



**2007 – 2013  
PROJECT PRIORITY LIST**

**FROM**

**CAPITAL AREA  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

ENDORSED BY THE TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
November 3, 2005

APPROVED BY THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
November 16, 2005

CAPITAL AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Date of Publication: November 23, 2005



CAPITAL AREA  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING  
ORGANIZATION  
LEAD PLANNING AGENCY: CITY OF RALEIGH

Professional Bldg, Suite 406  
127 West Hargett Street  
RALEIGH, NC 27601

November 23, 2005

Mr. Lyndo Tippet, Secretary  
North Carolina Department of Transportation  
P.O. Box 25201  
Raleigh, NC 27611-5201

**Subject: Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization  
FY 2007-2013 Transportation Improvement Program Recommendations**

Dear Secretary Tippet:

The enclosed document lists the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's recommended projects in priority order for consideration by the North Carolina Board of Transportation during the update of the FY 2007-2013 N.C. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). This request contains a comprehensive list of priorities within the Capital Area MPO's expanded metropolitan area boundary (MAB) that now includes portions of Franklin, Granville, Harnett, and Johnston counties in addition to the entirety of Wake County.

The Capital Area MPO Transportation Advisory Committee approved this document on November 16, 2005 after a public comment period of approximately four months including two public hearings. During this time, the Capital Area MPO TCC and TAC spent considerable time reviewing input received, and evaluating and prioritizing projects that are of the utmost priority. We hope that NCDOT will continue to use its best efforts to implement these highest priority projects as soon as possible. This report contains lists of top priority projects for roadways, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, enhancement, and intelligent transportation system (ITS) improvements, as well as a list of several proposed advanced planning studies.

It is clear that available state and federal transportation funding levels remain woefully inadequate to meet the transportation needs of the Capital Area MPO, the greater Triangle region and the State of North Carolina as a whole. However, we remain

committed to working in close cooperation with NCDOT to address our ever growing transportation challenges.

Thank you for your consideration of these projects requested for inclusion in the FY 2007-2013 TIP. If you have questions, or need additional information or assistance, please contact Mr. Ed Johnson, Director of the Capital Area MPO, at 919-807-8511 or Ed.Johnson@ci.raleigh.nc.us.

Sincerely,

  
Joe Bryan, TAC Chair  
Capital Area MPO

cc: Members, N.C. Board of Transportation  
David King, Deputy Secretary, Transit, Rail, Aviation, and Ferry, NCDOT  
Len Sanderson, P.E., State Highway Administrator, NCDOT  
Calvin Leggett, P.E., Manager, Program Development Branch  
Gregory Thorpe, PhD, Manager, Project Dev. & Environmental Analysis Branch, NCDOT  
Mike Bruff, P.E., Manager, Transportation Planning Branch, NCDOT  
Members, Capital Area MPO Transportation Advisory Committee  
Members, Capital Area MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

# **N.C. Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization**

## **RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY 2007-2013 CAPITAL AREA MPO METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) PROJECT PRIORITY LIST**

A motion was made by Mayor Meeker and seconded by Mayor Byrne for adoption of the following resolution and upon being put to a vote was duly adopted.

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee has found that the Metropolitan Planning Organization is conducting transportation planning in a continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive manner in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 1607;

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee has found that the Transportation Improvement Program conforms to the purpose of the North Carolina State Implementation Plan for maintaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards in accordance with 40 CFR 51 & 93;

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee has found the Transportation Improvement Program to be in full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI Assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee has considered how the Transportation Improvement Program will affect the involvement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in the FHWA and the FTA funded project (Sec. 105(f), Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2100, 49 CFR part 23);

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee has considered how the Transportation Improvement Program will affect the elderly and the disabled per the provision of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327, as amended) and the U.S. DOT implementing regulations;

WHEREAS, the CAPITAL AREA MPO FY 2007-13 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Project Priority List is a subset of the currently conforming 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan;

WHEREAS, the Transportation Plan has a planning horizon of 25 years, and meets all the requirements for an adequate Transportation Plan,

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee has provided for a minimum 30-day public comment period for the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program consistent with the MPO TIP Public Involvement Policy;

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee has solicited public and private transportation provider comment;


**N.C. Capital Area  
Metropolitan Planning Organization**

**RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY 2007-2013 CAPITAL AREA MPO  
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP)  
PROJECT PRIORITY LIST  
(CONTINUED)**

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, for years one and two, will serve as the project selection document for transportation projects within the CAPITAL AREA MPO, and the NCDOT may move projects and phases of projects without additional programming or project selection approval by the MPO within that three-year period, providing that air quality conformity and financial constraint criteria are still met;

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the CAPITAL AREA MPO Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) adopts the FY 2007-2013 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Project Priority List dated 16 November, 2005 for the NC Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization. Signed this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2005

  
Joe Bryan, Chair  
Transportation Advisory Committee

  
Ed Johnson, Capital Area MPO Director  
Transportation Advisory Committee Clerk

County of Wake

State of North Carolina

I, Shae F. Satterwhite, a Notary Public for said County and State, do hereby certify that Joe Bryan personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due execution of the foregoing instrument.

Witness my hand and official seal, this the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 20 05.



  
Notary Public

My commission expires 4/19/2008

# 2007-2013 PROJECT PRIORITY LIST

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item	Page
<b>Contents</b>	1
<b>Staff Report—The 2007-2013 MTIP Priority List</b> Summary and Explanation of Development Process	2
<b>The Priorities</b>	3
<i><b>Roadway</b></i> Table 1: Priority Roadway Projects	3-4
<i><b>Advanced Planning</b></i> Table 2: Advanced Planning Projects	5
<i><b>Bicycle and Pedestrian</b></i> Table 3: Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	6-7
<i><b>Enhancement</b></i> Table 4: Enhancement Projects	8
<i><b>Intelligent Transportation Systems</b></i> Table 5: ITS Projects	9
<i><b>Transit</b></i> Table 6: Transit Improvements (Funded Capital Needs) Table 7: Transit Improvements (Unfunded Capital Needs)	10-12 13-16
<b>Appendix A: Roadway Project User Benefits</b> Table A-1: Priority Roadway Projects with User Benefits and Technical Score	17
<b>Appendix B: The Prioritization Process</b> How CAMPO Prioritizes Its Project Requests	18-22
<b>Appendix C: Staff Report—Public Comment Process</b> Summary of Process and Comments Received	23-24

## **CAMPO STAFF REPORT**

Prepared by: Jake Petrosky, Planner  
For: Inclusion in Priority Report FY 2007-2013

### **SUBJECT: MTIP Priorities for Fiscal Years 2007-2013**

---

#### **Purpose of Document**

Every two years, the Capital Area MPO (CAMPO) produces a document detailing the transportation needs of the MPO's service area, which, as of October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005, includes all of Wake County, all 13 government jurisdictions therein, and jurisdictions within the new expanded CAMPO Metropolitan Area Boundary (MAB). The new CAMPO "MAB" includes portions of Granville, Franklin, Johnston, and Harnett Counties, the City of Creedmoor, the Towns of Franklinton, Youngsville, Bunn, Clayton, and Angier. This document should fairly represent a prioritized, financially constrained list of local transportation needs. It should endorse those projects that are programmed to benefit the transportation systems within each community, and identify any project that should be deleted or modified from the current Transportation Improvement Program. However, the addition, deletion, or major modification of a project must conform to the Long-Range Transportation Plan. This submittal is different in that CAMPO is endorsing all current TIP projects that have funding within the current MTIP or by way of a previously arranged funding agreement as the top priority. With "pipeline" projects excluded, this document represents, to a large degree, unfunded capital needs across the region.

#### **Method (General)**

All member agencies are invited to complete a request package, distributed by CAMPO, for prioritized transportation needs in their own area. A public involvement process is carried out by each local jurisdiction in accordance with local guidelines. Public involvement should be proactive at the local level since a citizen must have his or her project endorsed by a municipality to receive attention from CAMPO. In addition the CAMPO TAC holds a public hearing in order to provide a forum where stakeholders are invited to submit comments on the draft priority list. "Transportation needs" may include bridges, highway improvements, rail crossing/safety improvements, greenways, bikeways, sidewalks, other enhancements, advanced planning studies or implementation plans, and bus transit or rail capital items. These requests are prioritized by CAMPO staff and routed through a technical subcommittee appointed for the task of reviewing priorities and the ranking procedures. Their recommendations are forwarded to the TCC for endorsement. Finally, the elected officials on the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) must approve a prioritized list for joint review with the N.C. Department of Transportation.

