



WILMINGTON URBAN AREA Metropolitan Planning Organization

P.O. Box 1810
Wilmington, North Carolina 28402
910 341 3258 910 341 7801 FAX

Meeting Agenda

Wilmington Urban Area MPO
Transportation Advisory Committee

Members:

City of
WILMINGTON
Lead Planning Agency

Town of
CAROLINA BEACH

Town of
KURE BEACH

Town of
WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH

NEW HANOVER
County

Town of
BELVILLE

Town of
LELAND

Town of
NAVASSA

BRUNSWICK
County

PENDER
County

CAPE FEAR PUBLIC
Transportation
Authority

North Carolina
BOARD OF
TRANSPORTATION

TO: Transportation Advisory Committee Members
FROM: Mike Kozlosky, Executive Director
DATE: October 21, 2009
SUBJECT: October 28th Meeting

A meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area MPO Transportation Advisory Committee will be held on Wednesday, October 28th at 4pm. The meeting will be held in the City Council Chambers at Wilmington City Hall.

The following is the agenda for the meeting:

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of Minutes:
 - a. 9/30/09
- 3) Public Comment Period
- 4) Presentation
 - a. Urban Loop Prioritization Process
- 5) Old Business
 - a. Resolution supporting the beginning of discussions to bring I-20 to Wilmington
- 6) New Business
 - a. Resolution supporting the Cape Fear Skyway and encouraging and supporting New Hanover County, City of Wilmington, Brunswick County and the Town of Leland to utilize the land use planning tools available to preserve a corridor for the future Cape Fear Skyway
 - b. Resolution Adopting the Dow Road Corridor Study
 - c. Resolution Adopting the Pelican Drive/Salisbury Street Bicycle Plan
 - d. Resolution Adopting the List of Potential Enhancement Projects within the Wilmington MPO planning area boundary
- 7) Updates
 - a. Cape Fear Commutes
 - b. NCDOT
- 8) Announcements
 - a. Cape Fear Commutes meeting- October 21st
 - b. WMPO Bike/Pedestrian Committee meeting- December 10th
- 9) Next meeting –December 16, 2009

Attachments:

- Minutes from 9/30 meeting
- Proposed Urban Loop Prioritization Process
- General Statute for Weight Restrictions
- Resolution supporting discussion of I-20 to Wilmington
- Resolution supporting the Cape Fear Skyway encourages and supports New Hanover County, City of Wilmington, Brunswick County and the Town of Leland utilizing the land use planning tools available to preserve a corridor for the future Cape Fear Skyway
- Dow Road Corridor Plan (available at www.wmpo.org)
- Resolution Adopting the Dow Road Corridor Plan
- Pelican Drive/Salisbury Street Bicycle Plan (available at www.wmpo.org)
- Resolution Adopting the Pelican Drive/Salisbury Street Bicycle Plan
- Lists of Potential Enhancement Projects
- Resolution Adopting the List of Enhancement Projects within the Wilmington MPO's Planning Area Boundary
- NCDOT Project Update

Meeting Notes
Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
Transportation Advisory Committee
Date: September 9, 2009

Members Present:

Lanny Wilson, Chairman, NCBOT
Jonathan Barfield, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority
Jim Dugan, Town of Kure Beach
Alan Gilbert, Town of Carolina Beach
Mike Ballard, Town of Navassa
Laura Padgett, City of Wilmington
Bill Saffo, City of Wilmington
Jason Thompson, New Hanover County
Bill Sue, Brunswick County
Sharon Collins, Town of Belville
David Williams, Pender County

Staff Present:

Mike Kozlosky, Executive Director
Bill McDow, Transportation Engineer

1. Call to Order

Mr. Wilson called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM.

2. Approval of Minutes

The motion to approve the minutes for the June 24th meeting carried unanimously.

3. Public Comment Period

Mr. Dennis Anderson addressed the committee regarding the installation of medians on Market Street. He feels that they will adversely affect his restaurant located at 4301 Market Street. He told members he felt that the medians may not provide the best answer to the safety issues and asked that they reconsider moving forward with the project.

Mr. Bill Jane, Ms. Laura Trivett and Mr. Kevin O'Grady addressed members regarding the US 17 Business designation. They requested that the designation be removed from Market Street in the downtown area. Mr. Jane told members it is primarily a residential and historical area. They asked the TAC to request the state remove the US 17 Business designation from Market Street and 3rd Street. He suggested that it would make more sense to put the designation on Military Cutoff/Dawson/Wooster Corridor. Mr. Wilson referred the matter to the TCC and ask that they make a recommendation for consideration. He also suggested referring the matter to the Wilmington City Council because the route is within the city limits.

Mr. Steve Coggins, an attorney representing Mr. Dennis Anderson, addressed the group regarding the medians on Market Street. He told members he felt the medians are needed but only if interconnectivity is provided to the businesses. He is concerned about the sociological impact of funding and construction if you medianize all of Market Street without interconnectivity any where in the City. Mr. Coggins told members that Mr. Anderson was forced by a franchise agreement signed many years ago to upgrade and put in a 21st century store on Market Street. He would loose his entire franchise. You simply cannot approach the restaurant any longer from Princess Street. Interconnectivity will also improve traffic flow and avoid walling-off parts of the City and neighborhoods from each other which will further estrange the community. He stated that his greatest fear is that the number 8 project (Market Street Median Improvements – B-Section) on the Top-25 list will install the median and nothing but a median. In doing so you've not only destroyed a business, you have then created a long term waiting period before any interconnectivity comes and you may have created a

problem even worse than you tried to solve. It was his understanding that the projects would include the interconnectivity.

Mr. Barfield asked if any studies have been done to show the effects on business in this area. Mr. Thompson told members the point of the project is not necessarily to enhance businesses or cause a negative effect on a business; it is about moving the citizens safely through the community. Some of the projects may be detrimental to a business but it is better to the overall safety and welfare of citizens traveling the roads. It is sometimes a trade off we have to make. Mr. Wilson said sometimes it's a balancing act because if you allow all the accesses to the main artery, then you are naturally going to affect the capacity. Mr. Williams told members he feels that something has to be done on Market Street. We just can't walk away and not do anything. Ms. Padgett asked how often will there be cross-over's on Market Street with the plan. Mr. Kozlosky said depending on the cross section, you have any where from 1,200 to 1,500-feet based on the plan. He said that the plan has not yet been presented or adopted but there have been public meetings. Mr. Kozlosky told members that staff is still working through the Market Street Corridor Plan and there are still some land-use elements and land-use issues that need to be resolved with the consultant. Staff could bring the transportation element to the board within the next few meetings and come back with the land-use element at a later day.

Mr. Andy Koeppel addressed the members regarding the possible land-swap for the U-Haul Property. He asked if it would be possible for Ms. Padgett, Mr. Saffo, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Barfield to contact the City and County staff relative to the inventory of properties available. He has spoken to the U-Hauls property owner and he indicates that if the right piece were found, he would certainly be willing to consider a land swap. He suggested bring a report back to this committee with a list of property that would be suitable and we could take it to the TCC in the effort to move the matter forward. Mr. Thompson asked Mr. Koeppel to email him what size and parameters would be needed for the swap. Mr. Thompson asked if U-Haul expected to be paid for relocation too. Mr. Koeppel said that was never mentioned.

4. Old Business

None

5. New Business

a. Resolution adopting the revised Wilmington MPO Public Involvement Policy

Mr. Kozlosky told members the revised policy outlines how the MPO public involvement will be conducted, as well as includes the Town of Carolina Beach and Town of Kure Beach and Pender County as members. The policy also will make the MPO SAFETEA-LU compliant. Mr. Williams made the motion to adoption of the revised public involvement policy. Mr. Ballard seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

b. Resolution adopting the Walk Wilmington: A Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan

Mr. Kozlosky told members the City of Wilmington and the North Carolina Department of Transportation partnered to complete the *Walk Wilmington: A Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan*. The plan is a comprehensive plan that looks at sidewalks, multi-use paths, pedestrian signals and pedestrian crossing improvements throughout the City of Wilmington. It is a 25-year plan phased in short, medium and long-term recommendations. It was adopted by the Wilmington City Council at their meeting on August 4th and staff is presenting it to this committee for adoption. Ms. Padgett made the motion to adoption of the plan. Mr. Saffo seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

c. Resolution supporting the City of Wilmington, New Hanover County, University of North Carolina-Wilmington and Town of Wrightsville Beach's TIGER grant application

Mr. Kozlosky told members the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) included Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) discretionary grant funds.

These funds are in the amount of \$1.5 billion. The projects for funding must be completed by February 17, 2012, may not exceed \$300 million, and must create jobs and have a positive economic benefit to the communities. The City of Wilmington, New Hanover County and UNCW have all endorsed the TIGER grant application to make improvements and complete the Cross-City Trail as well as make improvements for the River to Sea Bikeway. Staff has received over 50 resolutions from businesses and organizations through out the community.

Mr. Sue asked if staff knows how much money will be coming into the area. Mr. Kozlosky replied no, not yet. These projects will be discretionary funds and the improvements we are requesting are between \$16 and \$17 million. Mr. Sue asked if staff has worked with Leland, Navassa or Belville to see if they have interest in applying for these funds. Mr. Gilbert told members Carolina Beach is moving forward with a multi-use path and asked why that's not included. He asked if there was any feed back regarding that project.

Mr. Kozlosky said the Cross-City Trail and the River to Sea Bikeway projects were identified as the most competitive project for this region that meets the qualifications. This application was prepared by UNCW, not the MPO. Projects must be completed by February 17, 2012.

Mr. Saffo reminded members that the City of Wilmington had been in the development process for the Cross-City Trail and the River to Sea Bikeway projects for years which allowed us to get to this point where the university can write the grant submittal for the project.

Ms. Padgett made the motion to support the City of Wilmington, New Hanover County, University of North Carolina-Wilmington and Town of Wrightsville Beach's TIGER grant application. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion and the resolution carried unanimously.

d. Resolution supporting "complete streets" within the Wilmington MPO

Mr. Kozlosky told members "complete streets" provide safe and convenient accommodations for pedestrians, bicyclists, public transit riders, and motor vehicle drivers throughout the MPO. They are more conducive to the efficient and safe movement of people, than projects designed primarily to move private motor vehicles. Design and construction of new transportation facilities should anticipate future demand for bicycling, walking, and public transit service and not preclude the provision of future accommodations. Mr. Kozlosky said the policy will allow for exemptions only if: 1) bicycle, pedestrian facilities and transit facilities are prohibited by law, or 2) cost of complete streets facilities are excessive or disproportionate to the need or probable use, or 3) sparsity of population and employment and/or level of transit service indicate an absence of future need. Members of the Board of Transportation endorsed a similar policy at their July meeting.

