

# **Conformity Determination Report**

## **2009–2015 Transportation Improvement Program**

- **Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization**
- **Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization**
- **Burlington-Graham Metropolitan Planning Organization**  
(for the portion of Orange County within the Burlington Graham MPO)
- **North Carolina Department of Transportation**  
(for the portions of the Triangle Ozone Maintenance Area in Chatham, Franklin, Granville, Johnston, Orange and Person Counties outside of MPO boundaries)

February 19, 2008

Digital versions of this report and its appendices are available at:  
<http://www.triangleair.org/topics.htm#transconf>

*This report was coordinated by the Triangle J Council of Governments for the North Carolina Department of Transportation, the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Burlington Graham Metropolitan Planning Organization, in cooperation with the Kerr-Tar Rural Planning Organization, the Triangle Area Rural Planning Organization and the Upper Coastal Plain Rural Planning Organization.*

## 1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to document compliance with the provisions of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) of 2005. The conformity determination for the 2009–2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is based on a regional emissions analysis that utilized the transportation networks in adopted and conforming 2030 Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTPs) and the emissions factors developed by the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR). All regionally significant federally funded projects in areas designated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) as air quality nonattainment or maintenance areas must come from a conforming LRTP and TIP.

MPOs and the NCDOT are required by 23 CFR 134 and 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 to make a conformity determination on any newly adopted or amended fiscally-constrained long range transportation plans and TIPs. Appendix A contains relevant portions of 40 CFR part 93. The intent of this report is to document the conformity determinations for the 2009–2015 TIPs for the Capital Area MPO, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO, the Burlington Graham MPO, and the rural portions of the Triangle Ozone Maintenance Area that are the responsibility of the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). In addition, the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), specifically, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), must make a conformity determination on the LRTPs and TIPs in all non-attainment and maintenance areas. The Research Triangle Region is a maintenance area for ozone.

Conformity Determinations for the amended 2030 Long Range Transportation Plans in the Triangle Ozone Maintenance Area were most recently approved as follows:

- Burlington Graham MPO: April 12, 2005
- Capital Area MPO: May 16, 2007
- Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO: May 9, 2007
- The NCDOT (for the rural portions of Chatham and Orange Counties in the Triangle Ozone Maintenance Area): June 7, 2007
- The NCDOT (for Franklin, Granville, Johnston and Person Counties): June 1, 2007

By these actions, the MPOs and NCDOT demonstrated that the amended 2030 Long Range Transportation Plans are consistent with Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act, the State Implementation Plan, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, and 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93. These conformity demonstrations were documented by the MPOs and NCDOT in the report entitled *Conformity Analysis and Determination Report*. That report included the regional emissions test comparison prepared for the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plans demonstrating that emissions in each of the analysis years of the long range plan (2002, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2020 and 2030) are less than or equal to, the motor vehicle emissions budget established by the State Implementation Plan (or base year emissions, in areas where no State Implementation Plan was approved or found adequate by EPA) in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93) and approved by USEPA for the corresponding year.

USDOT made its conformity determination on the amended 2030 Long Range Transportation Plans listed above on June 29, 2007. A copy of the letter approving the conformity determinations is

included in Appendix B.

The TIP for Fiscal Years 2009-2015 developed by the Burlington Graham MPO and adopted by the TAC on \_\_\_\_\_, 2008 is a subset of the conforming 2030 LRTP documented in this report.

The TIP for Fiscal Years 2009-2015 developed by the Capital Area MPO and adopted by the TAC on \_\_\_\_\_, 2008 is a subset of the conforming 2030 LRTP documented in this report.

The TIP for Fiscal Years 2009-2015 developed by the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO and adopted by the TAC on \_\_\_\_\_, 2008 is a subset of the conforming 2030 LRTP documented in this report.

The rural (donut area) county projects from the STIP for Fiscal Years 2009-2015 developed by the NCDOT and adopted by the Board of Transportation on \_\_\_\_\_, 2008, are consistent with the rural (donut area) projects from the 2007-2013 STIP (for the donut area counties of Chatham, Franklin, Granville, Johnston, Orange and Person) that were modeled and found to conform by the USDOT on June 29, 2007.