#### **Summary**

The priorities are shown in the enclosed tables, with the total amounts of funding requested standing at \$2,061 million. This figure does not include transit capital needs. This years' request does include a blanket endorsement of projects already programmed and partially or wholly funded in the first two years of the current MTIP. The top priority roadway projects for the CAMPO region are the requested upgrade of the Raleigh Signal System and all other currently funded projects as shown in Table 1. Transit funding requests increased due to the evolving Cary system (CTran). It is obvious that funding allocations are insufficient to meet the demand for transportation services and infrastructure: 75 roadway projects were received, totaling over \$2,625 million in cost. If all of the money the state spent on capital improvements in one year were invested in road improvements in Wake County alone, it would still be insufficient to cover these projects.

#### **For Further Information**

Details on the method the staff used for ranking projects are included in this report (Appendix B). However, a review of the current process for prioritizing all of the transportation projects within the draft FY 2007-2013 project priority list is currently being conducted by the CAMPO staff and MTIP Project Priority Subcommittee. Therefore, the prioritization process as presented is subject to change upon additional staff review.

**Table 1: FY 2007-2013 Top 40 Priority Roadway System Improvement Projects (\$1.94 Billion)**

<i>Recommended 2007-2013 Rank</i>	<i>TIP Number</i>	<i>MTIP ID</i>	<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Statewide Planning Tier</i>	<i>Division</i>	<i>Estimated Total Cost (\$1,000's)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<b>Priority #1 - Endorsement of current FY06-12 TIP projects (and subsequent funding agreements) not being requested for adjustment, including the following prior TIP Requests</b>							
1	U-4708	Raleigh 1	Raleigh Signal System Upgrade	N/A	5	28,000	
1	U-4703	Garner 1	Timber Dr. East from NC 50 to White Oak Road	3	5	17,550	
1	U-4901	Raleigh 2	Falls of Neuse widening from Ravens Ridge and relocation to north of Neuse River Bridge	3	5	18,000	
1	R-2809A	Wake Forest 1	NC 98 Bypass West of Thompson Mill Rd to US 1	2	5	19,500	Part A construct in FY 2007-2008
TOTAL:						83,050	
<b>Priorities #2 to 40 - Current TIP projects requested for acceleration and other high priority projects not currently programmed in the TIP</b>							
2	R-2635	Apex 1/Holly Springs 1/ Wake 3	I-540 Western Wake Freeway between NC 55 (Morrisville) to NC 55 Bypass (Holly Springs)	1	5	294,615	Benefits Wake and Harnett County
3	I-4744	Raleigh 8	I-40 from Wade Ave to US1/64	1	5	45,320	
4	R-2814	Rolesville 1	US 401 widening from Ligon Mill Rd to Franklin County line	1	5	34,485	Benefits Wake and Franklin County
5		Wake 1	Countywide Intersection Improvements	N/A	5	7,750	
6		Regional 1	I-40 (South) widening from I-440 to NC 42	1	5 & 4	103,000	Benefits Wake and Johnston County
7	U-2823	Raleigh 7	Glenwood Ave. (US 70) upgrade to freeway from TW Alexander to Duraleigh/Millbrook Rd.	1	5	62,500	
8	U-4763	Wake 5	Triangle Pkwy from NC 147 to McCrimmon Pkwy	1	5	111,484	
9	R-2814	Franklin 1	US 401 from Wake County Line to Louisburg	1	5	43,578	
10	R-2609	Harnett 1	US 401 from Fuquay-Varina to NC 210	1	6	48,688	
11	U-2719	Raleigh 6	I-440 from US1/64 to Wade Ave.	1	5	77,300	
12	U-3620	Morrisville 1A	McCrimmon Pkwy from Evans Rd to Perimeter Pkwy	3	5	7,727	
13		Granville 3	NC 50 from Wake County to Creedmoor	2	5	49,000	Study alternatives and environmental impacts
14	U-4437	Raleigh 4	NC 54(Hillsborough St)/CSX Railroad at Blue Ridge Rd - Grade Separation	2	5	10,000	
15		Cary 10	NC 54 (Chapel Hill Road) from NW Maynard Rd to Weston Pkwy	2	5	14,700	
16	U-3343	Morrisville 4A	Aviation Pkwy from I-40 to Dominion Dr	3	5	10,384	
17		Holly Springs 1	Holly Springs Rd from NC 55 Bypass to I-540	3	5	20,231	Study alternatives and environmental impacts
18		Wendell 1	Wendell Blvd (US 64 Business from US 64 Bypass to Little River)	3	5	27,678	
19		Cary 9	Holly Springs Road from Tryon Rd to Kildaire Farm Rd	3	5	24,000	Study alternatives and environmental impacts
20	R-2721	Wake 8	Southern Wake Expressway between NC 55 Bypass and US 401	1	5	174,590	



**Table 1: FY 2007-2013 Top 40 Priority Roadway System Improvement Projects (\$1.94 Billion)**

<i>Recommended 2007-2013 Rank</i>	<i>TIP Number</i>	<i>MTIP ID</i>	<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Statewide Planning Tier</i>	<i>Division</i>	<i>Estimated Total Cost (\$1,000's)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
21	R-2828	Wake 9	Southern Wake Expressway between US 401 and I-40	1	5	121,830	
22		Fuquay-Varina 4	Western Parkway from US 401 South to NC 55 North	3	5	46,870	Benefits Wake and Harnett County
23		Holly Springs 3	Main Street from NC 55 to SR 1152 (Holly Springs Road)	3	5	11,761	
24	U-2901	Apex 4	NC 55 Widening from US 1 to US 64	2	5	20,255	
25		Morrisville 2	Morrisville-Carpenter Rd from Davis Dr to NC 54	3	5	6,666	
26		Granville 1	US 15 throughout entire CAMPO portion of the county	1	5	53,400	
27	R-3410	Johnston 1	NC 42 from US 70 to NC 50	2	4	39,500	
28		Cary 1	Morrisville Parkway Ext. from Davis Dr. to NC 55	3	5	9,500	
29	R-2540	Harnett 2	NC 55 from Fuquay-Varina to NC 27 (Coats)	2	6	24,744	
30	U-3441	Knightdale 1A	Smithfield Rd from Forestville Rd to US 64 Business	3	5	2,790	
31	R-2829	Raleigh 10	I-540 from US 64 Bypass to I-40 South (Eastern Wake Freeway)	1	5	205,900	
32		Apex 2/Cary 11	Ten Ten Road from Apex Peakway to Kildaire Farm Road	3	5	19,626	
33	R-3600	Wake Forest 1	US-1A Widening (US 1-Capital Blvd./Wake Forest (NC 98) Bypass)	2	5	10,425	
34	U-3111	Raleigh 5	Tryon Road Ext. from Garner Rd to Rock Quarry Rd	3	5	21,050	
35		Apex 5	Kelly Road/Green Level Church Road from Green Level West to Old US 1	3	5	11,300	
36		Garner 2	Vandora Springs Rd widening. Timber Dr. to Old Stage Road	3	5	5,200	
37	U-3620	Morrisville 1B	McCrimmon Pkwy from Perimeter Pkwy to Davis Dr.	3	5	27,000	Includes NC 54 interchange / RR overpass
38	U-4432	Raleigh 9	Tryon Road Realignment from NCRR to Wilmington St	3	5	9,592	
39		Raleigh 11	T.W. Alexander Drive Between US 70 & Leesville Road	3	5	37,477	
40		Knightdale 3	Bethlehem Road from Smithfield Rd to Grasshopper Road	3	5	9,592	
TOTAL:						1,861,508	

**Table 2: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Priority Advanced Planning Projects (\$8.55 Million)****Advance Planning Projects**

