

Cornelius
Davidson
Huntersville
Kannapolis
Concord



Lincoln County
Mecklenburg County
Cabarrus County

November 21, 2013
12:30-2:30 PM
Huntersville Town Center
101 Huntersville- Concord Road
Rotunda Conference Room, 3rd Floor
Huntersville, NC

Regular Meeting Agenda

1. **Welcome and Introduction**
2. **Administrative Matters**
 - a. Approve Minutes of July 25, 2013 meeting
 - b. Amend MOU and Rules of Procedure to Reflect New MPO Boundaries and Names
3. **MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plan Updates**
4. **November 15 Corridor Intersection Inspection Review**
5. **What's New Along the NC 73 Corridor**

Each community will give a brief update of what is taking place along their respective portions of the Corridor
6. **Next Meeting Date and Location**
7. **Wrap-Up and Adjourn**

**NC 73 Council of Planning
July 25, 2013 Regular Meeting
Meeting Minutes**

Attendees: Bjorn Hansen, Centralina- staff; Jack Simoneau, Huntersville; Bill Coxe, Huntersville; Starla Rogers, Concord; Kevin Ashley, Concord; David Keilson, NCDOT Division 12; Linda Dosse, NCDOT-TPB; Margaret Pearson, Concord; Kassie Watts, Kannapolis; Scott Cole, NCDOT- Division 10; Jason Pauling, Cornelius; Bill Thunberg, LNTC; Sarah McCauley, Huntersville; Jeff Neely, Huntersville; Zac Gordon, Huntersville; Ben McCrary, Davidson, Brian Jenest, Davidson; Andrew Bryant, Lincoln County; Susie Morris, Cabarrus County; Phil Conrad- via teleconference, Cabarrus-Rowan MPO; Charles Knox, Lake Norman Chamber; Elinor Hiltz, Iredell County.

Welcome and Introductions: Susie Morris opened the meeting at 1 PM with a quorum present. Everyone then introduced themselves.

Administrative Matters: Bjorn Hansen stated that the minutes from the previous two meetings needed to be approved. Mr. Simoneau made the motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Conrad asked for the February minutes to be amended to note that the CRMPO submitted LRTP projects for the meeting, and that the item was not discussed, instead of stating that the projects were not submitted. He also noted a spelling correction to Ramah Road. Mr. Simoneau revised his motion to include the amendments. Ms. Morris seconded and the minutes were approved.

Mr. Hansen stated that officers for the next year needed to be elected, and that Ms. Morris could serve a second term as chairman, but a new vice-chairman would need to be elected for the vacant position. Ms. McCauley nominated Ms. Morris as chairman and Jack Simoneau as vice-chairman. Andrew Bryant seconded and the motion was approved.

MPO Projects and Prioritization Along Corridor: Mr. Hansen reviewed the process for the long-range plan updates for the area MPOs, and how the sections of the NC 73 corridor are being considered in the area MPO plans. Mr. Conrad stated that the section of the corridor in Cabarrus County is included in the 2030 list of projects for the MPO, but this might be optimistic. The CRMPO plan should be complete by the end of the year. Mr. Coxe stated that the sections of the corridor in Mecklenburg County vary, with most falling outside of the 2040 financially-feasible list, but a section in Huntersville near Vance Road may be included. The Lincoln County list has not yet been evaluated by the Gaston MPO. There was no action taken.

Davidson East Proposed Development: Mr. McCrary reviewed the proposed development at Davidson East, along with the NCDOT preference for access along the corridor, which currently is for two signals (Ramah and Bradford Park). Mr. Cole noted this would provide better overall mobility and accessibility along the section of NC 73 with the proposed development. Other requirements will be defined through the traffic study. Mr. Jenest expressed concern over the inability to require widening of the corridor through approvals for developments along the corridor. Mr. Coxe stated that the experience of requiring short segments to be widened in advance of corridor widenings has not been completely positive. Often the segments need to be rebuilt to line up with final designs for the corridor, and require maintenance. The current practice of reserving right of way for the future corridor is likely the best strategy. Mr. Hansen also stated that unless the proposed development has massive amounts of commercial and residential units there is little legal standing to require them widen the road due to their specific development. The group focused on intermediate term improvements, since widening through the

NCDOT process would take many years. This transitioned to the next agenda item. There was no action taken.

