



WILMINGTON URBAN AREA Metropolitan Planning Organization

P.O. Box 1810
Wilmington, North Carolina 28402
910.342.2781 910.341.7801 FAX

The mission of the Wilmington MPO is to develop and implement a comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan that supports the existing and future mobility needs and economic vitality of the Wilmington Urban Area. This shall be accomplished by protecting the environment, safe guarding the social equity, improving the quality of life for the citizens of the community, improving the local economy and providing for the safe and efficient mobility throughout the region. This is achieved through the long range transportation planning process which includes a comprehensive, continuous and cooperative approach from citizens and participating members.

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

Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting Agenda

TO: Technical Coordinating Committee Members
FROM: Mike Kozlosky, Executive Director
DATE: October 8, 2010
SUBJECT: October 13, 2010 meeting

A meeting of the WMPO Technical Coordinating Committee will be held on Wednesday, **October 13th** at 10:00 am. The meeting will be held in the Traffic Conference Room on the fourth floor of 305 Chestnut Street in downtown Wilmington.

The following is the agenda for the meeting:

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of Minutes:
 - a. 9/22/10
- 3) Presentation- US 17/NC 133 Design Alternatives
- 4) Old Business
- 5) New Business
 - a. Resolution supporting the Town of Belville for the NCDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative
 - b. Resolution supporting the Town of Wrightsville Beach for the NCDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative
 - c. Resolution adopting *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan*
- 6) Discussion
 - a. North Carolina Mobility Fund
 - b. Wilmington Multi-modal Transit Center
- 7) Updates
 - a. City of Wilmington/Wilmington MPO
 - a. US 17/NC 210 Corridor Study in Pender County
 - b. Market Street Corridor Plan
 - b. Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority
 - c. NCDOT
- 8) Announcements
 - a. Wilmington MPO Bike/Ped meeting-October 14th
 - b. NCDOT Listening Session- November 10th
- 9) Next meeting –December 1, 2010

Attachments:

- Minutes 9/22/10 meeting
- Wilmington MPO “Draft” STIP Supplement
- Resolution supporting the Town of Belville for the NCDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative
- Resolution supporting the Town of Wrightsville Beach for the NCDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative
- *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan* (found at www.wmpo.org)
- Resolution adopting *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan*
- North Carolina Mobility Fund Preliminary Report
- Wilmington Multi-modal Transit Study Letter
- City of Wilmington/Wilmington MPO Project Update (September)
- NCDOT Project Update
- NCDOT Listening Session 2.0 Prioritization flyer

**Wilmington Urban Area
Technical Coordinating Committee
Meeting Notes for September 22, 2010**

Members Present:

Mike Kozlosky, City of Wilmington
Stephanie Ayers, NC State Ports Authority
Sam Burgess, New Hanover County
Robert Waring, Town of Leland
Chris Sammons, Town of Belville
Ken Vafier, Pender County
Eryn Moller, Town of Wrightsville Beach
Albert Eby, Wave Transit
Don Bennett, City of Wilmington
Helen Bunch, Brunswick County
Jill Stark, FHWA
Shane York, NCDOT
Patrick Riddle, NCDOT
Allen Pope, NCDOT
Coke Gary, NCDOT

Others Present:

Joshuah Mello, City of Wilmington
Tara Murphy, City of Wilmington
Bill McDow, City of Wilmington

1. Call to Order

Mr. Kozlosky called the meeting to order at 10:06 am.

2. Approval of Minutes

The motion to approve the minutes for the August 11, 2010 meeting carried unanimously.

3. Old Business

No items

4. New Business

a. Resolution Supporting Bicycle and Pedestrian Amenities on the Cape Fear Skyway

Mr. Kozlosky told members Mr. Howard Capps spoke during the public comment period at the last TAC meeting asking members to support the addition of bicycle and pedestrian amenities on the proposed Cape Fear Skyway. Mr. Kozlosky said the addition of these lanes is recommended in the draft Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan and also supported by the Bicycle/Pedestrian committee. Currently there is not a cost estimate for these improvements. The resolution is requesting the NC Turnpike Authority to consider the addition of these amenities during the review process and determine if there would be a significant financial burden to the project.

Mr. Eby asked if mass transportation lanes are being considered. Mr. Kozlosky told members they are looking at all modes of transportation for the bridge.

Mr. Pope made the motion to support the resolution and forward to the TAC for consideration. Mr. Burgess seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

b. Resolution Supporting NCDOT Consider Airlie Road as a North Carolina Scenic Byway

Mr. Kozlosky told members a few months ago the MPO prepared a draft application asking the NCDOT to recognize Airlie Road as a North Carolina Scenic Byway. The Department requested a resolution of support from the MPO, the City of Wilmington and New Hanover County be submitted along with the final application for designation in 2012.

Mr. Bennett made the motion requesting NCDOT consider Airlie Road as a North Carolina Scenic Byway and forward to the TAC for consideration. Ms. Moller seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

5. Updates

a. Wilmington MPO/City of Wilmington

Mr. Kozlosky updated members on projects within the City of Wilmington. He told members one item not included on the report is the US17/NC210 Corridor Study. There have been two recent fatalities on the US 17 corridor in Hampstead. Staff received proposals from nine engineering firms and sent proposals to the NC Department of Transportation and the Pender County planning staff. The MPO requested scoring of the proposals by September 28th and plans to make the final selection once the scores are received. The target start date for the project is November 1st. The plan should be complete by the beginning of June 2011. Once the study is complete, it will be sent to the Department for the completion of designs.

b. Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority

Mr. Eby told members the new transfer center is within 5 days of the original construction deadline of November 26th and things are continuing to move along.

c. NCDOT Project Update

Mr. Riddle updated members on the projects for NCDOT. He told members it looks like the Wrightsville Avenue project should finally be complete in the middle of October. The Carolina Beach Road contractor is Cape Fear Paving and they will get started this fall. The Department will be holding a public information meeting some time during the second week in October for College Road improvements between Monkey Junction and Shipyard Boulevard.

d. Other updates

Mr. Kozlosky told members that staff plans to have a presentation on the long range transportation plan at next meeting.

Mr. Kozlosky said NCDOT released information on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant initiative. There are funds available for municipalities to complete bicycle or pedestrian plans and the deadline for submission is December. If any municipalities are considering submission, please contact him as soon as possible so that he can have the information ready for the October meeting.

7. Announcements

8. Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting was adjourned at 10:35am



Draft STIP Supplement

Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

2011 – 2020

August 2010

2011-2020 DRAFT STIP (HIGHWAY PROGRAM) FUNDING CATEGORIES

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS																			
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY/ SYSTEM	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH (MILES)	TOTAL PROJECT COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM											
								5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED FUTURE YEARS	
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020		
WAKE	NC 00	R-0000	* I-40 TO NC 96 EAST OF HOMETOWN. WIDEN TO A FOUR-LANE FACILITY WITH A BYPASS OF HOMETOWN ON NEW LOCATION. INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT PROJECT SEGMENTS A — I-40 TO NC 3 B — NC 3 TO SR 1003 C — SR 1003 TO NC 96. LOCATION / DESCRIPTION Project termini and a general work description. FUNDING See Highway or Public Transportation Funding Key for an explanation of funding categories used for each project phase.	7.3	63,450	250	NHS R 4,000 A NHS M 700 NHS U 1,500 NHS NHS NHS NHS NHS												
								PROJECT BREAKS											
								ESTIMATED COST Preliminary engineering, right of way, utility, mitigation and construction cost estimates by funding category in current dollars. Cost may include one or more funding types. Multi-year funding of a project segment indicates Cash-Flow Funding with proposed work type or activity beginning in the initial scheduled year.											
								UNFUNDED FUTURE COMMITMENTS PROJECT BREAK C											

WORK TYPE (ACTIVITIES)
A - Acquisition
AD - Administration
B - Booklets
C - Construction
CG - Construction (GARVEE)
CP - Capital
F - Feasibility Study
G - Grading and Structures
I - Inspections
L - Landscaping
M - Mitigation
MP - Mapping
N - Implementation
O - Operations
P - Paving
PE - Preliminary Engineering
R - Right of way
RG - Right of way (GARVEE)
S - Structures
SG - Signing
T - Training
U - Utilities