<i>Recommended FY 07-13 Priority</i>	<i>Requesting Agency Priority</i>	<i>Study Description</i>	<i>Estimated Cost (\$1,000's)</i>	<i>Points based on high Local Rank</i>	<i>Regional Benefit</i>	<i>Transportation Plan Conformity</i>	<i>Sponsor Cost Share</i>	<i>Addresses High Accident or Congestion Location</i>	<i>Total Score</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1	Prop. TCC-1	Southern & Eastern Wake Freeway Environmental Impact Study	3000	20	20	20	20	15	95	Refine alignment and design and identify ICI impacts for possible mitigation
2	Prop. TCC-2	I-40 HOV/HOT Programmatic Environmental Impact Study	3000	18	20	20	20	15	93	
3	Prop. TCC-3	Regional Transit System Plan Needs Analysis / Vision Plan (NCDOT / TTA / CAMPO / DCHC @ 25%)	1000	16	20	20	20	10	86	Addresses Knightdale- 1, Wendell-2, Zebulon 1, Cary-1, Cary-4, Cary-6, and Cary-7
3	Prop. TCC-3 Sub-Plan A	CSX Rail Line Study	100	20	15	20	20	15	90	Jointly Benefits Durham, Apex, RTP, and Cary
3	Prop. TCC-3 Sub-Plan B	Rail transit suitability study Eastern Wake / Johnston / Nash commuter rail line - Phase 2 Alternatives Analysis /Ridership Estimates	150	20	20	20	20	10	90	Part 1 Completed (2004) Part 2 - FTA Alternatives Analysis not yet funded
4	Prop. TCC-4	I-540 / US 64 / US 1 / NC 55 Comprehensive Sub-Area Plan	500	14	15	15	10	10	64	
5	Cary-3 Raleigh-3	Cary Parkway - Gorman St. Connector (Holly Springs Road to Tryon Rd. - Corridor Study / Alternatives Analysis	150	16	10	10	0	10	46	
7	Prop. TCC-5	NC 50 (I-540 to Creedmoor) Corridor Study / Alternatives Analysis	300	12	15	5	0	10	42	Study to address environmental concerns
8	Cary-5	Regional Rail Stations TOD Study	100	12	10	10	0	10	42	
9	Raleigh-3	Edwards Mill Road Extension (NC 54 to Western Blvd Ext.) Functional Design Study	150	16	10	10	0	5	41	
10	Cary 9	Southwest Area Plan Greenway Study	50	4	10	15	0	5	34	

**Table 3: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects (\$15.5 Million for Top Ten Projects, \$50.9 Million for all projects)**

<i>Recommended Rank</i>	<i>Municipal Rank</i>	<i>Division</i>	<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Estimated Cost (\$1,000s)</i>	<i>Technical Score</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1	Raleigh 2	5	Blue Ridge Road - Hillsborough Street to Wade Ave. Pedestrian improvements	1,100	100.0	
2	Cary 6	5	Regional Rail NW Cary Station. Bicycle/Pedestrian connector and crossing	800	95.0	
3	Apex 2	5	Olive Chapel Rd - NC 55 to Winecott Drive. Wide outside lanes and sidewalks.	1,862	89.9	
4	Knightdale 1	5	Mingo Creek Greenway - Phase I	525**	85.5	**Does not include Neuse River Bridge
5	Apex 3	5	Center Street - Apex Peakway to North Salem Street. Sidewalks	1,078	85.5	
6	Clayton 1	4	Little Creek Greenway (Clayton)	600	85.5	
7	Holly Springs 3	5	Bass Lake Road - Earp Street to Bass Lake. Sidewalk project	551	85.5	
8	NCSU.1	5	Western Boulevard Underpass	8,300	84.9	Includes Future Transit ROW
9	Raleigh 3	5	Raleigh Bike Map Update	100	84.9	
10	Apex 1	5	Laura Duncan Rd - Old Raleigh Rd to US 64. Wide outside lanes and sidewalks.	1,138	82.4	
11	Cary 1	5	Louis Stephens Drive - High House Road to Alston Ave. Bicycle accommodations	900	80.5	
12	Raleigh 6	5	East Martin Street - Fayetteville Street to Chavis Way Greenway. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements.	400	79.9	
13	Cary 9	5	Town-wide bicycle parking facilities	20	77.4	
14	Holly Springs 4	5	NC 55/Charter High School - Cayman Avenue to Third Street. Sidewalk project.	372	75.5	
15	Raleigh 5	5	Neuse River Greenway Trail - Horseshoe Farm Park to future Skycrest Drive Extension	4,000	75.5	Part of Mountains to Sea Trail
16	Raleigh 1	5	Pedestrian bridge over Glenwood Avenue at Mariott Drive	1,500	74.2	
17	Raleigh 10	5	Capital Boulevard pedestrian improvements, from Spring Forest Road to Old Wake Forest Road	1,500	73.0	
18	Cary 2	5	Western Wake Frwy Tunnel Upgrades	1,200	70.4	
19	Apex 4	5	S. Salem St./Apex Barbecue Rd - NC 55 to Kelly Rd. Wide outside lanes and sidewalk on north side.	2,914	69.8	
20	Morrisville 1	5	Aviation Parkway Bicycle Facilities (WOLs (NC 54 to Evans Rd.) and Restriping to Town Limits)	176	67.9	
21	Knightdale 2	5	Beaverdam Creek Greenway	377**	67.9	**Does not include Neuse River Bridge
22	W. Forest 1	5	US-1A Bicycle Lanes, Incidental Project	311	67.9	
23	Holly Springs 5	5	Downtown - Ballentine Street to Maple Street. Sidewalk project.	92	66.0	
24	Cary 8	5	Sensitize Traffic Signal Detectors for bicycles (along Kildaire Farm Rd. and Davis Drive)	120	62.9	
25	Holly Springs 1	5	Earp Street - NC 55 to Bass Lake Road (SR1393). Bicycle/Pedestrian accommodations	761	62.9	

**Table 3: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects (\$15.5 Million for Top Ten Projects, \$50.9 Million for all projects)**

<i>Recommended Rank</i>	<i>Municipal Rank</i>	<i>Division</i>	<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Estimated Cost (\$1,000s)</i>	<i>Technical Score</i>	<i>Comments</i>
26	F. Varina 3	5	Eastern Parkway - US 401 (north) to US 401 (south). Bicycle lanes.	896	60.4	
27	Cary 3	5	Kildaire Farm Road corridor - Ten Ten Road to Academy Street. Build greenway or bike path.	2,500	60.4	
28	Holly Springs 2	5	Holly Springs Road - NC 55 Bypass to Grassy Meadow Road. Sidewalk project.	165	60.4	
29	Clayton 2	4	Sam's Branch Greenway (Clayton)	1,100	55.3	
30	Raleigh 9	5	Six Forks Road pedestrian improvements, from I-440 Ramps to Atlantic Avenue	500	55.3	
31	BikePed Stkhldrs.3	5	Restriping and widening outside lanes on Kildaire Farm Road from Academy Street to Lochmere Drive	2,500	52.8	
32	Morrisville 2	5	Lake Crabtree Connector Trail (McCrimmon Pkwy to Morrisville Square)	400	50.3	
33	Clayton 3	4	East Clayton Bicycle and Pedestrian Connector (NC 42 from US 70 to Glen Laurel Rd)	500	48.4	
34	F. Varina 4	5	Western Pkwy - US 401 S. (S. Main) to NC 55 (north of town). Bicycle lanes	665	47.8	
35	Cary 5	5	Cary Parkway - Holly Springs Road to High House Road (Greenway or bike path)	3,100	42.8	
36	Raleigh 4	5	Honeycutt Creek Greenway Trail - Falls Lake to Bent Creek Trail.	1,400	42.8	
37	Cary 4	5	High House Road - Cary Parkway to NC 55. Bicycle accommodations	465	40.3	
38	BikePed Stkhldrs 2	5	At-grade bicycle/pedestrian crossing for CSX rail line between Green Hope School Road and Carpenter Upchurch Road.	25	39.0	
39	Cary 7	5	Build greenway or bike path along High House Road	1,470	37.7	
40	F. Varina 1	5	Fuquay-Varina Loop Road (Northeastern) - US 401(North Main St.) to NC 55/Wilbon Rd. Bicycle lanes	238	35.2	
41	F. Varina 2	5	Fuquay-Varina Loop Road (West) - US 401(South Main St.) to NC 55/Wilbon Rd. Bicycle lanes	260	32.7	
42	RTP-Comm.-1/BP-S.1	5	Leesville Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements. Strickland Road to Millbrook Road.	2,000	32.1	
43	Raleigh 10	5	Glenwood Avenue - Feasibility study for pedestrian crossings at Heresnipe Crk, Turkey Crk, and Sycamore Crk.	150	30.2	
44	Cary 10	5	MacDonald Woods Park Connector Bikeway	400	24.5	
45	Raleigh 7	5	I-40. Accessibility retrofits at Avent Ferry Road, Lake Dam Road, Trailwood Drive, and Rock Quarry Road.	2,000	20.1	