## **2.0 Relationship of the LRTP and TIP**

In accordance with 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93, no further regional emissions analysis is required for the Transportation Improvement Program if the TIP is a subset of the LRTP and if the following conditions are met:

- The TIP is consistent with the conforming LRTP such that the regional emissions analysis performed on the LRTP applies to the TIP;
- The TIP contains all projects which must be started in the TIP's timeframe to implement the highway and transit system envisioned by the LRTP in each of its horizon years;
- All federally funded TIP projects which are regionally significant are part of the specific highway or transit system envisioned in the LRTP horizon years; and
- The design concept and scope of each regionally significant project identified in the TIP is not significantly different from that described in the LRTP.

This report documents that the Transportation Improvement Programs for Fiscal Years 2009-2015 are subsets of the 2030 LRTPs for the Capital Area MPO, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO, the Burlington Graham MPO, and the rural portions of the Triangle Ozone Maintenance Area that are the responsibility of the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). The 2030 LRTPs for each of these areas are fiscally constrained and are consistent with 23 CFR Part 450 Subpart C. These conformity determinations are based on the most recent estimates of the emissions and the most recent planning assumptions (including population, employment, travel and congestion estimates available) as determined by the appropriate MPOs and NCDOT. It has been demonstrated in the Conformity Determination Report that the LRTPs conform to the provisions of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and the Transportation Equity Act (TEA 21) approved by the USDOT on June 29, 2007. Also, these LRTPs conform to the purpose of the State Implementation Plan (SIP in

accordance with 40 CFR Part 93. Although as subsets of LRTPs, no further regional emissions analysis (emissions budget comparison) is typically required for TIPs, new emissions budgets for NO<sub>x</sub> were published on December 26, 2007; therefore comparisons to these new budgets are provided below. All areas for all years conform to the new budgets.

**Chatham County**

Analysis Year	Model	Off-Model	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	1,783	0			
<b>2008</b>	<b>1,387</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,387</b>	<b>1,565</b>	<b>OK</b>
2010	1,255	0	1,255	1,565	OK
<b>2017</b>	<b>799</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>799</b>	<b>948</b>	<b>OK</b>
2020	603	0	603	948	OK
2030	448	0	448	948	OK

**Durham County**

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Off-Model (reduction)	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	18,938	73			
2007	13,081	72	13,009		
<b>2008</b>	<b>11,913</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>11,841</b>	<b>13,106</b>	<b>OK</b>
2009	10,744	71	10,673	13,106	OK
2010	9,470	71	9,399	13,106	OK
2012	7,439	64	7,375	13,106	OK
2015	5,097	53	5,045	13,106	OK
<b>2017</b>	<b>4,371</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4,326</b>	<b>4,960</b>	<b>OK</b>
2020	3,282	34	3,248	<b>4,960</b>	OK
2030	2,750	34	2,716	<b>4,960</b>	OK

**Franklin County**

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Rural portion	Total County	Budget Amount	
2002	619	2,524	3,143		
2008	455	1,578	2,033	2,048	OK
2010	400	1,263	1,663	2,048	OK
2017	271	755	1,026	1,139	OK
2020	216	538	754	1,139	OK
2030	178	359	537	1,139	OK

**Johnston County**

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Rural portion	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002		12,534			
<b>2008</b>		10,658	10,658	<b>12,583</b>	
2010		10,032	10,032	<b>12,583</b>	OK
<b>2017</b>		5,724	5,724	5,958	OK
2020		3,877	3,877	5,958	OK
2030		2,347	2,347	5,958	OK

**Granville County**

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Rural portion	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	207	4,414			
<b>2008</b>	138	2,472	2,610	<b>4,649</b>	
2010	115	1,825	1,940	<b>4,649</b>	OK
<b>2017</b>	70	925	995	1,714	OK
2020	51	539	590	1,714	OK
2030	47	383	430	1,714	OK

**Orange County**

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Off-Model	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	14,391	0			
<b>2008</b>	<b>8,967</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8,967</b>	<b>9,933</b>	<b>OK</b>
2010	7,159	0	7,159	9,933	OK
<b>2017</b>	<b>3,578</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,578</b>	<b>3,742</b>	<b>OK</b>
2020	2,043	0	2,043	3,742	OK
2030	1,382	0	1,382	3,742	OK

