



**TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of August 26, 2015**  
**10:30 a.m., Greensboro, NC**  
**3<sup>rd</sup> Floor GDOT Conference Room**  
**Melvin Municipal Office Building**

**ATTENDANCE**

Tyler Meyer	<i>GDOT/MPO</i>	Patrick Wilson	<i>NCDOT Division 7</i>
Craig McKinney	<i>GDOT/MPO</i>	Scott Whitaker	<i>Town of Summerfield</i>
Daniel Amstutz	<i>GDOT/MPO</i>	Matt Wallace	<i>Guilford County Parks &amp; Open Space</i>
Lydia McIntyre	<i>GDOT/MPO</i>	Oliver Bass	<i>Guilford County Planning</i>
Tram Truong	<i>GDOT/MPO</i>	Bill Bruce	<i>Town of Oak Ridge</i>
Adam Fischer	<i>GDOT</i>	Alex Rosser	<i>PTAA</i>
Mark Kirstner	<i>PART</i>	Hanna Cockburn	<i>GSO Planning Dept</i>
Fredrick Haith	<i>Winston-Salem DOT</i>	Taruna Tayal	<i>VHB</i>
Michael Abuya ( <i>by phone</i> )	<i>NCDOT TPB</i>		

**Tyler Meyer called the meeting to order at 10:34 am.**

**1. Approve Minutes of June 24, 2015**

Hanna Cockburn moved to approve the minutes of the June 24, 2015 meeting. Adam Fischer seconded the motion. The TCC voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the June 24, 2015 meeting.

**2. I-73 Pavement Rehabilitation (I-5735) MTIP Amendment**

Tyler Meyer explained that this Amendment has been requested by NCDOT to move a pavement rehabilitation project for I-73 from FY 2016 to FY 2025. This is the area of I-73 in southern Guilford County near the Randolph County line. Meyer noted he was not sure why this project was being moved out so far, and not received much background information on the Amendment.

Pat Wilson noted that it is a resurfacing project, and possibly this section of I-73 had been resurfaced recently; therefore it would not need to be resurfaced for some time. However, he did not have the full details on the Amendment and would ask Mike Mills for background information ahead of the TAC meeting.

**Planning for the transportation future**

Adam Fischer moved to recommend the I-73 Pavement Rehabilitation (I-5735) MTIP Amendment to the TAC for approval. Michael Abuya seconded the motion. The TCC voted unanimously to recommend the I-73 Pavement Rehabilitation (I-5735) MTIP Amendment to the TAC for approval.

### **3. Local Projects Oversight (M-0505) MTIP Amendment**

Tyler Meyer noted that this Amendment will add \$300,000 to the MTIP for NCDOT oversight of locally administered projects for FY 2016-2020. This oversight includes the review and approval of agreements, designs, contracting documents, and environmental documentation. Most projects are administered by the City of Greensboro in this area, but the towns and Guilford County may also have projects they administer. This money will come from the State Highway Trust Fund.

Mark Kirstner moved to recommend the Local Projects Oversight (M-0505) MTIP Amendment to the TAC for approval. Adam Fischer seconded the motion. The TCC voted unanimously to recommend the Local Projects Oversight (M-0505) MTIP Amendment to the TAC for approval.

## **Business Items**

### **1. Prioritization 4.0 Update**

Lydia McIntyre started by noting the Prioritization 4.0 (P4.0) process will be used in the development of the 2017-2027 STIP. It is a performance-based process to allocate state & federal funding. The MPO has its own project ranking process that is used to identify candidate projects to submit to NCDOT for P4.0. The MPO process will generally stay the same as last year with some minor adjustments to be discussed at the next MPO meeting.