KEY TO HIGHWAY FUNDING SOURCES	
APD - Appalachian Development	NHS - National Highway System
BOND - Revenue Bond	NHS(E) - National Highway System E:
BRGI - Bridge Inspectio	NRT - National Recreation Trails
C - City	O - Others
CMAQ - Congestion Mitigation	PLF - Personal Automobile License Plate Funds
DOD - Department of Defense	RR - Rail-Highway Safety
DP - Discretionary or Demonstration	S - State
FA - Bridge Replacement On-Federal-Aid System	S(E) - State Exempt
FLPF - Federal Lands Program (Forest Highways)	SF - State Ferries
FLPI - Federal Lands Program (Indian Reservation Roads)	SG - Safety Grant
FLPP - Federal Lands Program (Park Roads)	S(M) - State Match
FLPR - Federal Lands Program (Refuge Roads)	S(5) - State (Highway) Tr
HES - High Hazard Safety	SRTS - Safe Routes to School
HFA - Highway Fund Appropriation	STHSR - Stimulus High Speed Rail
HP - Federal-Aid High Priority	STP - Surface Transportation Program
HRRR - High Risk Rural Roads	STP - Surface Transportation Program
IM - Interstate Maintenance	STPEB - Surface Transportation Program, Enhancements (Bike)
IM(E) - Interstate Maintenance Exempt	STPEL - Surface Transportation Program, Enhancements (Local)
IMPM - Interstate Preventative Maintenance	STPEP - Surface Transportation Program, Enhancements (Pedestrian)
L - Local Matching Share	STPER - Surface Transportation Program, Enhancements (Roadside)
MOB - Mobility Funds	T - Highway Trust Funds
NFA - Bridge Replacement Off-Federal-Aid System	T2001 - State Rail Funds
NFAM - Municipal Bridge Replacement Program	TIFIA - Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Loan

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																														
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM										DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM										UNFUNDED		
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS												
INTERSTATE PROJECTS																														
DUPLIN NEW HANOVER PENDER SAMPSON	I-40	I-5203	INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE PRESERVATION FOR DIVISION 3.		5230		IMPM	C	523	C	523	C	523	C	523	C	523	C	523	C	523	C	523	C	523					
NEW HANOVER PENDER	I-40	I-5357	SOUTH OF NC 210 (MILE MARKER 408.6) IN PENDER COUNTY TO END OF I-40 (MILE MARKER 420) IN NEW HANOVER COUNTY. PAVEMENT REHABILITATION.	11.3	8600		IMPM												C	8600										
NEW HANOVER	I-140	I-5301	MARKET STREET TO I-40. PAVEMENT REHABILITATION.	6.0	2000		IMPM												C	2000										
NEW HANOVER	I-140	I-5325	I-40 TO US 421. PAVEMENT REHABILITATION.	6.0	2000		IMPM													C	2000									
RURAL PROJECTS																														
BRUNSWICK	US 17-74-76	R-3601	NC 133-SR 1472 INTERCHANGE TO THE US 421-NC 133 INTERCHANGE. ADD ADDITIONAL LANES ON NORTH AND SOUTHBOUND LANES AND WIDEN BRIDGE NO. 107 AND BRIDGE NO. 108.	1.5	18931	372	NHS			R	200																			
							NHS			U	100																			
							NHS			M	359																			
							NHS					C	17900																	
PLANNING/DESIGN IN PROGRESS																														
NEW HANOVER PENDER	US 17	R-3300*	HAMPSTEAD BYPASS, US 17 TO US 17 NORTH OF HAMPSTEAD. CONSTRUCT MULTI-LANE FACILITY ON NEW LOCATION.	14.0	219000		T													R	20000									
							T																				C	199000		
PLANNING/DESIGN IN PROGRESS																														
BRUNSWICK	SR 1472 VILLAGE DRIVE	R-4002	WEST OF SR 1437 (OLD FAYETTEVILLE ROAD) TO EAST OF US 17 INTERCHANGE RAMP WITH DUAL LEFT TURN LANES ON NORTH RAMP TO US 17. WIDEN TO MULTI-LANES.	0.9	11285	11285																								
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																														
BRUNSWICK	SR 1472 VILLAGE DRIVE	R-4063	WEST OF SR 1437 (OLD FAYETTEVILLE ROAD) TO SR 1438 (LANVALE ROAD). WIDEN TO MULTI-LANES.	3.4	21548	536	STP			R	3850																			
							STP			U	1500																			
							STP					M	162																	
							STP									C	15500													
PLANNING/DESIGN IN PROGRESS																														

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																												
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM										DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED					
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS										
RURAL PROJECTS																												
BRUNSWICK DARE NEW HANOVER	VARIOUS	M-0389	STORMWATER PILOT PROGRAM, DARE, NEW HANOVER AND BRUNSWICK COUNTIES. DEVELOP NEW AND INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND FILTERING MECHANISMS TO "CLEAN UP" DISCHARGES FROM NCDOT MAINTAINED OUTFALLS AND ASSOCIATED OUTLETS.		15000	15000																						
IN PROGRESS																												
NEW HANOVER	SR 1573 DOW ROAD	R-4708	US 421 (LAKE PARK BOULEVARD) IN CAROLINA BEACH TO US 421 (FORT FISHER BOULEVARD) IN KURE BEACH. WIDEN TO MULTI-LANES.	3.9	23400		STP															R	4700		R	4700		
							STP																		C	14000		
BRUNSWICK NEW HANOVER	WILMINGTON I-140/US 17	R-2633*	WILMINGTON BYPASS, US 17 SOUTH OF NC 87 IN BRUNSWICK COUNTY TO I-40 IN NEW HANOVER COUNTY. FOUR LANE DIVIDED FREEWAY ON NEW LOCATION.	20.2	625236	397570	NHS	CG	3405	AA	CG	3405	AA	CG	3405	AA	CG	3405	AA	CG	3405	AA	CG	3405	AA	CG	3405	AA
							NHS	C	15333	AA	C	15333	AA															
							S(M)	C	3450	AA	C	3450	AA															
							T					G	9467	BA	G	9467	BA	G	9466	BA								
							T																					
							T																					
AA NC 87 SOUTH OF BISHOP TO US 74-76 EAST OF MALMO IN BRUNSWICK COUNTY - UNDER CONSTRUCTION.																												
AB NC 87 SOUTH OF BISHOP TO US 74-76 EAST OF MALMO IN BRUNSWICK COUNTY - UNDER CONSTRUCTION.																												
BA US 74-76 EAST OF MALMO IN BRUNSWICK COUNTY TO SR 1430 (CEDAR HILL ROAD) - RIGHT OF WAY IN PROGRESS.																												
BB SR 1430 (CEDAR HILL ROAD) TO US 421 NORTH OF WILMINGTON - RIGHT OF WAY IN PROGRESS.																												
BC US 74-76 EAST OF MALMO IN BRUNSWICK COUNTY TO US 421 NORTH OF WILMINGTON.																												
CA WEST OF US 421 NORTH OF WILMINGTON TO WEST OF US 117-NC 133 - COMPLETE.																												
CB WEST OF US 117-NC 133 TO EAST OF NC 132 - COMPLETE.																												
CC EAST OF NC 132 TO EAST OF I-40 SOUTH OF CASTLE HAYNE - COMPLETE.																												
PLANNING/DESIGN IN PROGRESS; GARVEE BOND FUNDING \$31.05 MILLION; PAYBACK FY 2010-2021																												
URBAN PROJECTS																												
BRUNSWICK	US 74-76	U-3337	SR 1437 (OLD FAYETTEVILLE ROAD). CONVERT GRADE SEPARATION TO AN INTERCHANGE.		8200	500	NHS															R	700					
							NHS																			C	7000	
PLANNING/DESIGN IN PROGRESS																												
NEW HANOVER	SR 1411 WRIGHTSVILLE AVENUE	U-4733	SR 2313 (WILSHIRE BOULEVARD) TO FOREST HILLS DRIVE. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS.	0.5	7657	7657																						
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																												
NEW HANOVER	NEW ROUTE	U-4751*	SR 1409 (MILITARY CUTOFF ROAD) TO US 17. MULTI-LANES ON NEW LOCATION.	4.0	69820	6720	T								R	9050		R	9050									
							T																					
PLANNING/DESIGN IN PROGRESS																												

