

MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Summary Meeting Minutes
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 267
June 6, 2013

Voting Members: *TCC Chair* – Danny Pleasant (CDOT), *TCC Vice-Chair* – Joe Lesch (Union County), David Meachum (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Ken Tippet (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Eric Moore (LUESA-Air Quality), Louis Mitchell (NCDOT-Div. 10), Anil Panicker (NCDOT-TPB), Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Justin Carroll (Huntersville), 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)

Staff: Robert Cook (MUMPO), Nick Landa (MUMPO), Andy Grzymiski (CDOT), Anna Gallup (CDOT), Tracy Newsome (CDOT), Norm Steinman (CDOT), Jonathan Wells (C-M Planning), Dick Winters (Mecklenburg County Health Department), Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Zac Gordon (Huntersville), Keith Sorensen (Indian Trail), Elinor Hiltz (Iredell County), Jim Loyd (Monroe), Neil Burke (Mooresville), Scott Cole (NCDOT-Div. 10), David Keilson (NCDOT), Jack Flaherty (NCDOT-Public Transportation Division)

Guests: Steve Blakley (Kimley-Horn), Todd Steiss (Parsons Brinkerhoff), Bill Thunberg (LNTC) – phone

Danny Pleasant opened the meeting at 10:00 AM.

1. Ethics Awareness & Conflict of Interest Reminder

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

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Pleasant noted that one item needed to be added to the agenda regarding an update of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). He then asked if any other changes to the agenda were necessary. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adopt the June TCC agenda. Joe Lesch made a motion to adopt the agenda. Anil Panicker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Consideration of May Meeting Minutes

Mr. Pleasant asked if any changes to the minutes are necessary. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Lesch made a motion to approve the May TCC minutes. David Meachum seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

4. MPO Self-Certification

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook reminded the TCC that each year the MPO must certify its compliance with federal transportation planning laws and procedures. He provided an overview of the types of federal

requirements to which the MPO must adhere, and confirmed that those requirements had been met for FY 2013. He requested that the TCC recommend that the MPO adopt a resolution of compliance.

Motion:

Mr. Meachum made a motion to recommend that the MPO adopt a resolution certifying its compliance with federal transportation planning regulations for FY 2013. Mr. Lesch seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

5. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

a. Mallard Creek/IBM Drive Connector (TIP #U-2507AA)

Presenter: Scott Cole, NCDOT

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cole began by showing a map of the project location, and explained that the proposed TIP amendment is to add a project to the TIP that would complement an existing TIP project to improve Mallard Creek Road. He stated that the Mallard Creek Road project would remove an existing traffic signal and add a median, restricting access to some of the businesses in the area. In response to those concerns, NCDOT met with business owners and considered several options to remedy the situation. The conclusion was to construct a connector road between Mallard Creek Road and IBM Drive, behind the existing YMCA, and also add a connector road to the north of Mallard Creek Road to provide access to the apartments and stores on the north side of the road. Mr. Cole noted that a separate environmental review would be necessary, which would require a noise wall evaluation, because the project is on new location. He also indicated that the right-of-way for the connector road would be donated by the YMCA. The project was being presented for the TCC to consider amending the TIP, but an outstanding air quality conformity issue was raised because the project is not currently in the MPO's 2035 long range transportation plan (LRTP).

Mr. Pleasant asked why a noise wall would be required for a residential road. Louis Mitchell, with NCDOT's Division 10, responded that new federal and state requirements call for a noise study for all projects on new location. Mr. Lesch asked where the \$1.7 million anticipated project cost would come from. Mr. Mitchell stated that it would come from the Division 10 fund, to which Mr. Lesch noted his concern that funding this project could possibly lead to other TIP projects being delayed. Justin Carroll asked what the consequences would be if a noise wall was required. Mr. Cole replied that the neighbors would have to vote to determine if they want the noise wall, which the NCDOT hoped would not be the case. Bill Coxe suggested issuing a letter from the MPO to discourage requiring noise walls for these types of residential road projects.