Tyler Meyer said the next STIP will be 2018-2027, not 2017-2027. While it is being referred to as 2017-2027, that's just an interim administrative step and will not carry over to the final document. McIntyre said today's presentation will discuss step one of the MPO project ranking process: identify candidate projects. There have been some changes in the project submittal process for P4.0. In P3.0, the number of public transportation projects and aviation project submittals was unlimited, with up to 20 bicycle and pedestrian submittals. In P4.0 no more than 14 new projects per mode may be submitted for consideration. The number of roadway safety and infrastructure health project submittals is not restricted; however they are prioritized under a separate process not involving local input points from the MPO or DOT. Agencies allowed to submit projects are: City of Greensboro, MPO Towns, Guilford County Parks & Open Space, GTA, PART, PTIA, and Guilford County (TAMS).

McIntyre handed out a P3.0 project status map. Projects were categorized as *Committed*, *Existing*, *To Be Removed-Placed in Holding Tank*, or *Deleted*. *Committed* projects are those with right-of-way or construction through 2020. *Existing* projects are unfunded but will be automatically included in P4.0 evaluation. *To Be Removed-Placed in Holding Tank* projects will be permanently deleted unless resubmitted during this round of prioritization. Project data will be retained to make resubmitting easier. *Deleted* projects have been deleted by NCDOT based on new definitions or minimum cost thresholds. The Greensboro MPO had no projects in this last category. Projects listed as *Existing* need to be reviewed by the project sponsors and any modifications necessary must be sent to McIntyre by August 28. McIntyre noted that projects in the category *To Be Removed-Placed in Holding Tank* can always be resubmitted later if a sponsor does not wish to resubmit it at this time.

Scott Whitaker requested clarification on the deadline for projects modifications. McIntyre noted that technically SPOI does not require project modifications until September 1, but she requests sponsors send the modifications to her by August 28. Meyer added that sponsors should look at their projects to be sure the scope is up to date and all features of the project are included. McIntyre explained that the description of the scope and other information for the project is used to estimate its cost. If there is not enough detail and the cost is underestimated, there may not be enough money budgeted for its construction.

McIntyre clarified that *Existing* projects do not count towards the 14 per mode project limit. Any *To Be Removed-Placed in Holding Tank* projects that the MPO resubmits will count towards the project limit. Meyer

noted that it is possible to swap out projects in the *Existing* status for different projects and technically add more than 14 new projects. Daniel Amstutz clarified that project data for projects in the *To Be Removed-Placed in Holding Tank* status will be retained during the project submittal period for P4.0 and will not be deleted until after that time. Meyer explained NCDOT is cleaning up their database and trying to institute some quality control measures in the process. Most of the projects up for deletion are low-scoring projects from the last prioritization that don't have as many commitments that would push them towards the top. Amstutz asked why the number of projects per mode was limited to 14. Meyer noted that it had to do with the MPO area population.

Alex Rosser said it was his understanding that PTIA did not need to submit their projects to the MPO because the MPO will not be assigning any points to PTIA projects. McIntyre noted airport projects should be submitted through the MPOs, even though PTIA projects will compete on the Statewide Tier category. She will reach out to the NCDOT SPOT office for confirmation.

New projects must be submitted to the MPO by September 30. October 1 is the deadline for switching out or deleting projects. Other important highlights to the P4.0 schedule are the dates for the release of scores for the different project categories – Statewide, Regional, and Division. This time around, scores will be released for the Regional Tier projects before points must be put on the Division Tier projects. This will allow the MPOs to see where the projects fall in the Statewide and Regional Tiers before deciding on where to put points for Regional and Division projects. McIntyre noted SPOT Online will be open from mid-October to mid-November.

