

MINUTES
ORANGE COUNTY OUTBOARD
JANUARY 16, 2019
REGULAR MEETING

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

MEMBERS PRESENT: Art Menius, At-Large Representative (Chair); Jenn Sykes, At-Large Representative; Ed Vaughn, Cedar Grove Township Representative; David Laudicina, Cheeks Township Representative; Heidi Perry, At-Large Representative; Eric Broo, At-Large Representative; Amy Cole, At-Large Representative, Ram Athavale, Chapel Hill Township Representative; Randy Marshall, Bingham Township Representative;

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brantley Wells (Vice Chair), Hillsborough Township Representative; Donna Musson, Eno Township Representative; Johanna Birckmayer, At-Large Representative; Alyson West, At-Large Representative;

STAFF PRESENT: Abigaile Pittman, Transportation/Land Use Planner; Nish Trivedi, Transportation Planner; Tina Love, Administrative Assistant III;

OTHERS PRESENT: Matthew Day, TARPO; Tina Moon, Town of Carrboro

AGENDA ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER, DETERMINATION OF QUORUM AND INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS
Art Menius called the meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Art Menius: Change line 151 relative to favorable.

MOTION by Art Menius to approve the November 28, 2018 OUTBoard Minutes with correction. Seconded by Randy Marshall.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

AGENDA ITEM 3: CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONS TO AGENDA
There were none.

AGENDA ITEM 4: REGULAR OUTBOARD AGENDA

Art Menius: Nish isn't here so where do you want to start? Abigaile?

Abigaile Pittman: I can start with the Bicycle Safety report – page 23.

AGENDA ITEM 4B: BICYCLE SAFETY IMPLEMENTATION SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT (ABIGAILE PITTMAN)
Abigaile presented the status of the Bicycle Safety Subcommittee activities and next steps.

Heidi Perry: For the signs being put up in the County, it would be really nice if along with those signs, if there were signs the state would put up that say "4 feet or change lanes to pass". We've never asked them about this and since we are trying to make people aware of the new law this would be a reinforcement of the new laws passed in 2016.

Amy Cole: I have a question regarding conversations we had at the last meeting about the signage for the reduced speed on Orange Grove Road. You mentioned it would be discussed at the next NCDOT luncheon meeting, how did that work out?

Abigaile Pittman: I put it on that agenda for the meeting that was held on January 9th and NC DOT is going out to look at the intersection of Oakdale and Orange Grove Road for any additional potential SPOT safety improvements which could include signage or speed limits or flashing lights, etc. In addition, we have a staff engineer, Chris, preparing an estimate for preliminary engineering the purpose of entering discussions with Hillsborough about the sidewalks and maintenance. The 15 bicycle safety road signs are planned to be up by the end of this week. The website has all the links, and you can

54 go to it either through the Orange County website or directly. We need to decide on the social media ads, radio ads, etc.
55 and finalize the rest of the budget by the end of February.

56
57 **AGENDA ITEM 4A: ORANGE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PRIORITY LIST FOR SPOT 6.0 / FY 2022-2031 STIP (NISH**
58 **TRIVEDI) -**

59 *Nish Trivedi gave a presentation on SPOT 6.0. He spoke on the process that MPOs and local jurisdictions go through to*
60 *submit projects to be included in the next Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).*

61
62 Heidi Perry: Who determines the scoring criteria?

63
64 Nish Trivedi: The NCDOT Board of Transportation (DOT) determines the weights and criteria for the statewide, regional,
65 and division pots. A working group is meeting regularly and will make final recommendations to the Board of
66 Transportation?

67
68 Matt Day: DOT always defer to the working group.

69
70 Heidi Perry: Who comprises the working group?

71
72 Matt Day: The working group is 12 people from NCDOT and 12 non-NCDOT people. They have lots of meetings.

73
74 Ram Athavale: What do you mean by centerlines?

75
76 Nish: Centerline is the center of the road or center of right-of-way. NCDOT uses it to avoid double counting roads. It does
77 not take into account number of lanes. Centerline miles is simply length of road from one end to another.

78
79 Matt Day: DOT has two different ways of counting mileage; centerline and lane miles.

80
81 Nish Trivedi: Federal money is used for bike/ped projects and it is tied to STIP. The Federal money is the SDBGDA.

82
83 Matt Day: You can submit them for STI, there is federal money that is specifically for bike and projects. The federal money
84 is made part of the state's STIP.

85
86 Heidi Perry: And it requires a local match?

87
88 Nish Trivedi. Yes, these require local match and local administration.

