



600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202
704-336-2205
www.crtpo.org

TO: TCC Members
FROM: Neil Burke, AICP, PTP
Senior Principal Planner
DATE: February 27, 2014

**SUBJECT: Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Agenda
March TCC Meeting—March 6, 2014**

The next TCC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, March 6** at **10:00 AM** in **Room 267** of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (600 East Fourth Street). Attached is a copy of the agenda.

Please call me at (704) 353-0198 if you have any questions.



TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

AGENDA

March 6, 2014

10:00 AM

Room 267 – CMGC

-
1. **Adoption of the Agenda** Danny Pleasant
2. **Consideration of February Meeting Minutes** Danny Pleasant
ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented, or with amendments.
3. **TCC Bylaws (15 minutes)** Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented.

BACKGROUND: The TCC's bylaws are being updated due to the planning area expansion as well as to reflect changing circumstances since they were last reviewed in 2003. The attached version is the fifth revision to the bylaws, and reflects the work of the TCC's Bylaws Subcommittee as well as feedback received at TCC and Transportation Staff meetings. At a meeting held on February 26, the Bylaws Subcommittee recommended that the TCC adopt the bylaws as presented. A summary of proposed changes is attached.

ATTACHMENT: Draft bylaws and summary table of revisions

4. **2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (15 minutes)** Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI
- BACKGROUND: An update on activities related to the MTP's preparation will be provided. The 30-day public comment period for the draft MTP and draft conformity report began on Tuesday, February 18, 2014 and closes on Wednesday, March 19, 2014. The re-scheduled joint MPO/TCC workshop was held on Wednesday, February 19 prior to the MPO meeting. Public meetings have been held in Mooresville, Charlotte, and Indian Trail to receive comment on the plans, with another public meeting to be held in Charlotte on Friday, March 7. A summary of public comments received to date on the draft MTP and draft conformity report will be presented to the TCC.*
5. **Prioritization 3.0 (P3.0) (15 minutes)** Neil Burke
a. Update
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: The timeframe to enter new projects into NCDOT's SPOT database has ended, and CRTPO staff has submitted 22 new highway projects, and 20 new bicycle and pedestrian projects to NCDOT for quantitative scoring as part of P3.0. It is anticipated that final quantitative scores will be available in April or May of 2014. The MPO requested at its February 19 meeting that the final P 3.0 scores are shared with the TCC and MPO members prior to applying the approved local points methodology to rank the projects. The NCDOT divisions also received twenty bicycle and pedestrian project entries in P3.0.

b. P3.0 Local Input Point Methodology

Neil Burke

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: The MPO adopted the local points methodology, and staff submitted the final document to NCDOT. A summary of public comments will be presented.

ATTACHMENT: CRTPO P3.0 Local Input Point Methodology Public Comment Memorandum.

c. P3.0 Local Input Points Allocation Process

Neil Burke

ACTION REQUESTED: Endorse the transition of the local input points methodology subcommittee to serve in an advisory role in the allocation of local input points.

BACKGROUND: A process has been defined to assign local input points that incorporates the SPOT office requirements as well as the methodology that has been adopted by the MPO board.

ATTACHMENT: P3.0 Local Points Allocation Process Memorandum.

6. Unified Planning Work Program (15 minutes)

Robert Cook

a. FY 2015 UPWP

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is adopted annually in accordance with joint Federal Highway Administration/Federal Transit Administration (FHWA/FTA) transportation planning guidelines. The UPWP describes the planning activities that are anticipated for the coming fiscal year and documents the allocation of state and federal funds associated with each planning activity.

b. FY 2014 UPWP Amendment

Robert Cook

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented.

BACKGROUND: During the February TCC meeting, several minor amendments were presented to the TCC as information only. A mid-year review of the FY 2014 UPWP has been conducted and several minor amendments are needed.

ATTACHMENT: UPWP Memorandum

7. CONNECT Update (10 minutes)

Jonathan Wells

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: An update on the progress of the CONNECT our Future initiative will be provided, as well as information about upcoming CONNECT events.