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														
URBAN PROJECTS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
NEW HANOVER	US 17 BUSINESS MARKET STREET	U-4902	COLONIAL DRIVE TO SR 1402 (PORTERS NECK ROAD). ACCESS MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS.	8.6	11294	1294	NHS				C	2600	C																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																						
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED				
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS				
URBAN PROJECTS																						
NEW HANOVER	WILMINGTON	U-3338	SR 1175 (KERR AVENUE), RANDALL PARKWAY TO SR 2649 (MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PARKWAY). WIDEN TO MULTI-LANES.	3.2	74982	2666	STP	R	17810	B												
							STP	U	774													
							STP				M	67										
							STP						C	16300	B							
							STP															
							STP											R	4057	C		
							STP											U	152	C		
							STP															
							B	RANDALL PARKWAY TO SR 2649 (MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PARKWAY).														
							C	SR 1175 (KERR AVENUE) INTERCHANGE AT SR 2649 (MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PARKWAY).														
							PLANNING/DESIGN IN PROGRESS															
NEW HANOVER	WILMINGTON	U-4718	US 76 (OLEANDER DRIVE) AND NC 132 (COLLEGE ROAD). INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS.		40543	1842	S		C	250	B											
							NHS															
							NHS															
							NHS															
							NHS															
							A	RESURFACING - UNDER CONSTRUCTION.														
							B	DRAINAGE WORK - UNDER CONSTRUCTION.														
							PLANNING/DESIGN IN PROGRESS															
BRUNSWICK	WILMINGTON	U-4738*	US 17 TO INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD-CAROLINA BEACH ROAD INTERSECTION. CONSTRUCT A NEW FACILITY WITH STRUCTURE OVER THE CAPE FEAR RIVER.	9.5	1108119	4219	O															
NEW HANOVER	NEW ROUTE						O															
							O															
							PROGRAMMED FOR PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY ONLY - PROJECT CURRENTLY UNDER STUDY BY THE NORTH CAROLINA TURNPIKE AUTHORITY															
NEW HANOVER	WILMINGTON	U-4920	RANDALL PARKWAY, INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD-COVIL AVENUE TO SOUTH COLLEGE ROAD.		7643	7643																
							UNDER CONSTRUCTION BY CITY															
FEASIBILITY STUDIES																						
BRUNSWICK	US 17	FS-0803A	PROPOSED I-140 TO NC 133 (VILLAGE ROAD). ADD ADDITIONAL LANES.	6.0																		
							FEASIBILITY STUDY IN PROGRESS															
NEW HANOVER	US 17	FS-0803B	I-140 TO NC 50 IN ONSLOW COUNTY. ADD ADDITIONAL LANES.	18.5																		
ONSLOW																						
PENDER																						
							FEASIBILITY STUDY IN PROGRESS															
NEW HANOVER	US 421 (CAROLINA BEACH ROAD)	FS-1003B	SANDERS ROAD TO NC 132 (COLLEGE ROAD). WIDEN ROADWAY.																			
							SCHEDULED FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY															

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																			UNFUNDED																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					FUTURE YEARS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
FEDERAL BRIDGE PROJECTS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
NEW HANOVER	NC 133	B-4590	SMITH CREEK. REPLACE BRIDGE NO. 29		4519	9	FA																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																		
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS
MITIGATION PROJECTS																		
BRUNSWICK DUPLIN NEW HANOVER ONSLOW PENDER SAMPSON	VARIOUS	EE-4903	ECOSYSTEMS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR DIVISION 3 PROJECT MITIGATION.		5022	5022												
IN PROGRESS																		
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS																		
NEW HANOVER	WILMINGTON	EB-5121	EAST COAST GREENWAY. CONSTRUCT GREENWAY.		2000	2000												
								A 17TH STREET - JOHN D. BARRY ROAD TO HALYBURTON PARK AND GEORGE ANDERSON DRIVE TO MUSEUM DRIVE - UNDER CONSTRUCTION										
								B INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD, CONVERSE DRIVE TO PARK AVENUE; ROSEMONT AVENUE, WILSHIRE BOULEVARD TO END OF ROSEMONT - UNDER CONSTRUCTION										
ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS																		
NEW HANOVER	CAROLINA BEACH	E-4914	CAROLINA BEACH AVENUE, HARPER AVENUE TO SANDPIPER LANE AND CANAL DRIVE, SEAGULL LANE TO VIRGINIA AVENUE. CONSTRUCT MULTI-USE FACILITY.		270	270												
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																		
NEW HANOVER	WILMINGTON	E-4749	CONSTRUCT A BIKE PATH CONNECTING THE RIVER TO SEA BIKEWAY TO THE EASTWOOD ROAD PATH.		185	185												
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																		
NEW HANOVER	WILMINGTON	E-4516	US 74 (EASTWOOD ROAD), SR 1409 (MILITARY CUTOFF ROAD) TO CARDINAL LANE. CONSTRUCT MULTI-USE TRAIL.		435	435												
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																		
FERRY PROJECTS																		
BRUNSWICK CARTERET NEW HANOVER	VARIOUS	F-5301	CEDAR ISLAND, SOUTHPORT AND FORT FISHER DOCKS. REPLACE DOLPHINS.		1150		NHS									C	1150	
HAZARD ELIMINATION PROJECTS																		
NEW HANOVER	US 421 (CAROLINA BEACH ROAD)	W-5103	GEORGE ANDERSON ROAD TO SR 1100 (RIVER ROAD). VARIOUS SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS.	7.8	2519	2519												
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																		

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
HAZARD ELIMINATION PROJECTS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
BRUNSWICK	NC 133 RIVER ROAD	SF-4903C	SR 1551 (BLACKWELL ROAD/MAIN STREET) TO US 74-76 IN BELVILLE. VARIOUS SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS.	0.1	96	96	UNDER CONSTRUCTION																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																													
NEW HANOVER	NC 133	W-5306	US 117-NC 132 IN CASTLE HAYNE. CONSTRUCT A ROUNDABOUT.		1240		HES	R	40																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																		
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS
INTERSTATE PROJECTS																		
STATEWIDE	I-95	M-0412	CORRIDORS OF THE FUTURE PROGRAM. INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE DISCRETIONARY FUNDS (IMD) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO I-95 FROM FLORIDA TO VIRGINIA. NORTH CAROLINA TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO ADJOINING STATES UNDER TERMS OF AN AGREEMENT.		16800	16800												
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	I-9999	IM BALANCE.	0.0														
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	I-9998	INTERSTATE PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE.															
IN PROGRESS																		
RURAL PROJECTS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	M-0405	STATEWIDE MOWING MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS FOR PROPERTIES ACQUIRED BY NCDOT IN ADVANCE OF STIP PROJECTS.		1372	372	S	N	100	N	100	N	100	N	100	N	100	
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	M-0281	CENTER FOR TRANSPORTATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT	0.0	1500	1500												
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	M-0360	DESIGN SERVICES, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING FOR MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS.		15980	5980	S	PE	1000	PE	1000	PE	1000	PE	1000	PE	1000	
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	M-0376	STATEWIDE GEOTECHNICAL STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS PROJECT TO COVER NON-PROJECT SPECIFIC WORK.		14900	5900	S	PE	900	PE	900	PE	900	PE	900	PE	900	
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	M-0377	ENVIRONMENTAL STREAMLINING. COORDINATE, PLAN, FACILITATE, IMPLEMENT AND TRACK INITATIVES.		3000	3000												
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	M-0391	STRUCTURE DESIGN, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING FOR MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS		6978	2978	S	PE	400	PE	400	PE	400	PE	400	PE	400	
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	M-0392	HYDRAULICS, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING FOR MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS.		2800	1200	S	PE	160	PE	160	PE	160	PE	160	PE	160	
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-4701	TRAFFIC SYSTEM OPERATIONS PROGRAM (SIGNAL MAINTENANCE).		375230	175230	STP	C	20000	C	20000	C	20000	C	20000	C	20000	
IN PROGRESS																		