Mr. Thompson asked who makes the initial determination that it's excessive or disproportionate to the need. Mr. Kozlosky told him it would be up to the local municipality to make that decision. Mr. Sue made the motion to approve the resolution supporting "complete streets". Ms. Padgett seconded the motion and it carried in a 10 to 1 vote, with Mr. Thompson voting against the resolution.

e. Resolution requesting federal approval to extend I-20 into Wilmington

Mr. Kozlosky told members the resolution to extend I-20 from Florence, SC to Wilmington was brought to the committee's attention by Mr. Koepfel. The resolution requests that NCDOT begin discussions with the North Carolina Federal Highway Administration, South Carolina Department of Transportation and South Carolina Federal Highway Administration to see if it is feasible to bring I-20 into Wilmington. Mr. Sue asked if this is just super-imposing I-20 from Florence to Lumberton over I-95 and then from there over US 74. Mr. Kozlosky said yes, it would be designation only but you would also have to upgrade US 74 to interstate standards in order for this to become a reality. Mr. Thompson asked what effect that would have on the

weight limit. He asked staff what is the weight limit on an Interstate for trucks? He pointed out that weight limits on interstate highways are less. Mr. Pope told member that North Carolina legislation has seen fit to have many exemptions with truck weight limits which allow heavier loads to be hauled on NC roads.

Mr. Wilson asked if it is wishes of this board to send this request back to the TCC and ask them to evaluate the weight limit concerns and possible impact to businesses. Mr. Sue made the motion to table the resolution and send back to the TCC for study. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

f. Resolution adopting the Top 25 Projects in the Wilmington MPO's Planning Area Boundary for submission to NCDOT's Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation

Mr. Kozlosky told members that based on Executive Order #2, NCDOT is trying to become more transparent and more data driven in their daily processes. Staff has been asked to develop a Top-25 project list of highway projects for the MPO region. The NCDOT criteria to rank projects will be based on mobility, safety and infrastructure health and the quantitative analysis. He said they have been asked by the Department of Transportation to submit the list of Top-25 projects from the MPO between October 5th and October 30th of this year. Staff presented a preliminary list compiled by the TCC at their last meeting for the TAC's consideration.

Mr. Sue said he feels members need additional time to look at the list because he is not satisfied with its priority. Mr. Ballard asked if the members will have an opportunity to review the list and bring their recommendations for project priority to the next meeting.

Mr. Kozlosky told members the NCDOT will use the scoring matrix to prioritize projects from the list the TAC submits. The TCC developed this list based on the previous prioritization process. Ms. Padgett asked if the list from the TCC is in priority order. Mr. Kozlosky said yes.

Mr. Gilbert stated if you look at these projects and you weighted each project with the capital involved in implementing it, why a relatively small widening project like Dow Road has been moved to the bottom of the list in comparison to larger projects like the Cape Fear Skyway.

Mr. Wilson told member that the Cape Fear Skyway is a Turnpike Authority project and it is an entirely different funding source. Mr. Sue asked if that is so then why is it even on the list. Mr. Wilson said that project is not competing for funding against the rest of the projects on the list. You could also say that about the Wilmington Bypass project.

Mr. Gilbert asked if the process was arbitrary. Mr. Kozlosky said it was very arbitrary because staff does not have a matrix right now in order to prioritize projects. As part of the development of the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan, we are developing a matrix in order to prioritize the projects in the long range plan. Projects were arbitrarily prioritized based on conversations held with the TCC and their perceived need. Mr. Pope told members every project can only have one number and that project has to fall in that list somewhere in 1 to 25. It was just based on needs within our region, trying to prioritize with number 1 being the most desirable and number 25 having the lowest priority. It was a very difficult thing to do.

Mr. Kozlosky told members that any project that has funding associated with it is not included on this list. Therefore, these are the projects that will move from outside the 5-year work program and these projects will hopefully move into the 5th year based on the prioritization process.

Mr. Thompson suggested tabling this item. He told members that until we have the discussion on the Cape Fear Skyway Bridge, that will affect if he could vote for it in this current 1-25 or maybe move some things around.

Mr. Wilson told members with respect to the Cape Fear Skyway Bridge, the Turnpike Authority is coming down to a critical process where we are moving well along on the other turnpike projects in the state. We have come to the point where some of the routes that are buildable are quickly going away because of development and so the Turnpike Authority is coming to Wilmington October 14th to hold an informal meeting to discuss where we are in the process and what needs to occur if the community is serious about moving it along. There is no sense in spending the enormous amount of money if there is not a serious commitment on both sides of the river. We need to have full support for moving forward with the project.

Mr. Kozlosky reminded members that we have between October 5th and October 30th to submit this list of projects and staff will need time to confer with Mr. Pope to identify our projects to make certain we are consistent with projects in the Division. Mr. Pope told members the Division will not consider any projects until all the MPOs and RPOs lists are input so that they can prioritize for the entire division. Mr. Pope said that the TCC came to a conclusion that this is the top 25 projects in this ranking. There was a lot of discussion about the rankings, and now the TAC must have that same conversation and re-prioritize what needs to be done. The deadline is October 30th and the information must be put in before it will be considered. Mr. Wilson stated that this does not have to be voted on today, the committee has until the meeting at the end of this month to work out the problems.

Mr. Padgett asked what will happen at the state level once the TAC submitted the top 25 list. Mr. Kozlosky told members that once the list has been submitted, the Department will evaluate that list based on their criteria, as well as the Divisions list.

Mr. Ballard made the motion to table this item until the next meeting. Mr. Saffo seconded the motion. The vote carried unanimously. Mr. Wilson suggested that members get their comments back to the municipality's representative to the TCC.

Mr. Pope asked if the item was being tabled so members can go back to their TCC member and offer input from the municipality. Mr. Kozlosky told member that the TCC has already prioritized the projects. Now the TAC needs to move forward with how they want to prioritize this list. Mr. Pope asked if the TAC members were going to get their municipality prioritization changes to the MPO Executive Director. Mr. Saffo told members one of the big problems is the Cape Fear Skyway Bridge project. He said unless he knows what is going to happen on the other side of the river, we are looking at having to possibly purchase property and he is not going anywhere until he knows what is going to happen.

Mr. Wilson reminded members that the #1 and the #4 projects should not factor into where we prioritize any of the rest of the projects because project 1 & 4 don't compete against the other projects for funding. Mr. Wilson said it is still important for us to keep these two projects on the list because it reinforces the message to the Department of Transportation that the Wilmington Bypass is the #1 project in the region. The completion of the Bypass has been the #1 for the entire region for the last 18 years.

Mr. Wilson asked if staff used the previous prioritization list for the areas Top-10 projects. Mr. Sue pointed out that the Village Road project had been at the top of that list and it has been moved down to item 16.

Mr. Kozlosky reminded members that it is coming down to the issue of time. We have until October 5th to get this hashed out. The TCC went through and prioritized these projects based on their need. Mr. Wilson said this was also subjective criteria to what was the most important.

Ms. Padgett said she would like to make a substitute motion that members adopt the list as it is. Mr. Thompson told her we have already voted on this. Mr. Williams stated that there was a motion and a second on the floor. Ms. Padgett went on to say that her substitute motion is that we go ahead and adopt this because the state is going to take the matrix that was included in today's meeting package and rearrange the list anyway. Mr. Wilson said he disagreed because the Department is going to look at what are our top projects on the list and it will make a difference if something is number 25 or number 5.

Ms. Padgett stated that representatives from all our local governments are on the TCC and they have hashed this out to the best of their professional ability. The state is going to rearrange it within the division. Mr. Wilson pointed out that the state is going to try to mesh it all because we have two different MPOs and four RPOs to deal with in this division. The focus is going to be trying to accomplish the projects into some similar order as to what the MPO recognizes as our top-list. He said that it does make a difference if something is up on the Top-10 versus being down lower on the list.

Ms. Padgett told members that the state will base their decision on the matrix by using mobility, safety and infrastructure health and their overall goals. They are going to look at whether it is important on a state wide, regional or sub-regional level, which is exactly the kind of transportation plan we need in this country. They are going to look at whether or not there is congestion, whether the pavement is in good condition and whether or not the road is safe. They will weigh all those things within the division and move forward with it. We are going to have to start dealing with local issues and local funding on critical local roads and let the state use that matrix on this list. Mr. Gilbert pointed out by using that methodology, Carolina Beach may not ever get their project done. Dow Road has been on the list since 1983 and is a critical safety issue for Carolina Beach. Ms. Padgett pointed out that safety was a third of the big goals on the matrix.

Mr. Wilson said he thinks it is important on where the TAC decides to prioritize projects because it gives weight in this whole process as to where the state falls out. Mr. Thompson stated that he knows the Cape Fear Skyway Bridge and the associated River Road widening are important projects, but until we get some concrete commitment on the other side of the river, maybe we need to drop it to number 24 or 25 and moving other things around. He said he does not believe that it is going to happen from what he is hearing and seeing from the elected officials.

Mr. Kozlosky told members the important thing to point out is that we are going to be doing this every two years. This prioritization process was based on perceived need, there was no matrix developed at the local level. We will have a matrix in place at the local level for the next prioritization process. We will then have a scientific way in which we prioritize projects at the TCC level and submit this list to the TAC for prioritization. Mr. Kozlosky stated that he would like to move forward with a list that we can submit and then come back with the next prioritization process and really evaluate the projects based on a scientific evaluation.

Mr. Wilson told members what is going to end up getting more priority are projects that have more significant average daily trips because that is where more of the projects are going to be focused. Mr. Ballard suggested that everyone review the list and send any comments to Mr. Kozlosky. Mr. Wilson suggested getting the previous Top-10 list to members for comparison in order to help with compiling the new Top-25 for the department.

Mr. Wilson called for a second to Ms. Padgett's substitute motion. Mr. Barfield seconded her motion. The motion was to approve the Top 25 list as presented failed in a 5 in favor and 6 against. Mr. Wilson said that takes us back to the original motion by Mr. Ballard to table the item to the next meeting. The vote carried in a 7 to 4 vote with Ms. Padgett, Mr. Saffo, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Barfield voting against tabling the resolution.

6. Public Hearing

a. Resolution amending the State/Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs to fund the installation of a right turn lane on US 76 (Oleander Drive) westbound onto US 117-NC 132 (College Road) northbound (W-5132)

Mr. Kozlosky told members the total cost for the installation of a right turn lane on US 76 (Oleander Drive) westbound onto US 117-NC 132 (College Road) northbound (W-5132) project is \$390,000.

