- Mobility Fund projects should be delivered sooner rather than later – it is important that projects be “ready to go,” so that the public can see projects being built sooner rather than later.
- Develop support for Mobility Projects – This process should focus on broad parameters and criteria, and require/reward local support for the project. Also, while resolutions should be used to support a project, the process should ensure this does not become “I’ll support your project if you will support mine.”
- The process needs to consider whether Mobility Fund projects fix an “old problem” or should it be used to tackle something “new.”
- No one-size-fits-all project – the Workgroup indicated that both major projects, as well as smaller, less expensive but still high-benefit projects, should be considered. For example, there may be some small cost but high benefit projects like the “Pembroke Turn,” which is a rail project key to more efficient freight logistics.
- Interstate Maintenance needs – Recognizing the Mobility Fund does not provide funding for interstate maintenance, the Workgroup requested the final report highlight other needs of the North Carolina transportation system.
- Use Mobility Fund as a funding source - It was suggested that the Mobility Fund could be used as a funding source with certain criteria, similar to Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding.

Workgroup Meeting # 2 Summary

On September 21st, the Workgroup met a second time to review the public comments and discuss the Department's proposed options for the project criteria and selection process. The facilitated meeting resulted in a productive discussion regarding the type of criteria and process that should be proposed for further public comment. A brief summary of these discussions/issues is provided in the following paragraphs.

Minimum Requirements for Mobility Fund projects

Workgroup members were highly engaged in the discussion about what the minimum requirements should be for Mobility Fund projects, as well as about the approach and criteria for selection. That discussion was wide-ranging, and many different points of view and perspectives were shared. Through the course of the day-long meeting, several themes began to emerge as important to the group, and the points listed below reflect general agreement of the workgroup.

Recognizing that the purpose of the Mobility Fund is to *relieve congestion and enhance mobility across all modes of transportation* and that those projects which meet the Congestion and Intermodal Fund requirements are to receive preferential consideration, the workgroup generally agreed on the following minimum requirements:

- It is important for projects to be associated with Statewide or Regional Tier facilities. It is also important for other modal projects, beyond highways, to have the opportunity to compete for funds.
- The Mobility Fund should be used for capital costs, not for maintenance or operations.
- It is important for Mobility Fund projects to be consistent with Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) / Rural Planning Organization (RPO) transportation planning efforts and coordinated with local land-use plans where available. (It should be noted that members expressed interest in using this process as an opportunity to encourage regional planning and make strategic transportation investments).
- It is important that Mobility Fund projects can be delivered in a relatively short amount of time. As one member put it, "*We should think of this as a delivery fund, not a fund for more planning.*" Therefore, a substantial amount of work should be completed for the proposed projects (such as the completion of environmental documents or feasibility studies).
- Proposed projects (in non-attainment areas) should have positive or neutral air quality effects and ensure transportation conformity with federal regulations.

- There was significant discussion around whether a candidate Mobility Fund project should or should not already be listed in the Department's new 10-year Work Program. However, through the course of discussion, the group agreed that it is important for other emerging projects to have an opportunity to compete for funding. In other words, they shouldn't be excluded from applying.
- There was also significant discussion about whether a minimum project cost should be identified. Through the discussion, members indicated that it is important for both large, high-cost congestion projects, as well as smaller, quick-hit mobility projects to have an opportunity for funding, and thus, no minimum project cost was identified.

The minimum requirements described above provide the first level of screening for projects proposed to receive Mobility Funds. Specific selection approaches and criteria are outlined in the section entitled Preliminary Proposals for Project Selection. That section also provides additional detail on the Workgroup discussion during the second meeting.

Public Involvement Process

In August and September, the Department initiated an extensive effort to gather public input regarding the project criteria and selection process. The Department provided the following questions, which were intended to stimulate comments and discussion. **It was made clear these questions do not reflect the Department's policy or goals for the selection process or the Mobility Fund. They were presented for discussion purposes only.**

- What should the selection criteria consist of? For example, should it consider travel time savings; current and future volume-to-capacity ratios; economic development; economically distressed counties; connections to intermodal terminals (airports, seaports, etc.), military bases, major hospitals and universities/community colleges; major employment centers; current and future freight volumes; ability to leverage other funds (bonds, tolls, etc.); safety needs.
- How should projects that qualify to receive state grants from the Congestion Relief and Intermodal Transportation 21st Century Fund receive "preferential consideration" as stated in the legislation?
- Should a benefit-cost methodology or some other methodology be used to rank candidate projects? What would be factored into such a methodology?

A number of avenues were used to reach out to the public and stakeholder groups, including press releases, a new social media site (Citizens Connect), a promotional video, and solicitation of input via Workgroup member distribution lists. Several media outlets also ran stories encouraging the public to provide comments to the Department.

After the initial comment period ended, Department staff reviewed, analyzed and shared the comments with the Workgroup. More than 70 citizens, organizations, and/or planning partners submitted comments. While the majority of comments were related to project criteria and selection process, several comments were related to specific projects or were not related to the Mobility Fund. A detailed list of those comments and Department responses are attached as Appendix A.

Summary of Comments

The comments are grouped by topic and then by frequency using a 1-4 star scale.

★ = 1-4 comments

★ ★ = 5-8 comments

★ ★ ★ = 9-12 comments

★ ★ ★ ★ = 13-16 comments

Types of Projects

The Department received numerous comments about the kinds of projects that should be funded through the Mobility Fund. Not unexpectedly, the public indicated support for modal projects like transit and for highway projects such as urban loops and new interstates. Interestingly, the public also indicated that they would like to see projects such as signal improvements, ramp metering and improved message signs, which allow traffic to flow more smoothly without having to build new lanes. The numbers of comments associated with the specific kind of project the public would like to be funded are provided below:

- Transit ★ ★ ★ ★
- Urban loops/new interstates ★ ★ ★
- Technology and improved traffic signal coordination ★ ★ ★
- Passenger rail ★ ★
- Safety ★
- Maintaining current infrastructure ★
- Interstate widening ★
- Access management ★

Scoring Related

The public also provided a number of comments on the scoring factors that ought to be considered in the Mobility Fund selection process. The most frequently cited criteria included benefit-cost analysis, a measure of economic vitality and congestion measures. However, not all comments supported the idea that cost of a project should be considered. Below is a tally of the numbers of comments provided about each potential criterion.

- Benefit-cost analysis ★ ★ ★
- Economic vitality ★ ★ ★
- Congestion (based on travel time & volume/capacity ratio) ★ ★ ★
- Statewide Tier preference ★ ★
- Leverage other funds (public or private) ★ ★
- Consistency with land use ★ ★
- Preference given to projects that meet Intermodal Fund criteria ★ ★
- Enhance connection to other modes (multimodal) ★ ★
- Environmental and social effects ★ ★
- Intermodal terminals ★
- Crash rates ★
- Don't use cost ★
- Hurricane evacuation ★

Other Considerations

Public comments were also received on a number of other issues, as outlined below:

- Focus on expensive projects ★ ★
- Focus on moderately scaled regional projects ★
- Conscious of geographic funding distribution ★
- Local coordination of data and process ★
- Establish a selection committee ★
- Model criteria after TIGER II selection process ★
- Use Mobility Fund as a funding source ★
- Set aside modal allocation ★

PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS FOR PROJECT SELECTION

The Department has prepared two preliminary scoring options based on public comment and Workgroup input. These two options, along with a summary of the Workgroup’s discussion, are presented below.

Scoring Option One – Needs-Based Approach

Criterion	Weight	Group discussion
Congestion – measured by volume to capacity, which helps recognize how much demand the transportation infrastructure was designed to handle versus how much demand the transportation infrastructure has today	30%	The original Department proposal suggested weighting this factor at 20%; however, the Workgroup recommended increasing the weight to better address congestion –so this fund will better solve the problem it was intended to fix.
Safety – measured by crash rates (for rail project this could be highway/rail crossings, for transit this could be collisions with other vehicles)	5%	Though there was some discussion about other funds that are available to address safety concerns, the Workgroup indicated that safety ought to be considered.
Infrastructure Health – measured by condition of the infrastructure (such as pavement condition, service life of transit or rail vehicle).	5%	Although the Workgroup acknowledged that there are other funds to address infrastructure health needs, they wanted this criterion added, so that if all things for a project were equal, the one with a worse condition would rank higher.
Economic Vitality / Attractiveness – measured by economic impact. The specific measurement approach for this criterion has not been selected yet. The Department will provide	15%	There was good discussion around this criterion, and it was revised from the Department’s original suggestion of 30% weight on economic development (15% for job creation and 15% for economic vitality/attractiveness) to 15% for economic vitality alone. The Workgroup is interested in learning more about economic impacts, though some members

<p>additional information to the Workgroup in its next meeting to further explore how to measure economic vitality.</p>		<p>expressed confusion about why economic impact should be included as a Mobility Fund criterion.</p>
<p>Multi-modal – measured by number of people per vehicle, reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled or improvement to more than one mode of transportation</p>	<p>10%</p>	<p>The Workgroup agreed with the Department’s suggestion on weight and modified the criterion from either a yes/no approach (where full points would either be awarded for a project that provides multi-modal benefits or no points would be awarded at all) to a graduated approach where points would be awarded based on a scale tied to the amount of improvement.</p>
<p>Funding leverage – measured by percent of non-DOT dollars used</p>	<p>25%</p>	<p>There was significant discussion within the Workgroup related to this criterion. The group agreed and supports the Department’s position that federal earmark funds should not be counted as leveraged funds (though some acknowledged it would be tempting to do so). The Workgroup also agreed that toll funds could be used to leverage Mobility Funds.</p>
<p>Congestion and Intermodal Fund – measured by whether the project meets the requirements of that fund</p>	<p>10%</p>	<p>The Workgroup acknowledged the Assembly’s intent that certain projects which meet the Fund’s criteria should receive preferential treatment. Workgroup agreed with Department’s suggested 10% weight.</p>

Scoring Option Two – Benefit-Cost Approach

While this approach is similar to the needs-based approach described on the previous pages, the most important distinction is that the cost of a project is considered in this approach. Some Workgroup members indicated a strong interest in this approach “so that we can tell which projects give us the biggest bang for our buck.” Other members expressed concern that good rural candidate projects would not compete well due to high construction costs (such as projects in the mountains).