Revising the COP in 2013: Mr. Hansen reviewed a scope of work developed by the COP in 2010 based on the conclusion that the NCDOT would not be able to widen additional sections of the corridor for many years, and that the MPOs and local communities were focusing on waiting for widenings instead of developing intersection-focused projects that could be implemented much sooner. This study would not supersede the overall long-term recommendations for the corridor, but would instead identify smaller \$1-5 million projects that could be funded through STP-DA, CMAQ, spot safety, and Division-level STIP funds. Each of these pots of funds are within the control of the COP participants, and could deliver benefits much sooner than the current schedule. The attendees supported this strategy, although Mr. Conrad noted the CRMPO has an established CMAQ candidate project list and its section of NC 73 may fare well in the new Strategic Mobility Formula. After a discussion of whether to just focus on NC 73 in Mecklenburg County, or wait for funding from the three MPOs along the corridor, the group directed Mr. Hansen to contact the NCDOT traffic engineering unit for feedback on whether they could conduct such a study in house, as well as the Charlotte DOT for guidance on local traffic engineering firms. The study would be across Lincoln and Mecklenburg Counties at a minimum. Linda Dosse, Scott Cole, David Keilson, Bill Coxe, and Andrew Bryant agreed to help review materials and provide support in advancing the issue, with a final recommendation at the next COP meeting.

What's New Along the NC 73 Corridor: Ms. Morris asked each of the attendees to provide an update of projects along the corridor. She also reminded them to distribute project proposals for peer review by other COP members.

Lincoln County: The Carolina Ridge age-restricted development is being resubmitted as a traditional development immediately west of NC 16. A corporate business headquarters is also being proposed near the intersection of NC 16 and NC 73.

Davidson: The mental health hospital within Davidson East is currently under construction.

Huntersville: There is increased interest in development in their area and the town is considering improvements to US 21 and I-77 interchange/intersection.

Cornelius: An Elevation church and apartment complex are currently under construction. The town is also initiating an in-house overhaul of their development code.

NCDOT: The NC 73 and I-85 interchange is under construction and will be complete by mid-2014. The NCDOT is also working on a spot safety project for a left-hand turn lane at NC 73 and Chadbourne.

Kannapolis: The Christ King church will open soon, and a 72-unit apartment complex is being proposed at NC 73 and Jim Johnson.

Concord: A subdivision development that had been abandoned several years ago was being repropoed for development along NC 73.

Next Meeting Date and Location: The next meeting would be in November in Huntersville.

Adjourn: Mr. Bryant made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. McCauley seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 2:55 PM.

IMPLEMENTATION

Memorandum of Understanding

Each of thirteen participating jurisdictions and agencies were requested to approve a Memorandum of Understanding for the NC 73 Corridor Transportation/Land Use Plan, committing themselves to follow the recommendations of the Plan and to cooperate with each other in implementing the Plan. The Memorandum of Understanding is not a legal contract. Rather, it is a statement of intent by each jurisdiction. The approval of the Memorandum of Understanding can generally be considered to be acknowledgement that they:

- Adopt the MOU, as a statement of intent on behalf of the jurisdiction;
- Adopt a Council of Planning, agreeing to appoint a participant who can represent the jurisdiction's interests in the plan, can work cooperatively with the other jurisdictions, and can oversee the implementation of the recommendations within the jurisdiction;
- Accept the recommendations within their jurisdiction as guidance for land use and other actions to implement the Plan; and
- Acknowledge that their portion of NC 73 and any related roads in their jurisdiction is an integral part of an overall Corridor, and that actions taken that affect NC 73 within their jurisdiction that affect NC 73 in other jurisdictions as well, and must be made cooperatively.

The draft of the Memorandum of Understanding that was presented to each of the jurisdictions for adoption is as follows:

Memorandum of Understanding

Background

In February 2003, the North Carolina Department of Transportation (“NC DOT”), three counties, five municipalities, three Chambers of Commerce, two Metropolitan Planning Organizations and one Regional Planning Organization engaged the Centralina Council of Governments (“COG”) to administer a study of the NC 73 Corridor from Interstate Highway 85 in Cabarrus County to US Highway 321 in Lincoln County. Funds for this Corridor Study came from NC DOT, as well as from the counties, municipalities and private sector sources along the Corridor. [The term “Corridor” in the Memorandum means the area lying roughly within one-half (1/2) mile of the centerline of the NC 73 right of way between the highway’s intersections with Interstate 85 in Cabarrus County, and with US 321 in Lincoln County.]

The impetus for the NC 73 Transportation/ Land Use Corridor Plan (the “Plan”) was the recognition that increased development pressures along the Corridor, and the resulting vehicular burdens, have stressed the roadway’s capacity to serve as a reliable transportation facility for its many users. Moreover, all of the funding partners recognized two key factors: 1) considerable physical improvement will be required to

“fix” the corridor; and 2) the current and foreseeable land uses along the Corridor need to be evaluated before undertaking any capital investment in “fixing” the roadway itself.

Beginning with this broad consensus, COG and NC DOT selected a team of planners to undertake the details of this study. The contract of these planning services was executed in April 2003, and the planning team’s analysis began shortly thereafter.