Taruna Tayal noted that projects can be split into multiple phases but still be considered as one submission to SPOT. McIntyre said she did not believe this was the case for projects in the status *To Be Removed-Placed in Holding Tank*. Splitting these projects to perhaps get a better score would result in two project submissions, not one. Whitaker observed that the A&Y Greenway in Summerfield is currently split into two projects (north and south) in the database. McIntyre explained that if they were to segment it again, it would count as three projects, for example, instead of two. Whitaker said that Summerfield wanted to keep it as the two projects as shown. Meyer noted that MPO staff will analyze the potential bicycle and pedestrian projects to determine which would score the best, since there are more than 40 potential projects that could be submitted. However MPO staff will recommend submitting the priority A&Y project in Summerfield in any case. Tram Truong noted that bicycle and pedestrian projects in the cost range of \$100,000-\$500,000 score the best. Meyer advised that Whitaker should specifically ask for \$500,000 in federal funds, because when Greensboro requested \$500,000 for the Downtown Greenway Phase 2, NCDOT awarded \$400,000 in federal funds and \$100,000 in matching funds. Amstutz observed that although the Downtown Greenway Phase 2 costs much more than \$500,000, the City only asked for \$500,000—a level at which the project would score well and an amount which NCDOT would be prepared to contribute to help round out the funding package.

## **2. 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, MTIP 2016-2025 & Air Quality Analysis**

Lydia McIntyre discussed the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program 2016-2025, and the Air Quality Analysis, three federally required documents under development since the beginning of the year. Projects must be identified in the 2040 MTP in order to be funded by NCDOT through the P4.0 process. The MTP is multi-modal, covering highways, public transportation, rail, and bicycle and pedestrian. The MTIP 2016-2025 is the short-term program that identifies specific projects that are scheduled for construction in the area and this information is gathered from the STIP. Finally, the Air Quality Analysis is required for the Greensboro MPO area because the MPO is currently a maintenance area for PM 2.5. Although this does make the MPO eligible for additional funding sources to help mitigate the air quality issues, additional analysis is also required to have the MTP approved.

A public meeting was held on August 18<sup>th</sup> to gather public input on these documents and also the 2015 BiPed Plan Update. It was held at Greensboro City Hall at the same time as a City Council meeting to capture more participants. Over 30 people attended the meeting. A public survey is up online and available for comments during the public review period, which lasts until September 14. Staff will seek adoption of the 2040 MTP, MTIP 2016-2025, and Air Quality Analysis at the September MPO meeting.

The Greensboro MPO did very well in the last round of Prioritization, getting some carryover projects funded but also adding several new projects as well. FY 2016-2025 in the MTIP includes almost \$900 million in projects for the MPO area, with \$580 million committed from 2016-2020. Highlighted new roadway projects include: Sandy Ridge Rd/I-40 Interchange Improvements; NC 68/NC 150 Intersection Improvements; US 29/I-40/Bus I-85 Ramp Improvements; Church St Widening from Wendover Ave to Cone Blvd; and Randleman Rd Widening from Glendale Dr to Elmsley Dr. Highlighted bicycle and pedestrian projects include: Downtown Greenway Phase 2; Lindsay St sidewalk from Murrow Blvd to Bessemer Ave, north side; Holden Rd sidewalk from Meadowview Rd to Spring Garden St, west side; Lees Chapel Rd sidewalk, from Church St to Yanceyville St; and Lovett St sidewalk, from Florida St to Freeman Mill Rd. Other major projects include the Western and Eastern Urban Loop, I-73 Connector, and the US 220/NC 68 Connector.

### **3. BiPed Plan Update**

Daniel Amstutz presented the draft of the BiPed Plan Update, which has been under development for the past two years. The original BiPed Plan was first adopted in 2006, and as part of this Update much of the analysis and recommendations have been revamped since conditions have changed. Amstutz noted that Mary Brookshire in the City's Print Shop has been enormously helpful in formatting the document and providing graphic design work for the plan.

The 2015 BiPed Plan Update reviews improvements and accomplishments in bicycle, pedestrian, and trails & greenways since 2006; inventories existing conditions, facilities, programs, and policies; it identifies improvement needs and priorities for each modal area; and it will guide future innovations in infrastructure, safety, programs, and policies for the next 20 years. The structure of the plan includes an introductory chapter and three modal chapters for bicycling, pedestrians, trails and greenways. The chapters are similarly organized, with infrastructure, safety, programs and policies, and summary sections. Recommendations from the Towns and their bicycle and/or pedestrian plans were included.