Criterion	Weight	Group discussion
<p>Benefit-Cost Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion relief benefits weighted 80% within this criterion – measured by travel-time savings and the number of users of the transportation infrastructure over a 30-year period • Economic vitality weighted 20% within this criterion – measured by economic impact (specific approach to be determined) • The benefits listed above are added together and then divided by the total project cost minus non-DOT dollars 	80%	<p>The original Department proposal suggested weighting transportation benefits at 70%; however, the workgroup recommended increasing the weight to 80% to better address congestion.</p> <p>Much like the earlier discussion, the workgroup recognized the importance of leveraging other funds and so agreed with the Department’s suggestion of subtracting the amount of non-DOT funds provided from sources other than the Department from the project costs. By subtracting non-DOT Funds, the cost is decreased, and the overall benefit/cost score will be improved, resulting in a higher project ranking.</p> <p>Some members also requested future population growth be factored into this calculation.</p>
<p>Statewide Tier Facility/Strategic Highway Corridor – measured by whether the project has been identified as a Statewide Tier facility or Strategic Highway Corridor</p>	10%	<p>The workgroup discussed the importance of identifying projects to improve connectivity between major activity centers. They suggested adding this criterion in an effort to recognize those corridors that have already gone through a vetting process and have been identified as important to the state and/or region.</p>

Congestion and Intermodal Fund – measured by whether the project meets the requirements of that fund	10%	The Workgroup acknowledged the Assembly's intent that certain projects, which meet the Fund's criteria, should receive preferential treatment. Workgroup agreed with Department's suggested 10% weight.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

NEXT STEPS

The Department will continue to seek public comment, as well as stakeholder input, to refine the preliminary options through the month of October.

Looking ahead to November, the Department will continue to work in a collaborative way with the Workgroup by providing a summary of public comments and spending a significant amount of time during the November meeting to refine the project criteria and selection process for the Mobility Fund. Thereafter, a status update will be provided to the Board of Transportation.

After the Board of Transportation approves the project criteria and selection process, the Department will provide a final report to the JLTOC on December 15, 2010.

APPENDICES

A – Public Comments (in their entirety)

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
Jim McBryde - Blythe Construction Co.	<p>Priorities should be roadways or structures which are unsafe</p> <p>Modifications to existing roads to eliminate hydroplaning and accommodate current traffic</p> <p>Complete partially complete Interstates and major roads</p> <p>Repairs to extend useful life</p> <p>Do not spend funds on new road or expansion to enhance private, commercial or industrial development</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>
Michele Smith - Mooresville	Consider road improvements in Mooresville Road area, i.e.. Perth Rd., Bluefield Rd., Cornelius Rd and 177 needs an interchange and Fern Hill Rod should be widened.	This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.
Kelly Sopp - Mooresville	Need timing for traffic lights in "historic area" and not for new development projects	This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.
Unknown - Contact Us website	Why do we need roads when cities have no land use regulation.	Comment will be considered in developing project criteria. The Department believes that land use and transportation planning need to be better coordinated and integrated.
Kathy Brown	This area needs reliable, efficient public transportation- a perimeter route between Raleigh, Durham and Chapel Hill	The criteria for projects of Statewide and Regional significance is yet to be determined. If public transportation between Raleigh, Durham and Chapel Hill meets the regional and statewide significance criteria, it will be evaluated as a candidate projects for the Mobility Fund.
Gary Whitaker Law	Winston-Salem needs a beltway and Mobility Fund should build the Eastern Beltway.	The criteria for projects of Statewide and Regional significance is yet to be determined. If the Winston-Salem beltway project meets the regional and statewide significance criteria, it will be evaluated as a candidate projects for the Mobility Fund.
Colas - Mooresville	Route 150 needs to be widened and traffic lights coordinated. Also, add a light rail line from Statesville to Charlotte.	This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.
Bill Barlow - NCDOT Public Transportation Division	Mass transit for the Triangle. Also, if Yadkin River Bridge is the poster child, then other projects should be large projects not funded by Strategic Prioritization	The criteria for projects of Statewide and Regional significance is yet to be determined. If mass transit for the Triangle meets the regional and statewide significance criteria, it will be evaluated as a candidate projects for the Mobility Fund. The comment about large projects will be considered in the development of project criteria and selection process.
Pat Simmons - NCDOT Rail Division	Criteria should include partners who are willing to invest or assure service outcomes that are beneficial. Have good experience with use of private dollars invested, financial need and policy	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Jennifer Link	<p>Davis Dr. – access to 540 wants access restored.</p> <p>Highway 54 widening- Is only two lanes between Lichtin Blvd and Maynard Rd. in Cary- needs to be 4-lanes.</p> <p>McKrimmon Parkway & Davis Dr. Intersection-need re-strip lanes so 2 are straight through whereas now only 1 is straight through. May need additional lanes.</p>	<p>This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.</p> <p>This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.</p> <p>This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.</p>
Leona Johnson - Oates Rd. in Mooresville	Wants left turn restored into Fat Boys Restaurant and shopping center near NC 150.	This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.
Rick Vivolo - Savannah Subdivision in Wake County	Widening of Morrisville-Carpenter Road between Davis Dr. and NC 54 needs to be a priority- sidewalks are not complete.	This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.
Andrew Koeppel - Wilmington	<p>Restore rail line between Castel Hayne and Wallace to help Wilmington Multi-Modal facility and benefit State Port as well as passenger service.</p> <p>Complete Interstate connection between Wilmington and Charlotte. Now that Union County by-pass is about to begin, need a date to construct R-4441 (by-pass in Anson County) to link to Rockingham- Hamlet bypass.</p>	<p>NCDOT and local officials are working together to make this happen. DOT has applied for federal rail funds to re-study this corridor since the study done several years ago is out of date. The criteria for projects of Statewide and Regional significance is yet to be determined. If this rail link meets the regional and statewide significance criteria, it will be evaluated as a candidate projects for the Mobility Fund.</p> <p>Progress on upgrading the highway from Wilmington to Charlotte is moving forward. New interchange construction in Bolton and Evergreen will start this Fall. An at-grade intersection at Chadbourne has been closed. This corridor protection is very high on the MPO prioritization list. The criteria for projects of Statewide and Regional significance is yet to be determined. If this Interstate connection meets the regional and statewide significance criteria, it will be evaluated as a candidate projects for the Mobility Fund.</p>