Public meetings have been held in Cabarrus, Lincoln and Mecklenburg Counties during November 2003 and March 2004. The planning team’s work has been guided by a steering committee comprised of COG and representatives of all municipalities or counties having land use planning jurisdiction over property along the Corridor, as well as representatives of economic development or planning organizations affected by the NC 73’s capacity. In addition, the planning team has hosted a series of land use planning charrettes with the local planning staffs for each of the municipalities and counties having land use jurisdiction along the Corridor. The planning team has also held briefings for the elected officials in each of those communities.

The resulting Plan consists of maps, drawings and other graphics that are incorporated within a Plan Report. In particular, maps corresponding to various Corridor segments show the existing and proposed land uses for each such segment. These segment maps also display the recommended improvements to the NC 73 roadway and to roads and streets connected to NC 73 and within the Corridor.

Understanding

1. Parties to this Understanding:

The Parties are:

- a.) The municipalities and the counties having jurisdiction over 1) land use ordinances and determinations whether land uses along the NC 73 Corridor are in compliance with such ordinances; or 2) public investments along the corridor.
- b.) The inter-governmental planning organizations having jurisdiction for transportation planning along the NC 73 Corridor.
- c.) COG.
- d.) NC DOT.

2. Current Land Uses: Each Party commits to accept and abide by the component of the Plan that falls within that Party’s land use jurisdiction (including its extra-territorial jurisdiction) along the Corridor. Each Party’s relevant component of the Plan is attached to this Memorandum, and is incorporated herein.

3. Inducements to Other Parties: Each Party understands that its commitment to its respective component of the Plan has induced other Parties to make like commitments for their respective segments of the Plan insofar as that Party has jurisdiction over the land uses within its Plan segment. Based on this understanding, each Party commits its best efforts to maintain its land use designations as shown in its respective segment of the Plan.

4. Future Collaboration Among Parties:

The Plan designates certain areas along the Corridor where further planning is needed. In most cases, those areas require collaboration among various Parties where their land use jurisdiction boundaries converge. In such cases, each Party commits its best efforts to undertake that collaborative planning, including providing direction to its planning staff and/ or consultants engaged for such planning purposes. At the conclusion of any such collaborative planning process, each Party commits to adopt and abide by the land use ordinances determined appropriate and consistent with the Corridor Plan.

5. Council of Planning: The Parties agree that periodic reviews of the land uses and public investments along the Corridor will be required over time. In the spirit of effective collaboration and prudent long range planning, the Parties agree to establish a Council of Planning for the Corridor. This Council shall be comprised of at least one representative knowledgeable in regional planning issues from each Party. The Council shall meet periodically to review and discuss land uses development trends, transportation operations and public investment requirements.

6. Future Actions Affecting Land Uses Along the Corridor: All parties recognize that future governmental entities may not be contractually bound by the adoption of this Memorandum of Understanding. In recognition of this limitation, the Parties commit to review the status of land use and public investment decisions along the Corridor periodically. Furthermore, the Parties, in good faith, commit to: **1)** review the recommendations of the Council of Planning; and **2)** meet periodically with other Parties regarding emerging issues along the Corridor. The intent of this commitment is to promote periodic discussions of municipal and/or county goals, plans and strategies for maintaining effective development patterns, public investment and transportation flow along NC 73.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties, through their duly authorized representatives, have executed this Memorandum of Understanding and have attached maps relating to their respective jurisdictions, effective this

| _____ day of _____, 201304.

COUNTY OF CABARRUS

By

(Title)

COUNTY OF LINCOLN

By

(Title)

COUNTY OF MECKLENBURG

By

(Title)

CITY OF CONCORD

By

(Title)

CITY OF KANNAPOLIS

By

(Title)

TOWN OF CORNELIUS

By

(Title)

TOWN OF DAVIDSON

By

(Title)

TOWN OF HUNTERSVILLE

By

(Title)

CABARRUS – ROWAN METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

By

(Title)

CENTRALINA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

By

(Title)

~~LAKE NORMAN RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION~~~~GASTON-CLEVELAND-~~
~~LINCOLN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION~~

By

(Title)

~~MECKLENBURG—UNION METROPOLITAN PLANNING~~
~~ORGANIZATION~~~~CHARLOTTE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING~~
~~ORGANIZATION~~

By

(Title)

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By

(Title)

Funding, Design and Construction

The key to implementation of the roadway improvements is having the NC 73 Corridor on the NCDOT Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is the programming document for expenditures of State and Federal transportation funds. It identifies priorities for planning, design, right-of-way, and construction of roadway projects throughout the State, through a very prescribed process.

Currently, two sections of NC 73 are on the TIP, but neither is funded. The two sections are:

- TIP No. R-2236 A, from I-77 to Davidson-Concord Road in Mecklenburg County, and
- TIP No. R-2706 from SR 1356 in Lincoln County to SR 2145 in Mecklenburg County.