89
90 Matt Day: Yes. But STBGDA is available to MPOs not RPOs, you can get federal TAP funds through RPO and anyone
91 can get them through STI.

92
93 Nish Trivedi: There are federal Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds TAP also requires local match and local
94 administration. Local match is just one major cost of the project and Local Administration is also another additional cost.
95 Local jurisdictions have to pay both. Orange County has not addressed this issue yet.

96
97 Heidi Perry: Two years ago, wasn't \$4 million dollar rescinded back to the federal government because no one could
98 gather local matches for their projects?

99
100 Matt Day: This was based on the recession that happened a few years ago. There's a certain amount of that federal
101 money that has to be spent in towns less than 5,000 people, and they had a hard time getting towns that were that small to
102 contribute money. DOT is using some of those unused TAP funds on ADA curb-ramp improvements, for municipalities in
103 the state.

104
105 Heidi Perry: Where is Mebane? DCHC MPO, TARPO?

106

107 Nish Trivedi: Mebane is part in Orange County and majority in BG MPO Alamance County. It is in BG MPO in Orange
108 County, and Orange County is also in BG MPO.
109
110 Jenn Sykes: They are mutually exclusive, color coded in the maps.
111
112 *Nish Trivedi continued his presentation referring to Attachments on priorities for TARPO, BG/MPO, & DCHC/MPO.*
113
114 Nish Trivedi: Matt correct me if I'm wrong, but if you submit a highway project using a NCDOT standard street cross
115 section that has bike lane, NCDOT will put in that bike lane as part of the highway modernization project.
116
117 Matt Day: DOT is in the process of updating their bike/ped policy. My expectation is that once that update is done, the
118 answer would be, yes. Right now, I can't tell you that the answer is, yes.
119
120 Nish Trivedi: Staff recommends carrying forward and updating the County Priorities used in 5.0. Instead of asking for a
121 paved shoulder we are asking for a highway project with a bike lane. We would use the NCDOT standards street cross
122 section that has bike lane and sidewalk. The sidewalk is included should NCDOT ever change their policy
123
124 Matt Day: If you're going to submit these as highway projects, the DOT thinks you are saying the primary purpose of the
125 project is to modernize the highway with the bicycle lanes as a secondary benefit.
126
127 Nish Trivedi: These are modernization where the focus is improving safety, bring roads to current standards as the
128 primary purpose and the bike lane, pedestrian facility, multimodal component is a secondary benefit.
129
130 Matt Day: If the primary purpose of the project is to provide bike lanes then submit it as a bike project. If the primary
131 purpose is to improve and modernize the road with the bike lanes as a secondary benefit, then submit as a highway
132 project.
133
134 Nish Trivedi: If the bike is primary then you're required to provide local match and local administration. The County has
135 never addressed local match or local administration. I do not believe we have time to address it prior to submission. I'm
136 recommending these as highway modernization projects with the bike lane as a secondary benefit. These are all
137 modernization projects with two exceptions: NC 86 and NC 54 which the staff is recommending as widening projects. The
138 NC-86 is identified because it is in the current adopted TARPO CTP.
139
140 Matt Day: Yes it is in the CTP but just because it is in the CTP does not mean you may want to submit it.
141
142 Nish Trivedi: Yes, the reason these projects are identified is because it is for the County Priorities for SPOT 6 and later for
143 SPOT 7, 8, etc. Staff is identifying a full list that we will bring to you every SPOT cycle rather than reinventing the wheel
144 each time.
145
146 Heidi Perry: In order to make it a highway project with a modernization of bike lanes, does it have to have a curb and
147 gutter?
148
149 Matt Day: No. If you look at the DOT standard cross-sections and desire a bike lane, you will see curb and gutter.
150 Anything that doesn't have a curb and gutter, DOT will typically do a 4-foot paved shoulder, not a full 5-foot.
151
152 Nish Trivedi: No, I used that NCDOT standard street cross section as it is the closest one that reflects the existing 60'
153 right-of-way with a bike lane. I can update the recommendation of having a four-foot paved shoulder instead of a curb and
154 gutter, but it will not be a bike lane.
155
156 Heidi Perry: What makes it a modernization?
157
158 Nish Trivedi: Modernization projects are what NCDOT uses to bring the roads to current "modern" standards.
159