Motion:

Mr. Lesch made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed TIP amendment as presented, contingent upon the environmental and conformity issues being resolved. Mr. Carroll seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

b. I-485/Oakdale Road Interchange (TIP #R-2248G)

Presenter: Scott Cole, NCDOT

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cole informed the TCC that the proposed project is the result of repeated requests to pave ramps that have not been paved since their original construction. He indicated that loop funds would be utilized to complete the project, which would not impact the Division's equity funds. The project would improve

the interchange and also include the construction of three roundabouts. Debra Campbell stated that the Planning Department has been involved with the project and is supportive. Ralph Messera asked if the project was evaluated using the loop prioritization process, to which Mr. Mitchell responded it has not. Joshua Langen stated that he would like a similar analysis to be done with regard to the I-485/Weddington Road interchange. Mr. Cole replied that a letter could be written from the Town to NCDOT to request such an analysis. He also noted that the proposed I-485/Oakdale Road interchange improvements have outstanding conformity and environmental issues.

Motion:

Ms. Campbell made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed TIP amendment as presented, contingent upon the environmental and conformity issues being resolved. Anil Panicker seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

6. TIP Amendment Guidelines

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook informed the TCC that the TIP amendment guidelines were first introduced during the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) subcommittee meetings, and that it was determined that the appropriate procedure for adopting the guidelines is to take them through the standard TCC/MPO approval process. He noted that the guidelines have been reviewed by staff and the MOU subcommittee, but that a formal recommendation to adopt them has not yet been made. Prior to requesting action, Mr. Cook highlighted the following proposed changes to the guidelines:

- Item c in the Administrative Modification section was changed to include “state and/or local funds”;
- Item d was modified to state MTP instead of LRTP;
- Item e in the Amendments section, and the same language in the examples of Administrative Modification section, were changed to state “Minor cost increases in the TIP projects less than 25% of the original cost not to exceed \$2 million.” (per a staff meeting discussion); and
- Due to the above language, item f was removed from the Amendments section, and the same language in the examples of Administrative Modifications section was also removed.

Motion:

Mr. Messera made a motion to recommend that the MPO endorse the TIP amendment guidelines as presented. Adam McLamb seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. MPO Census-Related Activities

a. Planning Area Boundary Expansion – MOU Subcommittee

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook provided an overview of recent MOU subcommittee discussions and directed the TCC’s attention to a matrix that highlights proposed MOU revisions, which can be viewed [here](#). He noted that several of the items have been discussed by staff, but that formal action by the TCC has not been taken. He then highlighted each item in the matrix and noted that general consensus on the items had been reached previously. Several actions were taken to recommend endorsement of the proposed changes (listed below). Mr. Cook concluded by stating that other changes will be required, but that a majority of the work to amend the MOU language has already been completed.

Motion:

Mr. Lesch made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the first three items in the attached matrix regarding TCC membership. Mr. McLamb seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Carroll made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed changes to Section I-E-11 of the MOU, and to replace the Transportation Advisory Committee language on page 4 of the MOU. Lisa Stiwinter seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Stiwinter made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed changes to Section I-G of the MOU. Mr. Carroll seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Lesch made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed changes to Section I-E-14 of the MOU. Ms. Stiwinter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Hambright Rd, Everette Keith Rd, Verhoeff Dr Alignment Studies

Presenter: Zac Gordon, Town of Huntersville

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Gordon provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He began by displaying a map of the study area and identifying the roadways being evaluated for new alignment. He gave an overview of the alignment study, including the purpose and timeline. Mr. Gordon then focused on each alignment individually. Hambright Road was described first. Several alignments were considered, including a hybrid alignment of two previously considered options. The hybrid alignment reduced the number of homes impacted, and was ultimately the staff recommended option. It was noted that each alignment would require stream crossings.

He then described Everette Keith Rd and Verhoeff Drive, each of which only had one alignment recommended. A timeline was presented that indicated the Town board would make its recommendation in early August, which would be followed by MPO action in either August or September. Mr. Langen expressed concern about cost increases for the Hambright alignment, due to the fact that it requires stream crossings. Mr. Coxe indicated that more work will need to be done on that alignment in order to determine a more accurate cost estimate. Mr. Pleasant asked if the request before the TCC involves a Thoroughfare Plan action or a Comprehensive Transportation Plan action. Mr. Coxe replied that it will require amendments to the Thoroughfare Plan.