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
	Shelby By-Pass will provide interstate connectivity between Charlotte and Asheville	This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund
Linda Godbout - Terrel, NC	Project R-2307 (NC 27 in Lincolnton to I-77- widen to multi-lanes) Sections B and C should have priority over Section A there are numerous accidents and this is a major access corridor and evacuation route.	Section C is funded in 10-year Work Program. Sections A and B are not funded simply because sufficient funding is not available. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund.
North Carolina Ports Authority	<p>Improve connectivity for freight</p> <p>Enhance/improve "last mile" connecting port facility to nearest Interstate/highway.</p> <p>Complete interstate grade highway access to/from key origin/destination markets within the State to ports (Wilmington to Charlotte; Morehead City to I-95)</p> <p>Initiation of intermodal service for containers on rail) and support CSX National Gateway project for access to markets.</p> <p>Capital funding for port improvements</p> <p>Unimpeded movement of goods from NC military installations through NC ports and airports via roads and rail</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund</p> <p>This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund</p> <p>This comment provides some candidate projects. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If these projects meet the criteria, they will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund.</p> <p>This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund</p> <p>This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meet the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund</p>
Wendell Bailey - Bostic, NC	My idea for better traffic flow is better traffic lights at intersections.	This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund
Steve Hall	Need four solid lanes from New Bern to Jacksonville, NC and the actual development of Interstate 70 from New Bern to Raleigh.	This comment provides some candidate projects. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If these projects meet the criteria, they will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund
Douglas Jackson - Raleigh	<p>Add exit ramps to Jones Franklin Road on I-440 East and on-ramp on I-440 West</p> <p>Reedy Creek Br. over I-40 needs repair and add single lane on/off ramps. Add parking area on north side of I-40.</p> <p>Fix congestion at Crossroads. No easy way to access key roads upon exiting.</p> <p>Install exterior escalators in downtown Raleigh, North Hills and Cary similar to what is in Las Vegas</p> <p>Need elevated shopping center (like North Hills) where Aviation Parkway, Chapel Hill Rd and railroad meet and put railroad into a tunnel.</p>	<p>This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.</p> <p>This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.</p> <p>This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.</p> <p>This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.</p> <p>This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.</p>
Drew Johnson - Barnhill Contracting	<p>Consider projects in urban areas. A few projects were pulled to concentrate on Charlotte issues.</p> <p>Consider Goldsboro Bypass; Fayetteville Outer Loop; Columbia 64 improvements; Greenville US 264 Outer Loop completion for Mobility Fund projects.</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment provides some candidate projects. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If these projects meet the criteria, they will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund.</p>
Anne Hughes - Plymouth	Need to improve traffic signal at US 17 /NC 45 in Merry Hill	This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.
Daryl Vreeland - Greenville MPO	<p>Use benefit-cost methodology. More points for statewide impact, disaster evacuation routes, and hazardous material routes</p> <p>Something similar to Loop Process could be used. Other factors to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> travel time savings current and future volume-to-capacity ratios economic development economically distressed counties connections to intermodal terminals (airports, seaports, etc) military bases major hospitals universities/community colleges major employment centers current and future freight volumes ability to leverage other funds safety needs 	<p>This comment and suggested ranking criteria will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment and supporting factors will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process.</p>
	<p>Clear definition of eligibility which eliminates projects without statewide impacts</p> <p>Use a six criterion selection matrix to rank projects (matrix is attached separately)</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
High Point MPO	<p>Do NOT use cost as a ranking criterion but as a final selection filter.</p> <p>Projects must serve State or regional transportation (to/from regions, major activity centers, multi-modal hubs, passenger and freight hubs on principal arterials or higher, railway facilities, port facilities, fixed guide way facilities that offer an alternative to state or regional highway travel or pedestrian and bike facilities.</p> <p>Do not use "equity formula" to divide funds. Projects are likely to be in excess \$100 million, thus do not use cost as a ranking factor.</p> <p>Consider six criterion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economic Vitality- 20% - Economic effect measures include access to airports, intermodal hubs, major job centers, retail centers or tourist destinations 2. Safety- 25% - Projects should resolve safety problems 3. Freight Movement- 20% - Freight movement(logistics) should be separate consideration 4. Accessibility and Mobility- 20% - Reduced travel times, provide intermodal links, or eliminate bottlenecks. 5. Environmental and Social Factors- 10%- Projects should support environmental and economic sustainability 6. Eligibility for Congestion Relief and Intermodal Transportation 21st Century Fund- 5%- Legislated criterion-Projects not eligible receive no points. 	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>Mobility Funds are not subject to the Equity Formula. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment and the supporting six criterion will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process.</p>
Elena Talanker - Transportation Planning Branch	<p>Consider use of GIS in the project selection process but it may not be ready until Prioritization 3.0</p> <p>Cited a CALTRANS report which believes transportation is California's largest source of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (38% of the state's total GHG emissions). Also, increased VMT will increase GHG emissions but there is no research on how to prioritize projects on basis of GHG emissions.</p> <p>Cited a Utah 2009 graduate thesis paper proposing a two tier system. Tier 1 – population and education, existing infrastructure, economic attractiveness, tourism. Tier2 – congestion, economics, environmental impacts, safety</p> <p>Research from "Smart Growth America" shows that fixing transportation infrastructure through the economic stimulus programs underway improves capacity of facilities, resets depreciation clock and is more productive economically than expanding the capital stock</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment.</p> <p>Upon further review of the report, it also stated there are other important factors that play a role in assessing projects, including cost, regional scale impacts, and co-pollutants and operational impacts such as reductions in delay. Also, Duke Nicholas Institute professors claim 35% of GHG emissions in NC are from transportation sector and 65% from other sources.</p> <p>This thesis provides some excellent information via a literature review outlining project selection criteria from Ohio and a proposed Utah system. To our knowledge, however, the two-tier system outlined in the thesis however, has not yet been adopted by Utah DOT.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment and it will be considered in the development of project criteria and selection process.</p>
Avant Coleman - Upper Coastal Plain COG	<p>Each region should receive funds not just large metro regions. Concern is a fair distribution of funds. I-95 upgrade is needed.</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. The comment about I-95 upgrade is needed indicates this should be considered a candidate project. The criteria for projects is yet to be determined. If this meets the final criteria, it will be evaluated as a candidate projects for the Mobility Fund</p>
French Broad River MPO	<p>Passenger rail should receive priority</p> <p>Use mobility funds to fund Complete Streets policy, i.e. regional transit facilities and modify streets/thoroughfares to accommodate non-motorized traffic and reduce long-term VMT. Multi-modalism will create greater efficiency.</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>
Northwest Piedmont COG	<p>Don't let it become a slush fund for the General Assembly.</p> <p>Use it for projects that are more than 50% of the Division's TIP allocation, (i.e. costly projects)</p> <p>Use if for Interstate maintenance and bridges</p> <p>Look at secondary report to get more info.</p> <p>A significant amount of funding has gone East. How much?</p> <p>Who decides where the money goes?</p> <p>End the funding source after Yadkin River project and put funds back into TIP formula and pull it out when another emergency hits- i.e. US 64 bridge between Outer Banks and mainland.</p> <p>Should Universities and hospital get funding but these are not transportation oriented and are not usually in rural areas.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment but it appears to be beyond developing project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>The Department abides by the equity formula in developing the TIP. Urban Loop projects are now prioritized and programmed according to a prioritization process which has been open and transparent to the public.</p> <p>See above response. Transportation reform is about taking the politics out of transportation decision-making.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>
Robert Webb - Asheville	<p>Fund the I-26 Connector in Asheville.</p>	<p>This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
Stuart Matthew - Onslow County Planning & Development Department	Projects should be of Statewide and Regional Significance, relieve congestion, enhance mobility across all modes of transportation, have economic benefits of the project to the area and please consider how long has the jurisdiction/area been waiting for the project to be funded.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Measure significance to a region, i.e. universities, military, hospitals, airports, , etc.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Measure congestion (v/c or peak hour average travel speed)	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Benefit Cost has strong merits, especially if benefits criteria were confined to reductions in traffic and cost was requested funding from Mobility Fund.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Give credit for increased access to one or more alternative modes of transportation.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Cabarrus-Rowan MPO	Benefit Cost Considerations should include secondary benefits, calculate transportation efficiency benefits, standard planning horizon, discount rate, crash reduction benefits and service life of the project.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Emphasize projects of statewide significance.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Give preference to Mobility Projects on Statewide Tier from Prioritization 1.0.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Use traffic models to predict future volume/capacity ratios.	The Department does not have traffic models to predict v/c ratios across all modes statewide.
	Consider economic development as a variable but realize economic benefits are difficult to compare statewide.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Mecklenburg-Union MPO	Do not use Mobility Fund as matching funds for projects and use them only for projects that cannot advance otherwise.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Cost should not be a limiting factor as projects that will generate substantial benefit often have higher cost.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Seek concurrence from MPOs and RPOs to ensure consistency with local priorities and plans.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Initiate a Mobility Fund Committee with substantial local representation to review project submittals and selection, similarly as is done with enhancement projects and planning grants.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Emphasize projects of statewide significance using projects from Prioritization 1.0 that ranked high on Mobility on Statewide tier.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Gary Faulkner	Emphasize multi-modal, i.e. provides an alternative travel mode to relieve congestion or serves an alternative route to a major travel corridor or Interstate.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Preference for Innovative or sustainable long-term value) projects.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	First, define and identify Mobility Corridors (as was done for Strategic Highway Corridors)	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Use factors of safety, traffic volumes, economic needs, cost to construct and delivery timeframe.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Once criteria is defined, put more access control policies in place.	Thank you for the comment.
Monica Sanders	Mobility and land use must be part of a Mobility plan.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Building bypasses of bypasses must be reduced by better controlling the	Thank you for the comment.
Joel Setzer - NCDOT Division 14	NC needs to wake up to better public transit and light rail.	Thank you for the comment.
Stan Polanis - Winston-Salem Department of Transportation	Consider setting aside a small amount of funds to Divisions to address spot bottlenecks within a prescribed criteria.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Cost should not be a part of ranking factors because projects that have most benefits to a region are typically higher cost.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Focus on unimproved or unbuilt sections of national interstate system or multi-modal hubs critical to freight and passenger movements.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Include elements related to safety, congestion, freight mobility, air quality conformity, and economic development	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Long Range Transportation Plans, Regional Travel Demand Models and MPO's should be consulted throughout process.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Unknown - Contact Us website	Initiate a Mobility Fund Committee with substantial local representation to review project submittals and make project selection recommendations to BOT. NCDOT has used similar committees for Enhancement projects and planning grants.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
	Consider a rail system that will transport commuters throughout the State to the major cities of Charlotte, Winston-Salem, Greensboro, Raleigh, Durham, Wilmington, Fayetteville, etc. 24/7.	This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If this project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund.
Wilmington MPO	Consider the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of Service analysis and ranking criteria for all modes. Measures of effectiveness from multi-modal projects Efforts to leverage multiple funding sources Funding for all modes. Coordination with local land use development policies Consistency with community and statewide planning efforts Address economic growth, mode connectivity, environmental protection and safety 	This comment and the supporting nine criterion will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process.

