Managed (Fast) Lanes Study, Phase III Stakeholder Workshop #1

March 14, 2012

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Location:Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, Room CH-14Attendees:Sign-in Sheet is attachedPrepared by:Parsons Brinckerhoff and Clark & Chase Research

The workshop began at 10:10am (EDT) and ended at 2:00pm.

Key Questions about Fast Lanes and Congestion Pricing

During the workshop presentations (copies attached), the following questions or comments were mentioned by participants as information which should be obtained during the study's outreach efforts. The study team will address participant suggestions during the development of the public opinion survey, focus group scripts and interview questions for individual meetings (one-on-one sessions).

- Congestion Pricing Concept would you use it?
- Public perception of corridor lanes will they be impacted?
- Need to investigate both potential users <u>and</u> residents/local stakeholders in public outreach.
- Distinction between how you would manage lanes under Public/Private Partnership (P3).
 - o What differences does the public perceive?
- Implications of cost/revenue
 - o Use for Transit
- Perceptions on how revenue from Managed (Fast) Lanes can expedite projects.
- Opportunity to improve adjacent arterial street performance with *Fast Lanes* alternatives on Freeways.
- Use of Toll Revenue
 - Where does revenue go?
 - What promises can/should be made?
 - What is the P3 effect?
- P3 is a different concept for the public why do it?
 - Resources and risk; Increase risk = reduction in control of rules
- Public understanding of external factors that affect projects (Federal legislation changes, tax revenue decreases, etc.).
 - What is the public's understanding of these funding issues?
- Do financial assumptions include expansion of General Purpose Lanes?
 - Public Testing:
 - Just Managed Lanes
 - Managed Lanes + General Purpose Lanes

- Timing
- Public perception and understanding of environmental impacts more cars & pollution
- How does the North Carolina Legislature involve itself with P3 and Fast Lanes projects?
 - o Demonstration of support for federal highway tolling agreements
 - Political variability
- How to transition existing technology to switchable transponders
- Interoperability of switchable tags
- What about enforcement? How does that happen?
- Who pays for enforcement?
- Different vehicle occupancy requirements in different corridors ... Is that a problem?
- Rental car billing (for HOT lane use) ... how does that work?
- What about discounts for hybrid vehicle use?
- What about lanes that were always promised as "free" and now are considered for tolls?
- Any consideration for toll pricing changes due to seasonality?
- Issues regarding the posting of toll rates
- What about HOV cheaters with switchable transponders?
- What about using facial recognition technology (do we need to be cognizant of where tracking technology will be five years from now?)
- What about revenue from highways?
- Monroe Connector/Bypass will be connected to US-74 and I-485 Does the public know this?
- Why are Fast Lanes good?
- Access control, pricing, vehicle eligibility are three lane management tools.
- 1500-1700 Vehicles per hour optimum capacity of a single Fast Lane
- Primary intent provide reliability
- Messaging Project has to make money
- Do Fast Lanes operate all day?
- Transit services tend to be free.
- All persons who share rides could be required to have a transponder
- Enter & Exit in designated places only
- Reasons why you would implement Fast Lanes along a corridor
 - Option to congestion
 - Revenue generation
 - Protection of the corridor for future traffic growth
- Why would you like it?
- Transit also gets a time-savings helps transit customers as users
- Perceived fairness of policy minimize negative impacts
- Thought: measure the perceived value of various benefits
- Identify messages that resonate with broadest audience
- Pricing 3 models
 - Fixed price Monroe Connector/Bypass
 - Variable pricing fixed by the time of day
 - Variable dynamic based on demand. Is cheaper but less predictable
 - BEST practice don't start with variable dynamic but acquire history of demand
- Potential Fast Lanes users evaluate value of time vs. commuting cost.

Identification of Influencer/Opinion Setters in Each Corridor

Workshop attendees suggested persons listed below as potential participants in one-onone interviews for the I-485 South and US-74 East corridors. Stakeholders to be interviewed will be based on their representative nature of the community at large as well as their stature in the two corridors. These individual conversations will document stakeholder perceptions, concerns or visions for Fast Lanes implementation in not only a specific corridor and but also the region.