Mr. Wilson told members that we are required to have a public hearing regarding amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program. Mr. Wilson opened the floor to any one wishing to speak either for or against the proposed amendment. With no one wishing to speak, Mr. Sue made a motion to close the public hearing on the amendment to fund the installation of a right turn lane on US 76 (Oleander Drive) westbound onto US 117-NC 132 (College Road) northbound (W-5132). Mr. Williams seconded the motion and the vote to close the public hearing carried unanimously.

Mr. Sue made the motion to approve the resolution amending the State/Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs to fund the installation of a right turn lane on US 76 (Oleander Drive) westbound onto US 117-NC 132 (College Road) northbound (W-5132). Mr. Barfield seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

b. Resolution amending the State/Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs to fund the Wilmington Bypass (R-2633A)

Mr. Kozlosky told members this amendment is to utilize Garvee Bonds, stimulus funds, as well as traditional let-dollars in order to construct the "A"-Section of the Wilmington Bypass from US 74/76 to US 17 in Brunswick County. Ms. Padgett asked who will be the debtor on the Garvee Bonds. Mr. Wilson said it would be the State of North Carolina.

Mr. Wilson opened the public hearing to amend the State/Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs to fund the Wilmington Bypass (R-2633A).

Mr. Al Beatty, who is a member of the Planning Board for the Town of Navassa, told members he would like clarification on this particular project. He asked Mr. Wilson if the money has been appropriated to fund this section of the bypass by the State Board of Transportation. Mr. Wilson said yes they have voted to amend the Transportation Improvement Program. Mr. Beatty asked if they normally did this without a public hearing. Mr. Wilson responded that these projects require dual approval by both the Board of Transportation and the Wilmington MPO for all projects within the Wilmington MPO boundary and so the Board of Transportation relies on the Wilmington MPO to conduct those public hearings.

Mr. Beatty asked if the "B"-Section of the bypass is currently on the list and the "A"-Section was chosen to move forward. Mr. Wilson said we are actually accelerating the "A"-Section. The "A"-Section was unfunded for construction purposes. He explained that the "B"-Section is coming from a different source of funding called loop funding. The "A"-Section will utilize non-loop dollars. The Department of Transportation is in the process of coming up with the matrix of how the funds will be allocated. Mr. Beatty asked if any stimulus money is being used in the "A"-Section. Mr. Wilson said yes, over half the money that is being used is stimulus dollars.

Mr. Beatty said he read in the minutes from the last meeting that it was said that it was better to get something rather than nothing. He told members that Navassa is still winding up with nothing. Navassa is the most economically deprived community in the area. The unemployment rate is 15 to 20 percent. He said he does not think it is fair and is voicing his objection. He said that if you want to do something with federal stimulus dollars in the state and represent its citizens, then this committee should move forward to try to get everybody involved in the economic improvement. What you are doing with Section "A" is not benefiting the issues that you have out there. This Section "A" does nothing. He said that he thinks that the state government should always listen to its citizens at the public hearings and not put the cart before the horse.

Mr. Wilson said the decision to move forward with the "A"-Section was due to funding with respect to the funds that are available. Mr. Pope stated that the Department of Transportation had \$25 million of stimulus dollars to spend somewhere in our division. We also have about \$25 million dollars in Garvee Bonds capacity left within our division. That came to about \$50 million that could be applied to a project. This MPO has always said that the Wilmington Bypass is the number 1 priority. The department looked where they could spend \$50 million on the Wilmington Bypass. Section-A is about a \$120 million project and Section-B is a \$240 million project. Just the bridge crossing the Cape Fear River is \$140 million by itself. At that point it was determined that was where we could spend the \$50 million and then come up with the additional dollars. It was a lot easier to come up with an additional \$50 million than to come up with the \$190 million for the "B"-Section. That was the reason the "A"-Section was chosen to be built over the "B"-Section. Mr. Wilson told members the bypass will be built in sections like I-40 to Raleigh because there was not enough money to build it all. We will be able to go ahead with the "A"-Section because we will have the stimulus money along the Garvee Bonds and the monies that were transferred from the College Road and Oleander Drive project that was unanimously approved at the meeting in October of 2008.

Mayor Willis told members he was elected to the Navassa town council 1978. He has been an elected official for 31 years. There have been five incidents on this particular bypass where it seems that somehow they get the short end of the stick. The way that Navassa got in on the Metropolitan Planning Organization was because of the bypass. The initial plan for the bypass was to come through the heart of the Town of Navassa. They felt they should have some input on projects affecting Navassa and they put a representative from the town on the MPO. About the time he was elected as mayor in 1999, there was thought about an interchange. He said they realized that there would not be an interchange for the bypass within the town limits. He told members that they brought their concerns to the MPO and they did not get very good results until they started talking to the Environmental Justice staff in Washington. All of a sudden that grade exchange got changed to an interchange on one of the collector streets coming through Navassa. That was the second incident that left a bad taste in his mouth about the MPO and how they would treat Navassa. The 3rd and 4th thing that happened was that there was another little minority community at the southern end of the interchange called Spring Hill. The bypass had a route that was going to go through the heart of Spring Hill. After realizing that was going to be a problem, the community got together and went to NCDOT to voice their concerns and after many meetings, the route was changed. All of a sudden now, instead of an interchange and road that comes through that opens the town up, we are going to skip that and go and do one on the other end on a road that leads to no-where. That is being justified by saying how we are going to finish the route that actually connects the existing I-140 and US 17 bypass in our future plans. Well, once we realize that we have done this section and this section, and this section right here is left out, then there will be enough pressure and we will get enough money from somewhere to finish that. I don't know what Environmental Justice is but something isn't right. Mayor Willis read a resolution from the Town of Navassa stating that they are in opposition of funds being transferred to expedite the construction of the A-section.

Mr. Jim Thomas told members he is here to address members regarding the purchase of his property. The state told him they were going to purchase his property and he is ready for them to do that so he can go on with his life. He is not able to make any improvements to the property because the state intends to acquire the property. He asked why have they have put off buying his property. He and his family want to go on with their life. Mr. Wilson told him that the Board of Transportation has approved the acquisition of right-of-way for all the projects, but because of the scarcity of resources, they had to postpone acquisition of right-of-way for any projects right now. Mr. Pope told members there are several projects within the division in which all right-of-way activity have stopped. He said that the BOT authorized purchasing property in early 2008 and by December, right-of-way ran out of money due to the economic downturn, so all activity stopped because there was no money.

Mr. Thompson asked at what point would Mr. Thomas be allowed to have his property rights back. Mr. Pope stated that the Department of Transportation does not have formal protection on that corridor. Mr. Thompson asked how is the county stopping him from building his house. Mr. Kozlosky said it was probably based on their development regulations. Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Pope if there can be hardship consideration given in purchasing Mr. Thomas's property in this case because his injuries. Mr. Pope said it would have to come before the BOT and they would have to approve it being bought as a hardship case. There are criteria for that and he suggested that Mr. Thomas contact Hugh Thompson in the Right-of-Way Branch.

Mr. Ballard told members he comes out of Wilmington everyday and he gets so frustrated because traffic is always backed-up for miles. He said that we talked about relieving traffic, if we are going to relieve traffic, this is the perfect opportunity for us at this juncture. Section "A" will not benefit what we are trying to do.

Mr. Pope reminded members that that Section-"B" of the project is currently funding for right-of-way and construction in the current TIP in year 2012 for \$240 million. Mr. Pope said that \$240 million is there on paper, it is not there in green-dollars. Mr. Wilson said Mr. Ballard's question was if they taking money from the "B"-Section to pay for the "A"-Section. Mr. Pope said no. Mr. Pope said without that project going all the way to Mt. Misery Road, all you are doing is bring that congestion right through the middle of Navassa. Mr. Ballard said that would be better than what we have now with the traffic congestion coming out of Wilmington. Mr. Pope said the problem is that we have about \$50 million that can be spent, where is the remainder of the money coming from. If you take the other \$60 million that we have come up with to fund Section-"A", that is still \$110 million and there is still another \$30 million has to come from somewhere. That will mean taking a project down somewhere.

With no one else wishing to speak, Mr. Sue made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Sue told Mr. Ballard that if you check the minutes of the meeting regarding this project, when this committee talked about moving money to the "A"-Section, his first concern was why don't we do the "B"-Section. Mr. Sue stated that he was told that the problem would be that we don't have enough money to do the "B"-Section and it is already a part of the existing TIP that has been approved. The money has been approved, there is just no money in the bank. So it comes down to the bottom line that either we take and put that money here and keep it in this MPO area, or we loose it somewhere else. So we put it on the "B"-Section and we said we will make the rest of it up with Garvee Bonds or where ever we could find the money. Since that time, we got the stimulus package. We got \$50 million dollars for Division 3 and they were going to re-pave I-40 with the first part and take about \$9 million and pave Smith Avenue in Shallotte. We decided after the stimulus money was already allocated, that we would take the stimulus money and put it there on the "A"-Section and keep it in this division, in Brunswick

County rather than to let it go some where else. That is the reason the decision was made. It was either something or nothing. Mr. Pope added that the other MPOs and RPOs are upset because they didn't get stimulus dollars.

Mr. Williams made the motion to approve the resolution amending the State/Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs to fund the Wilmington Bypass (R-2633A). Ms. Padgett seconded the motion. The resolution carried in a 10 to 1 vote, with Mr. Ballard voting against the resolution.

7. Updates

a. Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Mr. Kozlosky updated members on Cape Fear Commutes and the CAC activities.

b. NCDOT Project Update

attached

8. Announcements

- a. **Bike/Pedestrian Committee meeting- September 10th at 5:15pm**
- b. **Citizen Advisory Committee meeting-September 16th at 4pm**

9. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:21 pm

Respectfully submitted

Mike Kozlosky
Executive Director
Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

Proposed Urban Loop Prioritization Process

The purpose of this effort is to create an Urban Loop prioritization process. This document is a draft proposal. Comments and suggestions for improvements are welcomed pertaining to any part of the proposed process. However, the Department is particularly interested in receiving comments on whether the “factors” described herein are relevant and whether the proposed “scoring” methodology is appropriate. **Comments should be received no later than close of business, Monday, November 30, 2009 and sent to the following website:** <http://www.ncdot.org/performance/reports/> under Strategic Prioritization.

Objective

Create an Urban Loop prioritization process that supports statewide growth, economic development and enhances mobility.

