

MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Summary Meeting Minutes
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 280
March 7, 2013

Voting Members: *TCC Chair* – Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Danny Pleasant (CDOT), David Meachum (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Ken Tippet (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Jason Rayfield (LUESA-Air Quality), David McDonald (CATS), Louis Mitchell (NCDOT-Div. 10), Anil Panicker (NCDOT-TPB), Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Adam McLamb – alt for Scott Kaufhold (Indian Trail), Ralph Messera (Matthews), Dana Clukey (Mint Hill), Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe), Shannon Martel (Stallings), Jordan Cook (Weddington), Joshua Langen (Wesley Chapel), Joe Lesch (Union County)

Staff: Nick Landa (MUMPO), Stuart Basham (MUMPO), Jonathan Wells (C-M Planning), Andy Grzynski (CDOT), Anna Gallup (CDOT), Tracy Newsome (CDOT), Norm Steinman (CDOT), Eldewins Haynes (CDOT), Dan Leaver (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), John Rose (CATS), Gwen Cook (Mecklenburg County Park & Recreation), Dick Winters (Mecklenburg County Health), Zac Gordon (Huntersville), Elinor Hiltz (Iredell County), Neil Burke (Mooresville), Erika Martin (Troutman), Scott Cole (NCDOT-Div. 10), David Keilson (NCDOT-Div. 12), Loretta Barren (FHWA)

Guests: Bjorn Hansen (Centralina COG), Bill Thunberg (LNTC), Beverly Davis (RS&H), Carl Gibilaro (Atkins), Steve Blakley (Kimley-Horn)

Bill Coxe opened the meeting at 10:00 AM.

1. Ethics Awareness & Conflict of Interest Reminder

Mr. Coxe read into the record the ethics awareness and conflict of interest reminder. No conflicts of interest were stated.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Coxe asked if any modifications to the agenda are necessary. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adopt the agenda. Danny Pleasant made a motion to adopt the agenda. David McDonald seconded the motion. The agenda was adopted unanimously.

3. Consideration of February Meeting Minutes

Mr. Coxe asked if any changes to the minutes are necessary. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Anil Panicker made a motion to approve the February TCC minutes. Mr. Pleasant seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

4. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

a. Prosperity Church Road NW Arc TIP Amendment (TIP #U-5507)

Presenter: Dan Leaver, Charlotte Engineering & Property Management

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Leaver provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are

incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He began by giving an overview of the project's location and informed the TCC about the funding history of the project. In addition, he provided an update on the status of the project, noting some of the upcoming tasks and associated schedule including a public hearing for the project to be held on March 26, and real estate acquisition to begin in June/July of 2013. He also indicated that the City would like to request that the project be split into two phases to account for the real estate acquisition in the Environmental Justice community, which the project will bisect. Mr. Coxe asked if two phases are necessary. Mr. Leaver noted that discussions with NCDOT resulted in the recommendation to phase the project in order to avoid construction delays.

Motion:

Mr. McDonald made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed amendment to the 2012-2018 TIP to: Reallocate \$1.7 million of the funds for project U-5507 for right-of-way; make funding available for right-of-way in FY 2013 and funding for construction in FY 2014; and, split the project into two phases (U-5507A & B). Mr. Pleasant seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

b. US 74 TIP Amendment (TIP #U-5526)

Presenter: Scott Cole, NCDOT Division 10

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cole provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He informed the TCC that the request from NCDOT is to amend the 2012-2018 TIP to add project U-5526 for planning and environmental studies on US 74, from I-277 to Wallace Lane, to determine the feasibility of converting the existing bus-way to managed lanes. He then highlighted three segments of US 74 that would be studied, which include: 1) I-277 to Albemarle Road, 2) Albemarle Road to Conference Drive, and 3) Conference Drive to I-485. It was also noted that NCDOT is entering into a contract to begin evaluating tolling and revenue and operations concepts, which would eventually lead to developing a concept for the corridor. He stated that the tolling and revenue information is necessary before the environmental review (Categorical Exclusion – CE) can be completed.