Overall or Both Corridors

- Lee Myers, former Matthews Mayor and MUMPO Chairman
- Jamie Bowers, WSOC
- Jason Stoogenke, WSOC
- Stacy Simms, Keith Larson or Vince Coakley, WBT radio
- Mike Collins, WFAE radio
- David Boraks, *davidsonnews.net*
- Bruce Henderson, *Charlotte Observer*
- Steve Harrison, Charlotte Observer
- Ken Elkins, Charlotte Business Journal
- Jeff Atkinson, Wingate University
- John Connaughton, UNC-Charlotte
- Ken Randall, "Committee of 21"
- Representative of Charlotte Chamber's Latin American Council

I-485 South Corridor

- Mike Parks, South Charlotte Weekly
- Chris Hummer, Carolinas Medical Center, Pineville
- Representative of Ballantyne Breakfast Club

US-74 East Corridor

- Tony Zeiss, Central Piedmont Community College
- Rick Hendricks, Hendricks Automotive
- Community representatives along the corridor to be provided by Brian Horton of the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT)

Scheduling of Workshop #2

The tentative date for the second stakeholder workshop is <u>Wednesday, June 20, 2012</u>. At this session, the results of the public opinion survey, focus group sessions and oneon-one interviews will be presented. The workshop will focus on recommended options for the I-485 South corridor based on public input and technical evaluations.

SIGN-IN SHEET Charlotte Region Fast Lanes Study Stakeholder Workshop March 14, 2012

(Please Print)

NAME	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS				
Reid Simons	NCDOT/NCTA	jtsimons@ncdot.gov				
Biorn Hensen	Certraline COG/LNRPO	BHANSEN GCENTRALINA. ORG				
RAY FSCHERT	PLANNING COMMISSION	RESCHERT @ AOL. COM				
Ned CURRAN	BISSELL COMPANIES	neurran a bissell-componies.com				
KEVIN ICARD	Town of PINEVILLE	Kicard @ pinevilledsl.net				
Bob Cook	MUMPO	vwcook Q charlottenc.gov				
NICK POLIMENI	MUMPO	np-limenie charlottenc.gor				
Cathy Hein	AAA Carolinas	cthein @ mailaaa, com				
Tim BOLOND	NCOOT - DIVISION 10	TBOLDNOL ONCOOT. GOV				
Louis L. Mitchell	NCOOT - Division 10	Lmitchell @ redot.gov				
Bill Coxe .	Town of Hundersville	broxe a huntersuille. orp				
NORM STEINMAN	Charbotte DOT	nsteinman @ ci. Charlotte. NL.US				
Tim Gibbs	Charlotte DOT	tgibbs@charlottenc.gov				
JIMMAN TRAVIS	NCDOT - PRODRAM MANAGEMENT	itravise nedot.gov				
JIMMY PAVIS	N'CDOT- PRODRAM MANAGEMENT	JERAVIS Enclot. Gov				

SIGN-IN SHEET Charlotte Region Fast Lanes Study Stakeholder Workshop March 14, 2012

(Please Print)

NAME	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS					
Anil Panicker	NCDOT - Transportation Planning	aponicker Cchaslotteric.gov.					
BRIAN HORTON	CDOT - Planning + Dessign	bhorton@ charlottenc. gov					
towischloods	E.A. ST.	Words @ bell sonth net					
JASON LAWRENCE	CATS	jlawrence & charlotte NC, gov					
RAUPH MSSSERZA	TOWN OF MATTHEWS	RMSSSSDZAC MATTHEWSNC. BON					



Charlotte Region Fast Lanes Study



Phase III Scope & Schedule Workshop Purpose

March 14, 2012

Phase III Funding



Submitted application in 2009 under FHWA's Value Pricing Pilot Program (VPPP)

- Received one of 10 VPPP grants awarded by FHWA in 2010
- NCDOT awarded non-federal matching funds in 2011
- Study managed by Charlotte Department of Transportation

