

2035 Long Range Transportation Plan

Resolution of Remaining Issues

Issues from 12/10/08 TAC Meeting

I-40 HOV/HOT

A TAC member requested that the I-40 general purpose widening west of NC 86 be taken out of the 2035 LRTP, and I-40 HOV between NC 54 and US 15-501 be put back into 2035 LRTP (HOV/HOT lanes were included in this segment of I-40 in the previously released 2035 LRTP Transportation Options). The TCC voted to:

- Keep the I-40 general purpose widening west of NC 86 and keep NC 54 as the terminus of the I-40 HOV lanes;
- Recommend that the I-40 corridor between I-85 (Orange County) and Johnston County be further studied for alternatives to address growing traffic volume.

The TCC is concerned that having only two lanes in each direction on I-40 west of NC 86 produces congestion (as shown in the Existing Plus Committed model network for the year 2035; see page 8-2 of the draft 2015 LRTP), and this congestion might cause air quality conformity problems. The TCC noted that the section of I-40 between NC 54 and US 15-501 did not show congestion in the same model network and therefore the TCC did not recommend extending the HOV/HOT lanes to that section of I-40.

Southwest Durham County and Northeast Chatham County Road Projects

The TAC requested that staff review road widenings in northeast Chatham County and southwest Durham County that were included in the 2035 LRTP Transportation Options but not included in the draft 2035 LRTP. These highway projects are:

| ID | Project | Project Limits |
|------|--|--------------------------------------|
| 19 | Farrington Point/Old Farrington/Farrington Mill Rd | Lystra Rd to Durham Co. line |
| 20 | Farrington Mill Rd | Barbee Chapel Rd to Chatham Co. line |
| 21 | Farrington Rd | Barbee Chapel Rd to Stagecoach Rd |
| 50.1 | Jack Bennett Rd/Lystra Rd | US 15/501 South to Farrington Pt. Rd |
| 76 | NC 751 | US 64 to O'Kelly Chapel Rd |

| ID | Project | Project Limits |
|------|-------------------|---|
| 78 | NC 751 | O'Kelly Chapel Rd to Fayetteville/Scott King Rd |
| 85.2 | O'Kelly Chapel Rd | NC 751 to Wake County Line |
| 101 | Stagecoach Rd | Farrington Mill Rd to NC 751 |

The TCC recommendations include:

- In lieu of general purpose widening, it is recommended that Transportation System Management (TSM) improvements be implemented along the aforementioned roads. Such improvements would include additional turn lanes, paved shoulders, intersection improvements to include roundabouts as well as other safety improvements. Many TSM improvements are recommended for these roads in the draft Farrington Road Corridor Study.

The TSM section of the 2035 LRTP has been modified to reference specific TSM improvements in northeast Chatham County and is provided as Attachment 7A.

- It is recommend that further discussion among Chatham County, Durham County and resource agencies (such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) officials on transportation and land use issues and solutions in this area.

Revenue Breakdown by County

A TAC member requested a breakdown of sales tax and vehicle registration revenue by County. Attachment 7E provides this information.

Station Area Revenues

A TAC member requested that a footnote be added to the local rail transit revenue line item (see page 2-5 in the Draft 2035 LRTP, i.e., salmon colored report) to indicate the start year for these revenues and that "private" be added to the line item name to indicate that there are private revenue sources. The start year is 2016. This footnote will be included in the final report.

Bus Transit Projects

At the December TAC meeting, staff stated that the bus transit changes presented at that meeting were not included in the travel demand model output (Triangle Regional Model – TRM) used for the draft 2035 LRTP report. The TCC requested that updated report sections reflect

the bus transit changes. Staff believes these documents will be very similar to those in the original draft report:

- Attachment 7B is the Bus and Light Rail Transit Projects map.
- Attachment 7C is the Congestion Map (V/C ratio map). This map is not included in the TAC packet and will be distributed at the TAC meeting.
- Attachment 7D is the Evaluation Measures table. This table is not included in the TAC packet and will be distributed at the TAC meeting.

New Revenue Issue (this issue arose after December TAC and TCC meetings)

A critical revenue issue was discovered after the December 2008 TAC and TCC meetings. A brief explanation of the revenue methodology will help in understanding the issue. The future purchasing power of all 2035 LRTP revenues are discounted by 4% each year to account for the trend that highway and transit cost inflation has been historically higher than the revenue growth. This discounting process was implemented for all the revenue sources but was not performed on the forecast for highway revenue.

The impacts are:

- The Highway Capital revenues (federal and state) in the 2035 LRTP financial plan will be reduced by \$617 million. Highway Capital revenues in the 2035 LRTP presented to the TAC in December was \$1,937 million (see table on page 2-5 of the draft 2035 LRTP report, i.e., salmon colored report), but should have been \$1,320 million.
- The Highway Maintenance revenues (federal, state and other) will be reduced by \$319 million. Highway Maintenance revenues in the 2035 LRTP presented to the TAC in December was \$1,146 million (see table on page 2-5 of the report), but should have been \$827 million. Since Highway Maintenance costs were assumed to be equal to Highway Maintenance revenues, Highway Maintenance costs would also be reduced by \$319 million to yield a new total of \$827 million. These Highway Maintenance costs and revenues reductions are equal and therefore do not effectively change the financial balance of the 2035 LRTP.

The Lead Planning Agency (LPA) staff has developed four possible solutions to address this highway funding shortfall. Staff favors the first solution:

LPA Staff Recommendation:

1. Assume new revenue sources to cover the \$561 million cost of the I-40 HOV/HOT project (#45). The cost and revenue of this single project will cover most of the highway funding shortfall. In addition, the project is to be implemented in the 2026-2035 time horizon, a time in which many transportation experts expect the use of managed lane toll revenues, state and local bonding, private investment and other highway finance alternatives for large highway projects to be more widely accepted.

The revenues for this project can be assumed to include:

- Toll revenue
- Bonding based on future toll revenue
- A 2nd round of state highway gap funding (a first round of gap funding supported the Triangle Expressway)

Other Options:

2. Delete the I-40 HOV/HOT project (#45) from the 2035 LRTP, thereby reducing costs by \$561 million. This solution is not recommended given the expected traffic volume growth in the I-40 corridor and concerns for meeting air quality conformity.
3. Delete multiple highway projects with a total cost of approximately \$600 million from the 2035 LRTP. This solution is not recommended because it would require the deletion of two many highway projects (perhaps 20 or more) and would likely require two additional months to identify and analyze the projects proposed for deletion.
4. Delete multiple highway projects, reduce bus transit projects and reallocate transit revenue to highway projects. This solution is not recommended because guidance from the TAC and public input supported the expansion of transit service and dedication of revenue from a new ½ cent sales tax to transit.