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
	Use a performance driven approach to projects Improved access to hospitals and improvements for hurricane evaluations.	
Unknown - Contact Us website	Do not use funds to replace existing facilities unless they add capacity. Consider investing a portion into railroad improvements to create the infrastructure for a commuter rail in the Piedmont (Charlotte thru Raleigh to Goldsboro).	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund
David King - Triangle Transit	Minimum of 33% of funds go to Intermodal Fund to provide state matching funds for major transit projects. Currently, there is no funding source for Intermodal Fund. Score projects on consistency with locally adopted land use plans and how well they facilitate sustainable land use, economic development and competitiveness, environmental impacts, energy conservation, VMT reduction, greenhouse gas reduction, defining planned growth areas, connections to Major economic activity centers, support for existing infrastructure, promotion of choice via multi-modal transportation system, evaluation of Return on Investment on a per acre or per mile basis. Ensure sufficient funding goes to projects in urban and metropolitan areas. Projects should leverage other funding and give preference to projects competing for Federal funding outside normal funding. Project evaluation metrics be consistent with Federal government initiatives i.e. Housing and Urban Development, EPA. Also, consider recommendations of Legislative Study Commission on Urban Growth and Infrastructure Issues from last year's budget.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Ralph Potter, Jr. - Cove City, NC	A letter was submitted. He asks to designate SER 1005 from Dover to NC 55 near New Bern as US 70A and it needs resurfacing.	Thank you for the comment. The issue has been referred to Division Engineer for follow-up.
Patricia Morton - Jacksonville	Lives on Haltown Road where it intersects to US 17 North to Maysville. Speed limit was 35 a long time ago but now is higher. Concerns are that children board the school bus and she has to remove many small animals because traffic will not slow down.	Thank you for the comment. The issue has been referred to Division Engineer for follow-up
Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO	Set aside a substantial percentage for the Intermodal Fund to provide State share of large transit projects funded by local options taxes. Only allow large projects. Transit projects should receive equal consideration Scoring should be facilitate compact growth(liveable, walkable, bikeable communities), redevelopment of brown fields, promote multi-modal systems, reduce congestion and promote safe and efficient systems, enhance connectivity and accessibility, manage access, support economic development, protect critical natural environment and sensitive areas, incorporate context sensitive solutions, maintain safe levels of air quality, noise and transportation impacts, promote energy conservation, VMT reduction and greenhouse gas reduction goals. Jurisdictions or regions applying should be evaluated on following criteria: define planned growth areas, and encourage development of brown fields, coordinate transportation systems and future land use patterns, promote multi-modal transportation systems, reduce congestion and promotes safe system operations, enhance street connectivity and accessibility thru access management tools, design collector road systems to guide growth, support economic development, protect critical natural resources and environmentally sensitive areas, maintain safe levels of air quality , noise and other impacts, promote energy conservation, VMT reduction, and greenhouse gas reduction goals, reduce driver distraction through education, enforcement and sign control,, develop comprehensive action plans for highway safety, consistency with other transportation and land-use plans. Create a NC Mobility Fund Committee to review projects and makes project selection to NCDOT staff and BOT, similar to enhancement projects and bicycle and pedestrian planning grants. Commend work on TIP and loop prioritization processes, and use elements of those for Mobility Fund.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. Thank you for the comment. It will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process.
Anthony Prinz	Funds should be allocated to facilities with considerable strategic value. Specifically, strategic highway corridors, areas with a significant military presence and hurricane evacuation routes. Improvements should be targeted toward corridors and/or intersections with significant and consistent peak hour delay. While capacity improvements are key, safety should also be heavily weighed. Look favorably on projects to retrofit existing roadways with access controls such as improved driveway spacing and replacement of two-way left-turn lanes with raised medians. These are generally lower-cost, high-impact projects that result in improved roadway capacity and safety.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
	<p>Priority should be given to implementing many moderately-scaled projects rather than a few large projects. This way many communities benefit from this significant transportation investment and funds can be distributed throughout the state.</p> <p>A portion of the mobility fund should be specifically set aside for ITS enhancements and to pilot technology enhancements.</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>
Charlotte Area Transit System	<p>Projects should be beyond capacity of equity formula.</p> <p>Measure benefits associated with diverse range of projects and modes.</p> <p>Use elements from US Dot's Tiger and Tiger II process, i.e.</p> <p>Promote: State of Good Repair (infrastructure health), economic competitiveness benefit/cost, mobility improvements, congestion relief, Federal and local participation, economic impact), sustainability air quality improvement, VMT reduction, energy conservation), livability (coordinated transportation and land use plan, coordination with housing needs assessment and plan, promotion of mixed-use transit oriented development, inclusion of pedestrian and bicycle friendly elements), safety, innovation/partnership innovative financing and project delivery, public-private and public-public partnerships.)</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>
Greensboro MPO	<p>Use a benefit-cost methodology</p> <p>Model TIGER II benefit cost analysis framework- with emphasis on livability m mobility, safety and environmental impacts</p> <p>Use performance-based project selection processes for major projects that focus on full range of economic, environmental, and social costs and benefits of investments.</p> <p>Complaints about Urban Loop prioritization methodology should not be associated with Benefit-Costa analysis methodology: to the contrary BCA would effectively address the concerns with the Urban Loop prioritization process and its reliance on non-monetized proxy estimates of a restricted set of benefits.</p> <p>The secondary criteria of TIGER II (job creation and economic stimulus, innovation, partnership, and projects readiness and NEPA) should be considered.</p> <p>Data Forecasting requires forecasting data usage levels and various impacts into the future and well-documented and generally accepted procedures are available for this process.</p> <p>The Department should propose a method for qualification for fund grants. The legal qualification for MPO plans and for housing and transit plans seems straightforward.</p> <p>An increased and sustained revenue source is needed.</p> <p>Interstate maintenance should be exempt from equity formula.</p> <p>Rebalance Highway Trust Fund allocations from current 25% for Loops and almost 65% to Intrastate program to secure increased loop program revenues and meet key needs and loop projects are very high local and State priority. Without this rebalancing, there will likely be a need to focus Mobility fund on Loop projects at the expense of multi-modal mission.</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment, however, it is beyond developing project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment, however, it is beyond developing project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>Thank you for the comments, however, the rebalancing of the trust fund is beyond developing project criteria and selection process.</p>
Ed Johnson - Capital Area MPO	<p>CAMPO staff supports Greensboro comments. Plus: Statewide Tier needs to be defined for all modes of travel and then use Mobility Fund as a source for funding Statewide tier projects.</p> <p>Do not use Mobility fund to postpone updating the current equity formula, i.e. modernize it sooner to be in line with addressing current and future transportation needs of State.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment, however, it is beyond developing project criteria and selection process.</p>
Chris Lukasina - Capital Area MPO	<p>Focus on being a flexible funding source that can be used for highly effective projects regardless of transportation mode that do not easily fit into other dedicated or more traditional funding sources. Multimodalism in the Mobility Fund should be applied with a congestion-relief perspective, addressing major rail corridors, urban fixed guideway systems, and grade separations necessary to ensure the success of the SEHSR and other statewide rail initiatives.</p> <p>Define Statewide tier across all modes.</p> <p>Address areas of congestion and inflated travel times within and between urban areas without regard to equity. Do not use equity formula for any part of Mobility fund.</p> <p>Do not use Mobility fund for urban loops or toll projects.</p> <p>Transit fleet expansion with limited operational assistance and cost-effective ITS or TDM activities would be acceptable.</p> <p>Data used to guide decisions should be vetted through MPOs and RPOs.</p> <p>Leverage local or regional investments and address immediate needs through innovative solutions.</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
	Carefully vet any limit on number of project submissions with MPOs/RPOs.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Joe Milazzo II - Regional Transportation Alliance	<p>Supports a minimum 1/3 allocation of future NC Mobility Fund resources for transit projects that will receive local option funding and are eligible for State grants under the Intermodal Fund, with no maximum allocation percentage specified. This helps ensure a multimodal focus for the fund, provide the</p> <p>Require "preferential consideration" for Intermodal bill-eligible transit projects, and enables the state's limited resources to go further by combining them with local option resources.</p> <p>Supports Mobility Fund selection and prioritization criteria for highway projects based on factors similar to the urban loop prioritization method, such as travel time savings, congestion levels, traffic volumes, and connectivity.</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. The law requires preferential consideration for projects that qualify for the Intermodal Fund.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>
Jake Cashion - Greater Winston-Salem Chamber of Commerce	<p>Mobility fund should help meet the needs of statewide logistics and congestion mitigation challenges while mitigating the NCDOT region's responsibility to fund projects of statewide significance.</p> <p>Piedmont is a unique geographical position that must be leveraged through a sound transportation system.</p> <p>Determine key benefits and not cost when determining "need". Take into account total economic impact from job creation to the number of businesses and citizens the project will support statewide.</p> <p>Use priority or urgency) for obtaining necessary environmental permits because this increases project delivery efficiencies and "time is money".</p> <p>Once a project is funded, please protect corridor and resolve right-of-way acquisition and pay fair market value asap.</p> <p>Use reduction in travel times for strategic freight movement as criteria.</p> <p>Any new capacity projects should not cause reduction in equity funds available to a Region.</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment. It will be considered as part of the project development process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>
Southern Environmental Law Center	<p>The law exempts the Mobility Fund from the Hghway Trust Fund Law.</p> <p>Similarly the fund exempts the fund from the "Equity Formula".</p> <p>Project criteria should track the objectives of the Intermodal Fund Law which may weigh against Highway Trust fund and toll road projects.</p> <p>Use the Fund to usher in a more comprehensive approach to transportation planning, oriented towards long-term solutions.</p> <p>Cost should be a factor but should be more than just construction costs. Use benefit-cost in a derivative fashion, i.e. cost per new rider or cost per milte or cost per linear mile.</p> <p>Use indirect benefits in calculations but recognizes that such estimations may be difficult to calculate on a project-by-project basis. Also, leverage the local tax base into this factor in accordance with Intermodal Fund law section 136-252b4.</p> <p>Do not interpret "statewide and regional significance" to impose a cost "floor" on projects.</p> <p>Fund demonstration projects of transportation and land use "scenario-based modeling", "context sensitive designs", "road diets", "access management strategies", and "alternative fuel bus and transit" practices.</p> <p>Ensure objectives from Intermodal Fund law of "housing needs assessment and plan", "an adequate and sustainable source of funding for it share of costs and approved "transit plan" are used.</p> <p>Transit plans include: anticipated traffic congestion relief, improvement of air quality, reduction in anticipated energy consumption, promotion bike-ped friendly environment connected to transit stations, promote mixed use and transit-oriented developments to encourage multi-modal mobility,</p> <p>Coordination of housing needs assessment, access to public transportation for areas with disproportionate number of households below the area median income, coordination and planning with local education agencies to reduce transportation costs, coordination with local governments with zoning jurisdiction to carry out elements of the plan.</p> <p>The elements above does not mean only public transit projects should be eligible but rail and highway could be eligible if they demonstrate that projects advance these criteria and objectives.</p> <p>The Intermodal Bill policies could be restated as follows to become Mobility Bill selection criteria: congestion relief over long-term, air quality benefits, reuction in per capita fossil fue use including greenhouse gas emissions, `opportunities for bike-ped to reduce personal trips, mixed use and transit oriented development to reduce personal trips, linkage to affordable housing for transit-dependent populations, multi-modal access to job-sheds, including for low income populations, multi-modal access to schools secondary, colleges, universities), local zoning in place to support transit use by encouraging mixed use communities of appropriate density, local financial participation for transportation investment.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment. This issue is being researched.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment. The Department agrees with the comment.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.</p>