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																							
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM										DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS					
RURAL PROJECTS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-4500	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.		10000		S	C	5000	C	5000												
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-2929	NATIONAL PARKS SERVICE SPOT SAFETY AND SIGN REHABILITATION.	0.0	1000		FLPP	C	100	C	100	C	100	C	100	C	100	C	100				
UNDER CONSTRUCTION BY FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-4436	NPDES PERMIT, RETROFIT FOURTEEN SITES PER YEAR TO PROTECT WATER QUALITY.		41878	16878	STP	N	2500	N	2500	N	2500	N	2500	N	2500	N	2500				
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-4067	POSITIVE GUIDANCE PROGRAM (PAVEMENT MARKINGS AND MARKERS, LED SIGNAL HEAD REPLACEMENT)		103412	63412	STP	C	4000	C	4000	C	4000	C	4000	C	4000	C	4000				
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-4066	WETLAND RESTORATION PROGRAM. COMPLETION OF WATERSHED ASSESSMENT PLANS IN ALL SEVENTEEN (17) RIVER BASINS TO IDENTIFY WETLAND AND STREAM RESTORATION PROJECTS FOR MITIGATION.		17500	17500																	
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-8888	STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR TRAFFIC FORECASTING, PRE-TIP PLANNING AND PURPOSE AND NEED STUDIES.		1494	494	S	F	100	F	100	F	100	F	100	F	100	F	100				
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-2930	NATIONAL PARKS SERVICE EMERGENCY PAVEMENT REHABILITATION.	0.0	700		FLPP	C	70	C	70	C	70	C	70	C	70	C	70				
UNDER CONSTRUCTION BY FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-4454	IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS THAT FURTHER ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT IN SMALL URBAN AND RURAL AREAS.		47000	47000																	
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-4049	TRAFFIC OPERATIONS (INCIDENT MANAGEMENT, 511, SMARTLINK, TEC, TMC)	0.0	230792	100792	IM	C	9750	C	9750	C	9750	C	9750	C	9750	C	9750				
							NHS	C	3250	C	3250	C	3250	C	3250	C	3250	C	3250				
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-4073	ASPHALT MATERIALS TESTING LABORATORIES CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN FOR GROUNDWATER CLEAN-UP AT 54 SITES.		22632	12632	STP	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000				
IN PROGRESS																							

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

								STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM										DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
RURAL PROJECTS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	R-9999WM	ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION.		178681	61631		NHS	M	50		M	1500		M	1500		M	1500		M	8500																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																																		
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM										DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED											
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS																
FEDERAL BRIDGE PROJECTS																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	BR-5100	REHABILITATE BRIDGES AT SELECTED LOCATIONS.		150000		FA										C	25000		C	25000		C	25000		C	25000		C	25000				
SCHEDULED FOR PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY ONLY																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	M-0418	STORM WATER RUNOFF. RESEARCH, DESIGN, CONSTRUCT, MAINTAIN AND MONITOR STORM WATER DRAINAGE FROM 50 BRIDGES OVER WATERWAYS. (HB 2346, SECTION 25.18)		5860	5860																												
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	M-0379	SCOUR EVALUATION PROGRAM OF EXISTING BRIDGES.		3100	3100																												
IN PROGRESS																																		
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	EB-5130	BICYCLE MAPS AND ROUTES. REVISE, UPDATE, REPRINT MAPS AND SIGN ROUTES.		600		STPEB	MP	5	A	MP	5	A	MP	5	A	MP	5	A	MP	5	A	MP	5	A	MP	5	A	MP	5	A	MP	5	A
							STPEB	MP	5	B	MP	5	B	MP	5	B	MP	5	B	MP	5	B	MP	5	B	MP	5	B	MP	5	B	MP	5	B
							STPEB	MP	50	C	MP	50	C	MP	50	C	MP	50	C	MP	50	C	MP	50	C	MP	50	C	MP	50	C	MP	50	C
A NORTH CAROLINA BICYCE HIGHWAY MAPS.																																		
B LOCAL BICYCLE MAPS.																																		
C URBAN, REGIONAL AND COUNTY BICYCLE MAPS.																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	EB-2956	STATEWIDE BICYCLE PROGRAM.	0.0	13645	8645	STPEB	C	500		C	500		C	500		C	500		C	500		C	500		C	500		C	500		C	500	
IN PROGRESS																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	EB-2966	SAFETY-EDUCATION PROJECTS.	0.0	670	420	STPEB	B	25		B	25		B	25		B	25		B	25		B	25		B	25		B	25		B	25	
IN PROGRESS																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	EB-4012	NORTH CAROLINA BICYCLING HIGHWAYS NO. 10 (SANDHILLS SECTOR): MAPPING AND SIGNING.	0.0																														
DELETED - WORK TO BE ACCOMPLISHED UNDER EB-3120																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	EB-4013	SPOT IMPROVEMENTS: SHORT PAVEMENT SECTIONS, BICYCLE RACKS AND SIGNING NEEDS.	0.0	3830	2830	STPEB	C	100		C	100		C	100		C	100		C	100		C	100		C	100		C	100		C	100	
IN PROGRESS																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	EB-4411	ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS FOR BICYCLE SAFETY ON STATE AND LOCAL DESIGNATED BIKE ROUTES.		9880	7880	STPEB	C	200		C	200		C	200		C	200		C	200		C	200		C	200		C	200		C	200	
IN PROGRESS																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	EB-3314	STATEWIDE PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES PROGRAM.	0.0	5600	4100	STPEP	C	150		C	150		C	150		C	150		C	150		C	150		C	150		C	150		C	150	
IN PROGRESS																																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	EB-5118	STATEWIDE BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITY DEVELOPMENT.		3331	3331																												
IN PROGRESS																																		

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																			UNFUNDED																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM										DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					FUTURE YEARS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	EB-9999	BIKE-PEDESTRIAN BALANCE		30000		STPEB									C	5000			C	5000																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		</

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

								STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
CONGESTION MITIGATION PROJECTS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
STATEWIDE	NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY	C-4902	NCSU, NORTH CAROLINA SOLAR CENTER CLEAN TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM. DEVELOP AND ADMINISTER A SEVEN YEAR CLEAN FUEL-ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY REBATE PROGRAM IN ALL CMAQ ELIGIBLE COUNTIES TO REDUCE EMISSIONS.		10378	1600	CMAQ O					N	1384		N	1386		N	1411		N	1413		N	1428																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																														
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM										DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM										UNFUNDED		
								FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016		FY 2017		FY 2018		FY 2019		FY 2020		FUTURE YEARS		
ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS (ROADSIDE)																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	ER-3102	IMPLEMENTATION OF STATEWIDE SCENIC BYWAYS PROGRAM.	0.0	1781	1031	STPEL	N	75	N	75	N	75	N	75	N	75	N	75	N	75	N	75	N	75	N	75			
IN PROGRESS																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	ER-3101	SPECIAL EVENTS PLANTING STATEWIDE.	0.0	13429	9429	STPEL	L	400	L	400	L	400	L	400	L	400	L	400	L	400	L	400	L	400	L	400			
IN PROGRESS																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	ER-3100	PLANTING OF WILDFLOWERS AND PERENNIAL BULBS ON FEDERAL-AID SYSTEM.	0.0	17849	11849	STPEL	L	600	L	600	L	600	L	600	L	600	L	600	L	600	L	600	L	600	L	600			
IN PROGRESS																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	ER-2973	ROADSIDE BEAUTIFICATION PROJECTS IN ALL FOURTEEN HIGHWAY DIVISIONS.	0.0	62993	32993	STPEL	L	3000	L	3000	L	3000	L	3000	L	3000	L	3000	L	3000	L	3000	L	3000	L	3000			
IN PROGRESS																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	ER-2971	SIDEWALK PROGRAM IN ALL FOURTEEN HIGHWAY DIVISIONS.	0.0	27358	13358	STPER	C	1400	C	1400	C	1400	C	1400	C	1400	C	1400	C	1400	C	1400	C	1400	C	1400			
IN PROGRESS																														
STATEWIDE	BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY	ER-3817	SCENIC ENHANCEMENT AND VIEWSHED PROTECTION.	101.4	2200	2200																								
IN ACQUISITION																														
HAZARD ELIMINATION PROJECTS																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	SI-4902	FREEWAY SIGNING INITIATIVE. INSTALL OR REPLACE CRITICAL DIRECTIONAL SIGNS.		200	200																								
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	SI-4901	NO NEED 2 SPEED SAFETY INITIATIVE. SIGNING, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION.		280	280																								
IMPLEMENTATION IN PROGRESS																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	SI-4900	BLUE STAR MEMORIAL HIGHWAY SIGNING. INSTALL SIGNS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS STATEWIDE.		250	250																								
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	SI-4735	SAFETY MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES.		1107	1107																								
IN PROGRESS																														
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	W-4715	POSITIVE MEDIAN BARRIER PROJECTS.		9000		HES	C	500	C	500	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000			
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	W-9999	HIGH HAZARD BALANCE, FISCAL YEARS 11-15.	0.0	117000		HES									C	19500	C	19500	C	19500	C	19500	C	19500	C	19500			