8. Upcoming Issues

9. Adjourn

CRTPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Summary Meeting Minutes
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 267
February 6, 2014

Voting Members: *TCC Chair* – Danny Pleasant (CDOT), *Vice-Chair* – Joe Lesch (Union County), Ken Tippet (CDOT-Bicycle Coordinator), Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Wayne Herron – alt for Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Andrew Ventresca (Iredell County), David Nelson – alt for Ralph Messera (Matthews), Eric Moore (LUESA-Air Quality), David McDonald (CATS), Lisa Thompson (Marvin), Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe), Allison Kraft (Mooresville), Scott Cole – alt for Louis Mitchell (NCDOT-Div. 10), David Keilson (NCDOT-Div. 12), Anil Panicker (NCDOT-TPB), Lynne Hair (Stallings), Phil Collins (Statesville), Greg Mahar (Waxhaw)

Staff: Stuart Basham (CRTPO), Curtis Bridges (CRTPO), Neil Burke (CRTPO), Robert Cook (CRTPO), Tim Gibbs (CDOT), Norm Steinman (CDOT), Jonathan Wells (C-M Planning), John Rose (CATS), Loretta Barren (FHWA), Louis Mitchell, (NCDOT-Div. 10), James Lim (NCDOT-Public Transportation), Pate Butler (NCDOT), Brett Canipe (NCDOT), John Underwood (NCDOT), Jim Loyd (Monroe)

Guests: Sashi Amatya (PB), Lynn Purnell (PB), Todd Steiss (PB), Carl Gibilaro (Atkins), Bill Thunberg (LNTC), LaPronda Spann (Lain Consulting), Alfred Badgett (Atkins), Radha Swayampakala (RS&H), Meg Fencil (Sustain Charlotte), Steve Blakely (Kimley-Horn)

Danny Pleasant opened the meeting at 10:00 AM. Voting members, staff, and guests introduced themselves. Bob Cook introduced Neil Burke, the new senior principal planner with CRTPO who started work on January 23, 2014.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Pleasant asked if any changes to the agenda are necessary. Hearing none, the January agenda was adopted by acclamation.

2. Consideration of January Meeting Minutes

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

3. Transportation Improvement Program Financial Plan

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook referenced the second draft of the CRTPO TIP Financial Plan document that was included in the agenda packet and can be found [here](#). An overview presentation of the TIP financial plan was made to the TCC by Sashi Amatya of PB at its January 2014 meeting, and Mr. Cook summarized the changes that had been made since the last presentation to the TCC. This version of the document incorporates the suggested revisions from FHWA and comments received at Transportation Staff Meetings on January 29 and February 5. Mr. Cook mentioned that the first phase of PB's work effort

was to confirm the financial assumptions in the 2012-15 TIP that was adopted by the MPO in July of 2011, and FHWA in December of 2011. The second phase of the scope of this project will include PB working with CRTPO staff to develop the framework for the next TIP. Mr. Cook requested that the TCC consider recommending the adoption of the TIP financial plan to the MPO and affirm the finding that the 2012-2015 TIP is financially constrained.

Motion:

Mr. Panicker made the motion to recommend that the MPO consider adopting the TIP financial plan and affirm the finding that the 2012-2015 TIP is financially constrained. Lisa Stiwinter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. CATS 2012 JARC and New Freedom Project Solicitation

Presenter: LaPronda Spann, Lain Consulting, LLC

Summary/Action Requested:

Ms. Spann began her presentation by reviewing the information that she presented to the TCC at its January 2014 meeting that outlined the background and eligibility for Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom projects. She noted that CATS is the direct recipient of the funds, and that a competitive process is required in order to allocate the funds. In total, six applications were submitted from five agencies within the CRTPO area in consideration for JARC and New Freedom projects. The designated review committee had approved the CATS Steele Creek Enhancement project at a total cost of \$262,402 for JARC funding, and the authorization for New Freedom funding to the Metrolina Association for the Blind to provide transportation to the blind and visually impaired at a cost of \$116,220. Bill Coxe asked how these programs will sustain their funding sources once the grant funding has been depleted, and how the project will continue if there is value shown to the users of these services. Ms. Spann explained that each agency must submit a sustainability plan as part of the project submittal process. The designated review committee will recommend projects based upon the content within the applicant's sustainability plan. Ms. Spann requested that the TCC consider recommending to the MPO that it endorse the projects recommended for funding.