160 Matt Day: It's generally projects to make the existing travel lanes to current safe standards, or to straighten out some
161 curves and to add shoulders if necessary.
162
163 Heidi Perry: What I did like was the 11-foot travel lane. Would 11-foot travel lanes be allowed?
164
165 Nish Trivedi: Yes. The majority of the cross section are 11-foot travel lane.
166
167 Heidi Perry: Where do separated multi-use paths stand?
168
169 Nish Trivedi: I can cover that at the very end of this presentation. Multi-use paths or shared use paths or side paths are all
170 considered independent bike/ped projects and funded through federal STBGDA. State funds cannot be used for them.
171
172 Heidi Perry: Does that count as part of a modernization?
173
174 Nish Trivedi and Matt Day: No.
175
176 Matt Day: There is a project in TARPO that has a multi-use path as part of a highway project but such projects falls under
177 the NCDOT Cost Share Policy which local jurisdictions have to pay.
178
179 Heidi Perry: Is this the 20% local match?
180
181 Nish Trivedi: No, cost share policy is based on the local jurisdiction population. Larger populated local jurisdictions pay
182 more for such projects. Durham County pays 50%
183
184 Eric Broo: What about sidewalks?
185
186 Nish Trivedi: This applies to sidewalks and I will show how this policy works at end of presentation.
187
188 Randy Marshall: Looking at Old Greensboro, we can modernize but not include the curb and gutter and sidewalk; is that
189 right? I thought DOT didn't do sidewalks.
190
191 Nish Trivedi: Yes, They administer and build sidewalks, through their pedestrian policy that requires local jurisdiction to
192 pay a percentage of the cost. They do not maintain them.
193
194 Randy Marshall. Why would you put curb, gutters, and sidewalks on Old Greensboro Highway when nobody is there to
195 maintain them? Why not just put the improvements of 11-foot travel lanes and 4-foot paved shoulders. Put something in
196 there that's likely to score higher and be more cost effective.
197
198 Heidi Perry: These projects were in there last year.
199
200 Nish Trivedi: Yes, these were in there as paved shoulder projects. The paved shoulder projects were not carried forward
201 at the MPO. Paved shoulder projects were not submitted by MPO to NCDOT because they could not be carried forward.
202 Old Greensboro road was carried forward as a modernization project, not just paved shoulder.
203
204 Heidi Perry: It wasn't submitted last time, and I'm not sure why?
205
206 Nish Trivedi: We did submit it and it is part of SPOT 5.0. It was given a regional and divisional score but it was too low to
207 give it points. Neither OUTBoard nor BOCC recommended it as a priority when it came to local input points so it did not get
208 any points.
209
210 Matt Day: It was submitted and scored, but it didn't score high enough for us to put points on.
211
212 Nish Trivedi: As part of your recommendation, would you be asking for removing curb and gutter on all these projects?
213 The focus for these staff recommendations is to modernize the roads, get 11-foot travel lanes and bike lanes.

214
215 Randy Marshall. I think so. Curb and gutter and sidewalk can't happen. We don't have a municipality to maintain, and we
216 should never put it in there.
217
218 Eric Broo: Would that be deemed by the DOT as too costly, nixing the project when we could otherwise get 80% of what
219 we really want?
220
221 Jenn Sykes: Does changing it up the probability of a higher score?
222
223 Nish Trivedi: Cost is a scoring criteria, reducing the cost may improve its score.
224
225 Matt Day: Curbs and gutters will be more expensive.
226
227 Nish Trivedi: Without curb and gutter, there will be no bike lane, just a 4-foot paved shoulder.
228
229 Matt Day: That will be cheaper and improve the score. We are working on ways to improve the modernization aspect so
230 they do not compete with capacity aspects. Perhaps scale differently.
231
232 Heidi Perry: What about bike counts as a provision like along Dairyland Road? There are more cyclists there on weekends
233 than cars.
234
235 Randy Marshall: If you're proposing to do a four-foot bike lane, that would wipe out the ditch, and you would have to do
236 the ditch beyond that and buy the right of way which would run the score down.
237
238 Nish Trivedi: And the length of the road. In SPOT 5.0 the length of Old Greensboro Road was from Alamance County into
239 DCHC MPO. It was not broken into segments. Matt, If we have a projects list and they cover a whole road, can we in the
240 MPO/RPO technical committees and submit only a portion of it?
241
242 Matt Day: As long as there's a logical reason for why we're breaking it at a certain point.
243
244 Nish Trivedi: This list is to get the whole corridor. In the MPO/RPO meetings, they will be divided into separate sections
245 for better scoring. That is why as part of staff recommendations we are providing you the two bases for breaking the
246 segments, Traffic Count (AADT) and Crashes (number and severity) both are variables used in calculating the quantitative
247 scores.
248
249 Heidi Perry: I would like to keep all these on here for discussion. I agree with Randy regarding removing the curb and
250 gutters and keeping them on here as paved shoulders. I would like for there to be some way of saying that the shoulder
251 should be able to withstand the same amount of traffic as the roads.
252
253 Nish Trivedi: That's why staff is recommending these as highway modernization projects, to bring that whole road to a
254 current standard, not just a road with a 2-foot paved shoulder but to ensure sufficient shoulder for safety purpose and/or
255 bike lane.
256
257 Heidi Perry: At some point, we might be able to add another foot to each of these and make them true bike lane projects.
258 I think we need to keep them on here as they are just so they don't go away without some reason for removing them.
259
260 Nish Trivedi: When MPO/RPOs submit highway projects to NCDOT, they must provide a standard street cross section
261 they want the road to be for scoring purpose.
262
263 Matt Day: When we submit these to DOT we have to pick one of their standard cross sections that we submitted it as.
264 We can write in the description what we'd like if one of those standard cross section doesn't exactly match up with what we
265 want.
266