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

								STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM															
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM						DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM						UNFUNDED			
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS					
HAZARD ELIMINATION PROJECTS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	W-5301	LANE DEPARTURE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENTS.		50000		HES	C	5000	C	5000	C	5000	C	5000	C	5000	C	5000				
STATEWIDE																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	W-4716	MEDIAN INLET REPLACEMENT PROJECT.																				
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	W-4714	RUMBLE STRIPS, SHOULDERS, ROADSIDE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS, AUXILIARY TURN LANES, RAISED PAVEMENT MARKERS AND PROFILE PAVEMENT MARKINGS.		10050	50	HES	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000				
STATEWIDE																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	W-4447	SAFETY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, PROJECT IDENTIFICATION, ANALYSIS AND PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING.		75829	23829	HES	PE	5200	PE	5200	PE	5200	PE	5200	PE	5200	PE	5200				
STATEWIDE																							
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	W-5300	SIGNAL RETIMING TO IMPROVE SAFETY.		10000		HES	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000				
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	SR-5000	SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM. EDUCATIONAL, TRAINING AND OTHER NON-INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS.		1925	925	SRTS	N	100	N	100	N	100	N	100	N	100	N	100				
STATEWIDE																							
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	SR-5001	SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM. PROJECTS TO IMPROVE SAFETY, REDUCE TRAFFIC, FUEL COMSUMPTION AND AIR POLLUTION IN VICINITY OF SCHOOLS.		45307	1307	SRTS	R	400	R	400	R	400	R	400	R	400	R	400				
								SRTS	C	4000	C	4000	C	4000	C	4000	C	4000	C	4000			
IN PROGRESS																							
PASSENGER RAIL PROJECTS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-3809	RAILROAD SAFETY INSPECTIONS IN ALL FOURTEEN (14) DIVISIONS.		5810	4310	RR	I	50	I	50	I	50	I	50	I	50	I	50				
								T2001	I	100	I	100	I	100	I	100	I	100	I	100			
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-4702	MAINTENANCE OF RAILROAD TRACK AND SIGNAL IMPROVEMENTS.		14130	5730	T2001	C	840	C	840	C	840	C	840	C	840	C	840				
IN PROGRESS																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-5202	ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES FOR RAIL CAPITAL PROJECTS.		19251		T2001	C	1750	C	1787	C	1824	C	1863	C	1902	C	2110				
STATEWIDE																							
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-4701	CAPACITY AND TRAVEL TIME IMPROVEMENTS TO FREIGHT AND PASSENGER RAIL CORRIDORS, NEW EQUIPMENT AND MATCH FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.		173118	98518	T2001	C	7460	C	7460	C	7460	C	7460	C	7460	C	7460				
							A RESTORE DOUBLE TRACK TO HOSKINS - UNDER CONSTRUCTION.																
PART UNDER CONSTRUCTION																							

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																			UNFUNDED		
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					FUTURE YEARS			
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS			
PASSENGER RAIL PROJECTS																					
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-4700	RAILROAD STATION REHABILITATION PROJECTS.		6900	6900															
IN PROGRESS																					
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-4404	SOUTHEAST HIGH SPEED RAIL CORRIDOR. UPDATE RAIL CROSSING INVENTORY FROM SOUTH CAROLINA STATE LINE TO THE VIRGINIA STATE LINE VIA RALEIGH AND CHARLOTTE AND THE APEX/CARY BYPASS SEGMENT.		150	150															
IN PROGRESS																					
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-4001	RAIL INDUSTRIAL ACCESS PROGRAM.	0.0	19000	9000	T2001	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000		
IN PROGRESS																					
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-3814	CROSSING CONSOLIDATION PROJECTS AS IDENTIFIED IN SOUTH END SEHSRC TRAFFIC SEPARATION STUDY. RIGHT OF WAY TO BE ACQUIRED BY MUNICIPALITIES.	0.0	597	597															
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																					
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-3419	SEALED CORRIDOR-SELECTED SEHSRC CROSSINGS. MEDIAN BARRIERS, ARTICULATED GATES, FOUR- QUADRANT GATES, WARNING DEVICE REVISIONS, SIGNAGE AND CAMERA SYSTEMS.	0.0	12307	12307															
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																					
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-5003	SOUTHEASTERN NORTH CAROLINA PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE, RALEIGH TO WILMINGTON VIA FAYETTEVILLE.		132357	2356	T2001												C 130001		
RIGHT OF WAY IN PROGRESS																					
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-5004	SOUTHEASTERN NORTH CAROLINA PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE, RALEIGH TO WILMINGTON VIA GOLDSBORO.		192087	3086	T2001												C 189001		
RIGHT OF WAY IN PROGRESS																					
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-3418	PLANNING, MANAGEMENT AND RESEARCH STUDIES.	0.0	14367	6367	T2001	F	800	F	800	F	800	F	800	F	800	F	800		
IN PROGRESS																					
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-3309	AT-GRADE CROSSING ELIMINATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, CORRIDOR INVENTORIES AND STUDIES IN ALL FOURTEEN (14) DIVISIONS.	0.0	9452	6452	RR	C	150	C	150	C	150	C	150	C	150	C	150		
IN PROGRESS																					

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM																		
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM					DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					UNFUNDED
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS
PASSENGER RAIL PROJECTS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	P-3815	CROSSING CONSOLIDATION PROJECTS AS IDENTIFIED IN NEWTON-HICKORY-CONOVER MPO TRAFFIC SEPARATION STUDY.	0.0	1620	1620												
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	Y-4100	HIGHWAY-RAIL CROSSINGS SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AND INVENTORY PASSENGER ROUTES.		15384	5384	RR	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	
UNDER CONSTRUCTION																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	Y-9999	HIGHWAY-RAIL CROSSING SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS, PASSENGER ROUTES.		13215	8315	RR	C	490	C	490	C	490	C	490	C	490	
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	Y-4415	HIGHWAY-RAIL CROSSING INVENTORY.		3075	2575	RR	C	50	C	50	C	50	C	50	C	50	
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	Y-4800	TRAFFIC SEPARATION STUDY IMPLEMENTATION AND CLOSURES.		17285	17285												
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	Z-4100	HIGHWAY-RAIL CROSSING SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AND INVENTORY.		9000	9000												
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	Z-5200	HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE CROSSING SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS.															
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	VARIOUS	Z-9999	HIGHWAY-RAIL CROSSING SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS.		90511	25511	RR	C	6500	C	6500	C	6500	C	6500	C	6500	
IN PROGRESS																		
STATEWIDE	CSX	P-5005	HIGH PRIORITY NORTH-SOUTH RAIL CORRIDOR OF THE FUTURE.		25975	950	STHSR	PE	425	A								
							STHSR	R	503	A								
							STHSR	C	5326	A								
							STHSR	PE	430	B								
							STHSR	R	400	B								
							STHSR	C	5941	B								
							T2001	C	4000									
							O	C	8000									
A PIEDMONT CORRIDOR - CSXT MP A 101.0 (ENFIELD CROSSING).																		
B PIEDMONT CORRIDOR - CSXT MP A 115.9 (ARMSTRONG CROSSING).																		
STATEWIDE	NCRR	P-3414	TRAVEL TIME IMPROVEMENTS TO FREIGHT AND PASSENGER RAIL CORRIDORS BETWEEN RALEIGH AND CHARLOTTE AND MATCH FEDERAL FUNDS.	0.0	71500	61500	T2001	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	C	1000	
IN PROGRESS																		