**Person County**

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Rural portion	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002		1,837			
<b>2008</b>		1,283	1,283	<b>1,359</b>	
2010		1,099	1,099	<b>1,359</b>	OK
<b>2017</b>		746	746	791	OK
2020		594	594	791	OK
2030		474	474	791	OK

**Wake County**

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Off-Model (reduction)	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	81,638	284			
2007	36,429	212	36,218		
<b>2008</b>	<b>33,415</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>33,206</b>	<b>36,615</b>	<b>OK</b>
2009	30,400	206	30,194	<b>36,615</b>	OK
2010	26,739	168	26,571	<b>36,615</b>	OK
2012	21,850	197	21,653	<b>36,615</b>	<b>OK</b>
2015	15,216	240	14,977	<b>36,615</b>	OK
<b>2017</b>	<b>13,263</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>12,995</b>	<b>16,352</b>	<b>OK</b>
2020	10,334	311	10,023	16,352	OK
2030	9,419	276	9,143	16,352	OK

The Burlington Graham MPO Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), as the decision making body of the Burlington Graham MPO, finds that the FY 2009-15 TIP is a subset of the 2030 LRTP for the Burlington Graham MPO, meets these conditions, and thus conforms to the purpose of the SIP (or base year emissions, in areas where no State Implementation Plan is approved or found adequate by EPA) in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93).

The Capital Area MPO Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), as the decision making body of the Capital Area MPO, finds that the FY 2009-15 TIP is a subset of the 2030 LRTP for the Capital Area MPO, meets these conditions, and thus conforms to the purpose of the SIP in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93).

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), as the decision making body of the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO, finds that the FY 2009-15 TIP is a subset of the 2030 LRTP for the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO, meets these conditions, and thus conforms to the purpose of the SIP in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93.

The North Carolina Department of Transportation, as the decision making body for STIP projects within the Triangle Area Ozone Maintenance Area that are outside of MPO boundaries, finds that rural (donut area) county projects from the FY 2009-15 STIP are consistent with the rural (donut area) projects from the FY 2007-2013 STIP (for the donut area counties of Chatham, Franklin, Granville, Johnston, Orange and Person) that were modeled and found to conform by the USDOT on June 29, 2007.

A copy of 2009-2015 TIP projects is attached to this report (Appendix C).

### **3.0 Latest Planning Assumptions**

The planning assumptions used to develop the Conformity Determination Report are the latest planning assumptions approved by the respective MPOs and NCDOT. Estimates of future population and employment are less than five years old. The vehicle age distribution and fleet mix distributions used as input to the emission model were based on the current data from North Carolina Division of Motor Vehicles. This data is also less than five years old.

### **4.0 Interagency Consultation**

The 2009-15 TIPs have undergone interagency consultation as required in the North Carolina Administrative Code Title 15A Subpart 2D 2002-2003 inclusive. An interagency consultation meeting involving the MPOs, NCDOT, NCDENR, FHWA and USEPA- Region 4 was held on November 29, 2007. A summary of issues raised and responses, along with any written agency comments, are provided in Appendix D. In addition, Conformity Technical Meetings were held on December 14, 2007 and February 15, 2008 and were attended by staff of FHWA, NCDENR, NCDOT, MPO and RPO partners to discuss 2009-15 TIP conformity requirements and timelines.

### **5.0 Public Involvement**

The 2009-15 TIPs were reviewed by the public in accordance with the Public Involvement Policies of

the Capital Area MPO, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO, the Burlington Graham MPO and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). This report was also made available for public review by the Kerr-Tar Rural Planning Organization, Triangle Area Rural Planning Organization and Upper Coastal Plain Rural Planning Organization. Copies of citizen comments and agency responses to them are attached to this report in Appendix E.

## **6.0 Findings of Conformity**

6.1. The Burlington Graham MPO TAC, as the decision making body of the Burlington Graham MPO, finds that the FY 2009-15 TIP is a subset of the 2030 LRTP for the Burlington Graham MPO Metropolitan Area. The TIP meets the conditions described earlier in this document and thus conforms to the intent of the Clean Air Act and the requirements of 40 CFR §93.

6.2. The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO TAC, as the decision making body of the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO, finds that the FY 2009-15 TIP is a subset of the 2030 LRTP for the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO Metropolitan Area. The TIP meets the conditions described earlier in this document and thus conforms to the intent of the Clean Air Act and the requirements of 40 CFR §93.