The TIP is fiscally constrained, meaning that the projected revenues match the projects programmed. This requires that project requests include a cost estimate. The implication of this for NC 73 is that addition of NC 73 improvements within the seven year horizon of the TIP would require removing or delaying other projects to maintain the funding ceiling set by the equity formula for the region. The Board of Transportation member decides if a project gets put into the TIP, with or without a completed feasibility study. A NCDOT feasibility study determines the scope of a given project, including a Right-of-way and construction cost estimate.

A project can only be recommended for inclusion on the TIP through the mutual concurrence of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and NCDOT. Each MPO develops its own needs list which is submitted to the NCDOT. Through a series of joint meetings, a Local TIP (LTIP) is developed. Because of the equity formula and the requirement for fiscal constraint, only the highest priority needs are likely to be included in the State TIP.

There are two steps that will be necessary to have all of NC 73 added to the TIP List:

1. NCDOT Feasibility Study. The recommended approach for NC 73 is to request the N. C. Department Transportation to accept The NC 73 Corridor Transportation/Land Use Plan and Memorandum of Understanding as the feasibility study for NC 73. It is recommended that the full NC 73 Corridor, from US 321 to I-85, be a single feasibility study, because of the integrated nature of all of the segments, including the network roads in addition to NC 73 itself. The feasibility study for R-2705 was done in 1991 and the study for R-2155 was done in 1995, so they would need to be included as part of the overall NC 73 feasibility study, since they are outdated. The NCDOT would need to prepare a right-of-way and probable cost estimate to complete the feasibility study.

2. Add NC 73 to the Local TIP. It is recommended that one of the first actions of the Council of Planning be to initiate negotiations with [Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization \(CRTPO\)](#)~~MUMPO~~, Cabarrus-Rowan MPO and [Lake Norman RPO](#)~~Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO~~ for inclusion on their LTIP²s. It will be very important for each of the LTIP's to include NC 73 as a high priority project, which will aid in having it added to the State TIP List. Once NC 73 has been added to the State TIP, it follows the prescribed process for funding, planning, design, right-of-way acquisition and construction. The priority given by the North Carolina Board of Transportation helps determine the priority of projects on the State TIP.

Jurisdiction Responsibilities

Local jurisdictions will be responsible for implementing the land use portions of the NC 73 Corridor Transportation/Land Use Plan. The kind of commitments that will be needed include:

- Maintain land use plans that are the basis for the Corridor Plan, or make changes with the concurrence of the Council of Planning that the changes would not have an adverse effect on the rest of the corridor
- Undertake area plans at locations identified in the segment plans, jointly with abutting communities where the area plans are in more than one jurisdiction
- Coordination with abutting jurisdictions to undertake area plans and to participate in the Council of Planning
- Maintain or adopt development policies that will maintain the right-of-way necessary for the appropriate road typology

- Require that developments follow the Corridor access guidelines as part of the land use and zoning approval process
- Require as part of the land use and zoning approval process that some road be funded and built as part of the developments, as indicated on the segment plans

The local jurisdictions will likely be requested to take responsibility for implementing some aspects of the roadway projects. This could place responsibility on local jurisdictions for some of the following:

- Require some pedestrian/bike trails as part of development approvals
- Possibly pay for landscape and urban design elements
- Possibly pay for sidewalks and pedestrian/bike trails
- Maybe some right of way acquisition
- Possibly maintenance of “amenities” in the right of way

The Centralina Council of Governments commitment includes:

- Participation in the NC 73 Council of Planning; and
- “Reminding” member communities of their commitments

| The MPO ~~and RPO~~ commitment includes:

- Transportation Plan amendments as necessary to incorporate NC 73 elements.
- Supporting the NC 73 Corridor Plan through inclusion of the Corridor on the LTIP; and
- Working for inclusion of the NC 73 Corridor on the State TIP.

The NCDOT commitment includes:

- Making its “best effort” to include the recommendations set forth in the NC 73 Corridor Plan in its long range planning for the corridor; and
- Following the road typologies, access management strategy and segment plan recommendations as guidelines for the design of NC 73 projects.

Recommendations for the Council of Planning

- **COG as Convener and Staff:** It is recommended that the Centralina Council of Governments (“COG”) serve as the convener for, and provide the staff functions to, the Council of Planning. Such staff functions include (but not limited to) the proposing operating by-laws, regular meeting dates and places, and minutes of meetings.
- **Communication Protocol among Jurisdictions:** With COG’s assistance, the Council of Planning should recommend to the jurisdictions along the Corridor

methods and frequencies of communicating information important to the Corridor's users, planners and funders. Specifically, the Council of Planning should present "State of the Corridor" reports to 1) NC Board of Transportation members having responsibility along the Corridor, 2) governing bodies of the Corridor's respective jurisdictions, and 3) economic development and planning organizations interested in the Corridor.