Background

The Urban Loops program designation and funding was established by the 1989 Highway Trust Fund as part of the Intrastate Highway System. The Trust Fund legislation stated the Intrastate System was “designed to support statewide growth and development objectives and to connect to major highways of adjoining states.” There were 7 loops established at that time (Asheville, Charlotte, Winston-Salem, Greensboro, Durham, Raleigh and Wilmington). Three additional loops were later added: Fayetteville and Greenville in 2003 and Gastonia in 2004.

Furthermore, G.S. 136-180 states that a new Interstate or freeway as the revised termini of an urban loop may be accepted if “The Board of Transportation finds that the purposes of the urban loop facility, specifically including reduced congestion and high-speed, safe, regional through-travel service, would be enhanced by the action.”

The Urban Loop Program currently totals 353 miles, 140 of which are open to traffic. The estimated cost to complete the program is now around \$5.5 Billion. At the current funding rate and the expected increases in construction costs, it will take more than 50 years to complete the program. The challenges in constructing these projects have been many and can be expected to grow in difficulty. Urban loop projects are new location projects that are large, complex and costly and can be very time-consuming to move through the project development process. Ever rising costs of engineering, right-of-way, construction and environmental impacts ensure that further delays in completing the Urban Loop program translate to additional funding needs. Economic development opportunities are lost when the urban loops are not completed. At the same time, revenues to the Department have declined. A prioritization process to help ensure the most cost-effective use of resources to complete the urban loop program is needed.

The 21st Century Transportation Committee report dated December 2008 included the following “policy objective”: “Enhance mobility and reduce congestion by accelerated

investment and completion of all planned urban loops with priorities established based on measurable transparent criteria.”

Purpose

The purpose of the loop prioritization process is to prioritize the remaining TIP projects that comprise the uncompleted sections of the 10 Loops.

Proposed Principles of an Urban Loop Prioritization Process

The following principles outline what an urban loop process should achieve. When the priorities are established, one should be able to say the priorities meet the test of following principles:

- Projects will support statewide growth and foster economic development
- Selection criteria will be data driven and transparent
- Selection criteria will be consistent with overall Strategic Prioritization Process
- Pilot effort will include a Benefit-Cost Type Methodology
- Pilot effort will be subject to public review and comment
- Secretary of NCDOT will have ability to move projects in final rankings

Proposed Methodology

A urban loop prioritization process would include both “needs” and “benefits” factors. This is based on research of various State’s highway prioritization processes. The most mature State prioritization processes have some form of a “benefit-cost” methodology that provides project rankings based on identifying not just the needs for projects but also incorporating the benefits and costs of the projects to meet those needs. Proposed “needs” factors and “benefits” factors are outlined below:

“Needs” Factors

The Strategic Planning Office of Transportation (SPOT) highway prioritization model is currently a needs-based only approach to prioritizing TIP projects but is limited to analyzing current conditions not future conditions. Therefore, the SPOT highway prioritization model is a starting point for establishing priorities for planned urban loops. Since urban loops are Mobility projects on the Statewide Tier, it is appropriate to use the highway prioritization matrix for scoring needs. This also shows consistency with one of the guiding principles. These “needs factors” are briefly described below but are more fully explained in the Attachment.

1. Congestion Score: A measure of recurring congestion on the parallel routes. The higher the congestion score, the more points to the project.

2. Safety Score: A measure of the past crash history indicating whether the crashes on the parallel routes are greater than comparable routes elsewhere in the State. The higher the crash rates, the more points.

3. Infrastructure Health Score: A measure of pavement conditions on the parallel routes. The worse the pavement ratings, the higher the points.

The highway prioritization model also has a qualitative scoring part which gives points based on project rankings of Divisions and local MPO's/RPO's. However, the loop program is a legislatively required program and thus it is not necessary for MPO's/RPO's and Division offices to rank loop projects. Assigning points based on priority rankings would essentially result in a ranking in one area canceling out a ranking in another area. Therefore, it is recommended there is no need to use qualitative ranking data.

“Benefits” Factors

The current highway prioritization model does not account for the “benefits” factors of how projects meet identified deficiencies because the data is not readily available for all TIP projects. A review of various other State's highway prioritization models generated a list of factors that are believed to be applicable to North Carolina for prioritization. With some effort, this data can be obtained or calculated from State databases. The “benefits” factors below are more fully explained in the Attachment.

- 1. Travel time savings.** This is the key measure of whether the urban loop will reduce congestion and provide greater mobility. The benefits are based on travel time savings the loop project would provide to the region. The travel time savings could be calculated using the travel demand model for the area. The higher the travel time savings, the more points.
- 2. Environmental Readiness Factor.** A measure of whether the project could be delayed due to environmental issues. The closer the project is to environmental completion, the higher the points. The project's status in the Merger Process would be used as the readiness factor.
- 3. Air Quality Conformity.** This is another environmental measure. If the project is required to be constructed to meet an air quality conformity determination, it gets points and the closer the horizon year for construction, the higher the points.
- 4. Economic Development.** A measure of the economic impact the project brings to the region. The NC Department of Commerce would provide this information. The measure is the number of direct, indirect and induced employment opportunities created by the urban loop investment. The greater the employment opportunities, the more points.
- 5. Freight Mobility Factor.** Domestic movement of freight will increase dramatically and the urban loops can assist in diverting truck traffic from central business districts, thus increasing mobility and safety and delaying pavement deterioration. The higher the truck volumes in the design year, the higher the points.
- 6. Multi-Modal.** A measure of the Department's commitment to promoting multi-modal options which boost the ability to move people and goods more efficiently on the transportation network. Multi-modal projects receive additional points.
- 7. Land Use.** A measure of whether transportation planning and land use planning are in concert with one another. Where local adopted land use plans show consideration for a future corridor and/or interchanges, projects receive additional points.

Scoring System For Loop Projects: Each project would have a Priority Ratio. The highest Priority Ratio project would be the highest ranked project, the next highest priority ratio project would be the next highest rank project, etc. The Priority Ratio would consist of the numerator being the sum of the points from the “needs” factors plus the

points from the “benefits” factors. The denominator of the Priority Ratio would be the project costs to complete the project using loop funds. This amount includes the preliminary engineering, right-of-way and construction phases of work. It does not include operational or maintenance costs since loop funds are not used for those purposes. The higher the priority ratio, the higher the rank. The details of this scoring system are shown in the Attachment.

Other Considerations:

It is important to remember the remaining TIP Loop projects are already in various stages of planning or project development. Once the rankings are determined, there will still need to be a check on the status of each loop project to help determine the most cost-effective method of scheduling these ranked loop projects. For example, there are other factors that could be considered such as: avoiding lapse of planning documents or permits, building usable segments, applying funds to areas based on construction costs, inflation, volumes of work and capacity of the industry, and whether non-loop (non-NCDOT) funds can be used to minimize the amount of loop funds to complete the project. Examples of non-loop funding contributions might be innovative financing options like TIFIA, tolling, public-private partnerships or local areas making protective purchases of right-of-way. At this time, no additional scoring is contemplated for these factors but they should be a part of the decision on when to schedule projects for funding.

Proposed Approach To Implementing This Urban Loop Prioritization Program

1. September 2, 2009 - Draft process presented to NCDOT Board of Transportation.
2. (October-November) – Solicit input from MPO’s in Urban Loop Areas
3. (October-November) - Post on NCDOT website for public comment for a minimum of 30 days.
4. (December- February 2010) - Review the comments, make appropriate adjustments and provide to BOT in the Spring of 2010.
5. By June 1, 2010, the top priority urban loop projects would be added to the NCDOT 5-year Work Program and 10-year Work Plan as appropriate and projects scheduled for funding.

“Needs” Factors:

General Theme on “Needs”: The higher the deficiencies, the more points.

The highway prioritization model scoring matrix for Statewide Tier Mobility Projects. This data resides in the Department’s databases. The data is the most current Volume to capacity and AADT data available – currently this data is 2008 data or newer. The “needs“ factor data is derived from the existing parallel routes that carry traffic now that would be expected to travel the new urban loop project. The scoring matrix uses the following quantitative scoring for mobility projects on the Statewide Tier:

1. Congestion score (80% of total needs score): The congestion score is a combination of Volume/Capacity (V/C) ratio and Average Daily Traffic (ADT). Sixty percent of this score is the volume/capacity ratio and 40% is AADT. It is recommended to use current NCDOT data.

2. Safety score (10% of total needs score): This is a combination of three equally weighted safety-related factors: Crash Density (The crash density of the study area versus the average crash density of similar facilities) plus Severity Index (measure of the mix of accident severity in a group of accidents at a location) plus Critical Crash Rate (the actual crash rate versus the critical crash rate for the study area). It is recommended to use current “3-year moving average” data.

3. Infrastructure Health score (10% of total needs score): Pavement Condition Rating on parallel routes. It is recommended to use current NCDOT data.

“Benefits” Factors

General Theme on” Benefit-Cost”: The greater the benefits, the more points.

1. Travel Time savings. This is a key measure of whether an urban loop is reducing congestion and thus improving mobility. The greater the travel time savings, the better for mobility, the greater the points. The Department’s Transportation Planning Branch (TPB) and various Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) traffic demand models have data which can provide travel time savings for urban loop projects, i.e. time savings in the area with and without the loop project. The greater the travel time savings, the more points. The Department envisions creating a table to outline the “travel time” savings and points to be awarded based on the travel time savings. To date, this table is not yet defined but proposed points would be between 0-50.

2, Environmental Readiness Factor. This factor shows that for projects already along in the process, more points are given. It encourages early completion of environmental documents. It also is an indicator of whether an urban loop project will successfully complete the Merger Process and obtain the necessary permits. For example, a project where there is an inordinate delay in reaching the next concurrence point, may be an indicator of additional delay to the project. Points are given according to stage of MERGER ’01 process. Use this table:

Concurrence Point 1 = 2 points (purpose and need)

Concurrence Point 2 = 4 points (list of alternatives)

Concurrence Point 2A = 6 points (bridging and alignment review)

Concurrence Point 3 = 8 points (LEDPA) Least Environmentally Damaging Project

Alternative

Concurrence Point 4A = 10 points (Avoidance and mitigation)

Concurrence Point 4B = 12 points (30 percent hydraulic review)

Concurrence Point 4C = 14 points (permit drawing review)

3. Air quality conformity. This is another environmental measure. Review which horizon year the project is to be constructed, if any. If it is not required as part of an air quality conformity determination, it gets 0 points. If it is to be constructed within 5 year horizon, it gets 20 points, if ten year horizon it gets 10 points and if it is at 15 year horizon or higher, it gets no points. Notes of caution: 1.) Urban areas should not be adding loop projects to air quality conformity determinations just to receive more points and 2.) not all urban loop areas are located in non-attainment areas..