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
	The above criteria are consistent with "preferential consideration" and advances the important state goals of "environmental sensitivity" and reducing VMT by at least "25%". Also this should provide insight into how well different projects would advance objective.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
AppalCART (Watauga County)	We have to reinvent the wheel for this. Our RPO has an objective Criteria for ranking projects that works very well. The state probably uses something similar. Why not take the money and use 1/3 for highway projects; 1/3 for public transportation projects; and 1/3 for rail projects Supplement existing formula programs rather than coming up with another grant process. There are too many funding pots for Public Transportation now. I would supplement the <i>FTA SECTION 5307</i> program for urban and 5311 for rural. It would be far better to increase the operating percentage than to come up with another program you do not have staff to administer and we do not have time to apply for.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Comments Submitted via Citizens Connect		
Bryan Morton	Cap tolls- we already pay so these are double taxation Direct highways - Consider building the following: 1. Raleigh to Charlotte 2. Charlotte to Fayetteville 3. Winston-Salem to Fayetteville Raleigh congestion areas: 1. Any place on Capital Blvd, Glenwood Ave., or Millbrook Ave. Capital Blvd on/off ramps from/to I-440. The 540 exit to I-40 & exiting I-40 to Page Rd. That's a commuting nightmare. Where I-40 splits into I-440 and the Benson (beach) exit	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment contains potential candidate projects that will be considered if they meet the project criteria and selection process. This comment contains potential candidate projects that will be considered if they meet the project criteria and selection process. This comment contains potential candidate projects that will be considered if they meet the project criteria and selection process. This comment contains potential candidate projects that will be considered if they meet the project criteria and selection process. This comment contains a potential candidate projects that will be considered if it meet the project criteria and selection process.
Kathy Brown	Reliable, efficient public transportation. There needs to be a perimeter route that runs between Raleigh, Durham, and Chapel Hill which intersects at many points providing direct transportation with only one changeover. Also, there is no public transportation in Morrisville.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. Thank you for the comment.
A.C. Reynolds	Northern Beltway in Forsyth County is the only road project that should be the highest priority in the state. Without cost where would project be ranked in Urban Loop Process?	This comment provides a candidate project once project criteria and selection process are in place. The project is ranked under the Urban Loop Process and that information has already been provided to Mr. Reynolds. Will evaluate it at the appropriate time under the Mobility Fund.
Chris Grano	Reinstall the trees that were taken down 10-15 years ago between MM17and 30. Motorists are looking at lake. No tolls Place signs to educate people about passing, merging and trucks out of left lane.	Thank you for the comment. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Derrick Rubright - Raleigh	Would like to see increased pedestrian accessibility in North Raleigh, specifically sidewalks on Litchford Road between Old Wake Forest Road and Rowland Road.	This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.
Lee Bonacum	Agrees with Chris Gano that I-77 is congested many days north and south because people like to look at the water between exits 28 and 33.	Thank you for the comment
Chris Law - Durham County	Consider widening Hwy 70 in Durham County due to the increase of traffic count and residents.	This comment is project related that appears to be more of a local issue rather than a project of regional or statewide significance. It has been referred to the NCDOT Division Engineer for consideration.
Alan Trieglaff	I think the money should be spent to pay more state employees to stand around and do nothing like most state workers do.	Thank you for the comment
Dennis Johnson	Instead of using the fund to start a new project we should use it to finish some projects that are only partly completed. Some projects that need completed are the loops that were started and only done halfway.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Anthony Foster	1) attract private sector money or support; 2) provide the greatest "bang for the buck" (e.g., efficient movement of transit and private vehicles); 3) address congestion on corridors of regional and statewide significance; 4) enhance traffic related information to residents and visitors (e.g., real-time travel information on highway signs or CAD/AVL projects for transit systems); and 5) improve the mobility options for seniors and persons with disabilities.	These comment will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process.
Kendal Smith	Roads widened and/or made bicycle friendly. It is important for both inside the city limits (Raleigh, Durham, Chapel hill...) creating connections to other transportations means (buses, trains) as well as routes that bicycle enthusiasts use.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
Leo Suarez	Alternate transit growth is stagnant. Explore ways to make our current highways more efficient. Examples could include more information signs, real time traffic data on the web, faster response to accidents, traffic forecasting to encourage people to plan ahead, better lighting, more rest stops. HOV lanes. Current car sharring programs need a bigger boost, or attract smart entrepreneurs to start a private car sharing program. Education/marketing programs are needed to show alternatives exist.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Michael DeHaan	Less construction focused on highways/rail and more on fixing regional/local bottlenecks like signaling intersections and widening short sections of roads to improve commute times.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Verinda Perfinder	Stop with the after school license checks. Go fight crime. Develop criteria that analyzes how much the improvement would cost for the next 50 years if is constructed and compare it versus what it would cost the taxpayers if it were not built. The latter being based on commuter delays, emissions, etc. It seems that the criteria and analysis lacks the comparison of not doing something versus just looking at the benefits. Also, finish what has been started with loop projects. Need less new projects.	Thank you for the comment. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Loretta Barren	Consider developing performance measures for mobility and congestion and evaluate projects based on whether they will actually achieve the desire performance measure. The answer to relieving congestion is not always building a new location roadway or widening. Travel demand management and ITS should be considered as well. Rather than trying to compare apples to oranges (highways to transit or bikes/ped) designate the funds to the individual modes. This will let you compare transit projects against transit projects, etc. This could also allow you to take in to account livability and quality of life.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Jenna Moore	Spend the money on a true analysis of where public transportation options are lacking a direct route and fill the hole.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Rae Buckley	High speed rail for the Triangle	This comment provides a candidate project. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the project meets the criteria, it will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund.
Jim McNealy	The current public transportation options need to be further researched and expanded, before money is spent on new options.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Marian Sciacchitano	It would be nice to have more mobility on the Outer Banks such as bus service and more sidewalks. To enhance the sidewalks and Route 158 NCDOT should create a fund to hire people to clean up the TRASH and add more plantings to enhance the beauty of the Outer Banks.	This comment provides candidate projects. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the projects meet the criteria, they will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund.
Phil Mason	Design new roads and retrofit existing roads where possible to accommodate transit, bicycles and pedestrians to enhance mobility options. Commuting infrastructure is needed for bicycles between communities in the Triangle. As it is, the roads are all about cars, that is very clear.	This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process.
Elizabeth Adams	Better signage for the park-n-ride lots, better amenities including real-time bus information, bike racks at bus stops, dedicated bus/HOV lanes for rush hour traffic, better integration of bus service with existing and future rail service, and other multi-modal investments are needed	Thank you for the comment. This comment also provides candidate projects. Project criteria and selection process are yet to be determined. If the projects meet the criteria, they will be evaluated for the Mobility Fund.
L C	Consider smart investments for projects statewide. All traffic signals under NCDOT maintenance should be LED Roads that are slated to be four lanes, widen or built on new location should do right-of-way acquisition now. When it comes time to build the road, the land is already there. Turning lanes should be lengthen where necessary Implementation of 85th percentile studies on roadways that see a high number of motorists going more than 6mph over the speed limit All toll roads that pay off the bonds and loaned money, by state law, should be a free road. Counties should remain barred from maintaining roads in the state unless a county has a population of over 200,000 people and the county is more than 85% urbanized. All freeways that have not been assigned number exits, should be given that based on the highway's length. (like the interstates and freeways currently) New toll roads considered by the NC Turnpike Authority can only be a minimum length of 50 to 75 miles long with limited exits and must be high speed exits to major roads. The current toll roads that are under construction or waiting to be built are grandfathered. Propose a study for Interstate 95 to be relocated as a 6 lane freeway with limited exits between north of Fayetteville and Lucama & south of Fayetteville and by the SC state line before South Of The Border. The I-95 sections that are bypassed will revert to US 301.	This comment will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process Thank you for the comment. Thank you for the comment. Thank you for the comment. Thank you for the comment. Thank you for the comment. Thank you for the comment. Thank you for the comment. This comment contains a potential candidate project that will be considered if it meets the project criteria and selection process

Mobility Fund Project Criteria and Selection Process - Comments from First Comment Period