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

STATEWIDE PROJECTS

FISCAL YEARS: TYPE OF WORK / ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS / PROJECT BREAKS

										STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM										UNFUNDED																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
COUNTY	ROUTE/CITY	ID NUMBER	LOCATION / DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	TOTAL PROJ COST (THOU)	PRIOR YEARS COST (THOU)	FUNDS	5 YEAR WORK PROGRAM										DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM					FUTURE YEARS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
								FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FUTURE YEARS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
PASSENGER RAIL PROJECTS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
STATEWIDE	NCRR-CSX	P-3819	FEDERALLY-DESIGNATED HIGH SPEED RAIL CORRIDOR BETWEEN CHARLOTTE AND VIRGINIA STATE LINE, ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY, DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.	260.0	16894	8746	T2001	R	1695																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														

* INDICATES INTRASTATE PROJECT

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

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE TOWN OF BELVILLE'S APPLICATION FOR THE
NCDOT 2011 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLANNING GRANT INITIATIVE**

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 Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization serves as the lead transportation planning agency to the municipalities in the Wilmington area; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization is committed to improving safety, protecting the environment and public health, and creating an opportunity for the surrounding communities to improve their quality of life through transportation and demand management; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation has made funds available for municipalities throughout the state to create bicycle and pedestrian plans through the NCDOT 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Belville recognizes the need to support and promote alternative modes of transportation throughout the town and region; and

WHEREAS, it is incumbent that the Town of Belville to ensure the safety and viability of these modes; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Belville recognizes the need for a town-wide comprehensive bicycle plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization endorses the Town of Belville's application for the NCDOT 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative for the development of a town-wide comprehensive bicycle plan.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Advisory Committee on October 27, 2010.

Jonathan Barfield Jr., Chair
Transportation Advisory Committee

Mike Kozlosky, Secretary

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

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE TOWN OF WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH'S APPLICATION
FOR THE
NCDOT 2011 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLANNING GRANT INITIATIVE**

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 Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization serves as the lead transportation planning agency to the municipalities in the Wilmington area; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization is committed to improving safety, protecting the environment and public health, and creating an opportunity for the surrounding communities to improve their quality of life through transportation and demand management; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation has made funds available for municipalities throughout the state to create bicycle and pedestrian plans through the NCDOT 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Wrightsville Beach recognizes the need to support and promote alternative modes of transportation throughout the town and region; and

WHEREAS, it is incumbent on the Town of Wrightsville Beach to ensure the safety and viability of these modes; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Wrightsville Beach recognizes the need for a town-wide comprehensive pedestrian plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization endorses the Town of Wrightsville Beach's application for the NCDOT 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative for the development of a town-wide comprehensive pedestrian plan.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Advisory Committee on October 27, 2010.

Jonathan Barfield Jr., Chair
Transportation Advisory Committee

Mike Kozlosky, Secretary

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTING CAPE FEAR COMMUTES 2035 TRANSPORTATION 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 N.C. Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS; the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization has established a comprehensive, cooperative and continuing (3-C) transportation planning process to develop an annual unified planning work program, 25-year long range transportation plan and Transportation Improvement Program to facilitate the expenditure of federal funds; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization has developed Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan to satisfy the requirements of the safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) as well as other federal state and local laws mandating a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning activities ; and

WHEREAS, *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan* is a product of a multi-modal, 3-C transportation planning process, compatible with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations long range vision; and

WHEREAS, *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan* is fiscally constrained; and

WHEREAS, *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan* was developed by the Cape Fear Commutes Citizen Advisory Committee in coordination with local elected and appointed officials, local municipal and county staff, service organizations, and the general public; and

WHEREAS, public comments were solicited at regular intervals during the planning process and a 30-day public comment period was held to receive comments on the plan.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Transportation Advisory Committee hereby adopts *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan*.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area MPO Transportation Advisory Committee on October 27, 2010.

Jonathan Barfield Jr., Chair
Transportation Advisory Committee

Mike Kozlosky, Secretary

NORTH CAROLINA'S MOBILITY FUND

Preliminary Report

October 1, 2010

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Scoring Option One – Needs-Based Approach

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

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

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

Scoring Option Two – Benefit-Cost Approach

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

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

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INTRODUCTION

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

According to § 136-188 of the Appropriations Act:

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

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

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

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

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

Timeline

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

COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS UNDERWAY TO DEVELOP THE PROJECT CRITERIA AND SELECTION PROCESS

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

Workgroup Involvement and Feedback

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

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

In addition, Internal Department staff includes:

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

See Appendix D for a list of Workgroup members.

Workgroup Meeting # 1 Summary

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

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

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

Workgroup Meeting # 2 Summary

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

Minimum Requirements for Mobility Fund projects

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

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

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

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

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

Public Involvement Process

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

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

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

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

Summary of Comments

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

★ = 1-4 comments

★ ★ = 5-8 comments

★ ★ ★ = 9-12 comments

★ ★ ★ ★ = 13-16 comments

Types of Projects

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

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

Scoring Related

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

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

Other Considerations

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

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

PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS FOR PROJECT SELECTION

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

Scoring Option One – Needs-Based Approach

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

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

Scoring Option Two – Benefit-Cost Approach

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

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

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

NEXT STEPS

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

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

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

APPENDICES

A – Public Comments (in their entirety)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B – Mobility Fund Legislation

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

ESTABLISH NC MOBILITY FUND

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

"Article 14A.

"North Carolina Mobility Fund.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"§ 105-187.9. Disposition of tax proceeds.

...

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

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

...

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

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

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

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

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

"§ 105-187.9. Disposition of tax proceeds.

...

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

(1) The sum of forty million dollars (\$40,000,000). twenty-six million dollars (\$26,000,000).

...

SL2010-0031 Session Law 2010-31 Page 157

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C – Congestion Relief & Intermodal 21st Century Transportation Fund

Also located at:

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

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

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

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

§ 136-251. Findings of fact.

The General Assembly finds that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Cities.

(2) Counties.

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

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

NC General Statutes - Chapter 136 Article 19 3

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

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

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

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

a. Relief of anticipated traffic congestion.

b. Improvement of air quality.

c. Reduction in anticipated energy consumption.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

§ 136-253. Grants to other units.

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

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

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

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

§ 136-254. Grant approval.

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

§ 136-255. Expenditure.

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

§ 136-256. Funds remain available until expended.

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

D – Workgroup Members

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



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

BEVERLY EAVES PERDUE
GOVERNOR

EUGENE A. CONTI, JR.
SECRETARY

September 23, 2010

Mike Kozlowski
City of Wilmington Development Services
102 North 3rd Street
Wilmington, NC 28401

Dear Mr. Kozlowski:

Subject: **Wilmington Multimodal Transit Center**, in Wilmington, New Hanover County, WBS# 42914

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Rail Division is evaluating the construction of a Wilmington Multimodal Transit Center (WMTC) in Wilmington, New Hanover County (see Figure 1). The WMTC will provide a facility for connections between various modes of transportation in central Wilmington.

The purpose of the WMTC is to serve as a centrally-located center that would optimize the interaction between local buses, intra-city buses, taxis, bicycles, pedestrians, and planned passenger rail service. The construction of the WMTC would encourage increased use of alternative travel modes.

The WMTC will accommodate the growing population in the Wilmington area. According to a recent transit study, the Wilmington urban area is expected to see a 75% increase in population between 2005 and 2035, with an 86% increase in employment. Within the City of Wilmington the population is projected to grow by 39% during this time period, with a 63% growth in employment. As the population of the region increases, this project is needed to combine rail with other transportation modes to improve the movement of passengers in the region.