267 Nish Trivedi: We can pick a NCDOT standard street cross section and modify it for what we want, like no curb and gutter
268 and/or 5-foot paved shoulder.
269

270 Eric Broo: So Old Greensboro Road should be sliced into two projects?
271

272 Nish Trivedi: One of the criteria is the cost benefit of the project. If it's a shorter portion, the cost is reduced and it's
273 benefit may be higher, thereby scoring better. Segments have a better chance of scoring better than the entire corridor.
274

275 Heidi Perry: If we put in the curb and the gutter, it automatically becomes a bike project. Because it's going to have a bike
276 lane. It's not a shoulder any more it's a lane for bikes
277

278 Nish Trivedi: The curb and gutter does not make it a bike project. When a project's sole purpose is to improve the bike
279 mode of travel that is what makes it a bike project. Simply asking for a bike lane makes it a bike project. Same with asking
280 for a sidewalk makes it a pedestrian project.
281

282 Matt Day: You could have a modernization project that has curbs and gutters and it would be a highway project as long
283 as your stated purpose of the projects is to improve that road.
284

285 Eric Broo: So select stretches that might get a different treatment might be obvious that they were for cyclists and be
286 discarded because there's no other logical reason for doing it?
287

288 Matt Day: I think if you had different designs for different sections then yes that would become obvious.
289

290 Nish Trivedi: That is why I am recommending congestion and safety be the factors used in breaking up segments and both
291 of them are standard criteria for SPOT scoring and geared toward highway projects rather than bike/ped.
292

293 Eric Broo: When do you intend to submit these?
294

295 Nish Trivedi: I am looking for your recommendation right now because both of our recommendations goes to the BOCC for
296 their final decision. We need to get these projects identified by March so we can submit them to MPO/RPO.
297

298 Eric Broo: The bicycle subcommittee could meet and talk about other specific segments?
299

300 Heidi Perry: I think we can't do that without the OUTBoard's recommendation.
301

302 Art Menius: Nish posed the question of whether we wanted to pull curb and gutter and sidewalk out of these projects do
303 we have a consensus on that or need further discussion?
304

305 Nish Trivedi: If that is your recommendation, I will update these entire lists by removing the curb and gutter and sidewalks,
306 and recommend County Priorities as Highway Modernization projects with a 5 foot paved shoulder, rather than 4-foot
307 which matching the NCDOT standard street cross section is 2B.
308

309 Randy Marshall: Will this paved shoulder be built to the same standards as the road?
310

311 Nish Trivedi: Yes, that's why it would be modernized to current standards.
312

313 Nish Trivedi: Do you get the updates for scoping?
314

315 Matt Day: With any kind of sizable project of the MPO/RPO, you should receive notices.
316

317 Art Menius: Where did the discussion about segmenting Old Greensboro project end up?
318

319 Nish Trivedi: As Matt said, it's better to segment these sections out. Right now, I'm listing it as the entire corridor as a
320 County concern/priority. Staff recommends using traffic count and crashes as the criteria for separating those segments.

321 It's listed as the entire corridor because we are recommending the entire corridor be a priority for the County for now and
322 future SPOT cycles. By breaking the corridor down into segments, each segment has a better chance of receiving a
323 higher score.