Commenter	Comment	Response
	<p>Propose a study to build a Durham to Spartanburg SC Turnpike Road that parallels I-85 with limited exits. This could be the only road that can remain as a toll road whether it is paid or not. It would facilitate inter-regional traffic to avoid the congested parts of the Triangle/Triad/Charlotte</p> <p>Hire an inspector to do quality assurance on our roadways to make the signs are posted. Signs such as where primary numbered highways are turning and making sure all speed drops have the "REDUCE SPEED AHEAD" and if applicable "BEGIN XX 1000 FEET AHEAD" signs. Finally, speed limit signage are properly posted and not obstructed by vegetation or anything else.</p> <p>Rumble strips on ALL four lane highways</p> <p>Highway reflectors mandatory on roadways seeing traffic volumes more than 20,000 to 30,000 AADT on a case by case study</p> <p>Improved traffic light synchronization</p> <p>A study to improve the I-40 corridor and add travel lanes with collector/distributor lanes at busy interchanges.</p>	<p>This comment contains a potential candidate project that will be considered if it meets the project criteria and selection process</p> <p>Thank you for the comment.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process</p> <p>This comment contains a potential candidate project that will be considered if it meets the project criteria and selection process</p>
Robert Stratton	Maintain what we have now, no more intermodal, replace all the mass transit planners, enforce speed limits, stop trucks that over weight and speeding.	Thank you for the comment.
William Hague	<p>Increase the level of service on existing facilities before constructing new routes.</p> <p>Score structurally deficient and functionally obsolete bridges – Non-bridge projects in the STIP that include replacing structurally deficient and functionally obsolete bridges should be scored and weighted.</p> <p>Fund the most-needed sections of a project, rather than the entire project. Example is the new I-26 bridge across the French Broad River (Section B) use the mobility fund, but leave the other sections (widening of I-240 [Section A] and reconfiguring Section C(I-26 interchange) subject to current funding and scheduling.</p> <p>Regional significance versus state significance – A notable example of this is with the urban loop prioritization process. It is unfair for the smaller cities to compete against larger cities for urban loop funding and unfair to fund the lower ranked projects with the mobility fund. NCDOT should consider using the mobility fund to help fund the highest ranked urban loop projects.</p> <p>Widen exit-to-exit and use the mobility fund to widen the sections with the highest congestion and traffic volumes closest to a city first.</p>	<p>This comment will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing the project criteria and selection process. This comment also contains a potential candidate project that will be considered if it meets the project criteria and selection process.</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process</p> <p>This comment will be considered in developing project criteria and selection process</p>
Sean Ulmer	Pave every gravel road in the state and people will buy better, higher price vehicle's. thus the state bringing in more tax rev. with the price of land now low buying right of ways would be less now than in 25 yrs. make a bold move now and the state will reap the Benefits down the road..	Thank you for the comment.

B – Mobility Fund Legislation

Also located at: <http://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2009/Bills/Senate/PDF/S897v8.pdf>

ESTABLISH NC MOBILITY FUND

SECTION 28.7.(a) Chapter 136 of the General Statutes is amended by adding a new Article to read:

"Article 14A.

"North Carolina Mobility Fund.

"§ 136-187. Creation of the North Carolina Mobility Fund.

(a) A special fund designated as the North Carolina Mobility Fund is hereby created. The Mobility Fund consists of revenue from appropriations or transfers by the General Assembly.

(b) The amounts deposited to the Mobility Fund shall be used as provided in this Article, notwithstanding any provision of Article 14 of this Chapter to the contrary. The provisions of G.S. 136-17.2A shall not apply to the application of the Mobility Fund.

"§ 136-188. Use of North Carolina Mobility Fund.

(a) The Department of Transportation shall use the Mobility Fund to fund transportation projects, selected by the Department, of statewide and regional significance that relieve congestion and enhance mobility across all modes of transportation. The Department of Transportation shall establish project selection criteria based on the provisions of this Article.

(b) The initial project funded from the Mobility Fund shall be the widening and improvement of Interstate 85 north of the Yadkin River Bridge.

"§ 136-189. Reports by Department of Transportation.

The Department of Transportation shall develop, and update annually, a report containing a completion schedule for all projects to be funded from the Mobility Fund, including the SL2010-0031 Session Law 2010-31 Page 155 selection criteria and reasoning used for each project. The annual update shall indicate the projects, or portions thereof, that were completed during the preceding fiscal year, any changes in the original completion schedules, and the reasons for the changes. The report shall also include the Department's anticipated schedule for future projects. The Department shall submit the report and the annual updates to the Joint Legislative Transportation Oversight Committee."

SECTION 28.7.(b) The Department of Transportation shall develop selection criteria under G.S. 136-188, as enacted by this act, and shall report to the Joint Legislative Transportation Oversight Committee on its development of the selection criteria. A preliminary report on the selection criteria for projects is due to the Joint Legislative Transportation Oversight Committee by October 1, 2010. A final report is due to the Joint Legislative Transportation Oversight Committee by December 15, 2010. When developing the project criteria and selection process, the Department shall give

preferential consideration to projects qualified to receive State grants from the Congestion Relief and Intermodal Transportation 21st Century Fund under Article 19 of Chapter 136 of the General Statutes. When developing the project criteria and selection process, the Department shall involve the public and other stakeholders, including, but not limited to, the North Carolina Association of Municipal Planning Organizations, the North Carolina Association of Rural Planning Organizations, the North Carolina League of Municipalities, the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners, the North Carolina Metropolitan Mayors Coalition, and the North Carolina Council of Regional Governments.

SECTION 28.7.(c) G.S. 136-176(b2), as amended by Subsection 25.5.(f) of S.L. 2008-107, reads as rewritten:

"(b2) There is annually appropriated to the North Carolina Turnpike Authority from the Highway Trust Fund the sum of ninety-nine million dollars (\$99,000,000). eighty-four million dollars (\$84,000,000). Of the amount allocated by this subsection, twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing costs and expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Triangle Expressway, twenty-four million dollars (\$24,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Monroe Connector/Bypass, fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Mid-Currituck Bridge, and thirty-five million dollars (\$35,000,000) twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Garden Parkway. The amounts appropriated to the Authority pursuant to this subsection shall be used by the Authority to pay debt service or related financing costs and expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued by the Authority to finance the costs of one or more Turnpike Projects, to refund such bonds or notes, or to fund debt service reserves, operating reserves, and similar reserves in connection therewith. The appropriations established by this subsection constitute an agreement by the State to pay the funds appropriated hereby to the Authority within the meaning of G.S. 159-81(4). Notwithstanding the foregoing, it is the intention of the General Assembly that the enactment of this provision and the issuance of bonds or notes by the Authority in reliance thereon shall not in any manner constitute a pledge of the faith and credit and taxing power of the State, and nothing contained herein shall prohibit the General Assembly from amending the appropriations made in this subsection at any time to decrease or eliminate the amount annually appropriated to the Authority. Funds transferred from the Highway Trust Fund to the Authority pursuant to this subsection are not subject to the equity formula in G.S. 136-17.2A."

SECTION 28.7.(d) Any funds appropriated to the North Carolina Turnpike Authority in fiscal year 2009-2010 under G.S. 136-176(b2) to cover debt service or related financing costs for the Monroe Connector/Bypass project and that remain unencumbered at the end of fiscal year 2009-2010 are hereby transferred to the North Carolina Mobility Fund, as enacted by this act, to be used for Phase II of the Yadkin River Bridge project, which is the widening and improvement of Interstate 85 north of

the Yadkin River Bridge. Additionally, there is transferred from the Highway Trust Fund to the Mobility Fund the sum of fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) for fiscal year 2010-2011 to be used for Phase II of the Yadkin River Bridge project.

SECTION 28.7.(e) The Joint Legislative Transportation Oversight Committee shall study the debt affordability for State transportation funding. The study shall include a comparison of State transportation debt practices to those of other states with strong credit Page 156 Session Law 2010-31 SL2010-0031 ratings and shall make recommendations on the appropriate use of debt for strategic transportation projects. The Committee shall contract with the Kenan-Flagler Business School at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for the completion of the study. The committee shall report the results of the study to the 2011 General Assembly.

SECTION 28.7.(f) G.S. 105-187.9 reads as rewritten:

"§ 105-187.9. Disposition of tax proceeds.

...

(b) Transfer. General Fund Transfer. – In each fiscal year year, the State Treasurer shall transfer the amounts provided below from the taxes deposited in the Trust Fund to the General Fund. The transfer of funds authorized by this section may be made by transferring one-fourth of the amount at the end of each quarter in the fiscal year or by transferring the full amount annually on July 1 of each fiscal year, subject to the availability of revenue.

(1) The sum of seventy-one million dollars (\$71,000,000). forty million dollars (\$40,000,000).

...

(c) Mobility Fund Transfer. – In each fiscal year, the State Treasurer shall transfer thirty-one million dollars (\$31,000,000) from the taxes deposited in the Trust Fund to the Mobility Fund. The transfer of funds authorized by this section may be made by transferring one-fourth of the amount at the end of each quarter in the fiscal year or by transferring the full amount annually on July 1 of each fiscal year, subject to the availability of revenue."

SECTION 28.7.(g) G.S. 136-176(b2), as amended by subsection (c) of this section, reads as rewritten:

"(b2) There is annually appropriated to the North Carolina Turnpike Authority from the Highway Trust Fund the sum of eighty-four million dollars (\$84,000,000). ninety-nine million dollars (\$99,000,000). Of the amount allocated by this subsection, twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing costs and expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Triangle Expressway, twenty-four million dollars (\$24,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Monroe Connector/Bypass, fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Mid-Currituck Bridge, and twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) thirty-five million dollars (\$35,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing

expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Garden Parkway. The amounts appropriated to the Authority pursuant to this subsection shall be used by the Authority to pay debt service or related financing costs and expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued by the Authority to finance the costs of one or more Turnpike Projects, to refund such bonds or notes, or to fund debt service reserves, operating reserves, and similar reserves in connection therewith. The appropriations established by this subsection constitute an agreement by the State to pay the funds appropriated hereby to the Authority within the meaning of G.S. 159-81(4). Notwithstanding the foregoing, it is the intention of the General Assembly that the enactment of this provision and the issuance of bonds or notes by the Authority in reliance thereon shall not in any manner constitute a pledge of the faith and credit and taxing power of the State, and nothing contained herein shall prohibit the General Assembly from amending the appropriations made in this subsection at any time to decrease or eliminate the amount annually appropriated to the Authority. Funds transferred from the Highway Trust Fund to the Authority pursuant to this subsection are not subject to the equity formula in G.S. 136-17.2A."