#### *Bicycle Chapter*

The recommendations of the Bicycle Chapter include updated bicycle facility recommendations, which were developed through an extensive process of coordination with the Traffic Engineering Division of GDOT, the BiPed Update Advisory Committee, and NCDOT. The original bicycle recommendations from the 2006 plan were used as the starting point for reviewing roadways for the possibility of bicycle lane facilities. Current conditions and connections to existing infrastructure were reviewed, among other factors, to make decisions about where facilities may be possible and warranted. The plan recommends, in centerline miles, 134 miles of bicycle lanes, 10 miles of protected bicycle lanes, 498 miles of paved shoulders, 20.5 miles of other on-road facilities, and 100 new bike racks. Centerline miles were used to compare with the numbers in the 2006 BiPed Plan, although the update recommends changing the way bike lanes are calculated to bike lane-miles. This new calculation method will add up each individual mile of bike lane as opposed to adding it up by the centerline of the roadway.

The chapter also includes a detailed analysis of crash data and countermeasures. Staff used 2007-2012 crash data from the NCDOT Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation for this analysis, because the data provides rich detail on crash locations, demographics, and crash reasons, among other data. This safety data was used to identify high-crash corridors, intersections, and hot spot areas.

Since 2006 there have been a number of changes in bicycle facility design, most notably the development of cycletracks, also known as protected bike lanes, which were imported from Europe. Protected bike lanes have been endorsed by FHWA, and they recently produced a design guide for it in May 2015. The BiPed Plan Update has identified 10 miles of roadways which could be converted to protected bike lanes. Other innovative techniques include using green paint in bike lanes and intersection designs that provide better guidance and visibility for bicyclists.

Maintenance has been highlighted as a significant concern in reference to bicycle facilities because road diets and other remarking projects are most cost-effective when done after a resurfacing. Part of the reason bicycle facilities have not been added more quickly is that street resurfacing is underfunded. A method being

studied by the MPO is scratching and remarking roadways to get bicycle facilities installed more quickly. This is being considered for streets not yet ready for resurfacing but with high potential for bicycle facilities.

General policy & programmatic elements of the Bicycle Chapter include instituting a Complete Streets policy; continuing programs such as Bike Month, the Bicycle Friendly Community program, and the BPAC; creating a new bike map; and reviewing the possibilities for a bike share program.

The map of bicycle facility recommendations includes conventional bike lanes, paved shoulders, protected bike lanes, and sharrows. The protected bike lane projects would be installed on roadways with considerable overcapacity relative to their traffic, including Church St downtown, the southbound side of Murrow Blvd, and sections of Randleman Rd, Yanceyville St, Holden Rd, Grandover Parkway, and Willoughby Blvd. Sharrows are markings that denote a shared roadway environment, when no space exists for a dedicated bike lane. They have been shown to reduce wrong-way and sidewalk riding, and they also provide a visual cue for bicyclists and motorists about the shared environment to increase awareness. Streets downtown, in particular, would benefit from shared lane markings. This chapter identifies the potential to install over 90 bike lane-miles in the next five years (equates to about 45 centerline miles). This will be done with a combination of road diet projects, narrowing of existing travel lanes on roadways (where wide outside lanes exist), and roadway widenings that are in development. This would bring the number of bike lane-miles in the City to about 114.

### *Pedestrian Chapter*

In the Pedestrian Chapter, the sidewalk priorities of the 2006 BiPed Plan have been updated using a GIS model to identify the most important roadways for new sidewalk. Staff considered input from the BiPed Update Advisory Committee in refining the criteria and relative weights for this. The results match well with the existing sidewalk projects and the professional judgment of staff. The sidewalk priorities are separated into Tiers, from Tier 1 (the highest priority) to Tier 4 (lower priority) and then rebalanced to identify top priorities by district to ensure an equitable distribution of recommend improvements throughout the City. All City Council districts have some Tier 1 projects. Additionally, more than 45 miles of sidewalk have been completed within the City by the independent construction program and roadways projects since 2006.