4. Economic Development. This is a measure of the economic impact the project brings to the region. The Department of Commerce has economic analysis models which provide the economic impacts to the surrounding region. NCDOT would provide the inputs as investment schedule and identify the region to be analyzed. It is proposed that the IMPLAN model be used. Details of the plan can be found at <http://www.implan.com>. The Dept. of Commerce would provide as an output the total economic impacts of direct, indirect, and induced effects, i.e. employment created. Direct effects used here would be the employment opportunities that an initial investment would have upon the region. Indirect effects are employment opportunities that regional suppliers and others will experience due to the initial project investment. Induced effects are employment opportunities due to the change in household purchasing due to change in compensation in the region. A table will be needed that provides points based on the expected total number of employment opportunities created by the urban loop project. Proposed points would range from 0-30.

5. Freight Factor. The State is expected to experience a 67% increase in domestic freight tonnage over the next 20 years (21st Century Report, 2008)- an explosive growth rate. The Department needs to accommodate the increase. Urban loop projects provide the opportunity to divert through truck traffic from central business district areas, thus increasing safety, reducing congestion and helping extend the pavement life. Projects that carry high truck volumes receive more points. Use projected 20-year forecasted traffic. If truck volumes >1000 = 1 point. If truck volumes >10,000 = 10 points (max) and similarly in-between. See Table:

Truck volume > 1,000 = 1 point

Truck volume >2,000 = 2 points

Continue volume to number ratio up to 10,000 and points assigned

Truck volume >10,000 = 10 points (max)

6. Multi-Modal. This factor is used in the Department's overall strategic prioritization process. The Department is committed to multi-modal projects. The definition of "multi-modal" is a project which encourages the use of 2 or more modes (highway, bicycling, walking, rail, ferry, aviation, transit) to achieve enhanced mobility in a travel corridor." Loop Projects must meet the definition of "multi-modal" and then will receive points based on the following scoring:

1. HOV/HOT or Light Rail or Bus Rapid Transit within the highway right-of-way = 9 points.
2. Connection to another transportation terminal (airport, seaport, rail depot, ferry terminal, inter-modal terminal, transit terminal) = 7 points. Connections to another transportation terminal are defined as a Loop Project providing access within one-half mile of the terminal right-of-way. One mile is chosen as a reasonable distance to whether the new loop truly would provide ready access to the terminal. Points can be received for either or both of these criteria.

7. Land Use. The Department recognizes there needs to be more coordination between land use planning and transportation projects. These issues are not mutually exclusive. Local governments establish land use plans. The Department does transportation planning. When these are coordinated, a better project will result. Where local land use plans have been adopted which show consideration for an urban loop corridor or urban loop interchanges, 10 points will be awarded to the respective loop project.

SUMMARY TABLE OF POINTS

“Needs” Factors

Points based on actual congestion, pavement and safety scores from NCDOT data bases but generally a score of near 100 would likely be high score.

| “Benefits” Factors: | Point Range |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Travel Time savings | 0-50 |
| 2. Environmental Readiness Factor | 0-14 |
| 3. Air quality conformity | 0-20 |
| 4. Economic Development | 0-30 |
| 5. Freight Factor. | 0-10 |
| 6. Multi-Modal | 0-16 |
| 7. Land Use | 0-10 |
| Total Potential “Benefits” Points | 0-150 |

Scoring System

**Priority Ratio =
$$\frac{\text{Needs factor points plus Benefits factor points}}{\text{Project Costs (Loop Expenditures)}}$$**

Priority Ratio: “Needs” factor points plus “Benefits” factor points in the numerator. Project Costs (representing preliminary engineering, right-of-way and construction) in the denominator.

A Priority Ratio which is a benefit-cost type ratio can be computed. The numerator in the ratio would be the simple addition of “needs” plus “benefits” factors. The denominator would be the sum of the expected project costs for preliminary engineering, right-of-way and construction. These costs would not include operations and maintenance costs that one could expect to see in a traditional benefit-cost methodology because loop funds are only used for the capital expenditure. These project costs would typically be in the millions of dollars which would result in a ratio having multiple decimal places. The

total project costs, therefore, should be shown in “millions” of dollars in order to make the final “priority ratio” a more easily understood number. The higher the priority ratio, the higher the rank.

§ 20-118. Weight of vehicles and load.

(a) For the purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

- (1) Single-axle weight. – The gross weight transmitted by all wheels whose centers may be included between two parallel transverse vertical planes 40 inches apart, extending across the full width of the vehicle.
- (2) Tandem-axle weight. – The gross weight transmitted to the road by two or more consecutive axles whose centers may be included between parallel vertical planes spaced more than 40 inches and not more than 96 inches apart, extending across the full width of the vehicle.
- (3) Axle group. – Any two or more consecutive axles on a vehicle or combination of vehicles.
- (4) Gross weight. – The weight of any single axle, tandem axle, or axle group of a vehicle or combination of vehicles plus the weight of any load thereon.
- (5) Light-traffic roads. – Any highway on the State Highway System, excepting routes designated I, U.S. or N.C., posted by the Department of Transportation to limit the axle weight below the statutory limits.

(b) The following weight limitations shall apply to vehicles operating on the highways of the State:

- (1) The single-axle weight of a vehicle or combination of vehicles shall not exceed 20,000 pounds.
- (2) The tandem-axle weight of a vehicle or combination of vehicles shall not exceed 38,000 pounds.
- (3) The gross weight imposed upon the highway by any axle group of a vehicle or combination of vehicles shall not exceed the maximum weight given for the respective distance between the first and last axle of the group of axles measured longitudinally to the nearest foot as set forth in the following table:

| Distance Group of Two Between Consecutive Axles | Maximum Weight in Pounds for any or More | | | | |
|--|---|---------|---------|---------|---|
| Axles* | 2 Axles | 3 Axles | 4 Axles | 5 Axles | 6 |
| Axles | 7 Axles | | | | |
| 4 | 38000 | | | | |
| 5 | 38000 | | | | |
| 6 | 38000 | | | | |
| 7 | 38000 | | | | |
| 8 or less | 38000 | 38000 | | | |

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|
| more than 8 | 38000 | 42000 | | | |
| 9 | 39000 | 42500 | | | |
| 10 | 40000 | 43500 | | | |
| 11 | | 44000 | | | |
| 12 | | 45000 | 50000 | | |
| 13 | | 45500 | 50500 | | |
| 14 | | 46500 | 51500 | | |
| 15 | | 47000 | 52000 | | |
| 16 | | 48000 | 52500 | 58000 | |
| 17 | | 48500 | 53500 | 58500 | |
| 18 | | 49500 | 54000 | 59000 | |
| 19 | | 50000 | 54500 | 60000 | |
| 20 | | 51000 | 55500 | 60500 | 66000 |
| 21 | | 51500 | 56000 | 61000 | 66500 |
| 22 | | 52500 | 56500 | 61500 | 67000 |
| 23 | | 53000 | 57500 | 62500 | 68000 |
| 24 | | | 54000 | 58000 | 63000 |
| 68500 | 74000 | | | | |
| 25 | | | 54500 | 58500 | 63500 |
| 69000 | 74500 | | | | |
| 26 | | | 55500 | 59500 | 64000 |
| 69500 | 75000 | | | | |
| 27 | | | 56000 | 60000 | 65000 |
| 70000 | 75500 | | | | |
| 28 | | | 57000 | 60500 | 65500 |
| 71000 | 76500 | | | | |
| 29 | | | 57500 | 61500 | 66000 |
| 71500 | 77000 | | | | |
| 30 | | | 58500 | 62000 | 66500 |
| 72000 | 77500 | | | | |
| 31 | | | 59000 | 62500 | 67500 |
| 72500 | 78000 | | | | |
| 32 | | | 60000 | 63500 | 68000 |
| 73000 | 78500 | | | | |
| 33 | | | | 64000 | 68500 |
| 74000 | 79000 | | | | |
| 34 | | | | 64500 | 69000 |
| 74500 | 80000 | | | | |
| 35 | | | 65500 | 70000 | 75000 |
| 36 | | | 66000** | 70500 | 75500 |
| 37 | | | 66500** | 71000 | 76000 |
| 38 | | | 67500** | 72000 | 77000 |
| 39 | | | 68000 | 72500 | 77500 |

| | | | |
|----|-------|-------|-------|
| 40 | 68500 | 73000 | 78000 |
| 41 | 69500 | 73500 | 78500 |
| 42 | 70000 | 74000 | 79000 |
| 43 | 70500 | 75000 | 80000 |
| 44 | 71500 | 75500 | |
| 45 | 72000 | 76000 | |
| 46 | 72500 | 76500 | |
| 47 | 73500 | 77500 | |
| 48 | 74000 | 78000 | |
| 49 | 74500 | 78500 | |
| 50 | 75500 | 79000 | |
| 51 | 76000 | 80000 | |
| 52 | 76500 | | |
| 53 | 77500 | | |
| 54 | 78000 | | |
| 55 | 78500 | | |
| 56 | 79500 | | |
| 57 | 80000 | | |

* Distance in Feet Between the Extremes of any Group of Two or More Consecutive Axles.

** See exception in G.S. 20-118(c)(1).

- (4) The Department of Transportation may establish light-traffic roads and further restrict the axle weight limit on such light-traffic roads lower than the statutory limits. The Department of Transportation shall have authority to designate any highway on the State Highway System, excluding routes designated by I, U.S. and N.C., as a light-traffic road when in the opinion of the Department of Transportation, such road is inadequate to carry and will be injuriously affected by vehicles using the said road carrying the maximum axle weight. All such roads so designated shall be conspicuously posted as light-traffic roads and the maximum axle weight authorized shall be displayed on proper signs erected thereon.

(c) Exceptions. – The following exceptions apply to G.S. 20-118(b) and 20-118(e).