Phase III Objectives

- Build on Phase I and II results
- Familiarize public with congestion pricing concept
 - Develop better understanding of policy & technical issues for congestion pricing
- Determine public acceptance for next Fast Lanes project(s)
 - I-485 South (I-77 to US-74)
 - US-74 East (I-277 to I-485)
- Define preferred Fast Lanes projects for above corridors

Study Schedul e

Fast Lanes Phase III Schedule (Updated Feb 2, 2012)			2012										
TAS	K NO. and DESCRIPTION	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
1	Project Management												
2	Program Definition & Analysis												
3	Examine New Framework Alternatives). 111. 111.				
4	Analysis for Early Tolling/Incremental implementation												
5	Confirm Public Acceptance					imani							
6	Pilot Program Design												

Workshop Purpose



- Common understanding & knowledge base (everyone has same information moving forward)
- Identify technical issues to explore in concept development
- Identify public acceptance issues for testing in assessment activities

Workshop Outcomes



 $\langle \! \rangle$

- Refined scope of work for technical analysis
 - What key issues must be resolved
 - What concepts hold the most promise
 - What are next steps in development
- Questions/concepts to be tested in public assessment activities
 - What opportunities/concepts should be tested
 - What specific policies or concepts need vetting
 - What do we need from public to gain permission to move forward

Charlotte Region Fast Lanes Study



Overview of Phases I and II

March 14, 2012

Types of HOV/ Managed Lane Designs



Not separated I-5, Portland















Barrier separated US 59, Houston

Pylon separation, SR 91, Orange Co. CA

Fast Lanes Study

- Performed between 2007 and 2009
- Evaluated all types of managed lanes (HOV, HOT, truck-only toll)
- Co-managed by NCDOT and City of Charlotte
- Analyzed 12 freeway and arterial corridors (340 miles in 10 counties) for Fast Lanes feasibility



Phases I and II Funding Partners

- Cabarrus-Rowan MPO
- Gaston Urban Area MPO
- Lake Norman Rural Planning Organization
- Mecklenburg-Union MPO
- North Carolina Department of Transportation
- Rock Hill-Fort Mill Area Transportation Study
- Rocky River Rural Planning Organization
- South Carolina Department of Transportation
- Town of Mooresville

Study Corridors (340 Mil es)



Phase 1 Screening Criteria



- HOV Lanes Demand
- HOT Lanes Demand
- Physical Conditions of Roadways

Phase 1 Screening Results







Phase 2 Eval uations

- Physical Design
- Operational Requirements
- HOT Lanes Revenues/Costs



HOT Lanes Revenue/Cost Anal ysis (2008 Dol Lars In Mil Lions)



	Length (Miles)	Y	rear 2013	Year 2030		
CORRIDOR		Capital Cost	Revenue	O&M Cost	Revenue	O&N Cost
I-85 North	30	\$550- 1,200	\$1-4	\$13	\$3-17	\$21
I-77 North	21	\$250-500	\$5-25	\$9	\$10-60	\$15
US-74 East	12	\$225-700	\$2-11	\$6	\$6-20	\$8
I-85 South	28	\$750- 1,700	\$6-27	\$12	\$20-95	\$20
NC-16 North	10	\$175-200	\$1	\$4	\$1-3	\$6
I-77 South	12	\$500-800	\$1-5	\$5	\$3-23	\$9
I-485 South	15	\$400-700	\$2-14	\$6	\$3-15	\$13
I-485 West	10	\$225-375	<u> </u>	\$4	\$1-2	\$9
I-485 NE	6	\$175-300		\$2	\$1	\$5

I-77 North Corridor



- Significant Fast Lanes demand in 2013 & 2030
- Among the best corridors for travel time savings/mile
- Recommended for more detailed corridor-level study
- NCDOT's HOV-to-HOT lanes conversion & extension study performed from 2009 to 2011
- Currently advertised by NCDOT as P3 project