**Table 4: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Priority Enhancement Projects (\$22.8 Million)**

<i><b>Recommended Rank</b></i>	<i><b>Local Rank</b></i>	<i><b>Project Description</b></i>	<i><b>Estimated Cost (\$1,000s)</b></i>	<i><b>Technical Score</b></i>
1	Cary.1	Downtown Cary Regional Rail Station Pedestrian Bridge	300	100.0
2	Holly Springs.1	NC 55 Downtown Enhancements	1,195	82.6
3	Apex.2	NC 55/South Salem Street Intersection Improvements	30	80.3
4	Holly Springs.4	Bass Lake Road (SR1393) Bike Path	821	80.3
5	Apex.1	US 64/Laura Duncan Road Pedestrian Underpass	1,815	75.8
6	Cary.2	TCAP Streetscape Facilities	250	75.8
7	Holly Springs.3	Middle Creek Bridge Replacement (Holly Springs Road SR1152) and Pedestrian Crossing	4,998	75.3
8	Holly Springs.5	Avent Ferry Road (SR1115) Bike Path	3,174	73.6
9	Apex.4	NC 55 Pedestrian Underpass at Beaver Creek Greenway (Between Upchurch St. and Bryan Drive)	363	73.6
10	Holly Springs.2	Bass Lake Road Enhancements (SR1393)	3,138	73.0
11	Apex.5	Kelly Road Pedestrian Overpass at Beaver Creek Greenway	173	59.6
12	Cary.3	Cary Elementary Parking Deck	50	58.4
13	Apex.3	Harwood Street Sidwalk Connection (S. Salem St. to Upchurch St.	575	51.1
14	Cary.4	Speight Branch Phase II - Link to Swift Creek	1100	48.9
15	Cary.9	Preservation Green Level Viewshed	250	48.9
16	Cary.6	White Oak Creek Greenway	2867	44.4
17	Cary.8	Preston Village Connector Greenway/Bicycle Facility	1460	30.9
18	Cary.5	Walnut Street Median Addition and Landscaping	80	22.5
19	Cary.7	Tryon Road Median Landscaping	100	4.5
20	Cary.10	Cary Parkway Median Landscaping from Preston to Evan Road	140	0.0

\*Enhancement projects were not included in the CAMPO FY2006-2012 MPO Priority List

**Table 5: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Priority Intelligent Transportation Systems Projects (\$39.5 Million)**

<i>Recommended Rank</i>	<i>City or Route</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>Finish</i>	<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Length (Miles)</i>	<i>Estimated Cost (1,000's)</i>
1	Raleigh	N/A	N/A	Citywide signal system upgrade	N/A	\$28,000
2	I-40	US 15-501	Wade Avenue	Detection	19	\$1,500
3	I-40	Wade Avenue	S. Saunders Street	Fiber, Detection, CCTV, DMS	9	\$5,500
4	I-40	S. Saunders Street	US 70	Fiber, Detection, CCTV, DMS	8	\$4,500

\*\*ITS Projects were not included in the CAMPO FY2006-2012 Priority List

**Table 6: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Transit Projects (\$43 Million)****DRAFT DOCUMENT -- INFORMATION WILL BE UPDATED 01/2006**

I.D. NUMBER	FISCAL YEAR	DESCRIPTION	SYSTEM	AMOUNT	FUNDING SOURCE	EXPLANATION
<b>RALEIGH</b>						
TG 4791	2007	Routine Capital	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$406,480	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$101,620	L	
				\$508,100	Total	
TG 4791	2007	Preventive Maintenance	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,032,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$508,000	L	
				\$2,540,000	Total	
TG 4792	2008	Routine Capital	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$252,880	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$63,220	L	
				\$316,100	Total	
TG 4792	2008	Preventive Maintenance	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,096,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$524,000	L	
				\$2,620,000	Total	
TG 4793	2009	Routine Capital	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$319,360	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$79,840	L	
				\$399,200	Total	
TG 4793	2009	Preventive Maintenance	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,080,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$520,000	L	
				\$2,600,000	Total	
TG 4794	2010	Routine Capital	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$220,480	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$55,120	L	
				\$275,600	Total	
TG 4794	2010	Preventive Maintenance	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,124,800	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$531,200	L	
				\$2,656,000	Total	
	2011	Routine Capital	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$318,080	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$79,520	L	
				\$397,600	Total	
	2011	Preventive Maintenance	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,162,400	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$540,600	L	
				\$2,703,000	Total	
	2012	Routine Capital	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$234,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$58,500	L	
				\$292,500	Total	
	2012	Preventive Maintenance	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,200,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$550,000	L	
				\$2,750,000	Total	

**Table 6: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Transit Projects (\$43 Million)**

**DRAFT DOCUMENT -- INFORMATION WILL BE UPDATED 01/2006**

I.D. NUMBER	FISCAL YEAR	DESCRIPTION	SYSTEM	AMOUNT	FUNDING SOURCE	EXPLANATION
	2013	Routine Capital	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$224,400 \$0 \$56,100 \$280,500	FUZ STAT L Total	
	2013	Preventive Maintenance	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,244,000 \$0 \$561,000 \$2,805,000	FUZ STAT L Total	
	2014	Routine Capital	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$129,040 \$0 \$32,260 \$161,300	FUZ STAT L Total	
	2014	Preventive Maintenance	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,244,000 \$0 \$561,000 \$2,805,000	FUZ STAT L Total	
	2013	Routine Capital	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$224,400 \$0 \$56,100 \$280,500	FUZ STAT L Total	
	2013	Preventive Maintenance	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,244,000 \$0 \$561,000 \$2,805,000	FUZ STAT L Total	
<b>CARY</b>						
TM-4716B	2007	Capital Cost of Contracting	Cary	\$640,000 \$0 \$960,000 \$1,600,000	FUZ STAT L Total	
TM-4716C	2008	Capital Cost of Contracting	Cary	\$680,000 \$0 \$1,020,000 \$1,700,000	FUZ STAT L Total	
TM-4716D	2009	Capital Cost of Contracting	Cary	\$800,000 \$0 \$1,200,000 \$2,000,000	FUZ STAT L Total	
TM-4716E	2010	Capital Cost of Contracting	Cary	\$960,000 \$0 \$1,440,000 \$2,400,000	FUZ STAT L Total	
TM-4716F	2011	Capital Cost of Contracting	Cary	\$960,000 \$0 \$1,440,000 \$2,400,000	FUZ STAT L Total	

DRAFT  
(will be updated 01/06)



**Table 6: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Transit Projects (\$43 Million)****DRAFT DOCUMENT -- INFORMATION WILL BE UPDATED 01/2006**

I.D. NUMBER	FISCAL YEAR	DESCRIPTION	SYSTEM	AMOUNT	FUNDING SOURCE	EXPLANATION
TM-4716G	2012	Capital Cost of Contracting	Cary	\$960,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$1,440,000	L	
				\$2,400,000	Total	
	2013	Capital Cost of Contracting	Cary	\$960,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$1,440,000	L	
				\$2,400,000	Total	
TRIANGLE TRANSIT AUTHORITY (TTA)						
TG-4812	2007	Routine Capital	TTA	\$118,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$29,500	L	
				\$147,500	Total	
TG-4821	2008	Routine Capital	TTA	\$118,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$29,500	L	
				\$147,500	Total	
TG-4822	2009	Routine Capital	TTA	\$118,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$29,500	L	
				\$147,500	Total	
TG-4823	2010	Routine Capital	TTA	\$118,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$29,500	L	
				\$147,500	Total	
	2011	Routine Capital	TTA	\$118,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$29,500	L	
				\$147,500	Total	
	2012	Routine Capital	TTA	\$118,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$29,500	L	
				\$147,500	Total	
	2013	Routine Capital	TTA	\$118,000	FUZ	
				\$0	STAT	
				\$29,500	L	
				\$147,500	Total	

DRAFT  
(will be updated 01/06/25)

DRAFT (will be updated 01/06)

**Table 7: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Transit Projects (Unfunded) (\$899 Million)**

**DRAFT DOCUMENT -- INFORMATION WILL BE UPDATED 01/2006**

I.D. NUMBER	FISCAL YEAR	DESCRIPTION	SYSTEM	AMOUNT	FUNDING SOURCE	EXPLANATION
<b>RALEIGH</b>						
	2007	Automatic Passenger Counters	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$326,934 \$0 \$81,734 \$408,668	FED STAT L Total	IF NOT FUNDED IN FY 2006
	2007	Surveillance Cameras	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$433,870 \$0 \$108,468 \$542,338	FED STAT L Total	IF NOT FUNDED IN FY 2006
	2007	New Fixed Routes Buses (19)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$4,415,600 \$425,600 \$478,800 \$5,320,000	FED STAT L Total	New Service per Transit Plan IF NOT FUNDED IN FY 2006
TD 4729	2007	Renovation of Transit Maintenance Facility	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$2,804,800 \$350,600 \$350,600 \$3,506,000	FED STAT L Total	\$500,000 of this project funded in FY 2004 for the Design & Engineering Phase; (F: \$400,000; S: \$50,000; L: \$50,000) IF NOT FUNDED IN FY 2005 OR FY 2006
TD 4730	2007	Intermodal Center - Land Acquisition and Construction	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$14,852,662 \$1,856,583 \$1,856,583 \$18,565,827	FED STAT L Total	\$184,173 of this project funded in FY 2004 for Design & Planning Phase; (F: \$147,339; S: \$18,417; L: \$18,417)
TA 4785 TA 4786	2007	Replace 40' Bus (14)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$4,246,280 \$409,280 \$460,440 \$5,116,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2007	New Fixed Route Buses (8)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$1,859,200 \$179,200 \$201,600 \$2,240,000	FED STAT L Total	New Service per Transit Plan
	2007	New Connector Buses (2)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$415,000 \$40,000 \$45,000 \$500,000	FED STAT L Total	New Service per Transit Plan
	2008	New Fixed Route Buses (4)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$929,600 \$89,600 \$100,800 \$1,120,000	FED STAT L Total	Per Transit Plan Per NCDOT, change to expansion buses and amount of \$6,170,000; per Ed, leave our original numbers