- **Small Area Plan Updates:** Municipalities having designated responsibilities for directing, or participating in, the development of small area plans identified in the Corridor Plan should report regularly to the Council of Planning on their planning progress (e.g., selection of consultants, scope of work, project schedule, and impacts on land uses and/or traffic volume and flow along the Corridor).
- **Developing Funding Priorities:** The Council of Planning should coordinate with the respective Metropolitan Planning Organizations ~~and with the Lake Norman Rural Planning Organization~~ to develop priorities among the various Corridor segments for the Local Transportation Improvement Program. Included in this coordination and prioritization process would be considering the impact of segment funding priorities to any revisions of the Thoroughfare Plan.
- **Update of Corridor Plan:** The Council of Planning should recommend updates to the NC DOT, the respective jurisdictions and planning organizations, as needed.

Recommended TIP Projects

State and Federal guidelines for TIP projects require that they begin and end at "logical termini," referring generally to major roads or highways where notable changes in traffic volumes could be expected to occur.

The following division of the 35 mile NC 73 corridor into TIP projects is based on the locations where notable changes in traffic volume are expected. The "logical termini" of these recommended project locations in most instances result in TIP projects that overlap jurisdictions. It is anticipated that this overlap will encourage the continued and ongoing cooperation of the various county, municipal, MPO/~~RPO~~, NCDOT division and private sector jurisdictions and agencies in order to secure funding for the projects which directly affect each of them.

1. **US 321 to new NC 16, Lincoln County.** This project would all be within unincorporated Lincoln County. It is all in the jurisdiction of ~~Lake Norman RPO (LNRPO)~~ ~~the Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO (GCLMPO)~~, and all in NCDOT Division 12. Anticipated traffic volumes through this section range from 14,000 near US 321 to 36,000 near the new NC 16. Traffic east of the new NC 16 is anticipated to be notably higher than to the west. This TIP project would include the section on new alignment from US 321 to Low Bridge Road and the potential section on new alignment from Reinhardt Circle to Maxwell Farm Lane, which is

the reason it is recommended as a single TIP project. Other than construction needed in the immediate vicinity of the NC 73 Bypass, recommended improvements to Salem Church Road and Hill Road should be required as part of commercial and employment center development. Because the section on new alignment from US 321 to near Airport Road would provide notable relief to the existing NC 73/NC 27, this could potentially be two TIP projects:

- 1a. US 321 to Airport Road, Lincoln County, and
- 1b. Airport Road to new NC 16

2. New NC 16 to new Gilead Road (SR 2136), Lincoln and Mecklenburg

Counties. This project would be partly within unincorporated Lincoln County, partly within unincorporated Mecklenburg County, and partly within the Town of Huntersville. It is partly in the jurisdiction of ~~LNRP~~~~O-GCLMPO~~ and partly in ~~Mecklenburg-Union MPO (MUMPO)-CRTPO~~. It is partly in NCDOT Division 12, and partly in Division 10. It includes a major crossing of the Catawba River. Anticipated traffic volumes range from 36,000 near new NC 16 to 50,000 near new Gilead Road. Because of the improvements proposed to Gilead Road for access to I-77 and to I-485 via Vance Road, traffic volumes are anticipated to drop from 50,000 to approximately 25,000 in each direction at this intersection. NC 73 portions of this section are all on existing alignment. Recommended improvements of Little Egypt Road from NC 73 to old NC 16, of old NC 16 and Pilot Knob Road from NC 73 to old NC 16 are recommended to be included as part of this TIP project, as they have a direct bearing on the functionality of NC 73 in the West Lake Norman segment. Other recommended roads shown as part of the bypass south of NC 73 and NC 16 should be required to be built as part of developments in the area.

3. New Gilead Road (SR 2136) to Davidson-Concord Road (SR 2693),

Mecklenburg County. This project falls partly within each of the Town of Huntersville, the Town of Cornelius, the Town of Davidson and unincorporated Mecklenburg County. It is in the jurisdiction of ~~MUMPO~~~~CRTPO~~, and NCDOT Division 10. Anticipated traffic volumes range from approximately 25,000 at new Gilead Road to 32,000 at Davidson-Concord Road, peaking at I-77 in the middle of the section. Because this is the central link of the limited network for the NC 73 corridor through Huntersville, Cornelius and Davidson, it is recommended to be a single TIP project for long-range planning purposes. This section is all on existing alignment. Recommended improvements to US 21 should be included as part of this TIP project, as they have a direct bearing on the functionality of NC 73. Recommended improvements to NC 115 should be part of the transit oriented development at the proposed NC 73/NC 115 commuter rail station.