US-74 East Corridor

Villa Heights

Silverwood

Mint

Pine Lake Country Club

51

Hickory Ridge

Marlwood

Marshbrooke

Wilora Lake

Oakhurst

Stonehaver

Sardis

Farm Pond

Highest *Fast Lanes* demand in 2013 & 2030

 High-ranking corridor in travel time savings/mile for *Fast Lanes* users

 Revenues exceed O&M cost estimates when HOT lanes are considered

Connects to Monroe Connector/Bypass

I-485 South Corridor

- Acceptable Fast Lanes demand, particularly in 2013
- Revenues exceed O&M cost estimates in 2013 & 2030 when HOT lanes are considered
- Opportunity to analyze potential for Fast Lanes as part of NCDOT's widening



Corridor-level Studies

- More detailed operations analysis & refined engineering design
- Demand estimates to reflect corridor phasing & project limits
- Updated traffic estimates and toll revenue for HOT lanes
- More detailed cost estimates based on refined design and lane operations
- Comparison of forecasted tolls and costs for facility over its life cycle

Charlotte Region Fast Lanes Study



Fast Lanes Common Understanding

March 14, 2012





Chuck Fuhs

FASTLANES CONCEPT



- Travel demand has outpaced the ability to build sufficient highway capacity
 - Limited funding
 - Limited space
 - Environmental
 - Public support





- Fast Lanes are dedicated lanes for one or more user groups
- Proactively managed to provide better reliability and/or level-of-service
- Primary benefit is travel time savings

SR-91 Express Lanes Orange County, CA



- Fast Lanes can take many forms, but local emphasis has been on including pricing
- Specific projects can be customized to meet local area needs
- Increasingly Fast Lanes projects incorporate multiple management strategies



- Fast Lanes with pricing are identified by many names:
 - High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes
 - Express Lanes
 - Managed Lanes
 - Express Toll Lanes (ETL)
 - Value Priced Lanes
- Names and branding can vary by region and can be reflective of differing lane management strategies



- Transit Enhancements
- Trip Reliability
 - Free up space in the general purpose lanes
- Commuter Choices
 - Offer toll-paying single occupant drivers a new commuting option



 \diamond

- Technology provides opportunity for additional lane management techniques
 - Pricing can be used to "sell" additional capacity in HOV lanes
 - Variable pricing levels regulate demand and ensure speeds are maintained
 Variable pricing levels regulate demand I-394 HOT Lanes Minneapolis, Minnesota





HOV strategies alone cannot address all utilization issues





 Variable pricing can provide a real-time tool to better management practice


Fast Lanes Concept

- Almost all existing HOT projects are conversions of HOV lanes to add pricing
 - SR-91 was constructed as express toll lanes
 - All other pricing are on existing HOV lanes in Seattle, Miami and Minneapolis (I-35W)
 - I-10 HOV lanes (Houston) and I-95 (Miami) reconstructed to include more HOT lanes



Fast Lanes Concept



 \diamond

- Mix of access control, eligibility, pricing and active traffic management are found on most new projects.
- Strategies have evolved with adopted technology: fixed restrictions to real-time
- Designs and operations need to be flexible to take advantage of changing demand, regional goals and objectives







Chuck Fuhs

HOW FAST LANES WOULD WORK IN CHARLOTTE

What they would look like



 \diamond

- Similar to I-77 HOV lanes
 - One or two lanes in each direction
 - Maybe some form of soft separation
 - Some open and some restricted access
 - Electronic toll readers over the lane
 - Advance signing of toll rate





How they would operate

- ♦ Typically operate all day or 24/7
- Transit and carpools (either 3+ or 2+) would be free
- All may be required to have a transponder account
- Entering and exiting only in designated locations
- Enforced through various strategies

Who would be able to use them

- Transit and carpoolers
- Solo commuters willing to pay toll and have a transponder account
- Motorcycles (same as for HOV lanes)
- Large trucks would probably be excluded



Who would operate and sponsor



- All local, state and federal agencies would be involved and have a stake in a successful outcome
- NCDOT would be the primary project sponsor
 - Either delivered conventionally or through a 3P arrangement in some form
- NCDOT/NCTA could likely run toll collection and account management