6.3. The Capital Area MPO TAC, as the decision making body of the Capital Area MPO, finds that the FY 2009-15 TIP is a subset of the 2030 LRTP for the Capital Area MPO Metropolitan Area. The TIP meets the conditions described earlier in this document and thus conforms to the intent of the Clean Air Act and the requirements of 40 CFR §93.

6.4. The North Carolina Department of Transportation, as the decision making body for STIP projects within the Triangle Area Ozone Maintenance Area that are outside of MPO boundaries, finds that rural (donut area) county projects from the FY 2009-15 STIP are consistent with the rural (donut area) projects from the FY 2007-2013 STIP (for the donut area counties of Chatham, Franklin, Granville, Johnston, Orange and Person) that were modeled and found to conform by the USDOT on June 29, 2007, in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93.

Copies of adopting and endorsing resolutions and conformity findings for 2009-15 TIP projects are attached in Appendix F.

## Appendix A: Air Quality Regulations

### 40 CFR 93.122(g)

(g) *Reliance on previous regional emissions analysis.*

(1) Conformity determinations for a new transportation plan and/or TIP may be demonstrated to satisfy the requirements of §§93.118 (“Motor vehicle emissions budget”) or 93.119 (“Interim emissions in areas without motor vehicle emissions budgets”) without new regional emissions analysis if the previous regional emissions analysis also applies to the new plan and/or TIP. This requires a demonstration that:

(i) The new plan and/or TIP contain all projects which must be started in the plan and TIP’s timeframes in order to achieve the highway and transit system envisioned by the transportation plan;

(ii) All plan and TIP projects which are regionally significant are included in the transportation plan with design concept and scope adequate to determine their contribution to the transportation plan’s and/or TIP’s regional emissions at the time of the previous conformity determination;

(iii) The design concept and scope of each regionally significant project in the new plan and/or TIP are not significantly different from that described in the previous transportation plan; and

(iv) The previous regional emissions analysis is consistent with the requirements of §§93.118 (including that conformity to all currently applicable budgets is demonstrated) and/or 93.119, as applicable.

(2) A project which is not from a conforming transportation plan and a conforming TIP may be demonstrated to satisfy the requirements of §93.118 or §93.119 without additional regional emissions analysis if allocating funds to the project will not delay the implementation of projects in the transportation plan or TIP which are necessary to achieve the highway and transit system envisioned by the transportation plan, the previous regional emissions analysis is still consistent with the requirements of §93.118 (including that conformity to all currently applicable budgets is demonstrated) and/or §93.119, as applicable, and if the project is either:

(i) Not regionally significant; or

(ii) Included in the conforming transportation plan (even if it is not specifically included in the latest conforming TIP) with design concept and scope adequate to determine its contribution to the transportation plan’s regional emissions at the time of the transportation plan’s conformity determination, and the design concept and scope of the project is not significantly different from that described in the transportation plan.

(3) A conformity determination that relies on paragraph (g) of this section does not satisfy the frequency requirements of §93.104(b) or (c).



## **Appendix B: Federal Conformity Finding on Long Range Transportation Plans**

The accompanying pages include the conformity finding on the amended 2030 LRTPs from FHWA. For digital versions of this document, the following pdf file contains the conformity letter:

Fhwaletter2007

## **Appendix C: 2009-2015 Transportation Improvement Program Projects**

In printed versions of this report, the accompanying pages include project listings, by MPO, RPO or County. For digital versions of this document, the following pdf files contain the project lists:

C1 Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO

C2 Capital Area MPO

C3 Triangle Area RPO (Chatham and Orange Counties)

C4 Kerr Tar RPO (Franklin, Granville and Person Counties)

C5 Johnston County

C6 Burlington-Graham MPO (no projects that add capacity in the Orange County section of the MPO)

For the draft version of this document, pdf files are available for the DCHC MPO (Appendix C1) and the Capital Area MPO (Appendix C2). There are no 2009-15 projects in the portion of Orange County within the Burlington-Graham MPO, although the MPO project list is included for reference.

Project listings for areas of counties outside of MPO boundaries are found in the RPO or Division summaries of the draft STIP: Kerr-Tar RPO for Franklin, Granville and Person Counties, Division 4 for Johnston County and TARPO for Chatham and Orange Counties.