- (1) Two consecutive sets of tandem axles may carry a gross weight of 34,000 pounds each without penalty provided the overall distance between the first and last axles of the consecutive sets of tandem axles is 36 feet or more.
- (2) When a vehicle is operated in violation of G.S. 20-118(b)(1), 20-118(b)(2), or 20-118(b)(3), but the gross weight of the vehicle or combination of vehicles does not exceed that permitted by G.S. 20-118(b)(3), the owner of the vehicle shall be permitted to

shift the load within the vehicle, without penalty, from one axle to another to comply with the weight limits in the following cases:

- a. Where the single-axle load exceeds the statutory limits, but does not exceed 21,000 pounds.
 - b. Where the vehicle or combination of vehicles has tandem axles, but the tandem-axle weight does not exceed 40,000 pounds.
- (3) When a vehicle is operated in violation of G.S. 20-118(b)(4) the owner of the vehicle shall be permitted, without penalty, to shift the load within the vehicle from one axle to another to comply with the weight limits where the single-axle weight does not exceed the posted limit by 2,500 pounds.
- (4) A truck or other motor vehicle shall be exempt from such light-traffic road limitations provided for pursuant to G.S. 20-118(b)(4), when transporting supplies, material or equipment necessary to carry out a farming operation engaged in the production of meats and agricultural crops and livestock or poultry by-products or a business engaged in the harvest or processing of seafood when the destination of such vehicle and load is located solely upon said light-traffic road.
- (5) The light-traffic road limitations provided for pursuant to subdivision (b)(4) of this section do not apply to a vehicle while that vehicle is transporting only the following from its point of origin on a light-traffic road to either one of the two nearest highways that is not a light-traffic road:
- a. Processed or unprocessed seafood transported from boats or any other point of origin to a processing plant or a point of further distribution.
 - b. Meats or agricultural crop products transported from a farm to first market.
 - c. Forest products originating and transported from a farm or from woodlands to first market without interruption or delay for further packaging or processing after initiating transport.
 - d. Livestock or poultry transported from their point of origin to first market.
 - e. Livestock by-products or poultry by-products transported from their point of origin to a rendering plant.
 - f. Recyclable material transported from its point of origin to a scrap-processing facility for processing. As used in this subpart, the terms "recyclable material" and "processing" have the same meaning as in G.S. 130A-290(a).

- g. Garbage collected by the vehicle from residences or garbage dumpsters if the vehicle is fully enclosed and is designed specifically for collecting, compacting, and hauling garbage from residences or from garbage dumpsters. As used in this subpart, the term "garbage" does not include hazardous waste as defined in G.S. 130A-290(a), spent nuclear fuel regulated under G.S. 20-167.1, low-level radioactive waste as defined in G.S. 104E-5, or radioactive material as defined in G.S. 104E-5.
 - h. Treated sludge collected from a wastewater treatment facility.
 - i. Apples when transported from the orchard to the first processing or packing point.
 - j. Trees grown as Christmas trees from the field, farm, stand, or grove to first processing point.
- (6) A truck or other motor vehicle shall be exempt from such light-traffic road limitations provided by G.S. 20-118(b)(4) when such motor vehicles are owned, operated by or under contract to a public utility, electric or telephone membership corporation or municipality and such motor vehicles are used in connection with installation, restoration or emergency maintenance of utility services.
- (7) A wrecker may tow any disabled truck or other motor vehicle or combination of vehicles to a place for repairs, parking, or storage within 50 miles from the point that the vehicle was disabled and may tow a truck, tractor, or other replacement vehicle to the site of the disabled vehicle without being in violation of G.S. 20-118 provided that the wrecker and towed vehicle or combination of vehicles otherwise meet all requirements of this section.
- (8) A firefighting vehicle operated by any member of a municipal or rural fire department in the performance of his duties, regardless of whether members of that fire department are paid or voluntary and any vehicle of a voluntary lifesaving organization, when operated by a member of that organization while answering an official call shall be exempt from such light-traffic road limitations provided by G.S. 20-118(b)(4).
- (9) Repealed by Session Laws 1993 (Reg. Sess., 1994), c. 761, s. 12.
- (10) Fully enclosed motor vehicles designed specifically for collecting, compacting and hauling garbage from residences, or from garbage dumpsters shall, when operating for those purposes, be allowed a single axle weight not to exceed 23,500 pounds on the steering axle on vehicles equipped with a boom, or

on the rear axle on vehicles loaded from the rear. This exemption shall not apply to vehicles operating on interstate highways, vehicles transporting hazardous waste as defined in G.S. 130A-290(a)(8), spent nuclear fuel regulated under G.S. 20-167.1, low-level radioactive waste as defined in G.S. 104E-5(9a), or radioactive material as defined in G.S. 104E-5(14).

- (11) A truck or other motor vehicle shall be exempt for light-traffic road limitations issued under subdivision (b)(4) of this section when transporting heating fuel for on-premises use at a destination located on the light-traffic road.
- (12) Subsections (b) and (e) of this section do not apply to a vehicle that meets all of the conditions set out below:
 - a. Is hauling agricultural crops from the farm where the crop is grown to the closest market.
 - b. Repealed by Session Laws 1993 (Reg. Sess., 1994), c. 761, s. 13.
 - b1. Does not operate on an interstate highway or exceed any posted bridge weight limits during transportation or hauling of agricultural products.
 - c. Does not exceed a single-axle weight of 22,000 pounds, a tandem-axle weight of 42,000 pounds, or a gross weight of 90,000 pounds.
- (13) Vehicles specifically designed for fire fighting that are owned by a municipal or rural fire department. This exception does not apply to vehicles operating on interstate highways.
- (14) Subsections (b) and (e) of this section do not apply to a vehicle that meets all of the conditions below, but all other enforcement provisions of this Article remain applicable:
 - a. Is hauling aggregates from a distribution yard or a State-permitted production site located within a North Carolina county contiguous to the North Carolina State border to a destination in another state adjacent to that county as verified by a weight ticket in the driver's possession and available for inspection by enforcement personnel.
 - b. Does not operate on an interstate highway or posted bridge.
 - c. Does not exceed 69,850 pounds gross vehicle weight and 53,850 pounds per axle grouping for tri-axle vehicles. For purposes of this subsection, a tri-axle vehicle is a single power unit vehicle with a three consecutive axle group on which the respective distance between any two

consecutive axles of the group, measured longitudinally center to center to the nearest foot, does not exceed eight feet. For purposes of this subsection, the tolerance provisions of subsection (h) of this section do not apply, and vehicles must be licensed in accordance with G.S. 20-88.

d. Repealed by Session Laws 2001-487, s. 10, effective December 16, 2001.

(15) Subsections (b) and (e) of this section do not apply to a vehicle or vehicle combination that meets all of the conditions below, but all other enforcement provisions of this Article remain applicable:

a. Is hauling wood residuals, including wood chips, sawdust, mulch, or tree bark from any site; is hauling raw logs to first market; or is transporting bulk soil, bulk rock, sand, sand rock, or asphalt millings from a site that does not have a certified scale for weighing the vehicle.

b. Does not operate on an interstate highway, a posted light-traffic road, except as provided by subdivision (c)(5) of this section, or a posted bridge.

c. Does not exceed a maximum gross weight 4,000 pounds in excess of what is allowed in subsection (b) of this section.

d. Does not exceed a single-axle weight of more than 22,000 pounds and a tandem-axle weight of more than 42,000 pounds.

(d) The Department of Transportation is authorized to abrogate certain exceptions. The exceptions provided for in G.S. 20-118(c)(4) and 20-118(c)(5) as applied to any light-traffic road may be abrogated by the Department of Transportation upon a determination of the Department of Transportation that undue damage to such light-traffic road is resulting from such vehicles exempted by G.S. 20-118(c)(4) and 20-118(c)(5). In those cases where the exemption to the light-traffic roads are abrogated by the Department of Transportation, the Department shall post the road to indicate no exemptions.

(e) Penalties. –

(1) Except as provided in subdivision (2) of this subsection, for each violation of the single-axle or tandem-axle weight limits set in subdivision (b)(1), (b)(2), or (b)(4) of this section or axle weights authorized by special permit according to G.S. 20-119(a), the Department of Crime Control and Public Safety shall assess a civil penalty against the owner or registrant of the vehicle in accordance with the following schedule: for the first 1,000 pounds or any part thereof, four cents (4¢) per pound; for the

next 1,000 pounds or any part thereof, six cents (6¢) per pound; and for each additional pound, ten cents (10¢) per pound. These penalties apply separately to each weight limit violated. In all cases of violation of the weight limitation, the penalty shall be computed and assessed on each pound of weight in excess of the maximum permitted.

- (2) The penalty for a violation of the single-axle or tandem-axle weight limits by a vehicle that is transporting an item listed in subdivision (c)(5) of this section is one-half of the amount it would otherwise be under subdivision (1) of this subsection.
 - (3) If an axle-group weight of a vehicle exceeds the weight limit set in subdivision (b)(3) of this section plus any tolerance allowed in subsection (h) of this section or axle-group weights or gross weights authorized by special permit under G.S. 20-119(a), the Department of Crime Control and Public Safety shall assess a civil penalty against the owner or registrant of the motor vehicle. The penalty shall be assessed on the number of pounds by which the axle-group weight exceeds the limit set in subdivision (b)(3), as follows: for the first 2,000 pounds or any part thereof, two cents (2¢) per pound; for the next 3,000 pounds or any part thereof, four cents (4¢) per pound; for each pound in excess of 5,000 pounds, ten cents (10¢) per pound. Tolerance pounds in excess of the limit set in subdivision (b)(3) are subject to the penalty if the vehicle exceeds the tolerance allowed in subsection (h) of this section. These penalties apply separately to each axle-group weight limit violated.
 - (4) The penalty for a violation of an axle-group weight limit by a vehicle that is transporting an item listed in subdivision (c)(5) of this section is one-half of the amount it would otherwise be under subdivision (3) of this subsection.
 - (5) A violation of a weight limit in this section or of a permitted weight under G.S. 20-119 is not punishable under G.S. 20-176.
 - (6) The penalty for violating the gross weight or axle-group weight by a dump truck or dump trailer vehicle transporting bulk soil, bulk rock, sand, sand rock, or asphalt millings intrastate from a site that does not have a certified scale for weighing the vehicle is one-half of the amount it otherwise would be under subdivisions (1) and (3) of this subsection.
 - (7) The clear proceeds of all civil penalties, civil forfeitures, and civil fines that are collected by the Department of Transportation pursuant to this section shall be remitted to the Civil Penalty and Forfeiture Fund in accordance with G.S. 115C-457.2.
- (f) Repealed by Session Laws 1993 (Reg. Sess., 1994), c. 761, s. 15.

(g) General Statutes 20-118 shall not be construed to permit the gross weight of any vehicle or combination in excess of the safe load carrying capacity established by the Department of Transportation on any bridge pursuant to G.S. 136-72.

(h) Tolerance. – A vehicle may exceed maximum and the inner axle-group weight limitations set forth in subdivision (b)(3) of this section by a tolerance of ten percent (10%). This exception does not authorize a vehicle to exceed either the single-axle or tandem-axle weight limitations set forth in subdivisions (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section, or the maximum gross weight limit of 80,000 pounds. This exception does not apply to bridges posted under G.S. 136-72 or to vehicles operating on interstate highways. The tolerance allowed under this subsection does not authorize the weight of a vehicle to exceed the weight for which that vehicle is licensed under G.S. 20-88. No tolerance on the single-axle weight or the tandem-axle weight provided for in subdivisions (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section shall be granted administratively or otherwise. The Department of Transportation shall report back to the Transportation Oversight Committee and to the General Assembly on the effects of the tolerance granted under this section, any abuses of this tolerance, and any suggested revisions to this section by that Department on or before May 1, 1998.