Three previous studies have investigated the construction of the WMTC. Two studies; *The Wilmington Urban Area Multi-Modal Transportation Center Feasibility Study (2000)*, and the *Wilmington Multi-Modal Transportation Center Evaluation Report (2004)*, applied selection criteria to various sites, compared the sites to each other, and developed a recommendation on a preferred site.

The third study, *Transit Needs Study for the Wilmington Multi-Modal Transportation Center, 2009*, analyzed the proposed WMTC in context with other area plans, presented the views of downtown transportation stakeholders, considered functional requirements, site design considerations and conceptual site layouts.

MAILING ADDRESS:
NC DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
RAIL DIVISION
1553 MAIL SERVICE CENTER
RALEIGH NC 27699-1553

TELEPHONE: 919-733-7245
FAX: 919-715-6580

WEBSITE: www.bytrain.org

LOCATION:
TRANSPORTATION BUILDING
1 SOUTH WILMINGTON STREET
RALEIGH NC

Results of the studies performed over the past 10 years resulted in the identification of one location as the preferred development site (see Figure 2). Various site concepts are under consideration. This site is located 300-feet north of Red Cross Road, bounded on the north by Hanover Road, on the west by 3rd Street and on the east by 4th Street.

As a part of the scoping process we would appreciate any information you have that would be helpful in evaluating potential community and environmental impacts for this project. If applicable, please identify any permits and/or approvals required by your agency.

Please note that there will be no formal interagency scoping meeting for this project. This letter constitutes solicitation for scoping comments related to the project. It is desirable that you respond by **November 8, 2010**, so that your comments can be used in the preparation of a proposed Federally-funded Environmental Assessment in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The US Fish and Wildlife Service lists eight endangered and four threatened species for New Hanover County (updated August 5, 2010). The listed species include the following:

<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Scientific Name</i>	<i>Status</i>
Red-cockaded woodpecker	<i>Picoides borealis</i>	Endangered
Wood stork	<i>Mycteria Americana</i>	Endangered
Cooley's meadowrue	<i>Thalictrum cooleyi</i>	Endangered
Rough-leaved loosestrife	<i>Lysimachia asperulaefolia</i>	Endangered
West Indian manatee	<i>Trichechus manatus</i>	Endangered
Red wolf	<i>Canis rufus</i>	Endangered
Hawksbill sea turtle	<i>Eretmochelys imbricate</i>	Endangered
Leatherback sea turtle	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	Endangered
Piping Plover	<i>Charadrius melodus</i>	Threatened
Seabeach amaranth	<i>Amaranthus pumilus</i>	Threatened
Green sea turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	Threatened
Loggerhead sea turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	Threatened

Investigations will be conducted to determine if any endangered or threatened species are in the project study area.

The project area will also be reviewed to determine if the project will affect any properties that may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Thank you for assisting us in this study. If you require further information regarding the proposed action or the environmental analysis process, please contact me by phone at (919) 715-6684 or by email at rlwhite@ncdot.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ryan L. White". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ryan" being more prominent than the last name "White".

Ryan L. White, P.E.
Rail Project Development Engineer
NCDOT Rail Division
Environmental and Planning Branch

RW/wk
Attachments

0' 1000' 2000'



PREPARED FOR:

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



RAIL DIVISION

PREPARED BY:



MOFFATT & NICHOL

FIGURE 1 - LOCATION MAP

WILMINGTON MULTIMODAL TRANSIT CENTER

WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER COUNTY

SEPTEMBER 7, 2010



Figure 2 - Project Site
WILMINGTON MULTIMODAL TRANSIT CENTER
 Wilmington, New Hanover County
 September 7, 2010



Prepared by:
 molitor & nichol

***City of Wilmington/Wilmington MPO
Project Update
September 2010***

WILMINGTON BYPASS (No significant change)

Project Description/Scope: Construct the Wilmington Bypass from US 421 in New Hanover County to US 17 in Brunswick County.

Current Status: NCDOT has let the design and construction of the Wilmington Bypass Section “A” from US 17 to US 74/76 as a “design-build” project. They anticipate completing this section of the Bypass in 2013. NCDOT prepared an “*Urban Loop Prioritization Process*” that prioritized the 10 urban loops across the state. NCDOT released the results of the Urban Loop Prioritization Process in August. The Wilmington Bypass “Section B” is funded from FY 2013 through 2020.

Next Step: Work to identify potential funding to expedite construction of the Wilmington Bypass Section “B”. The projects expected completion date is 2020

CAPE FEAR COMMUTES 2035 TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Project Description/Scope: Cape Fear Commutes 2035 is a federally-mandated assessment of the current and future transportation needs of people and goods within the Wilmington MPO area. Cape Fear Commutes 2035 will create a long range transportation plan with recommendations for how those needs should be addressed over the next 25 years.

Current Status: The MPO committee charged with crafting the Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan has finalized the draft plan. Comments were received during the 30-day public comment period and staff met with the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) on August 18th. Staff is addressing the comments in the final plan.

Next Step: Staff anticipates presenting the final plan to the TAC in October and potentially to City Council in December.

CAPE FEAR SKYWAY

Project Description/Scope: Construct the Cape Fear Skyway that will link from in the vicinity of US 17 to Independence Boulevard and Carolina Beach Road.

Current Status: On August 18th the maps for the proposed northern alignment were presented to the Wilmington MPO’s Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC endorsed a resolution that encourages New Hanover County, City of Wilmington, Brunswick County and Town of Leland to utilize North Carolina General Statute 136-44.50 to file a Transportation Corridor Official map for the proposed Cape Fear Skyway. The Town of Leland has schedule a public hearing for October 30, 2010 to discuss the filing of the Transportation Official Corridor map.

Next Step: Work with New Hanover and Brunswick counties, Town of Leland and City of Wilmington to preserve a corridor for the future Cape Fear Skyway from Independence Boulevard/Carolina Beach Road intersection to a location in the vicinity of US 17 and the Wilmington Bypass in Brunswick County. Work with North Carolina delegation to provide the necessary “gap” funding for the construction of the Cape Fear Skyway.

CITY OF WILMINGTON COLLECTOR STREET PLAN

Project Description/Scope: Complete a city-wide area collector street plan for the City of Wilmington including Monkey Junction.

Current Status: The Wilmington MPO has selected Stantec to complete the City of Wilmington Collector Street Plan. Staff has developed a scope of services and fee.

FIT COMMUNITY 2009 GRANT

Project Description/Scope: Submit a designation and grant application to the Fit Community 2009 grant program.

Current Status: The Ann Street Bicycle Boulevard is officially open and grant-funded promotional activities will continue as planned until September 2010. The final ride was held on September 18th.

Next Step: Let the Ann Street at South 5th Avenue intersection improvement project for bid in September, with construction to begin later in the fall.

5TH AVENUE PAVEMENT MARKING PLAN

Current Status: Kimley-Horn and Associates was hired to complete the design. The City has received and commented on the 90% design plans. Staff completed the data collection and a signal warrant analysis at the intersections of 5th Avenue/Grace, 5th/Princess, 5th/Chestnut and 5th/Red Cross. It has been determined the signals do not meet the traffic warrants; however, staff is currently reviewing the site distances.

Next Step: Complete the site distance analysis. Receive the 100% design plans. Bid and construct the revised pavement markings.

GARY SHELL CROSS-CITY TRAIL

Current Status: Construction on Phase I will be completed by the end of September. Construction on Phase II will be completed by the end of September. (A recommended cross-section and alignment along Mallard Street, Rill Road and Teal Street was approved by City Council on August 3rd). Kimley-Horn Associates, Inc. has completed design and permitting for Phases IIIA and IIIG. NCDOT has signed the municipal agreement and all necessary documentation has been submitted to FHWA.

Next Step: Phase IIIA and IIIG will be let for bid later in the fall.

MARKET STREET CORRIDOR PLAN

Project Description/Scope: Develop a corridor plan for Market Street from Colonial Drive to the Pender County line.

Current Status: The Wilmington MPO has received the final Market Street Corridor plan.

Next Step: Hold a joint City/County Planning Commission meeting in October and present the corridor plan to City Council, County Commissioners and Transportation Advisory Committee in January.