Issues with intersections around the City are also discussed – specifically signalized intersections that need pedestrian signals and curb ramp improvements. Using a similar GIS model, staff identified intersections needing these improvements and ranked them by high and lower priority. A pedestrian signal and curb ramp improvement project will be implemented over the next few years to address these deficiencies. Other intersection improvements such as installation of high-visibility crosswalks or bump-outs for specific areas could not be reviewed during the development of the plan, but this is an important step for implementing the recommendations in the near term.

Similar to the Bicycle Chapter, maintenance issues are a concern, and there is a significant amount of aging concrete and non-standard curb ramps that must be upgraded. Cracked and broken sidewalk is an accessibility issue and greater investment is needed to deal with existing sidewalks, as well as considering the long-term maintenance for new sidewalks.

In addition, the chapter includes a detailed analysis of crash data and countermeasures, similar to the Bicycle Chapter. Staff used the same data the Bicycle Chapter, and identified pedestrian high-crash corridors, intersections, and hot spot areas. General policy & programmatic elements of the Pedestrian Chapter include instituting a Complete Streets policy; using pedestrian-supportive land use policies; continuing programs such as Safe Routes to School, International Walk to School Day, and working with Active Routes to School Coordinators and the BPAC; and having the City apply to be a Walk Friendly Community.

The sidewalk priority map shows where the highest sidewalk priorities have been identified where no sidewalk exists. There are existing projects on many of these corridors already. The plan anticipates that the City will construct almost 100 miles of sidewalks in the next five to ten years through a combination of independent City sidewalk projects and roadway projects.

## *Trails and Greenways Chapter*

Staff closely coordinated with the Greensboro Parks and Recreation Department, the MPO Towns, and Guilford County Parks and Open Space to write the Trails and Greenways Chapter. The trail and greenway recommendations map from the 2006 plan was used as the base, and this map was added to and prioritized for the BiPed Plan Update through a model similar to the sidewalk model. The priorities are inside and outside the City, and it includes town priorities and regional priorities. Tier One projects are high-priority and have considerable ongoing effort behind them, and more than 13 miles are expected to be built in the next five to ten years. The plan recommends more than 460 miles of trails and greenways.

Funding and staffing are concerns for trails and greenways. Additional staffing is needed to promote and program activities for trails and greenways, as well as to plan and develop them. The plan also suggests consolidating some greenway names for existing & future greenways to highlight their regional connectivity, such as the Lake Daniel and Latham Park Greenways.

Maintenance is again an issue. Old greenway pavement is deteriorating, some greenway bridges are undersized, and root heaving and pavement cracking creates a tripping hazard on greenways. The size of the current greenway & trail network, at 112 miles, is enormous considering the small staff that maintains it, and resurfacing and pavement rehab is generally not budgeted for. Recommendations call for dedicated bond funding for needed greenway system reconstruction and repair.

Greenway and trail safety issues such as lighting and crime prevention has been addressed in the plan. Staff reviewed crashes on roads near trails & greenways, although there were only a few. Making improvements for greenway and trail road crossings is definitely an important consideration and implementation step for the plan. General policy and programmatic elements for trails and greenways include ensuring appropriate development adjacent to greenways; continuing programs such as the Adopt-A-Trail program, National Trails Day, and Park and Recreation Month; continuing to work with the Fat Tire Society on trail maintenance; upgrading signage standards; and improving mapping capabilities.

The greenways and trails priority map identifies Tier One projects such as the Downtown Greenway, A&Y Greenway to downtown Greensboro and in Summerfield, the Piedmont Greenway, the Vance Arlington Greenway, the N Buffalo Creek Greenway between Elm St and Yanceyville St, and the NE Community Trail Connector to Keeley Park.