Mr. Coxe asked for clarification about the limit of the planning and environmental studies versus the limit of the CE that will be completed for the project. Louis Mitchell responded that the intent is to study how managed lanes would operate from I-277 all the way to I-485, and that NCDOT will have to work with Charlotte and Matthews to ensure operational issues are worked out for the entire corridor to I-485. He emphasized the importance of public involvement during the process. Mr. Cole recommended that the limits of the project be extended from I-277 to I-485, instead of Wallace Lane.

Motion:

Mr. Pleasant made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed amendment to the 2012-2018 TIP to program project U-5526 for planning and environmental studies only on US 74, from I-277 to I-485. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

a. Plan Update

Presenter: Nicholas Landa

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Landa introduced the LRTP item, and noted that he would like to start by providing an update on the activities of the committees. He indicated that the Advisory Committee met on February 25 and began discussing chapter content for the Plan. In addition, he noted that the next Advisory Committee meeting

was moved to March 18 in order to allow more time between meetings. He also indicated that approximately 270 candidate projects have been submitted to be evaluated for potential inclusion in the LRTP. Mr. Landa then stated that there are a few action items related to the 2040 LRTP update for consideration by the TCC. He identified goals and objectives as the first action item to be considered, and indicated that action would also be requested on the proposed ranking criteria to be used to evaluate the candidate projects, as well as an endorsement of the membership of a ranking committee to assist with the evaluation of candidate projects.

b. Goals & Objectives

Presenter: Nicholas Landa

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Landa noted that an addendum to the TCC agenda packet was sent out on Tuesday, March 4 which contains the proposed draft 2040 LRTP Goals & Objectives, which can be viewed by clicking [here](#). He outlined the process for developing the goals and objectives as follows:

- Steering and Advisory Committees reviewed 2035 LRTP goals and objectives and made changes in order to improve formatting and content;
- Distributed draft goals and objectives to identified stakeholders in the region; and
- Provided a 21-day public comment period for review and comment.

Mr. Landa noted that all the stakeholder and public comments, as well as the draft goals and objectives, are contained in the addendum, and the TCC is requested to recommend that the MPO endorse the proposed 2040 LRTP Goals & Objectives. Debra Campbell asked for a clarification of the meaning of the language “Practice quality growth management” in Goal 5. Mr. Landa responded that it was carried over from the 2035 LRTP Goals & Objectives and asked if a TCC member who participated in the development of that plan could provide additional insight. Mr. Coxe stated that the language has to do with growth patterns which are more economically viable in the long run (e.g. multi-family use), and that the goal was intended to reward those intentional growth patterns with transportation investment. He also noted that perhaps the objectives listed do not particularly address that language, but that the stakeholder comments submitted by the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) also speak to that issue. It was recommended that language be added to better address quality growth management, or that the language be removed. Mr. Pleasant asked if there was time for the language to be modified prior to the March MPO meeting. Mr. Landa noted that the March action is a self-imposed deadline, and that if the TCC wishes to make a final recommendation then the action could be moved to the April MPO meeting.

Motion:

Mr. Pleasant made a motion to recommend that the goals and objectives be sent back to the Advisory Committee for final review, to be modified as appropriate, with consideration of the TCC discussion. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion. After being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

c. Highway Ranking Methodology

Presenter: Beverly Davis, RS&H

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Landa noted that the LRTP Advisory Committee reached consensus on the proposed ranking criteria at its February 11 meeting. He also noted that the criteria was presented to the MPO for information at its February 20 meeting, and was well received. He then introduced Beverly Davis, with RS&H, to highlight a few minor changes to the point structure of the criteria. Ms. Davis provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). Highlights of her presentation consist of the following:

- Reminder that the proposed criteria is a two-tiered approach – Tier 1 evaluates need and Tier 2 evaluates sustainability;
- Tier 1 was outlined as including congestion, safety and accessibility to employment criteria, for a total of 100 points;
- Tier 2 was outlined as including environmental justice (EJ) impacts, impacts to natural, historic and community resources, connectivity and benefit/cost ratio, for a total of 200 points;
- Changes to the Tier 2 point structure were noted, which includes up to 9 points each for EJ, natural, historic and community resources, and up to 14 points for connectivity (benefit/cost ratio remains unchanged at up to 50 points);
- Examples of what types of impacts Tier 2 evaluates, and how they will be evaluated, was discussed;
- Approximately 270 projects will be evaluated using the Tier 1 analysis, which will then be scaled down to approximately 70 or 80 projects based on financial forecasting and other factors.