4. Davidson-Concord Road (SR 2693) to Odell School Road (SR 1601),

Mecklenburg and Cabarrus Counties. This project falls partly with each of the Town of Davidson, unincorporated Mecklenburg County and unincorporated Cabarrus County. It is also with areas expected to eventually be annexed by the City

of Kannapolis and the City of Concord. It is partly in the jurisdiction of ~~MUMPO CRTPO~~ and partly in Cabarrus-Rowan MPO (CRMPO), and is in NCDOT Division 10. Anticipated traffic volume ranges from 38,000 at David-Concord Road to 30,000 at Odell School Road. This section is all on existing alignment.

Recommended improvements to Odell School Road south of NC 73 should be included as part of this TIP project, since it is part of the Untz Road southern alternative route and will relieve traffic on NC 73, resulting in a smaller and less expensive NC 73 project. Recommended improvements to Poplar Tent Church Road/Shiloh Church Road and to Odell School Road north of NC 73 should be part of the area plan development at those two locations.

5. **Odell School Road (SR 1601) to I-85, Cabarrus County.** This project falls partly within unincorporated Cabarrus County and partly within the City of Concord. It is also with areas expected to eventually be annexed by the City of Kannapolis and the City of Concord. It is all within the jurisdiction of CRMPO and NCDOT Division 10. Anticipated traffic volume ranges from 28,000 at Odell School Road to 44,000 at I-85. Because the recently completed Kannapolis Parkway has the potential to redirect some NC 73 traffic south to I-85, this section could potentially be two TIP projects:

5a. Odell School Road (SR 1601) to Kannapolis Parkway (SR 1430), and

5b. Kannapolis Parkway (SR 1430) to I-85

This project is all on existing alignment. Recommended improvements to Odell School Road and Untz Road should be included as part of this TIP project, since they are part of the southern alternative route and will relieve traffic on NC 73, resulting in a smaller and less expensive NC 73 project.

6. **Gilead Road (SR 2136) from NC 73 to I-77, Mecklenburg County.** This project falls partly within the Town of Huntersville and partly within unincorporated Mecklenburg County. It is all within the jurisdiction of ~~MUMPO CRTPO~~ and NCDOT Division 10. This project is the western half of the southern leg of the limited network for NC 73 through Huntersville. Anticipated traffic volumes are in the 25,000 to 35,000 range. This section is mostly on existing alignment, except for approximately the first ½ mile south of NC 73.

7. **Gilead Road (SR 2136), Huntersville-Concord Road (SR 2448) and Ramah Church Road (SR 2439) from I-77 to the proposed Prosperity Church Road Extension, Mecklenburg County.** This project falls partly within the Town of Huntersville and partly within unincorporated Mecklenburg County. It is all within the jurisdiction of ~~MUMPO CRTPO~~ and NCDOT Division 10. This project is the eastern half of the southern leg of the limited network for NC 73 through Huntersville. Anticipated traffic volumes are in the approximately 15,000 to 20,000 range. This section is mostly on existing alignment, except for the connection between Huntersville-Concord Road and Ramah Church Road.

8. **Catawba Avenue (SR 5544) and Westmoreland Road (SR 2147) from NC 73 to US 21, Mecklenburg County.** This project falls partly within the Town of Huntersville, partly within the Town of Cornelius and partly within unincorporated Mecklenburg County. It is all within the jurisdiction of ~~MUMPO-CRTPO~~ and NCDOT Division 10. This project is the eastern half of the northern leg of the limited network for NC 73 through Huntersville. Anticipated traffic volumes are in the approximately 25,000 to 30,000 range. This section is all on existing alignment.
9. **US 21, Bailey Road and Davidson-Concord Road (SR 2693) from Westmoreland Road to NC 73, Mecklenburg County.** This project is the western half of the northern leg of the limited network for NC 73 through Huntersville. The Bailey Road and Davidson-Concord Road sections have been proposed by the Town of Cornelius and the Town of Davidson as part of the Cornelius East & Davidson-Concord Road Vision Plan. This portion of the limited network is included for informational purposes only, and is not proposed as a TIP project.

Recommended TIP Project Priorities

The priorities for the TIP projects are shown separately for NCDOT Division 10 and Division 12, since they are accounted separately under the equity formula.

Division 10 Priorities

- Priority 1: New Gilead Road (SR 2136) to Davidson-Concord Road (SR 2693), Mecklenburg County. This project is currently the most congested in the corridor, with the largest projected population and the highest anticipated traffic volumes.
- Priority 2: New NC 16 to new Gilead Road (SR 2136), Lincoln and Mecklenburg Counties. This project is anticipated to carry 50,000 vehicles per day by 2025. It has the potential to become a major bottleneck.
- Priority 3: Davidson-Concord Road (SR 2693) to Odell School Road (SR 1601), Mecklenburg and Cabarrus Counties. This project is in the section of the corridor with the highest rate of projected population growth. It is already experiencing peak period congestion problems.
- Priority 4: Odell School Road (SR 1601) to I-85, Cabarrus County. This project serves a commercial and business corridor that currently experiences congestion and access management issues. If planned as two TIP projects, 4a. from Kannapolis Parkway to I-85 would be the higher priority of the two.