### *Wrap-up and Q&A*

The public review period for the plan is underway, and ends September 14. More than 30 people came out to the public meeting on August 18 to look at and review the plan. Staff plans to bring the BiPed Plan Update to the MPO for adoption at the next meeting in September. Hard copies of the plan are available at the offices of GDOT, Guilford County Commissioners, GTA, and PART; the MPO Town Hall offices; and at the City of Greensboro library branches.

Scott Whitaker asked if the Tier rankings for the greenways and trails referred to their priority in the plan. Amstutz noted that this is correct, and the southern portion of the A&Y Greenway through Summerfield is considered a top priority while the northern portion is tier 2.

Fred Haith inquired about the Greensboro Fat Tire Society. Amstutz explained that they are a mountain biking club that works with the Greensboro Parks & Recreation Department to build and maintain the mountain biking trails in the Greensboro Watershed area.

Michael Abuya asked if the maps for the BiPed Plan Update are online. Amstutz noted that the full plan and all the maps produced for the plan are available at [www.greensboro-nc.gov/bipedupdate](http://www.greensboro-nc.gov/bipedupdate). Abuya explained that NCDOT will be updating the CTP soon and would like to have the GIS data for their update.

Tyler Meyer encouraged TCC members to review the plan and provide comments before the end of the public review period. Adam Fischer thanked Amstutz and Tram Truong for their hard work on the BiPed Plan Update, as well as Craig McKinney and Lydia McIntyre for their work on the MTP.

#### 4. Triad Freight Study Presentation

Mark Kirstner emphasized that the Triad Freight Study is a regional project and included participation from all the Triad MPOs. Although the Freight Study is not a required activity, all the MPOs recognize that freight plays a very active role in transportation in the region. The goal is to develop a freight component to the regional travel demand model. Most travel demand models do not cover freight movement very well, so this is an evolution in travel demand modeling that puts the region on the cutting edge. Phase 1, which they have just completed, has involved the collection of freight survey data to create a freight facilities database. Phase 2 would involve developing and writing code for the advanced freight model to be integrated with the current regional model. Phase 3 will include collecting travel diary data collection and estimating the freight model.

Funding for Phase 1 came partially from a federal grant called SHRP2 C20. Fred Haith from the Winston-Salem MPO applied on behalf of the area and they were awarded \$150,000 to do the study. This funding has helped support the development of Phase 1 and will also be put towards the development of Phases 2 and 3. The Triad has received national recognition for its effort to integrate freight into its model.

Knowing more about freight movements will help inform land use planning, transportation planning, and project prioritization. Specific applications include investigating freight clusters, estimating truck trips, informing land use and zoning decisions, and identifying characteristics supporting freight clusters. Once freight can be modeled better, they can create scenarios, understand the dynamics between congestion and freight, and understand the impacts of land use decisions.

The Triad is a well-connected area for freight, and large companies such as FedEx and Polo Ralph Lauren have recognized that in setting up facilities here. One of the region's major advantages is that the roadway network is relatively uncongested compared to other metro areas. Most items come to us via truck, and by 2040 NC exports are expected to grow by 150%, while imports are expected to grow by more than 200%. The Freight Study ties into the regional plan Piedmont Together via two main goals: 1) to create more transportation choices through the development of safe, reliable and economical transportation infrastructure services; and 2) to maintain and enhance the region's competitive edge as a freight transportation and logistics hub on the Eastern Seaboard.

Fred Haith discussed the data collection efforts and results from Phase 1 of the study. The Freight Facilities Database has 968 facilities classified by type: distribution center, intermodal facility, major shipper, and retail. Information was collected from Chambers of Commerce, consultants, and individuals with insider knowledge of the freight industry. Haith pointed out that the highest percentage of intermodal facilities is in Greensboro.