Mr. Pleasant asked if the points are reset after the Tier 1 process, to which Ms. Davis responded that the Tier 1 and Tier 2 points will be cumulative. Bjorn Hansen asked if the project cost for the benefit/cost ratio criteria is calculated based on the total project cost, or the anticipated NCDOT project cost. Ms. Davis stated that it will be based on planning level cost estimates. Andy Grzymiski, with CDOT, clarified that it would only account for the anticipated amount of equity dollars for each project. Mr. Coxe noted that it needs to be made clear to the MPO that only the equity dollar cost of the project will be used to calculate the benefit/cost. The TCC further discussed how projects will be chosen to move from Tier 1 to Tier 2, what geography the list of 270 candidate projects includes, and concern was expressed that the majority of projects coming out of Tier 1 will be from the larger areas as opposed to the small communities. Mr. Landa reiterated that the ranking process is ongoing, that a ranking committee would be formed to evaluate the results of the Tier 1 quantitative scoring, and that the Advisory Committee endorsed the proposed criteria. He also provided an overview of the proposed timeline for evaluating the candidate projects.

Mr. Coxe stated his concern that the criterion is heavily weighted towards congestion. There was then further discussion by the TCC about the pros and cons of using total project cost versus only the equity project cost. Loretta Barren, with FHWA, noted that job creation and economic development could be more heavily weighted in future state evaluation criteria, which might impact how much weight is given to congestion. It was clarified that projects funded in the first years of the 2012-2018 TIP will not have to be ranked using the criteria. Ultimately, a motion was made by Mr. McDonald, and seconded by Andrew Grant, to recommend that the MPO approve the criteria as presented (see full motion below). Joe Lesch made a substitute motion, which was seconded by Shannon Martel, to recommend that the MPO approve the criteria using full project cost for the benefit/cost ratio criteria. Mr. Cole stated his concern that using full project cost would impact the State's ability to implement managed lanes projects. More discussion by the TCC resulted in Mr. Lesch withdrawing his substitute motion. The vote for the original motion, as stated below, was called.

Motion:

Mr. McDonald made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the criteria as presented, clarifying that the benefit/cost criteria in Tier 2 is intended to account for only the portion of project cost anticipated to be funded with equity dollars. Mr. Grant seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Landa stated that there is one more action related to the LRTP that is requested by the TCC. He presented a matrix of proposed TCC members, and staff, to participate in a ranking committee to evaluate

the LRTP candidate projects. The first meeting of the group is anticipated to take place in April. It was clarified that CDOT would be represented by either Tim Gibbs or Norm Steinman, not both. Mr. Landa suggested that approximately four or five meetings would be necessary, and that the identified members of the ranking committee are expected to attend all scheduled meetings. He also clarified that no MPO board members are being asked to be included on the committee, but rather MPO staff members.

Motion:

Mr. Pleasant made a motion to recommend that the TCC endorse the ranking committee membership, noting that only one TCC representative from CDOT will be included. Mr. Messera seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

6. MPO Census-Related Activities

a. Planning Area Boundary Expansion – MOU Subcommittee

Presenter: Nick Landa

Summary/Action Requested and FYI:

Mr. Landa provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He stated that he will be highlighting some of the recent activities of the MOU subcommittee, which was formed by the MPO to work on revisions to MUMPO's MOU. The only action requested is to recommend that the MPO endorse a new name for the MPO, the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO). Mr. Landa outlined the process for how the preferred name was decided upon, and stated that ultimately the name was chosen because it better identifies the geography for which the MPO plans (Charlotte region), and it better identifies the purpose for the organization (transportation planning). He also indicated that a lot of work will need to be accomplished to transition from the current name to the new name, so the sooner there is certainty about the new name, the sooner that work can begin.