**Table 7: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Transit Projects (Unfunded) (\$899 Million)**

**DRAFT DOCUMENT -- INFORMATION WILL BE UPDATED 01/2006**

I.D. NUMBER	FISCAL YEAR	DESCRIPTION	SYSTEM	AMOUNT	FUNDING SOURCE	EXPLANATION
	2008	New Commuter Buses (13)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$3,776,500 \$364,000 \$409,500 \$4,550,000	FED STAT L Total	Per Transit Plan
	2008	New Connector Buses (2)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$415,000 \$40,000 \$45,000 \$500,000	FED STAT L Total	Per Transit Plan
	2009	Real Time Traveler Info (3 informaiton kiosks)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$105,000 \$0 \$26,250 \$131,250	FED STAT L Total	Per Transit Plan - Technology NCDOT combined 2008 & 2009 Traveler Info project; NCDOT amount \$36,000; per Ed, leave our original numbers
	2009	AVL/CAD (8)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$400,000 \$0 \$100,000 \$500,000	FED STAT L Total	Per Transit Plan - Technology NCDOT combined 2008 & 2009 AVL project; NCDOT amount \$135,000; per Ed, leave our original numbers
TG 4787	2009	Replace 30' Bus (9)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$1,743,000 \$168,000 \$189,000 \$2,100,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2010	Replace 30' Bus (6)	Raleigh (Capital Area Transit)	\$1,195,200 \$115,200 \$129,600 \$1,440,000	FED STAT L Total	NCDOT had this project on the Draft STIP as 2 separate items
<b>CARY</b>						
	2007	Expansion Bus Purchase (4)	Cary	\$182,600 \$17,600 \$19,800 \$220,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2007	Bus Stop Shelters	Cary	\$176,000 \$0 \$44,000 \$220,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2007	Electronic Fareboxes	Cary	\$83,000 \$8,000 \$9,000 \$100,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2008	Park-n-Ride	Cary	\$144,000 \$0 \$36,000 \$180,000	FED STAT L Total	

**Table 7: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Transit Projects (Unfunded) (\$899 Million)**

**DRAFT DOCUMENT -- INFORMATION WILL BE UPDATED 01/2006**

I.D. NUMBER	FISCAL YEAR	DESCRIPTION	SYSTEM	AMOUNT	FUNDING SOURCE	EXPLANATION
	2008	Queue Jump Lanes -Davis Drive	Cary	\$480,000 \$0 \$120,000 \$600,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2008	Expansion Bus Purchase (2)	Cary	\$88,000 \$8,800 \$9,900 \$110,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2008	TTA Bus Stop Lanes	Cary	\$80,000 \$0 \$20,000 \$100,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2009	Expansion Bus Purchase (8)	Cary	\$365,200 \$35,200 \$39,600 \$440,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2011	Expansion Bus Purchase (2)	Cary	\$240,000 \$24,000 \$27,000 \$300,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2012	Replace Buses (2) New Bus Purchase (2)	Cary	\$348,600 \$33,600 \$37,800 \$420,000	FED STAT L Total	
<b>TRIANGLE TRANSIT AUTHORITY (TTA)</b>						
TE-4705A	2007	Regional Rail Service	TTA	\$66,000,000 \$22,000,000 \$22,000,000 \$110,000,000	FED STAT L Total	IF NOT FUNDED IN FY 2005
TE-4705B TE-4705C TE-4705D TE-4705E	2007	Regional Rail Service	TTA	\$138,000,000 \$416,000,000 \$138,000,000 \$692,000,000	FED STAT L Total	Section 5309, Capital Program Per NCDOT, NEW START, entry project in first year of FULL Funding: numbers per NCDOT IF NOT FUNDED IN FY 2006
TE-4707A	2007	Airport Rail Project	TTA	\$1,649,400 \$549,800 \$549,800 \$2,749,000	FED STAT L Total	IF NOT FUNDED IN FY 2006
TE-4707B	2007	Airport Rail Project	TTA	\$1,649,400 \$549,800 \$549,800 \$2,749,000	FED STAT L Total	

**Table 7: 2007-2013 CAMPO TCC Recommended Transit Projects (Unfunded) (\$899 Million)**

**DRAFT DOCUMENT -- INFORMATION WILL BE UPDATED 01/2006**

I.D. NUMBER	FISCAL YEAR	DESCRIPTION	SYSTEM	AMOUNT	FUNDING SOURCE	EXPLANATION
	2007	Advanced Technology Projects: AVL/CAD	TTA	\$180,000 \$60,000 \$60,000 \$300,000	FED STAT L Total	Technology State Grant
	2007	Advanced Technology Projects: Regional Transit Information Telephone System	TTA	\$60,000 \$20,000 \$20,000 \$100,000	FED STAT L Total	
	2007	Replace Buses	TTA	\$4,140,000 \$1,380,000 \$1,380,000 \$6,900,000	FED STAT L Total	Section 5309
TA-4818	2008	Replace Buses (22)	TTA	\$5,727,000 \$552,000 \$621,000 \$6,900,000	FED STAT L Total	Section 5309
TA-4797	2009	Replace Buses (8)	TTA	\$5,727,000 \$552,000 \$621,000 \$6,900,000	FED STAT L Total	Section 5309
TA-4797	2010	Replace Buses (8)	TTA	\$5,727,000 \$552,000 \$621,000 \$6,900,000	FED STAT L Total	Section 5309
TA-4819	2011	Replace Buses (15)	TTA	\$5,727,000 \$552,000 \$621,000 \$6,900,000	FED STAT L Total	Section 5309
TA-4945	2012	Replacement Buses (12)	TTA	\$5,727,000 \$552,000 \$621,000 \$6,900,000	FED STAT L Total	Section 5309
<b>North Carolina State University (NCSU)</b>						
	2007	Hybrid Diesel-Electric Bus (1)	NCSU	\$406,700 \$83,300 \$490,000	FED STAT L Total	NCDOT Statewide PTDF Funds IF NOT FUNDED IN FY 2006

**Appendix A: FY 2007-2013 Transportation Improvement Program -- "Top 40" Priority List for Roadway System Improvements (as recommended by TCC - Nov. 3, 2005)**