The second part of the data collected for the study included surveys from facilities that participated. Out of 800 facilities visited, more than 150 filled out surveys. This is a 20% return on surveys, which is better than the average (typically surveys have a 10-15% response rate). 38% of the surveys came from Guilford County, and 23% came from the Greensboro MPO area. Most freight facilities in the Greensboro MPO have more than 50 trucks per day. Major shippers make up the majority of the freight facilities in the region. However, intermodal facilities, while there are fewer, generate more trucks per facility. Multi Unit trucks make up the vast majority of the truck types on the roadways. Greensboro has a higher number of multi unit trucks on the roads than the regional average.

Lydia McIntyre noted that while all the MPOs were notified from the beginning about the SHRP2 grant and the freight study, Haith and the Winston-Salem MPO took the leading role in working on it. While the current model does have a commercial vehicle subcomponent, it is not very robust. This study will support development of much better freight analysis tools. McIntyre also pointed to a handout with comments from freight entities on transportation issues for them around the Greensboro MPO. Staff have been working with GDOT and NCDOT to see if these concerns can be resolved or if existing projects will address them.

Mark Kirstner closed out the presentation by discussing project findings. The highest concentration of freight facilities is in Guilford County followed by Forsyth and Alamance County. Major shippers make up the majority of the freight facilities. There are strong relationships between building square footage and

average truck trips, as well as the number of truck bays and average truck trips. For long term freight planning, it is important to develop freight supportive policies and investments in infrastructure to assist freight facilities, as it is a job creator in the region. Kirstner also emphasized that the database now has records on over 800 facilities.

Craig McKinney asked if the data will be revised and added to over time and mentioned two shipping facilities that will be opening in Alamance County. Haith noted that the data will be updated as changes occur, as anything that that becomes part of the regional model. McIntyre added that there still needs to be discussion about who maintains the database. She also noted that finding out that the square footage of facilities is linked to the number of trucks per day is new information that may be included in the model.

Bill Bruce observed that the information in the database provides information on where the trucks originate from, but inquired as to how to find out where they're going. Haith noted that this will be explored in Phase 2 with the tour-based modeling and travel diaries for truck drivers.

## **5. Project Updates**

Craig McKinney noted that they are waiting for NCDOT approval of the bid price for EL-5101 DG, sidewalks for Randleman Rd and Florida St. In addition, he expects a contract to be awarded for the Cone-Nealtown Extension project by City Council in either September or October. Tyler Meyer added that bids for these two projects came in close to the engineer's estimates unlike the bids for projects earlier this summer.

## **6. Strategic Reports**

Tyler Meyer noted that the state budget has not yet been resolved, and the competing transportation funding proposals are still up in the air. At the national level, the Senate has passed a multi-year reauthorization for transportation funding, but it remains to be seen if the House will take it up.

The next several MPO meetings will be needed due to Prioritization and other items. The November meeting may need to be rescheduled for October depending on the Prioritization timeline.

## **Other Items**

### **1. NCDOT Update**

Pat Wilson noted that he received more information on the action item on the I-73 Pavement Rehabilitation (I-5735) MTIP Amendment. The section of I-73 in question was resurfaced a few years ago. It was resurfaced early because it could not wait until FY 2016. The new funding that was identified needed to be moved back to 2025. On another note, the roundabout at SE School Rd was opened for traffic before the first day of school, although the project is not yet complete.

### **2. TCC Member Updates**

Michael Abuya asked Tyler Meyer about the approval dates for the FY 2016-2017 UPWP. Meyer explained that NCDOT TPB had expressed interest in moving the draft UPWP due date up to December. After discussing this with the other MPOs, and hearing many concerns about this change, NCAMPO sent a letter to NCDOT suggesting alternative dates. NCDOT has agreed to the alternative dates, which will be to have a draft UPWP due at the end of January, and the final due at the end of March.

Mark Kirstner passed around the PART Annual Report. He also corrected an update he gave a few meetings ago about PART Route 4 to Chapel Hill, noting that it actually starts from the Greensboro Depot, not the PART Hub.

### **3. Wrap-Up**

The next TCC meeting will take place September 23 at 10:30 am in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor GDOT Conference Room.

The meeting was adjourned by Tyler Meyer at 11:57 am.