

MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Summary Meeting Minutes
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room CH-14
July 11, 2013

Voting Members: *TCC Chair* – Danny Pleasant (CDOT), *TCC Vice-Chair* – Joe Lesch (Union County), Ken Tippette (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Jonathan Wells – alt for Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Eric Moore (LUESA-Air Quality), David McDonald (CATS), Scott Cole – alt for Louis Mitchell (NCDOT-Div. 10), Anil Panicker (NCDOT-TPB), Wayne Herron – alt for Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Ralph Messera (Matthews), Dana Clukey (Mint Hill), Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe), Shannon Martel (Stallings)

Staff: Robert Cook (MUMPO), Nick Landa (MUMPO), Stuart Basham (MUMPO), Andy Grzymiski (CDOT), Anna Gallup (CDOT), Tracy Newsome (CDOT), Norm Steinman (CDOT), John Rose (CATS), Jan Whitesell (C-M Planning), Jay Higginbotham (Mecklenburg County Park & Recreation), Megan Green (LUESA-Air Quality), Keith Sorensen (Indian Trail), Elinor Hiltz (Iredell County), Pate Butler (NCDOT), David Keilson (NCDOT), Loretta Barren (FHWA) – phone

Guests: Bill Thunberg (LNTC), David Wiggins (Steele Creek Resident’s Association)

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 asked if any changes to the agenda are necessary. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adopt the July TCC agenda. A motion and second to adopt the agenda were made, and it was approved.

3. Consideration of June Meeting Minutes

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

4. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

a. Bearskin Creek Greenway

Presenter: Lisa Stiwinter, City of Monroe

Summary/Action Requested:

Ms. Stiwinter provided a description of the project, including its location. She noted that it will connect several existing land uses in Monroe, including multiple parks. It was stated that the requested amendment is to program \$1,640,000 of federal and state funds for planning and design, and construction, in the current TIP. Ms. Stiwinter indicated that the right-of-way and any costs that exceed the \$1.64 million programmed will be the responsibility of the City of Monroe. She also noted that no

other projects would be delayed if this project is funded. Ken Tippetts asked for the total length of the project, to which Ms. Stiwinter responded it is 1.6 miles. Ralph Messera asked if the CSX railroad right-of-way would be an issue. Ms. Stiwinter responded that an existing culvert is being used, so there should not be a problem.

Motion:

Ms. Stiwinter made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed TIP amendment as presented. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

b. Toby Creek II and Little Sugar Creek Greenways

Presenter: Jay Higginbotham, Mecklenburg County Park & Recreation

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Higginbotham explained to the TCC that the requested TIP amendment is simply to shift funds across two greenway projects that are already funded in the current TIP, so no funding to any other TIP projects will be impacted. He indicated that the Toby Creek II greenway project was funded with both CMAQ and Enhancement Bicycle funds, but that the project is moving forward using the CMAQ funds. However, he noted that additional funding is needed for the Toby Creek II project, and additional funding is needed for the Little Sugar Creek greenway project in the TIP. Mr. Higginbotham stated that the request is to apply the excess funding from Toby Creek II to supplement the two programmed greenway projects – Toby Creek II and Little Sugar Creek. Mr. Coxe asked in which fiscal year the funding is requested. Mr. Higginbotham suggested that it should be either FY 2014 or 2015, and that he would get clarification prior to the MPO meeting.

Motion:

Mr. McDonald made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed TIP amendment, as presented. Mr. Coxe seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

c. Miscellaneous Amendments

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook informed the TCC that two TIP amendments are requested by NCDOT, which can be viewed [here](#). He noted that one of the amendments will require that the associated project be let from Raleigh, instead of the NCDOT Division 10 office. Scott Cole, with NCDOT, clarified that the likely reason for that change is because the project cost exceeds \$1.2 million. Mr. Cook then stated that both amendments are minor project delays which have been discussed with the project sponsors and there is no opposition to the requested amendments.