What would benefits look like

- Assured trip reliability
- Faster travel speeds in rush hours
- More modal choices for all users
 - transit, carpools and tolled users
- Less weaving and merging (than if capacity was added with general purpose lanes)
- Revenues that at least cover costs to operate and enforce
- Higher public satisfaction

How would they get implemented



- Experiences from other areas suggest:
- Convert existing HOV lanes as initial project (I-77N)



- Expand to new corridors as part of planned widening, new capacity or rehabilitation projects (US-74E, I-77N, I-485S)
- Eventually add connections so that the projects operate as a system (I-77N to I-277)







Heidi Stamm

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE



- Secure broad-based agreement on the purpose of the Fast Lane
 - Person throughput in corridor?
 - Option to congestion?
 - Revenue generation?
 - Protection of the corridor for future improvement?



 Your purpose will dictate facility operations, and supporting education, messaging, marketing and sales efforts



 \otimes

The environmental process can be the avenue for linking the Fast Lane ("product") with the purpose ("benefit")



- **Development of champions across** \diamond constituencies **STARTS NOW!**
 - **Business**
 - Political
 - Environmental
 - Enforcement



Champions come, go and change so pay attention to who they are, why they are supportive, and what is influencing them

- Moving into a "fee for service" arena so prepare for "customers", not "users"
- Perceived "Fairness" of policy
 - Minimize negative impacts
 - Expand universe of beneficiaries







- Be honest about your purpose
 - Everyone is watching, and the product will be VERY visible!
- Prepare at the earliest planning stage to measure and report as much as possible from the day of opening and beyond.
 - If you don't have data, someone, somewhere will make something up, and you may not like what they have to say







Lynn Purnell

TECHNICAL CHALLENGES

Questions/issues

- Who travels for free on Fast Lanes?
- When are Fast Lanes operated?
- What policy is used to establish toll rates?
- Are there special enforcement needs? Who performs enforcement?
- How does Fast Lanes toll collection interface with other NCDOT toll roads?
- What operational issues establish project limits?

Free Use of Fast Lanes



Free use depends upon objectives

	Carpool Preference Combinations		HOV 3+							
			Free 24/7	Free Peak Only	Free Off- Peak Only	Discount Peak Only, Pay All Other Times	Pay 24/7			
	HOV 2	Free 24/7	I-15 (CA), I-110 (CA) *, I-680 (CA), I-25 (CO), I-394 (MN), I-35W (MN), I-15 (UT), SR 167 (WA)							
		Free Peak Periods Only		I-10 (TX)						
		Free Off-Peak Periods Only	I-10 (CA) *, US 290 (TX)							
		Discount Peak Only, Pay All Other Times				I-30 (TX)*, I-635 (TX)*				
		Pay 24/7	SR-91 (CA)⁺, I-95 (FL), I-595 (FL) *, I-495 (VA) *, I-95 (VA) *, I-395 (VA) *				TBX (FL), LP1 (TX) *			
		* = Pending managed lane facility as of October 2011.								

t = SR-91 operates HOV-3+ 50% toll discount EB only on Thursday / Friday PM peak period.

Hours of Operation



- Almost all HOT lanes operate full-time. Exceptions:
 - Late evening / early morning "toll-free" (I-680, SR-167)
 - Reversible facilities close to change direction (I-15, I-25)
 - Off-peak revert to general-purpose use (I-394, I-35W)



Tol I Policy to Establish rates



 \diamond

Three pricing mechanisms

- Static / flat price (e.g. Monroe Connector)
- Variable time of day (fixed schedule that varies hourly)
- Variable dynamic (prices change near real time based on levels of demand)