MTIP ID	Project	Project Location	Statewide Planning Tier	Highway Division	Project Length (Miles)	2010 AADT	2030 AADT	Project Cost	Total User Benefits	Rank - Total Benefits	User Benefits Per Mile	Rank - Benefits per Mile	Pay Back Period (Years)	Rank - Payback Period	Technical Ranking Score	Technical Ranking Priority	2006-2012 TIP Priority #	2007-2013 TIP Priority #	Additional Note
<b>Priority #1 - Endorsement of current FY06-12 TIP projects (and subsequent funding agreements) not being requested for adjustment, including the following prior TIP Requests</b>																			
Raleigh 1	Signal System Upgrade	Citywide	N/A	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$28,000,000	\$1,600,000,000	8	N/A	1	0.35	3	75	3	1	1	
Garner 1	Timber Drive	NC 50 to White Oak Rd.	3	5	1.25	9,600	15,200	\$17,550,000	\$120,368,915	40	\$96,295,132	32	2.92	47	26	31	4	1	
Raleigh 2	Falls of Neuse Road	Raven Ridge Rd. to US 1	3	5	3.87	13,800	36,900	\$18,000,000	\$676,014,395	12	\$174,680,722	21	0.53	7	51	9	6	1	
Wake Forest 1	Wake Forest Bypass (NC 98)	West of Thompson Mill Rd to US 1	2	5	1.38	12,484	22,570	\$19,500,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	Part A construct in FY 2007-2008
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>5.12</b>			<b>\$83,050,000</b>	<b>\$2,396,383,310</b>										
<b>Priorities #2 to 40 - Current TIP projects requested for acceleration and other high priority projects not currently programmed in the TIP</b>																			
Apex 1/H Spr 5/W.Co	I-540 Western Wake Freeway	NC 55 (Morrisville) to NC 55 Bypass (Holly Springs)	1	5	12.30	157,000	203,000	\$294,615,000	\$7,214,918,469	1	\$586,578,737	5	0.82	21	57	7	5	2	Benefits Harnett County also
Raleigh 8	I-40 Widening	I-440 & US1/64 to Wade Ave.	1	5	4.10	100,300	122,000	\$45,320,000	\$1,658,091,563	7	\$404,412,576	7	0.55	10	61	6	9	3	
Rolesville 1	US 401	Ligon Mill Rd. to Franklin County line	1	5	8.29	10,900	20,300	\$34,485,000	\$258,489,616	23	\$31,180,895	46	2.67	45	40	15		4	Benefits Franklin County also
Wake Co 1	Intersection Improvements	Countywide	N/A	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$7,750,000	\$300,000,000	19	N/A	2	0.52	6	36	21		5	
Regional.1	I-40 South Widening	I-440 to NC 42	1	4 & 5	10.03	98,500	109,300	\$103,000,000	\$3,601,505,976	3	\$359,073,377	8	0.57	11	77	2		6	Benefits Johnston County also
Raleigh 7	US 70 Upgrade	Duraleigh Rd. to T.W. Alexander Dr.	1	5	4.05	29,300	98,600	\$62,500,000	\$972,435,387	10	\$240,107,503	13	1.29	33	63	5	7	7	
Wake Co 5A	Triangle Parkway	I-40/NC 147 to McCrimmon Pkwy.	1	5	6.26	95,900	137,500	\$111,484,000	\$1,970,614,754	6	\$314,794,689	10	1.13	29	47	12	8	8	
Franklin Co 1	US 401 Widening	Franklin County line to Louisburg	1	5	7.57	9,400	17,600	\$43,578,000	\$211,547,348	28	\$27,945,488	47	0.54	9	39	16		9	
Harnett Co 1	US 401	Fuquay-Varina to NC 210	1	6	13.45	9,800	22,300	\$48,688,000	\$100,921,589	42	\$7,503,464	68	0.72	24	27	30		10	
Raleigh 6	I-440 Widening	I-40/US 64 to Wade Ave.	1	5	3.81	109,000	119,000	\$77,300,000	\$1,042,809,497	9	\$273,703,280	11	1.48	36	49	10	10	11	
Morrisville 1A	McCrimmon Parkway - Part A	Evans Rd. (at Aviation Pkwy.) to Perimeter Pkwy.	3	5	1.53	6,300	31,800	\$7,727,000	\$242,951,979	26	\$158,792,143	22	0.64	16	36	20	19	12	
Granville Co 3	NC 50	Wake County to Creedmoor	2	5	3.29	4,300	20,000	\$16,417,000	\$46,862,320	55	\$14,243,866	56	7.01	43	8	59		13	Special Planning Study
Raleigh 4	Blue Ridge Grade Separation	Hillsborough St. and Blue Ridge Rd.	2	5	0.96	37,300	48,400	\$10,000,000	\$196,114,936	31	\$204,286,392	16	1.02	26	34	25		14	
Cary 10	Chapel Hill Road - NC 54	NW Maynard Rd. to Weston Pkwy.	2	5	3.82	39,500	63,500	\$14,700,000	\$463,968,466	15	\$121,457,714	26	0.63	15	41	14		15	
Morrisville 4A	Aviation Parkway - Part A	I-40 to Dominion Dr.	3	5	1.00	33,600	45,900	\$10,384,000	\$351,240,036	17	\$351,240,036	9	0.59	12	28	28		16	
Holly Springs 1	Holly Springs Road	NC 55 Bypass to proposed I-540	3	5	3.97	11,900	56,900	\$20,231,000	\$482,203,459	14	\$121,461,828	25	0.84	22	33	26	13	17	
Wendell 1	Wendell Blvd	US 64 Bypass to the Little River	3	5	5.74	3,400	6,500	\$27,678,000	\$32,080,368	58	\$5,588,914	71	17.26	68	18	42		18	
Cary 9	Holly Springs Road	Tryon Rd. to Kildaire Farm Rd.	3	5	5.89	15,300	44,500	\$24,000,000	\$798,903,423	11	\$135,637,254	23	0.60	14	47	13		19	
Wake Co 8	Southern Wake Freeway	NC 55 to US 401	1	5	8.17	105,000	144,800	\$174,590,000	\$3,489,997,375	4	\$427,172,261	6	1.00	25	72	4		20	Benefits Harnett & Johnston Counties also
Wake Co 9	Southern Wake Freeway	US 401 to I-40	1	5	8.56	102,700	139,100	\$121,830,000	\$5,731,082,375	2	\$669,518,969	4	0.43	4	95	1		21	Benefits Harnett & Johnston Counties also
Fuquay Varina 4	Western Parkway	US 401 South to NC 55 (West of town)	3	5	5.06	9,500	16,100	\$46,870,000	\$72,909,140	49	\$14,408,921	55	12.86	66	22	35		22	Benefits Harnett County also
Holly Springs 3	Main St. (Holly Springs)	Holly Springs Rd. to NC 55 Bypass	3	5	2.97	33,200	44,100	\$11,761,000	\$552,375,292	13	\$185,984,947	19	0.43	5	48	11	18	23	
Apex 4	NC 55	US 1 to US 64	2	5	3.20	25,100	28,400	\$20,255,000	\$244,784,360	25	\$76,495,113	37	1.65	39	35	23		24	
Morrisville 2	Morrisville Carpenter Road	Davis Dr. to NC 54	3	5	1.36	21,400	28,700	\$6,666,000	\$246,303,918	24	\$181,105,822	20	0.54	8	35	24		25	
Granville Co 1	US 15	NC 56 to Durham County Line	1	5	13.59	8,500	15,000	\$53,400,000	\$266,045,831	22	\$19,576,588	53	4.01	1	38	17		26	
Johnston Co 1	NC 42 (US 70 to NC 50)	US 70 to NC 50	2	4	8.65	11,700	23,400	\$39,500,000	\$196,827,930	30	\$22,754,674	48	4.01	53	38	18		27	
Cary 1	Morrisville Parkway	Davis Dr. to NC 55	3	5	1.39	9,800	24,300	\$9,500,000	\$120,292,861	41	\$86,541,627	35	1.58	37	29	27		28	
Harnett Co 2	NC 55	Fuquay-Varina to NC 27 (Coats)	2	6	14.29	15,400	26,100	\$24,744,000	\$298,865,584	20	\$20,914,317	50	1.66	2	36	22		29	
Knightdale 1A	Smithfield Road	Forestville Rd. to US 64 Business	3	5	0.74	5,000	10,400	\$2,790,000	\$12,374,234	66	\$16,721,937	54	4.51	54	17	44	20	30	
Raleigh 10	Eastern Wake Freeway	US 64 Bypass to I-40 (South)	1	5	10.85	50,700	80,000	\$205,900,000	\$2,862,230,322	5	\$263,800,030	12	1.44	35	53	8		31	I-40 (South) Widening Reduces Immediate Need
Apex 2/Cary11	Ten Ten Road	Apex Peakway to Kildaire Farm Rd.	3	5	3.28	16,800	28,300	\$19,626,000	\$312,902,165	18	\$95,397,002	33	1.25	31	25	32		32	
Wake Forest 1	US 1-A	US 1 to NC 98 Bypass	2	5	1.85	9,800	43,600	\$10,425,000	\$230,139,013	27	\$124,399,466	24	0.91	23	24	33		33	
Raleigh 5	Tryon Road Extension	Garner Rd. to Rock Quarry Rd.	3	5	1.55	8,500	19,500	\$21,050,000	\$140,049,446	36	\$90,354,481	34	3.01	49	21	40		34	
Apex 5	Kelly Rd/Green Level Church Rd	Green Level West to Old US 1	3	5	7.99	17,900	20,200	\$24,597,000	\$355,885,306	16	\$44,541,340	40	1.38	34	22	36		35	
Garner 2	Vandora Springs Road	Timber Dr. to Old Stage Rd.	3	5	0.84	6,800	14,700	\$5,020,000	\$11,172,129	69	\$13,300,153	59	8.99	64	22	37		36	
Morrisville 1B	McCrimmon Parkway - Part B	Perimeter Pkwy to Davis Dr.	3	5	1.34	8,200	42,600	\$11,300,000	\$278,380,970	21	\$207,746,993	14	0.81	20	38	19	19	37	Includes NC 54 Interchange / RR Overpass
Raleigh 9	Tryon Road Realignment	NS Railroad to Wilmington St.	3	5	0.76	19,400	35,200	\$5,200,000	\$147,096,298	35	\$193,547,761	17	0.71	17	21	39	16	38	
Raleigh 11	TW Alexander Drive	US 70 to Leesville Rd.	3	5	1.82	12,100	23,600	\$27,000,000	\$88,396,383	45	\$48,569,441	39	6.11	59	27	29		39	
Knightdale 3	Bethlehem Road	Smithfield Rd. to Grasshopper Rd.	3	5	2.77	2,500	5,300	\$9,592,000	\$8,512,769	74	\$3,073,202	75	22.54	71	21	38		40	
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>172.40</b>			<b>\$1,811,473,000</b>	<b>\$35,612,282,889</b>										