Motion:

Jonathan Wells made a motion to recommend that the MPO approve the proposed TIP amendments, as presented. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. MPO Census-Related Activities

a. Planning Area Boundary Expansion – MOU Subcommittee

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook began by providing an update of the expanded MPO planning area boundary, and noted that a decision has been made that will make Lincoln County part of the Gaston Urban Area MPO. He also indicated that the northeastern portion of the proposed boundary was modified slightly to include I-40 and NC 64, in Iredell County, within the new MPO boundary. Based on that information, the boundary is final and the MPO will be asked to endorse it at its July meeting. Mr. Pleasant noted that he was hesitant to ask the TCC to take action on an item that is political in nature, and that the MOU subcommittee might be a more appropriate venue for such action. Joe Lesch stated that because there have been agreements made with the adjacent MPOs, and with staff in the impacted geographies, he is comfortable making the motion to recommend that the MPO endorse the boundary (see Motion below).

Mr. Coxe observed that portions of the Charlotte Urbanized Area bleed into the adjacent counties outside the proposed new boundary area, and asked if those MPOs are capable of accomplishing the required planning duties for those areas. Mr. Pleasant suggested that regional agreements will need to be signed, which will place the responsibility with the appropriate MPO. Mr. Coxe stated that he would feel more comfortable if MPO board members attended the quarterly Charlotte Regional Alliance for Transportation (CRAFT) meetings. Jonathan Wells asked if it is necessary for the TCC to take action on the proposed boundary. Mr. Pleasant explained the MOU approval process, concluding that technically the TCC does not have to act on the boundary. He then asked if any other actions related to the MOU are being requested. Mr. Cook indicated that the draft MOU document needs to be discussed.

Mr. Cook stated that the TCC is being requested to recommend that the MPO endorse the draft MOU. He noted that the MPO has already taken action on the significant issues of voting and member fees, and that several revisions to update content and revise language in the document have been completed. It was suggested that additional changes may be necessary, but that they would be very minor. Mr. Cook also informed the TCC that after the MOU is endorsed by the MPO, there will be a request sent to each member jurisdiction outlining the procedure for getting the document signed. Mr. Coxe suggested that it might be a good idea to include the TCC membership in the MOU document, but keep the agreed upon language for the TCC to modify its own membership in the Bylaws. Mr. McDonald proposed including the TCC membership as an attachment to the MOU. Mr. Pleasant asked if an effective date has been set for the new MPO to be constituted. Mr. Cook stated that October 1, 2013 was proposed, but no formal decision has been made.

Motion:

Mr. Lesch made a motion to recommend that the MPO endorse the proposed expanded MPO boundary, as presented. Mr. Coxe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Wells made a motion to recommend that the MPO endorse the draft MOU, as presented, and release the document for signature by potential member jurisdictions. Mr. McDonald seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

6. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Process

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook informed the TCC that Scott Lane, one of the MPO's on-call consultants, has been asked to evaluate the MPO's UPWP process and look for ways to improve it, including formalizing the process. He noted that draft recommendations have been developed, which include making the document more transparent, and providing training to the member jurisdictions about how the money in the UPWP can be spent, among others. Mr. Cook also noted that it was suggested that a UPWP subcommittee be formed to help guide the process. Next steps stated include finalizing the recommendations and presenting the

results to the TCC and MPO for endorsement.

7. 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

a. Plan Update

Presenter: Nick Landa

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Landa provided the TCC with an update on the progress of the Plan development, as follows:

- Chapter development is underway;
- The MTP Advisory Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 15;
- Public meetings were held the last week of June; and
- Project ranking is underway.