- Priority 5: Gilead Road (SR 2136) from NC 73 to I-77, Mecklenburg County. This project will be needed to provide diversion of traffic from NC 73. Without this project, NC 73 from Catawba Avenue to I-77 would have to be a much bigger and more expensive road project.
- Priority 6 Catawba Avenue (SR 5544) and Westmoreland Road (SR 2147) from NC 73 to US 21, Mecklenburg County. This project is also needed to provide diversion of traffic from NC 73. Without this project, NC 73 from Catawba Avenue to I-77 would have to be a much bigger and more expensive road project.
- Priority 7 Gilead Road (SR 2136), Huntersville-Concord Road (SR 2448) and Ramah Church Road (SR 2439) from I-77 to the proposed Prosperity Church Road Extension, Mecklenburg County. This project is needed to eventually divert traffic from NC 73 so that NC 73 will not have to be a bigger and more expensive project. The timing of this project will be affected by the Prosperity Church Road Extension and the construction of the link between Huntersville-Concord Road and Ramah Church Road as part of development in that area.
- Priority 8 US 21, Bailey Road and Davidson-Concord Road (SR 2693) from Westmoreland Road to NC 73, Mecklenburg County. The priority for this section of the NC 73 corridor will be determined by the Towns of Cornelius and Davidson as part of the development of the Cornelius East & Davidson-Concord Road Area Plan.

Division 12 Priorities

- Priority 1 New NC 16 to new Gilead Road (SR 2136), Lincoln and Mecklenburg Counties. This project is necessary to relieve existing congestion in the vicinity of NC 73 and old NC 16, which is steadily increasing due to the rate of development in West Lake Norman. Further, it is anticipated to carry 50,000 vehicles per day by 2025 and has the potential to become a major bottleneck.
- Priority 2 US 321 to new NC 16, Lincoln County. This project will relieve congestion on existing NC 27 between NC 73 and US 321. It will also support economic development in the area around the Lincoln County Airport and between US 321 and existing NC 73. If planned as two TIP projects, 1a. from US 321 to Airport Road would be the higher priority.

Rules of Procedure

NC 73 Council of Planning

~~June 22, 2006~~ November 22, 2013

ARTICLE I-NAME

The name of this body shall be the NC 73 Council of Planning, hereinafter referred to as the COP.

ARTICLE II-PURPOSE

The purpose and goals of the COP shall be to:

1. To meet on a regular basis to discuss land use and transportation issues along that portion of the NC 73 Corridor that lies between I-85 in Cabarrus County, through northern Mecklenburg County, to US 321 in Lincoln County.
2. To monitor development along the NC 73 Corridor.
3. To provide an opportunity to comment and give feedback on development projects taking place along the Corridor.
4. To make recommendations to local governments, the Cabarrus-Rowan MPO, ~~Mecklenburg Union, MPO~~ Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization, the Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO ~~Lake Norman RPO~~ and NCDOT on issues of concern along the NC 73 Corridor.
5. To gauge progress on the implementation of the 2004 NC 73 Corridor Study and subsequent updates.
6. To undertake other mutually agreed upon tasks to enhance transportation system development and land use coordination along the Corridor.

ARTICLE III-MEMBERS

Section 1-Membership:

The COP shall consist of one or more officials from local governments along the Corridor, and invited persons from chambers of commerce and economic development agencies, and NCDOT. The initial membership shall include representatives from the following agencies

REGULAR MEMBERS

- Cabarrus County
- Lincoln County
- Mecklenburg County
- City of Concord
- Town of Cornelius
- Town of Davidson
- Town of Huntersville
- City of Kannapolis

INVITED AGENCIES

- CATS
- Cabarrus County Chamber of Commerce
- Cabarrus County Economic Development Commission
- Cabarrus-Rowan MPO

- ~~Lake Norman RPO~~Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO
- Lincoln County Chamber of Commerce
- Lake Norman Chamber of Commerce
- Lake Norman Economic Development Commission
- Lincoln County Economic Development Commission
- ~~Mecklenburg Union~~Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization-MPO
- NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch
- NCDOT- Division 10 Office
- NCDOT- Division 12 Office

Each member present shall have been appointed by his/her respective local government, agency, or organization to sit on the COP. Voting privileges shall be extended to regular member agencies only. Each regular member agency shall be able to cast one (1) vote on all matters for which voting is called for, irrespective of the number of persons present at that meeting representing that agency.