N. 3RD STREET CORRIDOR STREETScape IMPROVEMENTS

Project Description/Scope: In May 2006, a transportation bond referendum was approved that included \$5 million in improvements to the North 3rd Street corridor.

Current Status: The City has received the 100% final design plans and the 100% opinion of probable costs. Staff has worked with Cape Fear Public Utility Authority (CFPUA) to develop an Inter-local Agreement for the construction of the improvements along North 3rd Street.

Next Step: Bid the construction of the North 3rd Street improvements by the end of the year.

MASONBORO LOOP/MASONBORO SOUND/PINE GROVE

Project Description/Scope: Realign the intersection of Masonboro Loop/Masonboro Sound and Pine Grove Drive.

Current Status: The encroachment permit is in hand. The deeds for additional right-of-way have been secured from owners by the Attorney's Office. The negotiations are underway with the utility companies for their relocation. The project has been bid, however the bids were rejected

Next Step: Rebid the project and begin construction.

NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Project Description/Scope: Construct neighborhood traffic management improvements in the Pine valley East neighborhood.

Current Status: Due to funding, transportation planning staff was forced to prioritize the neighborhood traffic management improvements in Pine Valley East. The City opened and the low bidder was Barnhill Construction. The PO was approved by the City Council.

Next Step: The City will begin construction of the identified improvements in Pine Valley East on October 4th.

RANDALL PARKWAY

Project Description/Scope: Widen Randall Parkway from South College Road to Independence Boulevard.

Current Status: The consultant (WK Dickson) is finalizing the design. Property Acquisition continues, with offer letters being sent to parcel owners as appraisals and review appraisals are complete. Plats showing the existing and proposed ROW acquisition have been recorded. The environmental permitting is commencing.

Next Step: The City expects to solicit bids in late 2010, with construction expected to commence early 2011.

SAFELIGHT

Current Status: Seven of 13 sites upgraded to ATS technology, 3 sites have NCDOT permits for upgrade, the last three sites need new or revised plans to complete upgrade of system. The system has been at full operation strength except for one site affected by the Wrightsville Avenue road closure.

Next Step: Construct three permitted sites, finalize plans and procure NCDOT permits for last three sites. Two new sites and one upgraded site will have to be independently certified for UL compliance to pass county electrical inspection and receive power service.

TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM UPGRADE/EXPANSION 08TS10

Current Status: All contract construction and 30-day observation is complete. The camera and intersection at Eastwood at Rogersville, the intersections of the 6th Street RR Bridge, the Princess Place Fire Station, and the Pine Valley camera will be connected pending the final documentation for fiber optic testing.

Next Steps: Connect all remaining off system intersections and cameras and begin process of closing-out project upon receipt of fiber optic certification in an acceptable format from the contractor. Complete NCDOT reimbursement requests.

US 17/NC 210 CORRIDOR STUDY

Project Description/Scope: Develop a corridor plan for US 17 from Washington Acres to Sloop Point Road and NC 210 from US 17 to Island Creek Road.

Current Status: The Wilmington MPO has advertised a Request for Qualifications and received nine proposals. Staff is currently reviewing the proposals and plans to have a consultant under contract by November 1st..

Next Step: Develop the corridor study. The expected completion date is June 2011.



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

BEVERLY EAVES PERDUE
GOVERNOR

EUGENE A. CONTI, JR.
SECRETARY

October 8, 2010

TIP Projects:

R-2245: Second bridge to Oak Island over the intercoastal waterway.
Under construction

Open to traffic by the end of October 2010; two-lane two-way pattern

B-0682: Bridge to Sunset Beach over the intercoastal waterway.
Under construction

Estimated Contract Completion Date December of 2010

U-4733: intersection improvements SR 1411 (Wrightsville Avenue), from Forest Hills Drive to SR 2313 (Wilshire Boulevard).

Estimated Contract Completion Date middle of October 2010

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

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

Estimated Contract Completion Date December 2010

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

Estimated Contract Completion Date 7/1/2012

Memorial Bridge – painting of the Memorial Bridge.

Lane closures are not allowed from Memorial Day to Labor Day (fall/winter time) for the following times: 5:00 AM to 7:00 PM

Lane closures are not allowed from Memorial Day to Labor Day (spring/summer time) for the following times: 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM Monday thru Thursday

Contractor will be allowed to completely close the bridge for the following times:

April 13, 2010 to June 11, 2010 from 7:00 PM to 5:00 AM.

Estimated Contract Completion Date Spring 2011

B-5215 – SR 1115 (Stone Chimney Road) replace bridge #49 over branch of Lockwood Folly River. **Availability Date August 2, 2010; contractor has 120 days to complete**

B-5217 – SR 1115 (Stone Chimney Road) replace bridge #59 over branch of Lockwood Folly River. **Availability Date August 2, 2010; contractor has 120 days to complete**

B-5216 – SR 1115 (Stone Chimney Road) replace bridge #58 over branch of Lockwood Folly River. **Availability Date August 2, 2010; contractor has 120 days to complete**

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 November 16, 2010

Public Information Meeting October 19, 2010

R-2633 AA & AB: Construction of I-140 (Wilmington Bypass) from US 17 to US 74/76.

Availability Date March 29, 2010

Estimated Contract Completion Date July 3, 2013

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

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

U-4902 C: 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.

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

R-4063: widen SR 1472 (Village Road) from SR 1435 (South Navassa Road) to SR 1438 (Lanvale Road).

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.

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

Division Projects:

SR 1448 (Middle River Road): full depth patching from NC 211 to the paved end of system. Schedule to be under contract in the November 2010

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 November 2010

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.

Work complete except small areas of widening at radii

Resurfacing Projects:

New Hanover County contract (C202188):

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.

Estimated Contract Completion Date Fall 2010

Brunswick & New Hanover Counties contract (C202476):

Brunswick County:

NC 87 resurface from NCL of Boiling Springs to US 17, including spiral widening at various locations.

NC 211 resurface from 0.24 mile west of the Town of St. James to 0.18 mile east of SR 1500 (Midway Road).

SR 1300 (Calabash Road NW) resurface from SR 1308 (Etheridge Road NW) to NC 904,

SR 1132 (Shell Point Road) resurface from NC 130 to SR 1130 (Mt. Pisgah Road),

SR 1417 (Malmo Loop Road) resurface from NC 87 to US 74/76,

SR 1426 (Mt. Misery Road) resurface from US 74/76 to SR 1426

New Hanover County:

US 421 Truck resurface from 0.02 mile north of US 421 to 0.01 mile north of Queen Street (non-system).

SR 1301 (Princess Place Road) resurface from US 17 Business to 17th Street.

Estimated Contract Completion Date November 2010

Pender County contract (C202475):

NC 11 resurface from US 421 to US 117, including spiral widening at various locations.

Estimated Contract Completion Date November 2010

Brunswick County contract (C202562):

US 17 milling the outside lane and resurfacing the full width, from US 17 Business (southside of Bolivia) to US 17 Business (northside of Shallotte).

Estimated Contract Completion Date December 2010

Pender County contract:

NC 53 (Burgaw Highway) mill & resurface approaches to Bridge #34 (over the Cape Fear River), Bridge #37 (over Angola Creek just west of NC 50) & Bridge #39 (over Moores Creek just east of NC 50).

Estimated Contract Completion Date September 2010

*prioritization*2.0

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Listening Sessions

Join us and offer your feedback!

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

When and Where

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

RDU Airport Authority (1000 Trade Drive, RDU Airport)

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

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

Global Transpark Center Training Facility (Auditorium)

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

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

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

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

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

Western Piedmont Community College (Foothills Higher Education Center)

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

Agenda

- **Opening Comments / Welcome — NCDOT Staff**

- **Overview of Prioritization 1.0 — NCDOT Staff**

Current scoring system, submittal process, web interface and accomplishments

- **Data Driven Approach (Non-Highway Modes) – NCDOT Staff**

Presentations from Aviation, Bicycle & Pedestrian, Ferry, Rail and Public Transportation Divisions

- **Open Discussion — Attendees**

Input for creating Prioritization 2.0

- **Closing / Next Steps — NCDOT Staff**