324
325 Matt Day: The reason for segmentation is to cut down the cost to improve its score.
326

327 Nish Trivedi: I will keep the board updated as to what segment will be. Prior to MPO/RPO submitting it to NCDOT, they
328 will go through a 30-day public review period before their policy boards adopts the final project submission list.
329

330 Eric Broo: Does the DOT look at pedestrians and bicyclists when it comes to accidents?
331

332 Nish Trivedi: Yes. Safety was a criteria in SPOT 5.0 and it was based on 20% crash density, 20% crash severity, 20%
333 critical crash rate, and 40% safety benefits. In SPOT 5, it accounted for 10% of the total score in Statewide, Region, and
334 Division. This criteria is expected to be carried forward with SPOT 6.0
335

336 Eric Broo: That includes vehicle and bicycle interactions?
337

338 Nish Trivedi: NCDOT keeps record of all reported crashes, the crash data includes whether it involved pedestrian, cyclist,
339 or animal, as well as hitting a pole, object or rear ending someone.
340

341 Nish Trivedi: Your current recommendation is to remove curb and gutter, have 11-foot travel lanes, and a four-foot paved
342 shoulder increased to five, and I will find the standard cross section NCDOT uses. Should I remove sidewalks as well?
343

344 Heidi Perry: I think so.
345

346 Eric Broo: If there is a school or community center in the future where there should be a sidewalk, I think it would be
347 reasonable to include that portion as a sidewalk.
348

349 Nish Trivedi: Before we complete with TARPO, I want to mention the two projects that were mentioned for widening. As
350 Matt mentioned earlier, NC-86 is part of the adopted Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). I haven't been given
351 direction on whether we're updating the CTP or not. The CTP calls for NC-54 and NC 86 to be widened.
352

353 Matt Day: To provide a little background, NCDOT used to have a policy that was considered NC-86 as a strategic highway
354 corridor. Under the policy, NCDOT required that all plans had to show NC 86 as a four-lane expressway from Hillsborough
355 up to Virginia. That policy was removed a few years ago and we no longer have to show it as a four-lane express way. It
356 was never justified based on the volume of traffic. Recently, when the MPO did their CTP, it did not show a widening of
357 their section of it, so the RPO portion picks somewhere probably a couple miles north of Hillsborough.
358

359 Heidi Perry: We should look at what the population growth is for that part of the county.
360

361 Matt Day: If there's some question about whether that project is necessary, you have an opportunity to request that DOT
362 do an update to the plan to decide if that project is something that is based on updated forecasts, is necessary from the
363 traffic prospective, or something that can be removed from the plan.
364

365 Nish Trivedi: What do I need to do to request that from NCDOT?
366

367 Matt Day: Have the Board of Commissioners make a request to the RPO and then the RPO can make a request to DOT.
368 I think Nish was also going to talk about the widening of 54. The current CTP shows widening only being necessary out to
369 Orange Grove Road, but a recent corridor study suggested it needed to be widened all the way to Graham so that's
370 another thing you would want to go back and revisit in the plan.
371

372 Nish Trivedi: As Matt Day said those two sections are two separate projects that are being recommended as part of this
373 and are broken by traffic count as well.
374

375 Abigaile Pittman: I recall from 2013 that the commissioners actually it was either a letter or a resolution they sent with it?
376
377 Matt Day: Yes. Specific language inserted into the plan document itself was the only reason NC-86 widening was being
378 put in the plan, because of the strategic highway corridor.
379
380 Nish Trivedi: Would I need to get our board's recommendation to have that removed in updating the CTP?
381
382 Abigaile Pittman: Two of these projects are beyond the TARPO boundary, so I would suggest that you be thoughtful of
383 the language and not include something that is in these other jurisdictions.
384
385 Nish Trivedi: I believe that is referring to Dairyland Road and NC-54. Your attachments document which corridors
386 continue into DCHC MPO so we will be coordinating these with them.
387
388 Abigaile Pittman: And NC-86 going down to Eubanks.
389
390 Art Menius: I think the ones we are specifically talking about are NC-86 north of Hillsborough and NC-54 west of Carrboro.
391
392 Nish Trivedi: Staff is recommending that these be considered as new project and priorities for Orange County. I ask that
393 the OUTBoard recommend the BOCC to request TARPO to request NCDOT investigate NC-86 and update the CTP
394 accordingly.
395
396 Matt Day: You could request NCDOT do an update to look at NC-86, and if their analysis says that the traffic forecast
397 does not justify widening, then remove it.
398
399 **MOTION** by Eric Broo to have the BOCC request that the RPO request a reevaluation of NC 86 from NCDOT. Seconded
400 by Ram Athavale.
401 **VOTE: UNANIMOUS**
402
403 Nish Trivedi: What about NC 54? It is in TARPO CTP, this is a portion that goes Orange Grove Rd.
404
405 Matt Day: That stops at Dodson's crossroads because that is the boundary between the MPO and RPO.
406
407 Nish Trivedi: So the update should be the removal of Fayetteville Rd. and leave it to Dodson crossroads?
408
409 Heidi Perry: I thought the project was in flux after the corridor study?
410
411 Nish Trivedi: The Corridor Study is technically complete; it has been presented to all member jurisdictions and agencies.
412 Carrboro is currently working with DCHC MPO for additional work on it. NCDOT is satisfied with it. DCHC MPO is the only
413 agency responsible for adopting it. Graham has approved the study.
414
415 Tina Moon: There's two different issues here. There's two different jurisdictions in terms of the MPO vs. RPO. We should
416 be thoughtful with staff about knowingly having our elected officials at odds with one another.
417
418 Eric Broo: Since the study is still with the town and MPO to review the data; is it reasonable to wait?
419
420 Matt Day: The MPOs and RPOs get to submit projects, but so does the NCDOT division. If we choose not to submit,
421 then the division is going to submit this as a project.
422
423 Heidi Perry: Is it possible to ask the BOCC to postpone a decision on whether to add this project until the initial analysis is
424 done?
425
426 Nish Trivedi: You could recommend this project be tabled till MPO acts on the study.
427
428 Heidi Perry: I can't support the project until I get the rest of the requested answers.