Mr. Landa stated that the TCC held a staff meeting to discuss MOU issues, at the request of the MOU subcommittee, on February 18, which was led by one of the MPO's on-call consultants, Scott Lane. He then summarized the recommendations from that meeting as follows:

- o Weighted voting percentages of MPO membership would essential remain as is, with the City of Charlotte receiving approximately 42% of the total vote, each dues paying member agency with a population over 20,000 would receive 2 votes, and each dues paying member agency under 20,000 population would receive a minimum 1 vote;
- o Quorum requirements for MPO meetings would change from the requirements currently outlined in the MOU to a quorum being established by 51% of the eligible voting members present, or 60% of the eligible weighted vote;
- o In addition to the proposed new quorum requirements, a member agency missing two consecutive meetings would not be counted towards meeting the quorum requirement (until the next meeting attended by that respective member agency);

Mr. Landa indicated that at its February 20 meeting, the MOU subcommittee heard the recommendations outlined above and did not come to a consensus on the voting issue; however, the MOU subcommittee did agree to the new quorum requirements proposed. The subcommittee also requested more information about member dues/fees from staff. Mr. Pleasant presented a summary of the information compiled to date about the MPO budget and costs of operation, which did not include the TCC members' time spent on MPO activities. Discussion followed about whether or not it would be appropriate to attempt to calculate the time spent by TCC members on MPO activities, with the understanding that it would be difficult to accurately compile that information. Mr. Pleasant indicated that the next step

would be to outline a proposed FY 2014 budget to be discussed by the MOU subcommittee. It was announced that the next MOU subcommittee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 20.

Motion:

Mr. Pleasant made a motion to recommend that the MPO adopt the new name of Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization for the MPO. Mr. Messera seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

7. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

a. FY 2013 UPWP Amendments

Presenter: Nick Landa

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Landa provided information about proposed amendments to the FY 2013 UPWP, which can be seen by clicking [here](#). Specifically, he noted one change to the Plan, regarding funding previously proposed for the Fast Lanes Study – Phase III. He stated that the Charlotte DOT has indicated that there is no longer a need for those funds to be allocated to the Fast Lanes Study, so it is proposed that they be reallocated to on-call consulting services.

Motion:

Ms. Martel made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the amendments to the FY 2013 UPWP, as presented. Mr. Messera seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

b. FY 2014 UPWP

Presenter: Nick Landa

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Landa informed the TCC that staff is currently in the process of developing the FY 2014 UPWP, which will need to be approved prior to the beginning of the FY 2014 fiscal year. He noted that the amount of Section 5303 funds allocated to the MPO was provided after the agenda packet was distributed. The correct amount was stated as being \$324,024, and it was noted that the funds are currently split between CDOT and CATS, but that further discussion is necessary to determine how these funds will ultimately be divided. Mr. Landa concluded by indicating that the TCC and MPO will be updated as work continues to finalize the FY 2014 UPWP.

8. I-77 HOT Lanes Project

Presenter: Bill Coxe, Town of Huntersville

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Coxe began by describing the proposed project limits, and stated that amendments to the LRTP and TIP, as well as a conformity determination for both documents, will be required to move forward with the project. He then announced that a workshop is being held by the Lake Norman Transportation Commission (LNTC) on March 13, the intent of which is to provide general information about public-private partnership funding arrangements, and also specifically how it could be applied to the I-77 HOT lanes project. He continued by providing an update on the proposed schedule for public involvement and MPO action(s), which is subject to change. It was noted that an Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared concurrently with an anticipated release date in April. He concluded by indicating that the financial components of the I-77 project will be discussed at the April TCC meeting.

9. Hambright, Verhoeff & Everette Keith Road Alignment Studies

Presenter: Zac Gordon, Town of Huntersville

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Gordon provided information to the TCC via a PDF presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He indicated that Verhoeff Drive has been added to the study, and gave an overview of the area of study for the proposed changes to the Thoroughfare Plan. Proposed alignment options for Hambright Road, Verhoeff Drive and Everette Keith Road were presented. He concluded by outlining the next steps, including that future action is anticipated at the April TCC meeting.

10. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)

Presenter: Anil Panicker, NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Panicker stated that staff level meetings have been ongoing to define all the categories on the CTP maps, and as soon as changes to the maps are completed, based on the discussions at those meetings, then the maps will be sent to NCDOT for review. Mr. Landa added that the CTP database team has been meeting to determine which fields are appropriate to be included in the database, as well as a format for presenting the CTP database information.

11. Upcoming Issues

No upcoming issues were presented.

12. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 PM.