## Appendix B: How the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Prioritizes Its Project Requests

**Overview** The Capital Area MPO places each project requested by a member government through a rigorous technical evaluation. This technical evaluation has been incrementally enhanced over the last several years in order to better inform the TCC in developing its recommended TIP priority lists. Periodically, MPO staff, at the direction of its TCC and TAC, have revised the criteria by which projects are ranked in hopes of improving the process. The goal of the prioritization process is to inform a priority list that, if funded, results in the highest benefit to each of the transportation modes that are integral to this region's transportation system.

### HIGHLIGHTS OF PREVIOUS CHANGES

#### Modifications In The 1999 Methodology

Use the approved Triangle Regional Model to address user benefits.

Limiting the number of submitted projects by population size.

Assess environmental impacts, including air quality, stream quality, wetlands, and critical habitats (roadways).

Assess community impacts, including historic and "4F" properties, low-income populations, and minority communities (roadways).

Assessment of how well a community uses access management tools to prolong the life of a proposed roadway facility (integration of land use impacts).

Better public involvement; especially through the use of the CAMPO web site and Transportation Plan Update 2025 project planning process.

#### Modifications In The 2002 Methodology

Consolidate 5 former factors into the "Local Priority" factor for roadways. The Project Priority Subcommittee would evaluate this factor, which accounts for 20% of a roadway project's score. Cost performance was also shown by comparing project cost to the User Benefits portion of the roadway score.

Allow non-municipal members and the Project Priority Subcommittee to recommend projects.

Revise Enhancement criteria to match those used in the NCDOT call for projects in 2000; these will be CAMPO's priorities for the next call.

**Background** The Capital Area MPO undertook an extensive update of its priority request mechanism in 1997, and modifications have been made in each cycle since that time (1999, 2002, and 2004). A subcommittee of the TCC was formed to examine the way in which we had performed our requests in previous years, and to develop new procedures as recommended.

In 1997, the subcommittee recommended that an objective system should be created that would prioritize projects in a reproducible manner. Criteria for highways, transit, and bicycle/ pedestrian projects were developed and weighted according to a survey of the subcommittee members. In 1999, the update of the mechanism focused on including environmental variables in the highway project analysis and solidifying the forecasted average daily traffic figures using the newly-created Triangle Regional Model (see box at left). Other priority mechanisms were considered for other modes, including transit, but were not recommended for incorporation by the TCC. The revised priority model, including the new variables and weighting schemes, was approved by the TCC and TAC in August, 1999.

The 2002 update focused on assessing alternative evaluation mechanisms, especially MicroBenCost and STEAM. Adjustments were made to the Roadway and Enhancement evaluation models, as shown at left. The table to the left indicates what variables were used to assess various project types in this cycle, which was generally responsible for the data collection, and how important each

variable is to the ultimate score of a project. The staff then took these criteria and weights and developed a spreadsheet system that would assign a raw score to each project, which could then be transformed into a zero- to 100-point ranking system. The final spreadsheet could be used by anyone that wished to know

how their project, or a proposed project, ranked relative to any other. The TCC was kept informed of the subcommittee's work throughout this process. All of the particular ranking systems used are described below, and each produces a raw score for each project, which is then normalized to fit a 100-point scale, thus equalizing the rankings across modes of travel. In this way, projects were ranked within each mode, but could also be ranked across modes of travel.

A number of improvements were recommended in the 2006-2012 Project Priority Listing, some of which were completed in this cycle (denoted by an asterisk "\*\*"):

- Make the system GIS-friendly, a continuing effort;
- Consider alternative, turn-key evaluation systems;\*
- Address the issue of intersection/interchange improvements;\* and
- Improve the existing rating system (eliminate redundant criteria\*, include instructions for each rating system and the summary sheet\*, re-examine how impacts to low-income and minority communities are addressed\*, and re-examine cost-benefit measures to the roadway model\*).

Better integration of the TIP Project Priority List and the MPO's 2030 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) was cited as a desired improvement in the 2006-2012 TIP Request report. This remains a high priority and would have been accomplished in this cycle if the timing had worked out better regarding the addition of portions of four additional counties to the MPO which are not yet a part of the MPO's 2030 LRTP. However, by reviewing the project list contained in the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan report and the Project Priority List, our government agencies were able to compare the two and make some adjustments to each for Wake County. The other long-term improvement was to continue to develop a more comprehensive review process with NCDOT during the priority process. This was facilitated by having two meetings with NCDOT upper management in this past TIP cycle.

**Roadways** The most complex of the rating systems is reserved for roadway improvements, not surprising since the majority of current transportation capital improvement funds spent are on these types of facilities. A user benefits analysis is used to determine both the user benefits (expressed in time/wages saved or lost with or without the proposed facility). Forecasted and current ADT volumes were developed with the approved Triangle Regional Model. This portion of the analysis can also produce accident (safety) benefits. The 2007-2013 cycle includes various environmental (air and water quality, historic/park properties, wetlands and critical habitat) and environmental justice (low-income and minority populations) factors. These factors were intended to "flag" potential environmental problems associated with a proposal, which could in turn be used to adjust the project to avoid the impact. Ultimately, this may result in great benefits to the time it takes to design and construct a project, as well as its ultimate costs to taxpayers and the community.

***Two significant changes were made in the 2007-2013 cycle of TIP Project Request evaluations:***

First, each project's cost was compared to that project's calculated user benefits, a methodology used to derive the economic value of the reduced travel time and increased safety each roadway improvement project would be expected to accrue. These user benefit comparisons were done in three different ways --- (1) By overall total benefits (where larger projects have larger overall benefits, without consideration of project cost or length), (2) by user benefits per mile of project length (which normalizes projects by length but not by cost, thereby identifying the most productive projects without regard for project cost), and (3) by a variation of the often used benefit-cost ratio approach that calculated how long a project would take to pay for itself if done so using the accrued user benefits. The results of these comparisons are presented in Appendix A.



Second, five previous factors were combined into a “Local Support” factor, which was judged subjectively by the Project Priority Subcommittee itself as 20% of the overall project score. These five factors are:

- Local Priority Listing: Position on the approved, submitted local priority listing;
- Access Management/Lane Efficiency: Indicates how well the governing body protects the capacity of the proposed facility through access management and land use planning;
- Continuity of Request from Previous Local Priority List: Weight assigned to projects that have been in the previous priority listing submitted by the government agency;
- Financial support exhibited by sponsoring agency(-ies), which may include direct financing, private participation, or corridor protection; and
- Adherence to the goals/objectives within the CAMPO adopted long-range transportation plan.

In the new MPO counties (Franklin, Granville, Harnett, and Johnston), it was not possible to perform these evaluations for those member governments’ proposed projects since they are currently not in the MPO’s 2030 Long-Range Plan with present and future year traffic forecasts. Therefore, using the priority rankings most recently developed by these governments’ respective former Rural Planning Organizations (RPOs), MPO staff made manual adjustments to the project rankings to place projects benefiting those areas into the MPO’s most important priorities.

Prior to final approval of the TIP Priority Project Request, all priority rankings were reviewed for adjustments as deemed appropriate by the MPO’s Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC).

**Advanced Planning Studies** Introduced in the previous listing, this category of project requests includes large planning and implementation studies for ITS and HOV measures, for example. The order of these projects is determined by the Project Priority Subcommittee.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects** This system is employed for bicycle projects and greenways. Proximity to schools and other pedestrian “generators,” local rankings, and safety concerns were taken into account during the project evaluations. In general there were changes made to the evaluation criteria in order to make the project ranking system more objective and transparent. The revision of the ranking system was based on input from TCC members and members of the Capital Area MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Stakeholders Group. The changes made prior to the development of the 2007-2013 Priority List are listed below:

- Points for “Connection to Existing Facilities” were removed due to the difficulty in determining what fulfilled this criterion.
- Added weight was given to projects that benefit other modes of travel and would improve safety at high hazard locations. Projects that increased safety for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as improved access to transit stops/stations received a better score than projects that improved conditions for a single mode. High hazard locations for pedestrians and bicyclists were queried using NCDOT’s Traffic Engineering and Accident Analysis System (TEAAS).
- A new criterion was added entitled, “Regional Significance,” this was done in order to give preferential treatment to projects that would benefit a large area. These points would be awarded based on a staff determination.
- Projects were awarded additional points if they were located in a minority or low income community.
- Previously projects received points if they were located near a “pedestrian generator” and additional points if they were located near a “bicycle generator.” These two criteria were combined in order to simplify the criteria.