429
430 **MOTION** by Heidi Perry to ask the BOCC table this project until the MPO work on it is complete: Seconded by Eric Broo.
431 **VOTE: 8-1**; Opposed by Jenn Sykes.
432
433 Jenn Sykes: There are people who can't afford to live and they must use a car to get to work. And we are an economic
434 hub and we need to be very cognizant of that because the consequences of not making it easier to work.
435
436 Matt Day: I would suggest that you also hold off and do the NC-86 and NC-54 updates to the CPT at the same time. If
437 we're going to hold off making any decisions about what to do with NC-54, then I would also recommend that you hold off
438 on making any requests about 86.
439
440 Heidi Perry: So don't ask the RPO to update the CTP on NC-86?
441
442 Matt Day: We can't ask DOT to do an update on one thing now and then come back six months from now for another
443 update. If we're going to have multiple requests, we need to make it all as one request.
444
445 Heidi Perry. So, what's the timing in terms of these two projects, because we're waiting for more information on NC-54.
446 So, we don't want to ask them to do the CTP on that, yet?
447
448 Matt Day: I would say even if we ask them to do a CTP update now on NC-86, you're not going to get that back for
449 another year, year and a half.
450
451 Heidi Perry: So, what should our request be?
452
453 Nish Trivedi: You can recommend both NC-86 and NC-54 be tabled till MPO/RPO CTPs are updated.
454
455 **MOTION** by Eric Broo, Seconded by Heidi Perry.
456 **VOTE: 9-0**; Abstention by Jenn Sykes
457
458 Jenn Sykes. The development issues aren't worth waiting on. The traffic congestion is already there and it's going to get
459 worse. It's going to get worse before it gets better, and I'd rather just try to get something started. This area is the
460 economic hub of the rural area.
461
462 Heidi Perry: We want to get cars off of roads.
463
464 Jenny Sykes: That may be ideal but it is not practical especially in rural Orange County. There people will always need to
465 drive to get to work.
466
467 Nish Trivedi: The corridor study provides specific intersection improvements along NC-54 as short term solutions.
468
469 Matt Day: When we submit these things, we try to keep them as vague as possible. We don't get into the specifics of turn
470 lanes, how long it is, or which direction or any of that.
471
472 Eric Broo: Would the details be worked through a public process?
473
474 Nish Trivedi: When STIP projects are committed and implemented, NCDOT host local officials and public meetings during
475 preliminary design. They take public comments so they can better finalize the design of these projects. Regarding the
476 other County Priorities that cross into Carrboro, they will be updated to remove curb and gutter but we will continue to
477 coordinate with Carrboro. Just because they may be part of Orange County's priority list, they may not be submitted by us,
478 Carrboro may choose to submit them.
479
480 Heidi Perry: Old NC-86 is a road that I think need a separated mixed-use path between Hillsborough and Carrboro.
481 Maybe along with modernization. I just feel that a bike lane or a shoulder on that road is not going to take care of the
482 problems.