9 Exp	ress es	Toll Schedule Effective July 1, 2011			Eastbound SR-55 to Riverside Co. Lin			
	Sun	М	Ти	W	Th	F	Sat	
Midnight	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
1:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
2:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
3:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
4:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
5:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
6:00 am	\$1.30	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$1.30	
7:00 am	\$1.30	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$1.30	
8:00 am	\$1.65	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	
9:00 am	\$1.65	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	
10:00 am	\$2.55	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.55	
11:00 am	\$2.55	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.55	
Noon	\$3.05	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$3.15	\$3.05	
1:00 pm	\$3.05	\$2.90	\$2.90	\$2.90	\$3.15	\$4.95	\$3.05	
2:00 pm	\$3.05	\$4.15	\$4.15	\$4.15	\$4.25	\$3.10	\$3.05	
3:00 pm	\$2.55	\$4.45	\$3.70	\$3.95	\$5.45	\$9.75	\$3.05	
4:00 pm	\$2.55	\$5.05	\$7.30	\$7.80	\$9.45	\$8.85	\$3.05	
5:00 pm	\$2.55	\$4.85	\$6.75	\$8.00	\$9.30	\$7.50	\$3.05	
6:00 pm	\$2.55	\$4.45	\$3.60	\$3.60	\$4.40	\$5.35	\$2.55	
7:00 pm	\$2.55	\$3.15	\$3.15	\$3.15	\$4.55	\$5.00	\$2.10	
8:00 pm	\$2.55	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.90	\$4.55	\$2.10	
9:00 pm	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.90	\$2.10	
10:00 pm	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$2.10	\$1.30	
11:00 pm	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	

Enforcement Considerations

- - Visual enforcement is primary means
 License plate recognition systems
 Transponder requirements
 Registration programs
 Unrestricted use erodes active

management



Tol I Collection Issues

- Collection mechanisms
 - Electronic toll collection protocols
 - Virginia / Northeast US: Mark IV
 - Offers switchable tag option
 - Florida: ISO 18000 6b
 - Georgia: ISO 18000 6c
 - License plate tolling
- Interoperability



Lane Design Considerations



 \diamond

Fast Lanes cross sections vary based on design constraints and operational conditions

♦ Lane, buffer, and shoulder widths all vary throughout the U.S.

Full Standards (3+2 with Frontage Road)











David Ungemah

LESSONS LEARNED FROM EXISTING PROJECTS



SR-91 in Orange County, CA was the first to use value pricing and first fully automated toll facility in the U.S. (1996)

Privately financed and built the project in exchange for a 35 year operating lease







The 10-mile facility provides two lanes in each direction with a single entrance, exit and tolling location

The Express Lanes are separated from general-purpose lanes with channelizers located in a two-foot painted buffer





 Toll rates are <u>static variable</u>, based on a predetermined rate schedule

Peak toll
 about \$10
 during Friday
 PM
 peak periods

9 Express Lanes		Effective July 1, 2011			Eastbound SR-55 to Riverside Co. Line			
	Sun	М	Tu	W	Th	F	Sat	
Midnight	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
1:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
2:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
3:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
4:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
5:00 am	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	
6:00 am	\$1.30	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$1.30	
7:00 am	\$1.30	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$1.30	
8:00 am	\$1.65	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	
9:00 am	\$1.65	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	
10:00 am	\$2.55	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.55	
11:00 am	\$2.55	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.55	
Noon	\$3.05	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$3.15	\$3.05	
1:00 pm	\$3.05	\$2.90	\$2.90	\$2.90	\$3.15	\$4.95	\$3.05	
2:00 pm	\$3.05	\$4.15	\$4.15	\$4.15	\$4.25	\$3.10	\$3.05	
3:00 pm	\$2.55	\$4.45	\$3.70	\$3.95	\$5.45	\$9.75	\$3.05	
4:00 pm	\$2.55	\$5.05	\$7.30	\$7.80	\$9.45	\$8.85	\$3.05	
5:00 pm	\$2.55	\$4.85	\$6.75	\$8.00	\$9.30	\$7.50	\$3.05	
6:00 pm	\$2.55	\$4.45	\$3.60	\$3.60	\$4.40	\$5.35	\$2.55	
7:00 pm	\$2.55	\$3.15	\$3.15	\$3.15	\$4.55	\$5.00	\$2.10	
8:00 pm	\$2.55	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.90	\$4.55	\$2.10	
9:00 pm	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.10	\$2.90	\$2.10	
10:00 pm	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$2.10	\$1.30	
11:00 pm	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.30	