(i) Repealed by Session Laws 1993 (Reg. Sess., 1994), c. 761, s. 16.

(j) Repealed by Session Laws 1987, c. 392.

(k) From September 1 through March 1 of each year, a vehicle which is equipped with a self-loading bed and which is designed and used exclusively to transport compressed seed cotton from the farm to a cotton gin may operate on the highways of the State, except interstate highways, with a tandem-axle weight not exceeding 50,000 pounds. Such vehicles shall be exempt from light-traffic road limitations only from point of origin on the light-traffic road to the nearest State-maintained road which is not posted to prohibit the transportation of statutory load limits. This exemption does not apply to restricted, posted bridge structures. (1937, c. 407, s. 82; 1943, c. 213, s. 2; cc. 726, 784; 1945, c. 242, s. 2; c. 569, s. 2; c. 576, s. 7; 1947, c. 1079; 1949, c. 1207, s. 2; 1951, c. 495, s. 2; c. 942, s. 1; c. 1013, ss. 5, 6, 8; 1953, cc. 214, 1092; 1959, c. 872; c. 1264, s. 6; 1963, c. 159; c. 610, ss. 3-5; c. 702, s. 5; 1965, cc. 483, 1044; 1969, c. 537; 1973, c. 507, s. 5; c. 1449, ss. 1, 2; 1975, c. 325; c. 373, s. 2; c. 716, s. 5; c. 735; c. 736, ss. 1-3; 1977, c. 461; c. 464, s. 34; 1977, 2nd Sess., c. 1178; 1981, c. 690, ss. 27, 28; c. 726; c. 1127, s. 53.1; 1983, c. 407; c. 724, s. 1; 1983 (Reg. Sess., 1984), c. 1116, ss. 105-109; 1985, c. 54; c. 274; 1987, c. 392; c. 707, ss. 1-4; 1991, c. 202, s. 1; 1991 (Reg. Sess., 1992), c. 905, s. 1; 1993, c. 426, ss. 1, 2; c. 470, s. 1; c. 533, s. 11; 1993 (Reg. Sess., 1994), c. 761, ss. 10-16; 1995, c. 109, s. 3; c. 163, s. 4; c. 332, ss. 1-3; c. 509, s. 135.1(b); 1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 756, s. 29; 1997-354, s. 1; 1997-373, s. 1; 1997-466, s. 2; 1998-149, ss. 8, 9, 9.1; 1998-177, s. 1; 1999-452, s. 23; 2000-57, s. 1; 2001-487, ss. 10, 50(e); 2002-126, s. 26.16(a);

2004-145, ss. 1, 2; 2005-248, s. 1; 2005-276, s. 6.37(o); 2005-361, s. 3; 2006-135, s. 1; 2006-264, s. 37; 2008-221, ss. 7, 8, 9.)

**WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
BEGIN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE NORTH CAROLINA FEDERAL HIGHWAY
ADMINISTRATION, SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND SOUTH
CAROLINA FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION TO BEGIN THE PROCESS OF
EXTENDING I-20 INTO WILMINGTON.**

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, I-20 extends from Atlanta, Georgia to Florence, South Carolina; and

WHEREAS, interstate connectivity between Atlanta and Wilmington with one interstate number will create the perception that it is easy to travel between both cities; and

WHEREAS, there is a great deal of ocean freight tonnage to and from Atlanta that goes to Savannah and Charleston, two ports with limited capacity; and

WHEREAS, it is possible to make I-95 and I-20 co-extensive between Florence, South Carolina and the I-74 corridor in North Carolina by modifying the signage; and

WHEREAS, South Carolina expects NCDOT to help bring I-73 into South Carolina from the Rockingham area and should be willing to help North Carolina with regards to the I-20 corridor in exchange to this assistance.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Transportation Advisory Committee requests that the North Carolina Department of Transportation begin discussions with the North Carolina Federal Highway Administration, South Carolina Department of Transportation and South Carolina Federal Highway Administration to begin the process of extending I-20 into Wilmington.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Advisory Committee on October 28, 2009.

Lanny Wilson, Chairman
Transportation Advisory Committee

Mike Kozlosky, Secretary

**WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE CAPE FEAR SKYWAY AND ENCOURAGING AND
SUPPORTING NEW HANOVER COUNTY, CITY OF WILMINGTON, BRUNSWICK COUNTY AND
TOWN OF LELAND UTILIZING THE LOCAL LAND USE CONTROLS TO PRESERVE A
CORRIDOR FOR THE CAPE FEAR SKYWAY

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the N.C. Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Cape Fear Skyway is a proposed 9.5 mile facility crossing the Cape Fear River that will provide a future connection from US 17 in Brunswick County to US 421 in New Hanover County; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Cape Fear Skyway is a regional transportation project that will provide increased benefits to the community that include: additional access to the Port for commercial deployments, direct access to the west side of the Cape Fear River; reduction of future traffic demand on the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge, allow for uninterrupted travel across the Cape Fear River, allow for emergency response vehicles to travel across the Cape Fear River without the possibility of delay, decrease evacuation times during natural disasters, improve access to the Military Ocean Terminal at Sunny Point and provide for improved access to the Port facilities for military deployments; and

WHEREAS, due to the possibility of encroaching developments in the potential corridors for the Cape Fear Skyway the Wilmington MPO would encourage New Hanover County, City of Wilmington, Brunswick County and the Town of Leland to utilize the land use tools available to preserve a corridor for this important transportation project.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Transportation Advisory Committee hereby recognizes their continued support for the Cape Fear Skyway.

NOW THEREFORE ALSO, be it resolved that the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Transportation Advisory Committee encourages and supports New Hanover County, City of Wilmington, Brunswick County and the Town of Leland utilizing the land use planning tools available to preserve a corridor for the future Cape Fear Skyway.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area MPO Transportation Advisory Committee on October 28, 2009.

Lanny Wilson, Chair
Transportation Advisory Committee

Mike Kozlosky, Secretary

**WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE DOW ROAD CORRIDOR STUDY

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides planning services and sets policies and priorities for transportation in the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the NC Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, in 2002 the North Carolina Department of Transportation completed a Feasibility Study that evaluated several different cross-sections and recommended a four-lane divided facility between US 421/Lake Park Drive and K Avenue and a two-lane cross-section between K Avenue and Fort Fisher Boulevard; and

WHEREAS, the Dow Road widening and extension project fell in an environmentally sensitive area and could also impact several stakeholders including Sunny Point Marine Ocean Terminal, United States Air Force, Carolina Beach State Park and Fort Fisher Recreational Area; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Dow Road widening and extension project was to evaluate the feasibility of an improved north-south access in both Carolina Beach and Kure Beach that was expected to reduce traffic congestion on US 421, which currently operates at or above capacity during the peak periods; and

WHEREAS, there are existing bike lanes on Dow Road and with the widening and extension, multi-modal access was expected to improve between various facilities in and around Carolina and Kure Beaches; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization commissioned Wilbur Smith & Associates to analyze and evaluate potential corridor alternatives, develop a preferred alternative and develop conceptual design plans for the widening and extension; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization received a resolution from the Town of Kure Beach not supporting the extension of Dow Road and based on their concerns the scope of the Dow Road Corridor Study was modified to address economic impacts, security issues, environmental impacts, pedestrian and bike improvements, speed, access management and other issues along the existing corridor and possible future widening of Dow Road; and

WHEREAS, the Dow Road Corridor Study recommends the widening of the shoulders along Dow Road, intersection improvements at various intersections along Dow Road and US 421, the construction of a multi-use path along Dow Road, and improvements to the curve at K Avenue.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Transportation Advisory Committee of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby adopts the Dow Road Corridor Study.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Advisory Committee on October 28, 2009.

Lanny Wilson, Chair
Transportation Advisory Committee

Mike Kozlosky, Secretary

**WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE *PELICAN DRIVE/SALISBURY STREET BICYCLE PLAN*

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington MPO and Town of Wrightsville Beach collaboratively began the Wrightsville Beach Bicycle Corridor Study in October 2008 to consider a east-west bicycle connectivity along Salisbury Street as well as Pelican Drive, and north-south connectivity along Lagoon Drive and North Lumina Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the study included a field inventory of existing conditions, public outreach efforts through the design process and preparation of 30% design plans; and

WHEREAS, the Pelican Drive/Salisbury Street Bicycle Plan provides recommendations for sharrows and bicycle lanes on Salisbury Street for more advanced cyclists and the installation of sharrows on Pelican Drive, in combination with stand alone bicycle-pedestrian bridges and a multi-use path north of Salisbury Street to accommodate bicyclists of a variety of skill levels and abilities; and

WHEREAS, the *Pelican Drive/Salisbury Street Bicycle Plan* will be used as a guide to improve bicycle facilities along Pelican Drive and Salisbury Street in the Town of Wrightsville Beach; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Wrightsville Beach adopted the *Pelican Drive/Salisbury Street Bicycle Plan* on September 9, 2009.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Advisory Committee hereby adopts the *Pelican Drive/Salisbury Street Bicycle Plan*.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Transportation Advisory Committee on October 28, 2009.