483
484 Nish Trivedi: A mixed-use path, shared-use path, side path, or any independent bike/ped facility like is part of two different
485 funding and administration requirements. Federal STBGDA which requires 20% local match and local administration or a
486 sidewalk that is part of NCDOT's Pedestrian Policy and requires 50% cost share for first 5-foot width and 100% local cost
487 for any additional width.
488
489 Matt Day: Yes, I think in theory you could do that. DOT will administer it through the sidewalk cost share policy. If you
490 were to submit as a stand-alone project, it would be only a 20 percent match.
491
492 Abigaile Pittman: I think they would need right of way as well, does that influence?
493
494 Nish Trivedi: Old NC-86 right-of-way is 60'; a mixed-use path will require right-of-way acquisition. County would still have
495 to address the local match and local administration issue or pay share of the cost of the bike/ped facility.
496
497 Amy Cole: Is it possible to have a collaboration with the power company so that we could actually use their right of way as
498 the area where the side path would actually be built?
499
500 Matt Day: It's possible, but usually they don't have right of way; they just have an easement.
501
502 Ed Vaughn: I'm with Heidi on this one. We need separate bike/ped path to utilize the Mountain-to-Sea Trail.
503
504 Nish Trivedi. Staff recommends the bike lane along Old NC-86 because as part of DCHC MPO 2045 Metropolitan
505 Transportation Plan (MTP) recently adopted, this board recommended Old NC-86 as a Bike/Ped corridor, Board of County
506 Commissioners approved and we succeeded in getting it added to the MTP.
507
508 Matt Day: You have two options; one option is to do a modernization requesting a side path with the possibility of cost
509 share, or the second option is to submit it as a stand-alone bike/ped project knowing that it requires a letter of commitment
510 from the county to agree to administer and maintain.
511
512 Nish Trivedi: Another option is just like the other modernization projects, you could recommend removing curb and gutter,
513 and sidewalk and extending the paved shoulder to 5-feet.
514
515 David Laudicina: Why wouldn't you put the multi-use thing on NC-86?
516
517 Nish Trivedi: Because the multi-use path is considered an independent bike/ped facility, subject to either federal
518 requirement of 20% local match and local administration or state sidewalk cost share.
519
520 Jenn Sykes: I think some properties probably had some trouble getting the right of ways granted.
521
522 Nish Trivedi: For clarification, you want to turn Old 86 into a modernization with a multi-use path?
523
524 Heidi Perry: Separated side path.
525
526 Art Menius: Multi-use side path.
527
528 Matt Day: Just understanding that there will be a local match and local administration or cost share required. While that
529 project is slightly in TARPO it is mostly in the MPO and you will be competing with all the other MPO projects.
530
531 Amy Cole: Is it possible to do a countywide survey to see whether or not people would support it and make it more likely
532 to score well?
533
534 Nish Trivedi: Surveys do not go into SPOT scoring.
535

536 Matt Day: In more rural areas, it's harder to get rural bike/ped projects. You're better off scoring it as a highway project
 537 because the criteria used for bike/ped projects are based on your proximity to points of interest and density of population,
 538 things working against rural projects.

539
 540 Nish Trivedi: Bike/Ped scoring variables are destinations, densities, connectivity, cost effectiveness and safety.
 541

542 **MOTION** by Heidi Perry that the Old NC-86 improvement be submitted as a road modernization project with a separated
 543 side-path, seconded by Ed Vaughn.

544 **VOTE: 8-1.** Opposed, David Laudicina.
 545

546 David Laudicina: I live close along there and close enough to Old 86 that I don't want any more encroachment on my
 547 property.
 548

549 Amy Cole: You will have problem getting right-of-way along Old NC-86.
 550

551 Nish Trivedi: I don't know how Carrboro feels about Old NC-86 improvements.
 552

553 Tina Moon: I think this will make for a good corridor study for bike/ped connection between Hillsborough and Carrboro.
 554 Carrboro is about to embark on a bike plan and this area may come up.
 555

556 *Nish Trivedi continued the presentation and directed the OUTBoard to Attachment 2 regarding DCHC and attachment 3,*
 557 *BG MPO Project List.*
 558

559 Nish Trivedi: Now DCHC MPO. DCHC's SPOT process is tentatively using the adopted MTP. If it is not in the MTP it may
 560 not get submitted. I have identified possible projects that my require updating the MTP in order for them to be submitted
 561 into SPOT. Right now these are just potential projects identified in DCHC MPO area. Some of these projects are covered
 562 in TARPO but cross into DCHC. Because they cross between MPO/RPO they may be easier to submit in one than the
 563 other. They are simply presented in both because they cross jurisdiction boundaries. Nish Trivedi: I have added US-70 to
 564 the list because it crosses both DCHC MPO and BG MPO connecting Mebane, Hillsborough, and Durham. It is a Strategic
 565 Freight Corridor in DCHC MPO. There is increasing traffic and crashes along it. Lebanon Road is also added as a potential
 566 project because it too crosses both MPOs. Mebane is against widening Lebanon Road but they support intersection
 567 improvements along it due to serious crashes and increasing traffic. Nish Trivedi: As you can see in the table for US-70,
 568 there are over 14,000 vehicles going east from Mebane through Hillsborough and into Durham, many of them avoiding the
 569 I-85 traffic and trucks avoiding the weigh station. There have also been over 1,100 accidents over the past ten years and
 570 10 of them being fatal, that's over 100/year and 1 fatality per year while traffic along it continues increasing. US-70 will be
 571 the detour when NCDOT later widens I-85.
 572