 \diamond

- OCTA (public agency) purchased the SR-91 lease from the PPP in 2003 for \$207 million
 - Public outcry over restrictive non-compete clause contained in lease
 - SR-91 generates about \$45 million in revenues annually
 - \$36 million toll revenue
 - \$9 million other fees
- Expansion to Riverside County





- I-95 HOT Conversion and Expansion, Miami, FL
 - 21 miles of HOV to HOT
 - Single to dual lanes
 - HOV-2+ to HOV-3+
 - Restrictive Registration
- Public-public partnership
 Cost: \$122 million

Sun-Sentinel.com August 1, 2008

Crash course: New I-95 express lanes make rush hour crawl





- 95 Express Lanes operating near optimal \diamond capacity during peak hours
 - Express lanes: 45 mph over 98% of the time
 - Net profit of \$850,000 per month
 - Revenues: \$1.1 million; Costs: \$260,000
- Benefits extend to all users
 - 2008 HOV: 20 mph | 2009 EL: 58 mph
 - 2008 GPL: 15 mph

2009: 40 mph







Update on NC Turnpike Programs and Projects

NC Quick Pass Triangle Expressway Monroe Bypass Garden Parkway

Fast Lanes Phase III Workshop, March 14, 2012 Reid Simons, Director of Community Relations, NCDOT/Turnpike

NC Toll Operations

Transponder Program – NC Quick Pass

- No toll booths, no stopping
- Automatic debit, customer friendly
- Up to 35% cost savings on tolls
- Sticker tag or hard case tag





Video Technology-Bill By Mail



Or

NC Quick Pass







Sticker \$5



Hard case \$20

NORTH CAROLINA Turnpike Authority

Triangle Expressway





Phase I-Now Open Phase II-Opens August Phase III-December



Marketing & Outreach Campaign





TRIANGLE

EXPRESSWAY



- Special Events
- Chamber events
- Employer events
- Traffic Radio
- Community Newspapers
- Digital Media
- Direct Mail
- Gas Toppers



Monroe Bypass



Current Monroe Bypass Schedule

- Completed Final Plan of Finance Nov. 2012
- Awarded Design Build Contract Fall 2012
- Right of Way Activity Fall 2012 2013
- Complete Final Designs Spring 2012
- Groundbreaking August 2012
- Open to Traffic Dec. 2015


Monroe Bypass Activity



Aggressive Right of Way Schedule



Working with community and engineers on final designs

Right of Way Office 5419 Indian Trail Fairview Road 704-893-0131



Monroe Bypass Constructors Design Build Team

Website www.monroeconnector-bypass.com



Sample Signage and Aesthetics







Tolling Concept for US 74 and Business 74



Monroe Time and Cost Savings



Monroe Toll Rate Assumptions



Garden Parkwav



ROD Announced March 1



Current Schedule

- Final EIS complete
- Investment Grade T&R Study complete
- *Record of Decision approved*
- Obtain Permits Summer 2012
- Financial Close Early Fall 2012
- Award Contract Fall 2012
- Final Designs Fall 2012 to 2nd Quarter 2013
- Right of Way Activity Fall 2012 -2013
- Project Opening December 2015





Design-Build Contract Structure

East: I-485 to Wilson Farm Road (9.5 miles)

- Four-lane, divided highway
- interchanges at I-485, Dixie River, South Point, South New Hope, Union Rd
- Three bridge crossings Catawba River, Creek and South Fork and two rail crossings
- All IT tolling equipment for entire project (20+ m)
- West: Wilson Farm Road to I-85 (11.5 miles)
 - Four-lanes from Wilson Farm Road to US 321
 - Two-lanes from US 321 to I-85



Time Savings to Gaston County



Estimated Toll Rates 2016



Questions? Thank you



Transportation Funding in Charlotte – Mecklenburg & MUMPO Area

Norm Steinman, Charlotte DOT March 14, 2012 Fast Lanes Study Phase III Stakeholders Workshop

Background

Mecklenburg County One of the South's Key Economic Centers

Year	Population	Employ- ment	Person Trips per Day	
2010	920,000	550,000	4.3 million	
2035	1.35 million	1.1 million	6.5 million	

47% population growth

100% employment growth

Regional Travel Destination

In 2000...