Lanny Wilson, Chair
Transportation Advisory Committee

Mike Kozlosky, Secretary

Lists of Potential Enhancement Projects for the Wilmington MPO (2009)
Technical Coordinating Committee
October 14, 2009

- Purchase of the rail corridor from New Hanover County Public Schools
- Landscaping at the west side of the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge
- Landscaping at Johnny Mercer's Pier in Wrightsville Beach
- Separate bicycle/pedestrian facilities over the waterways (Bradley Creek, Wrightsville Beach and Navassa)
- Landscaping at I-40/I-140 interchange
- Landscaping at Blackwell Road in Belville
- Streetscape project in Castle Hayne
- Bike/Pedestrian Connection between Castle Hayne and Holly Shelter
- Landscaping at the Monkey Junction intersection
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements from *Walk Wilmington: A Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan*
- Retro-fit the Snows Cut Bridge to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian access
- High visibility crosswalks at designated locations in Carolina Beach
- Multi-use path along the entire length of Dow Road
- Sidewalk Improvements along East Lake Park Boulevard within Carolina Beach
- Davis Park Greenway in Navassa
- Cedar Hill Road Roundabout in Navassa
- Environmental Stormwater Mitigation at Cedar Hill & Old Mill Intersection
- Cedar Hill Road multi-use path in Navassa

- Environmental Stormwater Mitigation at Broadway and Main Streets
- Sidewalks along Main Street in Navassa
- Improvements at the Wilmington Railroad Museum (to include the casket cart, observation platform, stationmaster tower and 1920's office)

**WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE PRIORITIZED LIST OF POTENTIAL ENHANCEMENT
PROJECTS FOR THE WILMINGTON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the North Carolina Board of Transportation, and

WHEREAS, on January 23, 2009 Governor Purdue signed Executive Order #2 reforming the Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, this Executive Order identified that the Department of Transportation has an obligation to ensure that highway construction plans are developed and that projects are awarded based on professional standards designed to meet the needs of citizens and communities across the state fairly, efficiently and effectively; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation is working to develop prioritization tools for all modes of transportation will evaluate projects based on an analytical analysis; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation has reorganized the process and there will not be a call for enhancement projects, however all requests will now be handled by the Program Development Branch; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization is being proactive in developing a List of Potential Enhancement Projects; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization has reviewed and evaluated potential enhancement projects in the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization's planning area boundary.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Transportation Advisory Committee hereby endorses *List of Potential Enhancement Projects (2009)* for submittal to the North Carolina Department of Transportation.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Advisory Committee on October 28, 2009.

Lanny Wilson, Chairman
Transportation Advisory Committee

Mike Kozlosky, Secretary



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

BEVERLY EAVES PERDUE
GOVERNOR

EUGENE A. CONTI, JR.
SECRETARY

October 21, 2009

TIP Projects:

B-4223: replace Bridge # 21, over the Northeast Cape Fear River.
Under construction, traffic has been shifted to the new alignment and bridge.
Structure Work Complete

R-2245: Second bridge to Oak Island over the intercoastal waterway.
Work will begin again this week.
Contract Completion Date December 31, 2009 (approximate delay of 5 months)

B-0682: Bridge to Sunset Beach over the intercoastal waterway.
Under construction
Estimated Contract Completion Date December of 2010

U-4903: resurfacing of US 76 (Oleander Drive) from 16th & 17th Streets to Independence Boulevard. Work to be completed at night. Additional work will be let with this contract; Milling & resurfacing of Oleander Drive, from Independence Boulevard to Pine Grove Road. Also modifying the lane configuration at the intersection of Oleander Drive and College Road, by adding dual left turns on Oleander Drive.
Work Complete

We will have a future contract to construct a right turn lane for Oleander Drive westbound on to College Road northbound. Start Date May 2010

U-4733: intersection improvements SR 1411 (Wrightsville Avenue), from Forest Hills Drive to SR 2313 (Wilshire Boulevard).
Estimated Contract Completion Date Winter 2009 (utility delays)

B-4031: replace Bridge #72 over Jinny's Branch and construct approaches, on NC 179.
Work Complete

U-5017A: Letting Date 10/21/2008 Wilmington Computerized Signal System
Estimated Contract Completion Date Nov. 2010

U-5017B: Letting Date 11/18/2008 Wilmington Computerized Signal System
Estimated Contract Completion Date June 2011

U-5017C: Letting Date 12/16/2008 Wilmington Computerized Signal System
Estimated Contract Completion Date Jan. 2011

U-3462: Town of Shallotte, SR 1357 (Smith Avenue) extension from West of US 17 Business to NC 130. Under construction and funded by stimulus.

Estimated Contract Completion Date Dec. 2010

R-4002: widen SR 1472 (Village Road) from SR 1437 (Old Fayetteville Road)/SR 1435 (South Navassa Road) to east of US 17 Interchange ramps, to a 4-lane divided facility.

Estimated Contract Completion Date June 2011

R-3324: Long Beach Road extension, two lane road on new location, from NC 211 to SR 1525 (Bethel Road)

Letting date 7/2010

B-4030: replace Bridge #9 over Bear Branch, on NC 130.

Letting Date August 18, 2009

R-2633 AA & AB: Construction of I-140 (Wilmington Bypass) from US 17 to US 74/76. Right of Way 2008 (Has begun) and Construction Fall 2010
Design/Build – January 2010 Selection of Design/Build Team

U-4902 B: construct a concrete median island from SR 1402 (Porter's Neck Road) to Colonial Drive (non-system road). Project is in the planning process and awaiting the completion of the Market Street Corridor Study.

R-2633 B: Construction of I-140 (Wilmington Bypass) from US 74/76 to US 421. Right of Way 2008 (Has begun) and Construction 7/19/2011

R-5021: NC 211 widening, from NC 87 to SR 1500 (Midway Road).
Right of Way 2013

R-4063: widen SR 1472 (Village Road) from SR 1435 (South Navassa Road) to

SR 1438 (Lanvale Road).
Right of Way 2012 and Construction 2013

U-3338 B: Widening of Kerr Ave. from Randell Parkway to Martin Luther King, Jr. Parkway.
Start Date May 2013

Military Cutoff Road Extension (U-4751) and Hampstead Bypass (R-3300): extending Military Cutoff Road from Market Street to the Wilmington Bypass, with an interchange at the Bypass. NCDOT and the merger team are scheduled to have selected a preferred alternative by Winter 2009/2010 and complete the final environmental impact statement by Summer 2010. Right of way is scheduled for 2013.

R-3601 US 17/74/76: Widening across the “causeway”, between Leland and Wilmington. AT the beginning the planning process. We will move into the merger process afterwards and then to design. A scoping meeting will be held in the next couple of months.
Start Date July 2013

Feasibility Studies for NC 211 & NC 904: Completion Date Fall 2009

NC 211 – from SR 1500 (Midway Road) to US 17

NC 904 – from NC 179/904 (Beach Drive) to US 17

FS-0203C Feasibility Study for College Road: from SR 1327 (Gordon Road) to US 17 (Market Street).

R-3432 – SR 1163 (Georgetown Road) extend from SR 1184 (Ocean Isle Beach Road) to NC 179. Start Date June 2013

W-5103 – US 421 (Carolina Beach Road) from George Anderson Road to SR 1100 (River Road) construct various safety improvements at 20+ intersections.

Letting Date January 19, 2010

W-5104 – NC 132 (College Road) from US 421 (Carolina Beach Road) to US 117 (Shipyard Blvd.) construct various safety improvements at 10+ intersections.

Letting Date September 14, 2010

Division Projects:

NC 87 - Boiling Spring Lakes: install two right turn lanes and extend existing left turn lane at the intersection of SR 1539 (East Boiling Spring Lakes Road) and NC 87.

Estimated Contract Completion Date December 2009

SR 1448 (Middle River Road): full depth patching from NC 211 to the paved end of system. Schedule to be under contract in the Summer 2009

US 117 (College Road): extend left turn lane along US 117 (College Road) at Randall Parkway to provide additional storage. Schedule to be under construction in the Summer 2009

SR 1345 (Royal Oak Road): mill patch the rutted section of SR 1345 (Royal Oak Road), due to increased truck traffic. Schedule to be under contract in the Summer 2009

SR 1455 (Porter's Neck Road): construct a roundabout at the intersection of SR 1455 (Porter's Neck Road) and SR 1402 (Edgewater Club Road). Currently the right of way is being obtained.

SR 1403 (Middle Sound Loop Road): redesign the intersection of SR 1403 (Middle Sound Loop Road) and SR 1407 (Darden Road), into a roundabout design. Design is complete and our schedule is to construct the roundabout in the summer of 2010, when school is complete.

SR 1492 (Pine Grove Road): redesign intersection at SR 1492 (Pine Grove Rd) and Masonboro Loop Road. Schedule to have permitting complete by August 2009, bid project in September 2009, award in October 2009, construction to begin in December and complete by end of March 2010.

US 421 Carolina Beach: widen Carl Winner Street to allow dual right turn lanes onto US 421 northbound.

NC 132 (College Road): extend the left turn lane southbound on NC 132 and New Center Drive intersection. Schedule to be under construction in the Summer 2009

NC 132 (College Road): extend the left turn lane northbound on NC 132 and Martin Luther King Parkway. Schedule to be under construction in the Summer 2009

Resurfacing Projects:

These roads are in this Brunswick County contract: **Availability Date July 2009**
Estimated Contract Completion Date May 2010

NC 211 mill patching and resurfacing from SR 1500 (Midway Road) to SR 1114 (Zion Hill Road).

SR 1539 (East Boiling Springs Lake Road) resurfacing from NC 87 to RR tracks.

SR 1115 (Stone Chimney Road) mill patching and resurfacing from NC 211 to US 17.

SR 1119 (Stanley Road) mill patching and resurfacing from end of maintenance to SR 1120 (Sabbath Home Road).

SR 1527 (Wescott Road) resurfacing from NC 211 to SR 1526 (Jabbertown Road).

SR 1527 (Wescott Road) patching and resurfacing from SR 1526 to SR 1528 (East Moore Street).

These roads are in this Pender County contract: **Availability Date July 2009**
Estimated Contract Completion Date May 2010

NC 50 resurface from North Topsail Drive/Roland Drive to 0.09 miles north of NC 210, no work on swing bridge over the intercoastal waterway.

These are in this New Hanover County contract:

Estimated Contract Completion Date June 2010

US 421 milling and resurfacing from Snows Cut Bridge to Carolina Sands Drive.

US 117/NC 132 resurfacing from SR 1322 (Murrayville Road) to bridge over I-40.

SR 1574 (Service Road) milling and resurfacing from SR 1573 to SR 1573.

SR 1592 (Landsdowne Road) mill patching and resurfacing from NC 132 to SR 1516 (Navaho Trail).

SR 1516 (Navaho Trail) mill patching and resurfacing from SR 1592 to SR 1492 (Masonboro Loop Road).

SR 1492 (Masonboro Loop Road) patching and resurfacing from SR 1517 (Trails End Road) to SR 1505 (Beasley Road).

SR 1411 (Dawson Street Extension) resurfacing from US 76 (Oleander Drive) to SR 1411 (Wrightsville Avenue).

SR 1411 (Wrightsville Avenue) patching from SR 1411 to Independence Boulevard.

SR 1411 (Wrightsville Avenue) patching from Huntington Road to US 76.

SR 1411 (Wrightsville Avenue) milling and resurfacing from US 76 to US 74.

SR 2313 (Wilshire Boulevard) patching from SR 1411 to SR 1175 (Kerr Avenue)

SR 1302 (North 23rd Street) milling and resurfacing from US 17 Bus. To north of RR Tracks.