Motion:

Mr. Carroll made a motion that the TCC find that all alignments are reasonable and feasible. Under the provisions of the MOU, the approved alignment for each of these thoroughfares must coincide with the wishes of the local jurisdiction; therefore, the TCC recommends that the MPO adopt these alignments as they are endorsed by the Town Commission of the Town of Huntersville. Mr. Meachum seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

9. 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)/Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

a. Plan Update

Presenter: Nick Landa

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Landa informed the TCC that federal transportation legislation refers to a MPO's long range plan as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP); therefore, the next long range plan of the MPO will be called

the 2040 MTP instead of the 2040 LRTP. He then provided the TCC with an update on the progress of the Plan development, as follows:

- Tier 1 roadway project ranking is underway;
- RFQs for prospective consultants to assist with the production of the Plan, and public involvement activities associated with Plan development, are due June 7;
- Three public meetings have been scheduled for the end of June to explain the purpose of the MTP, provide information about the different components of the Plan, and to discuss significant Plan milestones. TCC members are encouraged to inform Town boards and constituents about the public meetings; and
- The next MTP Advisory Committee meeting will be held on June 17.

b. Horizon Years

Presenter: Anna Gallup, Charlotte DOT

Summary/FYI:

Ms. Gallup reminded the TCC that the long range plan is divided into horizon years, and that the originally intended horizon years for the 2040 MTP would have to be modified due to unforeseen air quality conformity issues. She stated that a CO limited maintenance plan has been submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency but has not yet been approved, which makes it necessary for a model run to be completed for the year 2015 – due to the fact that this region has previously been classified as a maintenance area for CO. A conformity run is also required for the year 2025 based on the fact that the out year budget for ozone in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) is 2025, and this region is classified as non-attainment for ozone, requiring emission data for that budget year. In addition, it is required that the horizon years for the MTP are not more than 10 years apart. Ms. Gallup indicated that since model runs are required for 2015 and 2025, that those years be used as the first two horizon years for the MTP, and suggested that since 2030 and 2040 were the original outer two horizon years identified for the Plan, that they not change, meaning the plan would have four horizon years – 2015, 2025, 2030 and 2040. It was clarified that no TCC action is necessary, but that the interagency consultation group has come to agreement on the proposed horizon year changes.

10. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update

Presenter: Anil Panicker, NCDOT

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Panicker provided an update on the development of the CTP, stating that the draft maps are complete and are ready to be sent to NCDOT's Transportation Planning Branch for review.

11. Upcoming Issues

Mr. Landa provided an overview of the proposed new transportation legislation introduced by the NC House as HB 817 (Strategic Mobility Formula). He also noted that he has, and will continue to distribute notes of the Strategic Planning Office of Transportation (SPOT) workgroup, which is responsible for developing criteria to evaluate projects to be funded, based on the guidelines included in HB 817. It was also stated that if TCC members would like to provide input to the SPOT workgroup, comments can be sent to Mr. Landa to be forwarded to the workgroup. Mr. Panicker asked about how local input will be determined, to which Mr. Landa responded that it will be split between the NCDOT Division offices and the MPOs/RPOs. Mr. Pleasant noted that STP-DA funds would not be exempt from the Division Needs category, limiting the amount of funds that would be available to allocate to projects in that category.

Mr. Cole stated that TIP project U-5115, funded with STP-Direct Attributable funds in FY 2015, is programmed in the 2012-2018 TIP for construction only. He indicated that NCDOT would like to use some of that funding for planning and environmental work and for right-of-way acquisition, along with construction. He noted that the timing for spending the funds might need to change, but that the total dollar amount would remain the same. Mr. Lesch made a motion to recommend that the MPO amend the TIP in order to account for the requested funding changes to TIP project U-5115, as presented. Mr. Messera seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

12. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 AM.