## Appendix D: Comments from Interagency Consultation meeting

### TRIANGLE MAINTENANCE AREA

#### 2009 – 2015 TIP REVIEW INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION MEETING NOVEMBER 29, 2007 NCDOT Boardroom

*12/4/07 version*

#### Meeting Attendees:

- EPA: Amanetta Wood
- FHWA: Bill Marley, Loretta Barren, Eddie Dancausse Jill Stark
- NCDOT: Dan Thomas, Terry Arellano, Rockne Bryant, Mike Stanley, Atefe Northcutt, Michael Abuya, Linda Dosse, Mike Orr, Andy Bailey, Rick Lakata, Julie Bollinger, Van Argabright, Hemal Shah, Scott Walston, Julie Bollinger, Jonathan Parker, Shannon Ransom, Linh Nguyen, Sarah Smith, Ray McIntyre
- NCDAQ: Heather Hildebrandt
- Winston Salem MPO: Wendy Miller (via phone), Greg Errett (via phone) Fred Haith (via phone)
- High Point MPO: David Hyder
- Greensboro MPO: Lydia McIntyre (via phone)
- Burlington Graham MPO: Mike Nunn (via phone)
- CAMPO: Kenneth Withrow
- DCHC MPO: Ellen Beckman, Andy Henry (via phone)
- MUMPO: Bob Cook, Bob Cook (via phone), Tim Gibbs (via phone), Andy Grzynski (via phone), Joe McLelland (via phone), Barry Mosley (via phone)
- Gaston MPO: Hank Graham (via phone)
- Cabarrus Rowan MPO: Phil Conrad (via phone)
- Hickory MPO: John Tippett (via phone)
- Rocky Mount MPO: Bob League
- FCEAD: Carey Gentry (via phone)
- TJCOG: John Hodges-Copple
- Rocky River RPO: Dana Stoogenke (via phone)
- Lake Norman RPO: Rebecca Yarbrough (via phone)

## FHWA Review Comments:

### TRIANGLE AREA

#### DCHC

- **R-2000** (*Durham County STIP*) mileage in STIP is 29 and in LRTP is 0.69. Please explain.
  - The R-2000 mileage in the STIP (29 miles) is for the entire length of the project, while the mileage in the Amended 2030 LRTP (.0.69) is for the portion of the R-2000 project that is in the DCHC MPO planning area (i.e., Durham County).

#### BG MPO

- No comments

#### CAMPO

- **R-2814** (*Franklin County STIP*) mileage in STIP is 18.5 and in LRTP is 8.29. Please explain.
  - The 8.29 miles represents projects in the 2030 LRTP (From Ligon Mill Road to Franklin County) that were within the Capital Area MPO jurisdiction at that time. Franklin County at the time of the 2030 LRTP completion was not a member of the Capital Area MPO
- **I-4745** (*Johnston County STIP*) not in LRTP. Please explain.
  - Johnston County was not a member of the Capital Area MPO at the time of completion of the 2030 LRTP.
- **U-3334** (*Johnston County STIP*) not in LRTP. Please explain.
  - Johnston County was not a member of the Capital Area MPO at the time of completion of the 2030 LRTP.
- **R-2000** (*Wake County STIP*) mileage in STIP is 29 and in LRTP is 11. Please explain.
  - The CAMPO LRTP does not list completed projects. The LRTP has project F1a that corresponds to sections F and G of R-2000. Project F4a corresponds to sections AA, AB, and AC of R-2000. As this date, sections F and G of R-2000 are open to traffic.
- **R-2809** (*Wake County STIP*) mileage in STIP is 4.7 and in LRTP is 1.39. Please explain.
  - The draft STIP description includes the length of the whole project (Wake Forest Bypass). As of the completion of the 2030 LRTP, 3.31 miles of the project had been completed. The 1.39 miles of project in the LRTP were not under construction.
- **U-5024** (*Wake County STIP*) not in LRTP. Please explain.
  - Project U-5024 (Green Oaks Parkway in Holly Springs) is an economic development project that is partially being funded using economic development funds from the State of North Carolina. This project is not regionally significant and no Federal funds will be used.
- **U-4901** (*Wake County STIP*) not in LRTP. Please explain.
  - In 2020 HY as segments A12 and A13b

- ❑ **R-2257** (*Granville County STIP*) not in LRTP. Please explain.
  - Granville County was not a member of the Capital Area MPO at the time of completion of the 2030 LRTP.