Motion:

David McDonald made the motion to recommend that the MPO consider endorsing the CATS Steele Creek Enhancement Project for JARC funding and the Metrolina Association for the Blind project for New Freedom funding. Mr. Coxe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. TCC Bylaws

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook began his presentation by discussing the recent modifications to the TCC bylaws document. The changes that are suggested within the document are as follows:

- The chief executive officer of each member agency is the authority for designating TCC alternates;
- The four focus area representatives (bicycle, pedestrian, greenway, and public health) have been added to the draft document as participating members of the TCC;
- A representative of the FHWA, and the NCDOT-Public Transportation Division have been added to the draft bylaws document as non-voting members of the TCC;

Mr. Cook then shared comments received from Mr. Coxe in advance of the meeting stating that TCC and

associated subcommittee meetings are subject to the open meetings law and must be advertised accordingly. Mr. Cook indicated that he will request a ruling from the City of Charlotte Attorney's office to confirm that TCC and related subcommittee meetings are subject to the open meetings law and would require advertisement and posting of agendas and meeting minutes to the CRTPO website. Mr. Coxe had also provided comments regarding a proposed text change to the Comprehensive Transportation Plan amendments section within the bylaws.

Mr. Pleasant noted that the NCDOT – Public Transportation Division is listed twice in the document; once within TCC members, and again as a non-voting member. Mr. Cook indicated that he would strike through one of the entries. Mr. Pleasant also indicated that his preference would be that the NCDOT-Public Transportation Division should be a voting member of the TCC. Mr. McDonald also supported Mr. Pleasant's statement by stating that if the highway divisions receive a vote then the public transit division should also receive a vote within the TCC bylaws. James Lim from the NCDOT-Public Transportation Division mentioned that Debra Collins is the new director with the division and he will get Ms. Collins preference on voting versus non-voting member status and provide this information to Mr. Cook as soon as possible. Mr. Coxe explained that the rationale for identifying the NCDOT-Public Transportation Division as a non-voting member in the previous version of the bylaws was that the department had concerns about voting on items that may constitute a conflict of interest. Mr. McDonald also noted that the Metropolitan Transit Commission's point of contact should be listed as the chief executive officer and not the chief transit officer as it is currently written. It is anticipated that a motion to approve the bylaws will be presented at the March 2014 TCC meeting.

6. 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook gave an update on the status of the MTP and stated that progress has been made in completing the final report document, and developing the draft conformity report. The 30-day public comment period for the MTP draft conformity document will begin on February 14 and end on March 17. A joint TCC/MPO workshop was scheduled on Wednesday, February 12 at 10:00 a.m. with the purpose of reviewing the draft MTP and draft Conformity Report. CRTPO staff will provide an overview of the chapters within the MTP and how they are used once the document is adopted.

Mr. Cook then provided an update on the MTP public involvement meeting schedule. The first MTP public involvement meeting was held on February 5 at the Charlotte Transit Center, and positive feedback was received. The focus of the public involvement effort for the MTP is to obtain a good cross-section of feedback by holding meetings at community colleges and other civic locations throughout the CRTPO planning area. A comprehensive list of MTP meetings can be found [here](#). Mr. Cook mentioned that Ms. Toni Tupponce was a sub-consultant that is leading the environmental justice public outreach component of the MTP. Ms. Tupponce has public outreach events planned at the Statesville Library, West Charlotte Recreation Center and the Monroe Library throughout the month of February. Mr. Cook mentioned that four general public workshops will be held throughout the region in February and March for citizens to review the draft plan and make their views known. Allison Kraft asked for materials that could be distributed to the municipalities hosting public workshops in an effort to inform citizens. Mr. Cook mentioned that CRTPO staff will be sending electronic copies of MTP brochures to these communities to distribute at their discretion.