- 960,000 trips per day from surrounding counties
- One in three jobs held by commuters from adjacent counties

By 2030...

an additional 1.2 million trips per day will cross Mecklenburg County line



Funding Issues

NCDOT FY 2012 Budget



Uses of Funding



Federal-Aid

- Derived from federal fuel tax (18.4 cent gas tax, 24.4 cent diesel tax)
- Annual formula-based apportionments to states
- Can pay for core programs, intrastate and secondary roads
- Subject to equity formula (NC)
- Core programs have specific purposes, thus limited flexibility
- Flat long-term growth when considering inflation disappointing results from federal re-authorization bill – obligation authority only 86 percent

Reduced Federal Outlook



Highway Fund

- Derived from state fuel tax (29.2 cents) and fees (inspections, license fees, registration, etc.)
- Can pay for maintenance, Powell Bill, transit, bridges and operations
- Not subject to equity formula
- Not used for TIP highway projects
- Flat long-term growth when considering inflation – recent fee increases helped

Highway Trust Fund

- Derived from state fuel tax (9.7 cents), fees, and 3% Highway Use Tax
- Established in 1989
- Has specific statutory purposes
- Primarily for completion of 3600-mile intrastate system and construction of designated Urban Loops
- Intrastates subject to equity formula, but secondary roads, urban loops, and Powell Bill are not
- Positive long-term growth Governor's budget reduced General fund transfer from \$250 M to \$170 M – but trust fund is restricted to projects mandated by the Legislature

Funding Gap for NCDOT (NC Strategic Planning Office of Transportation)

\$10 Billion Available \$53 B Gap for 2018-22

\$63 Billion Submitted

North Carolina Growth



Funding Gap for MUMPO-Highways (MUMPO 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan)

\$2.8 Billion Funded



\$9.1 Billion Needs

Ways of Funding Transportation Used Nationwide

- •Sales Tax
- •Personal Income Tax
- •Cigarette Tax
- •Liquid Fuels Tax
- •Motor Vehicle Rental Tax
- •Motor Vehicle Lease Tax
- •Vehicle Registration Fee
- •Vehicle Title Fee

•Tire Tax •Vehicle Property Tax •Property Tax •Real Estate Transfer Tax •Transportation Impact Fees •Casino Revenue •Lottery •Highway/Bridge Toll Revenue

Ways of Funding Transportation Used in North Carolina

- •Sales Tax
- •Fuel Tax
- •Motor Vehicle Rental Tax
- •Motor Vehicle Lease Tax
- •Vehicle Registration Fee
- •Vehicle Title Fee

- •Tire Tax
- •Vehicle Property Tax
- •Property Tax
- •Transportation Impact Fees
- •Highway/Bridge Tolls

Funding Gap in Mecklenburg County

	Expenditures (in billions)	Revenues (in billions)	Funding Gap (in billions)
Capital Projects			
NCDOT (LRTP)	\$ 6.1	\$ 2.1	\$ 4.0
Charlotte (TAP)	\$ 6.4	\$ 1.25	\$ 5.2
Towns	\$ 1.3	\$ 0.1	\$ 1.2
Capital Subtotal	\$ 13.8	\$ 3.4	\$ 10.4
Maintenance			
NCDOT (LRTP)	\$ 5.0	\$ 3.8	\$ 1.2
Charlotte (TAP)	\$ 1.1	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.35
Towns	\$ 0.2	\$ 0.13	\$ 0.07
Maintenance Subtotal	\$ 6.3	\$ 4.68	\$ 1.62
			\frown
Total	\$ 20.1	\$ 8.1	\$ 12.0

Committee of 21 Recommendations

Revenues

- Maintenance of Local Roads Vehicle Registration Fee (\$18M)
- Construction of Roads Sales Tax (\$71M)
- Construction and Expansion of Freeways Tolls (\$52M)
- Future Road Funding Source Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee instead of gas tax (\$79M)

Questions and Comments