## **DONUT AREAS**

- ❑ Chatham
  - No comments
- ❑ Franklin
  - No comments
- ❑ Granville
  - No comments
- ❑ Johnston
  - No comments
- ❑ Orange
  - No comments
- ❑ Person
  - No comment

## **Division of Air Quality Comments on the 2009-2015 STIPs**

### **Triangle Area**

#### **CAMPO**

- I could not find the following projects in the TIP:
  - **U-2908**, NC 54
    - This project was constructed and completed by the Town of Cary.
  - **U-4410**, South Loop Road
    - This project is partially complete in the LRTP. The portion that should have been in the TIP is complete. That is why it is not included in the TIP.
  - **U-4026**, Davis Drive
    - It is in the TIP under page 5-36.
  - **R-2906**, NC 55
    - This project is complete.
  - **R-2907**, NC 55
    - This project is complete.
  - **U-3344**, Airport Blvd
    - It is in the TIP under page 5-34.
  - **R-2641**, I-540 (Eastern)
    - This project is complete.
  - **U-3101**, US 1- 64
    - This project is complete.
  
- I could not find **U-5024**, Green Oaks Parkway, or **U-4901**, Falls of the Neuse Road, in the plan.
  - Project U-5024 (Green Oaks Parkway in Holly Springs) is an economic development project that is partially being funded using economic development funds from the State

of North Carolina. This project is not regionally significant and no Federal funds will be used.

- Project U-4901 In 2020 HY as segments A12 and A13b

## **DCHC**

- I could not find the following projects in the TIP:
  - **U-3105**, Garrett Road/ Chapel Hill Road
    - This project is complete
  - **U-2102**, Guess Road
    - This project is complete
  - **U-3853**, Hopson-Page Rd Ext
    - This project is complete
  - **I-2204**, I-40
    - This project is complete
  - **U-2302**, NC 86
    - This project is complete
  - **R-942**, US 15-501
    - This project is complete
  - **U-2808**, Us 70/Miami Blvd/ Mineral
    - This project is complete
  
  - **U-4410**, Hopson Rd realignment
    - **This project is will be completed in 2008**
- I could not find **I-5104**, I-540/I-40 intersection improvements, in the plan. Construction begins in 2010.
  - I-5104 will be folded into project R-2000. It does not impact the way that R-2000 was modeled for conformity.
- I could not find **U-4763B**, Triangle Parkway, in the plan. Is the part shown on the TIP not in Durham County?
  - This project in the amended LRTP (#66)
- Is the part of **U-2831** in the 2009 horizon year of the plan, the part complete?
  - The part of U-2831 in the LRTP is complete

## **Burlington Graham MPO**

- No Comments

## **Donuts**

- No comments for Person County.
- No comments for Orange County.
- No comments for Chatham County.
- No comments for Franklin County.
- No comments for Granville County.

- No comments for Johnston County.

## **EPA Comments for 09-15 TIP**

### **Overall Comments**

- Provide more description in future to determine if bridge projects are exempt or not. Any change for capacity would make the project nonexempt. For future descriptions, please provide existing and proposed lanes and the length for the bridge projects.
  - EPA is recommending that this be done for future LRTP updates/conformity determinations. FHWA will set up a conference call with EPA and NCDOT to discuss the details of this request and how it can be implemented.
  - In NC Federal Bridge Replacement does not allow for increased capacity. For additional capacity it will have a different project number associated with it.
- Recommend complete listing of exempt projects and enough information for IAC to make a determination on whether this project is truly exempt per the transportation conformity rule. In the exempt listing it would be helpful for the projects to be categorized as exempt per 93.126, 93.127 or 93.128 of the transportation conformity rule.
  - EPA is recommending that this be done for future LRTP updates/conformity determinations. FHWA will set up a conference call with EPA and NCDOT to discuss the details of this request and how it can be implemented.
- For multi-county projects it is going to be even more important when subarea budgets are available to account for the portion of the project in a particular county in that particular county's regional emissions. This will mean that more detail on what the terminus for the projects are based on the county and not the entire project.
  - EPA is recommending that this be done for future LRTP updates/conformity determinations. FHWA will set up a conference call with EPA and NCDOT to discuss the details of this request and how it can be implemented.
- Our recommendation for donut county projects in the future will be to have a listing of projects in the donut area that were considered in the regional emissions analysis for the LRTP adoptions so that subsequently we can compare these projects for future conformity determinations. For projects in LRTP it is easier to find the legacy listing.
  - EPA is recommending that this be done for future LRTP updates/conformity determinations. FHWA will set up a conference call with EPA and NCDOT to discuss the details of this request and how it can be implemented.
- For donut areas it is highly recommend an addendum table which provides complete project description (i.e., number of existing versus proposed lanes; terminus; whether the project is exempt; whether the project is regionally significant; and year for which the projects were considered open-to-traffic for the purpose of the regional emissions analysis).
  - EPA is recommending that this be done for future LRTP updates/conformity determinations. FHWA will set up a conference call with EPA and NCDOT to discuss the details of this request and how it can be implemented.