- Discretionary Points for Geographic Equity were added (Max 4 points). This was done in order to ensure the equal representation of municipalities on the final top twenty priority list. Points were awarded at the discretion of CAMPO staff.
- Project Located on Thoroughfare was added (8 points) (5 points were allotted for multiuse paths in the vicinity of a thoroughfare). This was done in order to encourage the improvement of pedestrian and bicycling conditions on important bicycling and walking routes that currently have no accommodations.
- Projects with ROW, O&M, and Construction Contributions were increased in priority; this was done in order to encourage partnerships between NCDOT, CAMPO, and CAMPO member governments.
- Additional points were awarded to project that had a high cost/benefit ratio.

**Enhancement Projects** Previously enhancement projects were not submitted in the TIP priority list. These projects were thought to be an integral part of improving the transportation system in the Capital Area and it was decided to include a list of priorities in the 2007-2013 CAMPO Priority List. These projects were evaluated using criteria similar to that which used in the ranking of the bicycle and pedestrian projects.

**Intelligent Transportation Systems** Previously intelligent transportation system (ITS) projects were included solely in the cost of roadway projects, or completed using ITS grants separate from the TIP. It was determined that CAMPO's priority ITS projects should be identified in the TIP. The ITS projects were ranked by the TCC with input from the NCDOT Traffic Engineering Branch. To further develop and advance desirable regional ITS project priorities, a Triangle ITS Stakeholders group was established in 2004 and has had several meetings over the past year. The efforts of this group have contributed greatly to the overall quality and technical credibility of our MPO's currently identified ITS priorities.

**Recommendations for Improving the Current Priority Setting System** The Project Priority List has gained considerable acceptance at both the technical and policy levels. However, there will always be opportunities presented to make the system better, more integrated, more comprehensive, and more accessible to stakeholder groups and the public. The following are areas where improvements could be made in the short run, probably by the next cycle:

- Aggressively attack the issue of major intersection/interchange improvements, for which there is no assessment mechanism currently used. A robust assessment tool here could also help in Comprehensive Transportation Plan (the emerging NCDOT equivalent of a "vision plan" for roadways, transit, and bike/ped facilities) evaluations of interchanges. In any case, consideration should be given to the FHWA assessment guidelines that are available.
- Re-assess the linear costs used in the cost spreadsheet model. This update should include a review of the cross-sections available to the user in the model as well as updating the linear construction and ROW costs. This needs to be done well in advance of the 2009-2015 TIP cycle.
- Improve the collection and use of accident data to augment project scores. The lack of spatially referenced accident data makes it difficult to quantify and illustrate high hazard safety locations in the region. The newly developed NCDOT Linear Referencing System (LRS) may make the process of mapping accidents more efficient.
- Find a better way (objective) to treat air quality performance. This item in part assumes that staff can assess the performance of a roadway based on its design characteristics, speed, and traffic flow. In order to do this accurately, it is imperative that good speed and emissions data be collected on a variety of cross-sections in rural, fringe, and urban areas.
- Complete the integration of the Project Priority List model with the long-range transportation plan analysis. It is only by a thorough system-level analysis and comprehensive public involvement

effort that an accurate determination of overall objectives and implementation strategies can be developed. This level of effort is simply too great to accomplish outside of the transportation plan update process with the current resources available to CAMPO. Additionally, this would eliminate confusion over the duplicative project determination process implicit in both exercises (project priority list and long-range plan updates). Although this was partially accomplished this year, it was primarily on an ad-hoc basis, as local governments were working with both processes in roughly the same time frame.

- Most importantly, continue to build strategic partnerships with NCDOT Professional Staff as well as with our NCDOT Board of Transportation Members. This includes not only with the staff of the several branches of NCDOT located in Raleigh, but also with the Division and District Engineers for the three highway divisions (4, 5, and 6) that our MPO now embraces, and our neighboring MPOs and RPOs that together represent the greater Triangle Region.

## **CAMPO STAFF REPORT**

Prepared by: Jake Petrosky, Planner  
For: Inclusion in Priority Report FY 2007-2013

### **SUBJECT: Comments on Draft MTIP Priorities for Fiscal Years 2007-2013**

---

#### **Public Involvement Process**

The Capital Area MPO Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) held a public hearing on August 17, 2005 and left the hearing open until the November 16, 2005 meeting. Notifications advising the public of the comment period and public hearing were made utilizing (1) the Capital Area MPO's web site, (2) the News and Observer newspaper (legal ads printed 8/21/2005 & 11/09/2005), (3) the Carolinian newspaper (legal ads printed 8/24/2005 & 11/11/2005), and (4) the MPO's mailing list. In addition, the Que Pasa newspaper and the La Connexion newspaper were notified of the comment period and corresponding public hearing. During August, September, and November a portion of the TAC meetings were reserved for public comment on the draft FY 2007-2013 MTIP Priority Lists. This document includes a summary public comments made at the August 17, 2005 TAC meeting, a response to the comments, and a cost summary of requested priorities by mode. No other comments by the public on the TIP Priority Lists were received during the public comment period.

#### **The Regional Transportation Alliance**

Joe Milazzo, Executive Director of the Regional Transportation Alliance (RTA), expressed support of the acceleration of the projects as outlined. He noted that RTA and the greater Triangle business community believe that a number of projects on the priority list are critically needed. Mr. Milazzo continued to convey that RTA endorsed CAMPO's top three priorities:

- #1. Raleigh Signal System Upgrade (citywide)
- #2. Western Wake Freeway (Morrisville to Holly Springs)
- #3. I-40 Widening (Wade Avenue to US 1/64)

It was mentioned that RTA believes that the completion of these projects is essential to maintaining the mobility of Triangle residents and businesses. Mr. Milazzo expressed appreciation for whatever could be done to accelerate these items.

#### **The Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC)**

Attorney Gudrun Thompson, of the Southern Environmental Law Center, expressed concern that if we fail to meet air quality standards by the deadline, we risk sanctions including loss of Federal Highway funds. She spoke of the requirement to demonstrate transportation conformity and that failure to do so results in a lower image of the area and the possible delay of transportation projects. Ms. Thompson noted that there is a linkage between air quality and human health. Poor air quality causes children to develop asthma. She noted that of 96,000 local residents who suffer from asthma, 1/3 of them are children. She stated this area ranked 4<sup>th</sup> in the nation in vehicular noxious emissions per capita and that urban sprawl is the problem. Between 1991 and 2000, land consumed by urbanized areas in the Triangle grew 74% and the per capita vehicle miles traveled are 13<sup>th</sup> in the nation. She indicated there are few transportation options available so we drive everywhere. 85% of Wake County residents in 2000 drove alone to work. She stressed the need to get people out of their cars; by increased funding for transportation alternatives. She noted the 2006-2012 TIP funds overwhelmingly go to road projects and pointed out that this is worse than the last TIP; which is a step in the wrong direction for air quality, sprawl and the quality of life in this area. The TTA rail system will help reduce smog emissions. She urged CAMPO to implement other transportation strategies including increasing funding for bike/pedestrian projects, etc. Ms. Thompson stated that as other regions have discovered, the Triangle can't build its way out of congestion by constructing more highways.

**CAMPO Response to SELC Comments**

CAMPO staff responded to Ms. Gudrun after the meeting by noting that the FY 2007-2013 Priority List includes a number of transit, bicycle, pedestrian, enhancement, and advance planning projects that, if funded, would help to better the Triangle's air quality by increasing the transportation options available to citizens. It was also mentioned to Ms. Gudrun that transit and bicycle and pedestrian projects are a priority for the Capital Area MPO, but the way the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) allocates federal transportation funds by mode has great impact on what type of projects receive funding.

**FY 2007-2013 MTIP Priority List Summary by Mode**

Overall the FY 2007-2013 Priority list includes over \$3 billion in transportation projects, of which road projects make up 65%, un-funded transit projects (including the Triangle Regional Rail Phase I) make up 31% and together, funded transit, bicycle and pedestrian, advanced planning and intelligent transportation system (ITS) projects compose the remainder.