SECTION 28.7.(h) G.S. 105-187.9, as amended by subsection (f) of this section, reads as rewritten:

"§ 105-187.9. Disposition of tax proceeds.

...

(b) General Fund Transfer. – In each fiscal year, the State Treasurer shall transfer the amounts provided below from the taxes deposited in the Trust Fund to the General Fund. The transfer of funds authorized by this section may be made by transferring one-fourth of the amount at the end of each quarter in the fiscal year or by transferring the full amount annually on July 1 of each fiscal year, subject to the availability of revenue. (1) The sum of forty million dollars (\$40,000,000). twenty-six million dollars (\$26,000,000).

...

SL2010-0031 Session Law 2010-31 Page 157

(c) Mobility Fund Transfer. – In each fiscal year, the State Treasurer shall transfer thirty-one million dollars (\$31,000,000) forty-five million dollars (\$45,000,000) from the taxes deposited in the Trust Fund to the Mobility Fund. The transfer of funds authorized by this section may be made by transferring one-fourth of the amount at the end of each quarter in the fiscal year or by transferring the full amount annually on July 1 of each fiscal year, subject to the availability of revenue."

SECTION 28.7.(i) G.S. 105-187.9(b) is repealed.

SECTION 28.7.(j) G.S. 105-187.9(c), as amended by subsection (h) of this section, reads as rewritten:

"(c) Mobility Fund Transfer. – In each fiscal year, the State Treasurer shall transfer forty-five million dollars (\$45,000,000) fifty-eight million dollars (\$58,000,000) from the taxes deposited in the Trust Fund to the Mobility Fund. The transfer of funds authorized by this section may be made by transferring one-fourth of the amount at the end of each

quarter in the fiscal year or by transferring the full amount annually on July 1 of each fiscal year, subject to the availability of revenue."

SECTION 28.7.(k) G.S. 136-176(b2), as amended by subsection (g) of this section, reads as rewritten:

"(b2) There is annually appropriated to the North Carolina Turnpike Authority from the Highway Trust Fund the sum of ninety-nine million dollars (\$99,000,000). one hundred twelve million dollars (\$112,000,000). Of the amount allocated by this subsection, twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing costs and expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Triangle Expressway, twenty-four million dollars (\$24,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Monroe Connector/Bypass, fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) twenty-eight million dollars (\$28,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Mid-Currituck Bridge, and thirty five million dollars (\$35,000,000) shall be used to pay debt service or related financing expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued for the construction of the Garden Parkway. The amounts appropriated to the Authority pursuant to this subsection shall be used by the Authority to pay debt service or related financing costs and expenses on revenue bonds or notes issued by the Authority to finance the costs of one or more Turnpike Projects, to refund such bonds or notes, or to fund debt service reserves, operating reserves, and similar reserves in connection therewith. The appropriations established by this subsection constitute an agreement by the State to pay the funds appropriated hereby to the Authority within the meaning of G.S. 159-81(4). Notwithstanding the foregoing, it is the intention of the General Assembly that the enactment of this provision and the issuance of bonds or notes by the Authority in reliance thereon shall not in any manner constitute a pledge of the faith and credit and taxing power of the State, and nothing contained herein shall prohibit the General Assembly from amending the appropriations made in this subsection at any time to decrease or eliminate the amount annually appropriated to the Authority. Funds transferred from the Highway Trust Fund to the Authority pursuant to this subsection are not subject to the equity formula in G.S. 136-17.2A."

SECTION 28.7.(l) Subsections (f) and (g) of this section become effective July 1, 2011. Subsection (h) of this section becomes effective July 1, 2012. Subsections (i), (j), and (k) of this section become effective July 1, 2013. The remainder of this section becomes effective July 1, 2010.

C – Congestion Relief & Intermodal 21st Century Transportation Fund

Also located at:

http://www.ncdot.org/download/about/mobilityfund/Article19_IntermodalCongestionRelief.pdf

NC General Statutes - Chapter 136 Article 19.
Congestion Relief and Intermodal 21st Century Transportation Fund.

§ 136-250. Congestion Relief and Intermodal Transportation 21st Century Fund.

There is established in the State treasury the Congestion Relief and Intermodal Transportation 21st Century Fund, hereinafter referred to as the Fund. The Fund shall consist of all revenues appropriated and allocated to it. Interest on earnings of the Fund shall remain within the Fund. (2009-527, s. 1.)

§ 136-251. Findings of fact.

The General Assembly finds that:

- (1) Increased use of rail for transport of freight will reduce highway congestion as well as allow economic expansion in a way that lessens the impact on the State highway system.
- (2) Public transportation, in addition to a program of urban loops and toll roads, will enable North Carolina to have a balanced 21st century transportation system.
- (3) As part of its initial program of internal improvements, the State capitalized the North Carolina Railroad in the 1840s and invested in other railroads, and those internal improvements led to North Carolina's rapid economic development. The North Carolina Railroad, with a 317-mile corridor from Charlotte to Morehead City, is still owned by the State.
- (4) Improved rail facilities and restoration of abandoned rail lines can allow increased access to the North Carolina State ports and military installations located within the State.
- (5) Session Law 2005-222 found that expanding and upgrading passenger, freight, commuter, and short-line rail service is important to the economy of North Carolina; and provided that the State would seek to provide matching funds partly so it can leverage the maximum federal and private participation to fund needed rail initiatives, such as the restoration of the rail corridor from Wallace to Castle Hayne and a rail connection between north-south and east-west routes in the vicinity of Pembroke.
- (6) Rail freight plays a vital role in economic development throughout the State. Intermodal service depends on partnerships with railroads, trucking companies, seaports, and others in the transportation logistics chain. North Carolina has 3,250 mainline miles of track, with Class I railroads holding seventy-nine percent (79%) of the trackage rights, the remainder controlled by local railroads and switching and terminal railroads. The 2006 Mid-Cycle Update to the North Carolina Statewide Intermodal Transportation Plan identified seven hundred ninety-nine million dollars (\$799,000,000)

in freight rail needs over the next 25 years, including maintenance and preservation, modernization, and expansion.

(7) North Carolina's short-line railroads play a key role in the State's economic development and transportation service and are needed to provide essential services to other modes of transportation and the North Carolina port system. North Carolina agriculture is dependent upon essential service by short-line railroads. State funds are needed to maintain short-line railroads as viable contributors to economic development, agriculture, and transportation in this State in order to prevent the loss of regional rail service. The Department of Transportation reported that 44,992 rail cars handled by short-lines kept 179,688 trucks off North Carolina highways. Short-line railroads are essential to preserve and develop jobs in rural and small urban areas of North Carolina.

(8) Intermodal facilities and inland ports can greatly reduce freight traffic on North Carolina's highway system, reducing demand, congestion, and damage.

(9) The proposed North Carolina International Terminal will need high-capacity intermodal access.

(10) Most of North Carolina's growth is in its urban regions. According to the State Data Center, during the first decade of the 21st century, sixty-six percent (66%) of the projected 1,270,000 growth in population is in 15 urban counties surrounding Charlotte, Raleigh, and the Triad, while forty percent (40%) is in just six counties: Mecklenburg, Wake, Durham, Orange, Forsyth, and Guilford.

(11) This large urban population growth greatly taxes resources. Despite the visionary creation of the Highway Trust Fund by the 1989 General Assembly and the funding of urban loop highways, congestion continues to worsen. Creation of a special fund to help meet urban transportation needs with alternatives such as rail transit and buses, coupled with land-use planning, will spur and guide economic development in a more economically and environmentally sound manner. Investment in public transportation facilitates economic opportunity to the State through job creation, access to employment, and residential and commercial development. Public transportation also protects the public health by decreasing air pollution and reducing carbon emissions. It reduces traffic congestion, road expenditures, public and private parking costs, and the number of traffic accidents. Charlotte's recent success in opening the first phase of its light rail system, with ridership significantly over projections, shows that North Carolinians are willing to use transportation alternatives.

(12) Significant local revenues are needed to match State funds so that a major portion of the expenses is borne by the localities receiving the majority of the benefits. A local option sales tax for public transportation was approved by a fifty-eight percent (58%) favorable vote in Mecklenburg County in 1998 and reaffirmed by a seventy percent (70%) favorable vote in 2007. Extending this authority to additional jurisdictions, along with other revenue options, will enable localities to demonstrate local support for additional transit options.

(13) Surveys have indicated broad public support for providing additional public transportation options and for allowing localities to generate revenue to match State grants. (2009-527, s. 1.)

§ 136-252. Grants to local governments and transportation authorities.

(a) Eligible Entities. – The following entities are eligible to receive grants under this

section from the Fund for public transportation purposes, which includes planning and engineering:

(1) Cities.

(2) Counties.

(3) Public transportation authorities under Article 25 of Chapter 160A of the General Statutes.

(4) Regional public transportation authorities under Article 26 of Chapter 160A of the General Statutes.