## **TRIANGLE AREA**

### **DURHAM**

- Could not find **U-4763B** in Durham County in the LRTP. Please Explain.
  - This project is in the amended LRTP (#66)

### **CHATHAM**

- No comments

### **ORANGE**

- No comments

### **WAKE**

- Could not find **U-5024** in Wake County in the LRTP. Please Explain.
  - Project U-5024 (Green Oaks Parkway in Holly Springs) is an economic development project that is partially being funded using economic development funds from the State of North Carolina. This project is not regionally significant and no Federal funds will be used.
- Could not find **U-4901** in Wake County in the LRTP. Please Explain.
  - Project U-4901 In 2020 HY as segments A12 and A13b
- For project R-2000 in Wake County, please explain why the TIP has the project listed as 29 miles whereas the LRTP has it listed as 11.
  - The CAMPO LRTP does not list completed projects. The LRTP has project F1a that corresponds to sections F and G of R-2000. Project F4a corresponds to sections AA, AB, and AC of R-2000. As this date, sections F and G of R-2000 are open to traffic.
- For project **R-2814** in Wake County, please explain why the TIP has the project listed as 18.5 miles whereas the LRTP has it listed as 8.
  - The 8.29 miles represents projects in the 2030 LRTP (From Ligon Mill Road to Franklin County) that were within the Capital Area MPO jurisdiction at that time. Franklin County at the time of the 2030 LRTP completion was not a member of the Capital Area MPO

### **JOHNSTON**

- Could not find **I-4754** in Johnston County in the LRTP. Please Explain.
  - This project is in Johnston County outside of the MPO boundary.
- Could not find **U-3334** in Johnston County in the LRTP. Please Explain.
  - Johnston County was not a member of the Capital Area MPO at the time of completion of the 2030 LRTP.

### **GRANVILLE**

- No comments

### **FRANKLIN**

- No comments



## **Appendix E: Comments and Responses from Public Involvement Process**

[NOTE: Appendix E will be included in the Final Report.]

## **Appendix F: TIP Adoption and Conformity Resolutions**

Appendix F includes TIP adoption/endorsement and conformity finding resolutions for applicable MPOs (adoption), RPOs (endorsement) and the NCDOT (conformity findings for rural counties, since TIP adoption has already occurred).

For digital versions of this document, the following pdf files contain these actions:

- F1 Burlington-Graham MPO 2009-15 TIP adoption
- F2 Burlington-Graham MPO 2009-15 TIP conformity finding
- F3 Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO 2009-15 TIP adoption
- F4 Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO 2009-15 TIP conformity finding
- F5 Capital Area MPO 2009-15 TIP adoption
- F6 Capital Area MPO 2009-15 TIP conformity finding
- F7 NCDOT Chatham County (rural portion) 2009-15 TIP conformity finding
- F8 NCDOT Franklin County 2009-15 TIP conformity finding
- F9 NCDOT Granville County 2009-15 TIP conformity finding
- F10 NCDOT Johnston County 2009-15 TIP conformity finding
- F11 NCDOT Orange County (rural portion) 2009-15 TIP conformity finding
- F12 NCDOT Person County 2009-15 TIP conformity finding
- F13 Kerr-Tar RPO 2009-15 TIP conformity endorsement
- F14 Upper Coastal Plain RPO 2009-15 TIP conformity endorsement
- F15 Triangle Area RPO 2009-15 TIP conformity endorsement

[NOTE: this appendix will be included in the final report]

## **Appendix G: Public Notifications**

Appendix G includes public notifications of the draft TIP. [NOTE: this appendix to be added in the final report]

For digital versions of this document, the following files contain these actions:

G1 Burlington-Graham MPO 2009-15 TIP notification

G2 Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO 2009-15 TIP notification

G3 Capital Area MPO 2009-15 notification

## **Appendix H: Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets**

Appendix H includes a copy of the Federal Register Notice for the Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets promulgated on December 26, 2007.