Hearing no questions, highway project ranking was discussed in more detail.

b. Tier 1 Roadway Project Scores – Division 10

Presenter: Nick Landa

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Landa reminded the TCC that approximately 270 MTP candidate projects were received, and that the MPO endorsed a two-tiered roadway project ranking methodology in March 2013. He emphasized that the intent of the methodology was to filter projects through the quantitative Tier 1 criteria in order to evaluate a smaller pool of projects using the Tier 2 criteria. This was done because funds are limited, and it will not be possible to fund all the projects submitted. He noted that the Tier 1 scores for Division 10 are complete, but the Tier 1 scores for Division 12 are not, due to the expansion of the travel demand model, which is not quite complete. Mr. Landa stated that the ranking committee formed by the TCC has met several times, in which a recommendation for where to make the cutoff between Tier 1 and Tier 2 for Division 10 projects has been made, and project ranking using the Tier 2 criteria has begun. He indicated that the ranking committee recommends all projects in Division 10 that scored 95 points, or more, be evaluated using the Tier 2 criteria – which would be a total of 86 projects advancing to Tier 2, more than was originally proposed when the criteria was adopted by the MPO. He then asked for questions.

Mr. Coxe commented that only one jurisdiction is listed for each project, which is misleading since many projects cross through more than one jurisdiction. Mr. Pleasant asked if the information will be available in a map format, to which Mr. Landa replied that it will. Mr. Landa also noted that the information will be posted on the MPO website, both as a list and a map. Mr. Pleasant then asked how non-highway modes are being addressed in the Plan. Mr. Landa responded that historically, the MPO has only focused on ranking highway projects in the long range plan because the type of revenue anticipated for the Plan has traditionally funded highway projects. He noted that other modes and other funding types are identified in the Plan, but not in the same detail as highway projects. Mr. Coxe suggested that the Plan include non-highway projects that are "existing and committed" (for funding) in the TIP. Norm Steinman noted that the State's transportation legislation has changed so it will be important to work towards being competitive on a statewide level for all modes. Anil Panicker asked how the scoring works for Tier 1 versus Tier 2, to which Mr. Landa replied that the scores are cumulative for projects that advance to Tier 2. Mr. Coxe asked if the TCC desired to take action on the recommended cutoff of 95 points. Mr. Pleasant suggested that it is important for the TCC and MPO to have a voice throughout the evaluation process, and also noted that human input is important when using a quantitative ranking system. He also stated that he would like to know how non-highway modes are being addressed in the MTP, and suggested that it be presented to the TCC at a future meeting. Mr. Coxe asked if that issue could be

included on an Advisory Committee agenda, to which Mr. Landa indicated it could.

8. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update

Presenter: Nick Landa

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Landa stated that he included this item on the agenda to provide an update about the progress of the CTP. He noted that work is underway on a few different components of the Plan. First, he noted that the draft maps have been sent to NCDOT's Transportation Planning Branch for review and asked if Mr. Panicker could provide a potential timeline for completion of the review. Mr. Panicker stated that he has received some preliminary comments with regard to formatting. After those changes are addressed, he indicated that NCDOT will make a presentation to the TCC about its review of the maps.

Secondly, Mr. Landa stated that a report is underway to describe the purpose of the CTP and how it is intended to be used. He noted that several staff meetings have gone into the development of the report and that it is largely complete, but a few outstanding issues remain that will be scheduled for discussion at future staff meetings. Finally, he reminded the TCC that a database group has also been formed to determine the structure and content for the underlying information supporting the maps. He asked Jan Whitesell, Charlotte Planning Department GIS staff helping lead the effort, to provide a brief update on the database. Ms. Whitesell provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). She provided an overview of database issues that have been discussed, the membership of the CTP database committee, and some of the proposed functionality of the database upon completion. Several examples were provided, and it was noted that the intent is to link the CTP database to a MTP database and TIP database in order to utilize data across all three plans and programs.

9. Upcoming Issues

Mr. Landa announced that a bill was passed to exempt TCC members from the State Ethics requirements, and that all Statements of Economic Interest previously submitted by TCC members would be destroyed. He also announced that House Bill 817 passed, meaning the new Strategic Mobility Formula is law, signifying a change in transportation funding distribution throughout the State.

Mr. Pleasant noted that a meeting was recently held to discuss MPO staffing levels, which is an important issue that will require further discussion and analysis.

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