NC General Statutes - Chapter 136 Article 19 3

(5) Regional transportation authorities under Article 27 of Chapter 160A of the General Statutes.

(b) Requirements. – A grant may be approved from the Fund only if all of the following conditions are met:

(1) The application is approved by all Metropolitan Planning Organizations under Article 16 of this Chapter whose jurisdiction includes any of the service area of the grant applicant.

(2) The applicant has approved a transit plan that includes the following:

a. Relief of anticipated traffic congestion.

b. Improvement of air quality.

c. Reduction in anticipated energy consumption.

d. Promotion of a pedestrian- and bike-friendly environment around and connected to transit stations.

e. Promotion of mixed-use and transit-oriented developments and other land-use tools that encourage multimodal mobility.

f. Coordination with the housing needs assessment and plan provided in subdivision (3) of this subsection.

g. Promotion of access to public transportation for individuals who reside in areas with a disproportionate number of households below the area median income.

h. Coordination and planning with local education agencies to reduce transportation costs.

i. Coordination with local governments with zoning jurisdiction to carry out elements of the plan.

The applicant may also include plans for new public transportation services and public transportation alternatives beyond those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.) that assist individuals with disabilities with transportation, including transportation to and from jobs and employment support services.

(3) The applicant has approved a housing needs assessment and plan, or includes with its application such assessment and plan (or assessments and plans) approved by another unit or units of local government within its service area, that includes the following:

a. A housing inventory of market rate, assisted housing units, and vacant residential parcels.

b. An analysis of existing housing conditions, affordable housing needs, and housing needs for specific population groups, such as people who are elderly, are disabled, have special needs, or are homeless.

- c. A catalogue of available resources to address housing needs.
 - d. Identification of potential resources and a strategy to provide replacement housing for low-income residents displaced by transit development and to create incentives for the purpose of increasing the stock of affordable housing to at least fifteen percent (15%) within a one-half mile radius of each transit station and bus hub to be affordable to families with income less than sixty percent (60%) of area median income.
 - e. Goals, strategies, and actions to address housing needs over a five-year period.
- (4) The applicant has an adequate and sustainable source of funding established for its share of project costs.
- (5) The applicant agrees to submit to both the Secretary and each Metropolitan Planning Organization that approved the application a periodic update of the implementation of both the transit plan and the housing needs assessment and plan. Each Metropolitan Planning Organization receiving such update shall afford interested parties the opportunity to comment on the update.
- (c) Multiyear Allotments. – Grants from the Fund may be committed for a multiyear basis to stabilize the phased implementation of a plan, including multiyear allotments. The Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the Board of Transportation, shall approve, and amend from time to time, a rolling multiyear projection of up to 15 years for allocation of funds under this section. No applicant is eligible under the 15-year plan projection for more than one-third of the total funds to be granted under this Article during that 15-year period.
- (d) Cap; Matching Requirement. – A grant under this section may not exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the cost of the project and must be matched by an equal or greater amount of funds by the applicant. In evaluating projects, qualification for federal funding shall be considered. (2009-527, s. 1.)

§ 136-253. Grants to other units.

- (a) Eligible Entities; Purposes. – State agencies and railroads are eligible to receive grants under this section from the Fund for any of the following purposes:
- (1) Assistance to short-line railroads to continue and enhance rail service in the State so as to assist in economic development and access to ports and military installations. This may involve both the Rail Industrial Access Program and the Short Line Infrastructure Access Program, as well as other innovative programs. Grants under this subdivision shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the nonfederal share and must be matched by equal or greater funding from the applicant. Total grants under this subdivision may not exceed five million dollars (\$5,000,000) per fiscal year.
 - (2) Assistance to any railroad in the construction of rail improvements, intermodal or multimodal facilities or restorations to (i) serve ports, military installations, inland ports or (ii) improve rail infrastructure to reduce or mitigate truck traffic on the highway system. Grants under this subdivision shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the nonfederal share and must be matched by equal or greater funding from the applicant. Total grants under this subdivision may not exceed ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) per fiscal year.
 - (3) Assistance (i) to the State ports in terminal railroad facilities and operations, (ii) to improve access to military installations, and (iii) to the North Carolina International Terminal. Grants under this subdivision shall not exceed fifty

percent (50%) of the nonfederal share and must be matched by equal or greater funding from the applicant. Total grants under this subdivision may not exceed ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) per fiscal year.

(4) Expansion of intercity passenger rail service, including increased frequency and additional cities serviced. Routes under this subdivision must extend beyond the territorial jurisdiction of a transportation authority.

(b) Commuter Rail Service Grants. – State agencies, railroads, transportation authorities under Article 25 of Chapter 160A of the General Statutes, regional public transportation authorities under Article 26 of Chapter 160A of the General Statutes, and regional transportation authorities under Article 27 of Chapter 160A of the General Statutes are eligible to receive grants under this section from the Fund for the introduction of commuter rail service. Routes under this subsection must extend beyond the territorial jurisdiction of a transportation authority. (2009-527, s. 1.)

§ 136-254. Grant approval.

All grants made under this Article are subject to approval of the Secretary of Transportation after consultation with the Board of Transportation. The Fund may be administered in conjunction with G.S. 136-44.20 and G.S. 136-44.36, but any funds allocated under those sections shall continue to be available as provided therein. (2009-527, s. 1.)

§ 136-255. Expenditure.

No monies shall be expended from the Fund until appropriated by the General Assembly. (2009-527, s. 1.)

§ 136-256. Funds remain available until expended.

Appropriations to the Fund remain available until expended. (2009-527, s. 1.)

D – Workgroup Members

Last Name	First Name	Organization/Unit	Email Address	Phone
Argabright	Van	NCDOT Program Development Branch	vargabright@ncdot.gov	(919) 733-2039
Barlow	Bill	NCDOT Public Transportation Division	wrbarlow@ncdot.gov	(919) 733-4713
Black	Paul	Triangle Area RPO	pblack@tjcog.org	(919) 558-9397
Collins	Jennifer	Goldsboro Urban Area MPO	jcollins@ci.goldsboro.nc.us	(919) 580-4327
Dabney	Unwanna	Federal Highway Administration (Advisory)	Unwanna.Dabney@dot.gov	(919) 747-7023
Davis	Mike	NCDOT Information Technology	msdavis5@ncdot.gov	(919) 707-2032
Fearing	Charles	NCDOT Ferry Division	cfearing@ncdot.gov	(252) 473-3461
Holder	Mike	NCDOT Division Twelve	mholder@ncdot.gov	(704) 480-9025
Hughes	Craig	High Country RPO	chughes@regiond.org	(828) 265-5434
Huskins	Betty	North Regional Council of Governments	betty@ridgetopassociates.com	(828) 273-0276
Leonard	Kevin	North Carolina Association of County Commissioners	kevin.leonard@ncacc.org	(919) 715-4369
Lewis	Bobby	NCDOT Division Four	bobbylewis@ncdot.gov	(252) 237-6164
Lukasina	Chris	Capital Area MPO	chris.lukasina@ci.raleigh.nc.us	(919) 996-4402
Meyer	Paul	North Carolina League of Municipalities	pmeyer@nclm.org	(919)715-3930
Mills	Mike	NCDOT Division Seven	mmills@ncdot.gov	(336) 334-3192
Patel	Alpesh	NCDOT Strategic Planning Office	agpatel@ncdot.gov	(919) 715-8717
Simmons	Pat	NCDOT Rail Division	pbsimmons@ncdot.gov	(919) 733-7245
Stewart	Jill	NCDOT Information Technology	jestewart@ncdot.gov	(919) 707-2022
Talanker	Elena	NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch	etalanker@ncdot.gov	(919) 733-4705
Vine-Hodge	John	NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Division	javinehodge@ncdot.gov	(919) 807-0772
Voelker	Don	NCDOT Strategic Planning Office	djvoelker@ncdot.gov	(919) 715-0951
Walston	Bobby	NCDOT Aviation Division	bwalston@ncdot.gov	(919) 840-0112
Wasserman	David	NCDOT Strategic Planning Office	dswasserman@ncdot.gov	(919) 715-1273
White	Julie	North Carolina Metropolitan Mayor's Coalition	jwhite@nclm.org	(919) 715-7895

prioritization2.0

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Listening Sessions

Join us and offer your feedback!

NCDOT is hosting four listening sessions across the state to get your input on the way we prioritize projects.

When and Where

- **Nov. 8 at 9 a.m. in Raleigh**

RDU Airport Authority (1000 Trade Drive, RDU Airport)

As you enter the airport area, follow signs to Rental Car Return. RDU Center is located across from Thrifty Car Rental.

- **Nov. 10 at 9 a.m. in Kinston**

Global Transpark Center Training Facility (Auditorium)

<http://www.ncgtp.com/center.html>

- **Nov. 15 at 9 a.m. in Greensboro**

Greensboro Coliseum Special Events Center, Meeting Room 1 (A and B)

http://www.greensborocoliseum.com/guest_services/directions

- **Nov. 16 at 10 a.m. in Morganton**

Western Piedmont Community College (Foothills Higher Education Center)

<http://www.wpcc.edu/academics.php?cat=18%E2%80%8E>

Agenda

- **Opening Comments / Welcome — NCDOT Staff**
- **Overview of Prioritization 1.0 — NCDOT Staff**
Current scoring system, submittal process, web interface and accomplishments
- **Data Driven Approach (Non-Highway Modes) – NCDOT Staff**
Presentations from Aviation, Bicycle & Pedestrian, Ferry, Rail and Public Transportation Divisions
- **Open Discussion — Attendees**
Input for creating Prioritization 2.0
- **Closing / Next Steps — NCDOT Staff**