## Appendix I: Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets

Appendix I includes comparisons between the emissions generated by the transportation network in each county for each analysis year and the Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets promulgated on December 26, 2007.

### Chatham County

Analysis Year	Model	Off-Model	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	1,783	0			
<b>2008</b>	<b>1,387</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,387</b>	<b>1,565</b>	<b>OK</b>
2010	1,255	0	1,255	1,565	OK
<b>2017</b>	<b>799</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>799</b>	<b>948</b>	<b>OK</b>
2020	603	0	603	948	OK
2030	448	0	448	948	OK

### Durham County

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Off-Model (reduction)	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	18,938	73			
2007	13,081	72	13,009		
<b>2008</b>	<b>11,913</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>11,841</b>	<b>13,106</b>	<b>OK</b>
2009	10,744	71	10,673	13,106	OK
2010	9,470	71	9,399	13,106	OK
2012	7,439	64	7,375	13,106	OK
2015	5,097	53	5,045	13,106	OK
<b>2017</b>	<b>4,371</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4,326</b>	<b>4,960</b>	<b>OK</b>
2020	3,282	34	3,248	<b>4,960</b>	OK
2030	2,750	34	2,716	<b>4,960</b>	OK

### Franklin County

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Rural portion	Total County	Budget Amount	
2002	619	2,524	3,143		
2008	455	1,578	2,033	2,048	OK
2010	400	1,263	1,663	2,048	OK
2017	271	755	1,026	1,139	OK
2020	216	538	754	1,139	OK
2030	178	359	537	1,139	OK

### Johnston County

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Rural portion	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002		12,534			
<b>2008</b>		10,658	10,658	<b>12,583</b>	
2010		10,032	10,032	<b>12,583</b>	OK
<b>2017</b>		5,724	5,724	5,958	OK
2020		3,877	3,877	5,958	OK
2030		2,347	2,347	5,958	OK

Granville County

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Rural portion	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	207	4,414			
<b>2008</b>	138	2,472	2,610	<b>4,649</b>	
2010	115	1,825	1,940	<b>4,649</b>	OK
<b>2017</b>	70	925	995	1,714	OK
2020	51	539	590	1,714	OK
2030	47	383	430	1,714	OK

Orange County

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Off-Model	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	14,391	0			
<b>2008</b>	<b>8,967</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8,967</b>	<b>9,933</b>	<b>OK</b>
2010	7,159	0	7,159	9,933	OK
<b>2017</b>	<b>3,578</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,578</b>	<b>3,742</b>	<b>OK</b>
2020	2,043	0	2,043	3,742	OK
2030	1,382	0	1,382	3,742	OK

Person County

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Rural portion	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002		1,837			
<b>2008</b>		1,283	1,283	<b>1,359</b>	
2010		1,099	1,099	<b>1,359</b>	OK
<b>2017</b>		746	746	791	OK
2020		594	594	791	OK
2030		474	474	791	OK

Wake County

NOx Comparison Table (kg/day)					
Analysis Year	Model	Off-Model (reduction)	Comparison Amount	Budget Amount	
2002	81,638	284			
2007	36,429	212	36,218		
<b>2008</b>	<b>33,415</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>33,206</b>	<b>36,615</b>	<b>OK</b>
2009	30,400	206	30,194	<b>36,615</b>	OK
2010	26,739	168	26,571	<b>36,615</b>	OK
2012	21,850	197	21,653	<b>36,615</b>	<b>OK</b>
2015	15,216	240	14,977	<b>36,615</b>	OK
<b>2017</b>	<b>13,263</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>12,995</b>	<b>16,352</b>	<b>OK</b>
2020	10,334	311	10,023	16,352	OK
2030	9,419	276	9,143	16,352	OK