573 Heidi Perry: One of the reasons for not approving the widening of US 70 was to find better ways to keep the trucks on the
 574 interstate. The trucks are exiting onto 70 to avoid a weigh station. Adding capacity to 70 would exasperate that problem,
 575 would allow trucks to bypass an important safety measure that we have in place for the public good. Another expressed by
 576 a majority of the OUTBoard, was the understanding that adding lanes to roads brings more cars and Vehicle Miles
 577 Traveled (VMTs), not fewer, and that the state's focus should be on finding ways to decrease VMTs.
 578

579 **MOTION** by Heidi Perry to not recommend US-70 as possible project, seconded by Eric Broo.
 580

581 **VOTE: 8-1.** Opposed by Jenn Sykes.
 582

583 Nish Trivedi: Each jurisdiction in the BGMPO is allowed to submit 10 projects, and I don't want us to lose our chance of
 584 getting a project in, so I'm asking for all five to be considered as potential projects.
 585

586 Art Menius: Any opposition to moving forward with all five?
 587

588 Abigaile Pittman: Didn't the U.S. 70 map get removed?

589 Nish Trivedi: The OUTBoard does not want it removed because remove gives negative connotation. They are just “not
590 recommending” it as a potential project.
591
592 Eric Broo: So, we’re talking about four; numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5?
593
594 Heidi Perry: I’m confused about three because you said that NCDOT was doing a study on how to handle the railroad
595 there so why would you do the road extension project?
596
597 Nish Trivedi: NCDOT is doing an express Feasibility Study of Buckhorn Road that will address both the widening and a
598 grade separation to US-70 using Mebane’s recently adopted Traffic Separation Study.
599
600 Heidi Perry: You said something about the railroad.
601
602 Nish Trivedi: The Mattress Factory Road Extension to US-70 involves an at-grade crossing and Mebane is coordinating
603 with NCDOT to determine what is the best way to do that. NCDOT railroad division is all in favor for removing at grade
604 crossings to better connect Raleigh to Charlotte. The Feasibility Study is geared towards identifying the best way to widen
605 Buckhorn Road, create a grade separation and connect to US-70 for SPOT purpose.
606
607 Matt Day: Their ultimate goal for that line between Raleigh and Charlotte is to get rid of all the at-grade crossings.
608
609 Heidi Perry: So, assuming the project scored highly and were to get funded, they would have to make that part of the
610 extension?
611
612 Nish Trivedi: Yes
613
614 Matt Day: Yes. If project 3 were to get submitted and got funded, the railroad wouldn’t let them build a new at grade
615 crossing.
616
617 Nish Trivedi: As part of the Feasibility Study NCDOT is also evaluating an at grade separation for Buckhorn Road and the
618 grade separation is also part of the staff recommendation.
619
620 **MOTION** by Heidi Perry to keep the four projects on the list for the BGMPO. Eric Broo seconded.
621 **VOTE: UNANIMOUS.**
622
623 **AGENDA ITEM 5: STAFF UPDATES**
624
625 **AGENDA ITEM 5A: EFLAND-BUCKHORN-MEBANE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN (NISH TRIVEDI) -**
626 *Nish Trivedi gave a quick update on the progress and updates since the last time it came before the OUTBoard. We will*
627 *be posting this draft plan on January 31 to the website.*
628
629 **AGENDA ITEM 5B: MPO/RPO NCDOT PROJECT UPDATES (NISH TRIVEDI)**
630
631 Nish Trivedi: Included in your packet is the NCDOT update for all projects in Orange County. Let me know if you have any
632 questions on them. Thank you.
633
634 Nish Trivedi: I-40 Widening, there is a public meeting scheduled for January 24 in Hillsborough at the Passmore Center.
635 Chapel Hill is working with NCDOT to get another public meeting in Chapel Hill.
636
637 **AGENDA ITEM: ADJOURNMENT**
638 OUTBoard meeting was adjourned.
639