Section 3-Term of Membership:

Term of office for all seats on the COP shall be for two years. Re-appointments to the same position shall be allowed.

Section 4- Administration

The Centralina Council of Governments (CCOG) shall serve as the administrative staff to the COP. The CCOG shall appoint a Secretary for the COP.

ARTICLE IV-OFFICERS

Section 1-Officers Defined:

The officers of the COP will consist of a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman serving annual terms, but shall be limited to two consecutive terms. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall each be a representative from one of the “regular member” communities on the COP.

Section 2-Duties of Officers:

Duties of the Chairman include, but shall not be limited, to:

- Preside at all meetings of the COP.
- Decide all points of order or procedure.
- Work with CCOG to draft meeting agendas.
- Call special meetings of the COP, as needed.

The Vice-Chairman shall conduct the duties of the Chairman in the event of the Chairman’s absence.

Should neither the Chairman nor Vice-Chairman be able to preside at a meeting, regular members present shall elect a person to serve as a Chairman for that meeting. Such person elected shall have all the powers, duties and responsibilities of the Chairman for that meeting.

A representative from CCOG shall serve as the Secretary.

ARTICLE V-MEETINGS

Section 1-Regular Meetings:

Meetings will be held on a quarterly basis on dates, times and locations to be determined by the COP membership and the Chairman. Meeting notices and agendas are to be mailed in sufficient time for them to have been received by each COP member, but not later than seven (7) days prior to the meeting date. Notice of the meeting shall be posted on the COP web site and notices submitted to local newspapers at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting date.

Section 2-Special Meetings:

Special meetings may be called by the Chairman, or at the request of any regular member petitioning the Chairman. Whenever possible, at least seven (7) days notice shall be given. In no event shall a special meeting be called with less than forty-eight (48) hours notice.

Section 3-Workshops:

The COP may choose to hold workshops from time to time. Notice for all workshops shall be provided in the manner as regular meetings of the COP.

Section 4-Attendance:

Each member shall be expected to attend each regular meeting and each special meeting provided at least seven (7) days notice is given of the latter.

Section 5-Agenda:

The agenda is a list of considerations for discussion at a meeting. Any member of the COP can place items on the agenda prior to its distribution, so long as they are presented to the Secretary prior to distribution of the agenda to the COP membership. Additional items may be placed on the regular agenda following discussion of the last item on the regular agenda, as long as a majority concurrence of the present and eligible regular voting membership is received.

Section 6- Quorum:

A quorum of the COP shall be required to hold a meeting. Any regular or special meeting will be cancelled without a quorum present. A quorum shall consist of one (1) or more members being present from a majority of the regular membership agencies, as depicted in Article III, Section 1 herein.

Section 7-Voting Procedures:

Each regular member agency shall be given one (1) vote on all matters for which a vote is called for. The Chair may vote on any matter as the representative from his/her community.

The Chairman may call for a vote on any issue, provided that a motion has been made and seconded and such motion is generally within the purposes of the COP as set forth in Article II herein and provided the issue is on the agenda as outlined in Article V, Section 5. A majority vote of the regular membership communities present at the meeting vote shall be sufficient for approval of matters coming before the COP. By approval of a majority of the remaining regular membership communities present, one or more voting members may withdraw from voting on an issue due to a conflict of interest. If all members present representing a regular committee abstain from voting, such community shall be considered to have voted in the affirmative on the matter at hand, unless such community shall have been previously excused from voting on said matter. In the absence of any direction from these rules or other duly adopted voting procedures pursuant to certain approval actions, Robert's Rules of Order will designate procedures governing voting. Any vote or resolution will be non-binding for any affected agency, and a statement indicating such will be included on any resolution. One function of the COP is to provide a forum for peer review of proposed actions in the corridor. Those reviews will generally be agency-to-agency and not subject to votes of the whole.

The COP will generally not vote on matters of local or NCDOT land use or transportation decisions in the corridor. However, the COP reserves the right to make a communal recommendation when those decisions have the potential to significantly affect (positively or negatively) either the NC 73 Plan or the corridor operations.

ARTICLE VI- APPROVAL/AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF PROCEDURE

Initial adoption and any subsequent amendment to these rules of procedure shall require the affirmative vote of at least a majority of the COP's regular members, at a regular COP meeting, provided that written notice of the proposed amendment has been received by each member at least thirty (30) days prior to the meeting at which the amendment is to be considered and provided that such amendment does not conflict with the NC 73 Memorandum of Understanding adopted by each regular member, any locally adopted regulation, or any State statute.

The NC 73 Council of Planning approved these rules of procedure on _____.

Chairman
NC 73 Council of Planning

Secretary
NC 73 Council of Planning