7. Prioritization 3.0 (P3.0)

a. Update

Presenter: Neil Burke

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Burke provided the following update about the P3.0 process:

- MPO project entry window shifted by one week to January 27 – February 24. NCDOT has stated that this will not delay the overall P3.0 timeline.
- CRTPO staff is currently entering 22 new highway projects and 20 bike/ped projects into NCDOT's SPOT database.
- Public involvement has begun on CRTPO's draft P 3.0 local point methodology document with the public comment period beginning on January 28 and ending on February 11. A press release was issued on January 28 announcing the public comment period. The document has been posted on the CRTPO website, and public comment on the draft methodology is possible at the February 19 MPO meeting.

b. P3.0 Local Input Point Methodology

Presenter: Neil Burke

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Burke provided an update on NCDOT's approval process for the CRTPO draft local points methodology. CRTPO staff received comments from the NCDOT SPOT office on January 17. Overall, the nature of the comments was minimal, with most of the notes intended to clarify CRTPO's approach to assigning the local points. CRTPO staff made the changes that the SPOT office had requested, and NCDOT has granted conditional approval of the document.

Mr. Burke then summarized the SPOT comments that pertained to CRTPO's public involvement strategy. A summary of these comments that he presented are shown below:

- Public Involvement is targeted to the proposed CRTPO methodology and preliminary assignment of points.
- The CRTPO website must contain the draft local points methodology document that shows NCDOT comments and staff responses. In addition, there must be an opportunity for users to submit comments via the CRTPO website.
- All comments will be presented to the TCC and MPO board.
- The final allocation of points will be posted to the CRTPO website.

Next, he provided an overview of the SPOT comments that were targeted to the approach of CRTPO's local points methodology. A summary of the comments that Mr. Burke presented are displayed below:

- SPOT suggested relabeling the determination of the project funding cutoff for regional impact and division needs projects from a "criteria" to a "pre-screening exercise."
- The SPOT office suggested the use of project weighting to the criteria to indicate importance. CRTPO staff provided additional documentation in the document to show that weighting the criteria is not necessary because the MTP score is the primary criteria, with the SPOT P3.0 score being the secondary criteria for highway projects.
- The SPOT office wanted additional supporting text within the document to emphasize that the MTP contains both quantitative and qualitative criteria.

Mr. Burke then provided an overview of the Prioritization 3.0 schedule for the TCC, and reminded the group that CRTPO should receive final quantitative scores from SPOT in May. Once the scores are received staff and the local points subcommittee will use the methodology to assign points to projects. Once the list has been presented to the TCC and the MPO, a second public comment period will begin to receive input on the assignment of local points to recommended projects.

Scott Cole mentioned that the fourteen NCDOT divisions must develop a methodology to prioritize their projects and assign local points. He mentioned that NCDOT-Division 10 held an additional call for projects public workshop on January 30, and twenty-five new project requests were received from the public. Each division can add up to twenty new projects as part of P3.0. Mr. Cole mentioned that NCDOT-Division 10 will submit its list of proposed projects by close of business on Friday, February 7. Mr. Cole mentioned that there will be an additional follow-up meeting on Wednesday, February 12 that is intended for the MPOs and RPOs within Division 10 to provide comment on the list of projects that the Division intends to submit.

David Keilson explained that NCDOT-Division 12 will hold a public workshop in Shelby on February 6 to receive comments on a list of proposed projects to be submitted as part of P3.0.

Mr. Burke requested that the TCC consider two recommendations for endorsement. The first recommendation he presented was a recommendation to authorize CRTPO staff to address any public comments received during the two-week public comment period, and the second recommendation was to consider recommending the revisions to the draft local input point methodology to the MPO for its adoption at its February meeting.

Motion:

Mr. McDonald made a motion to authorize CRTPO staff to address public comments and to recommend the revisions to the MPO for its adoption. Joe Lesch seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Proposed Ramp Metering Feasibility Study

Presenter: Scott Cole, NCDOT

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cole provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). His Power Point presentation contained an online video that was shown to the TCC regarding a ramp metering project that had recently been completed in the Kansas City area. Mr. Cole defined a ramp metering system as a low-cost operational strategy that controls the flow of vehicles entering a freeway by installing traffic signals at on-ramps. This strategy has demonstrated congestion reduction benefits on the mainlines of urban freeways, but can cause operational issues for arterials in vicinity of interchanges with ramp meters. Mr. Cole explained that NCDOT has proposed a ramp metering feasibility study the interstate highways in Cabarrus, Gaston, Iredell, and Mecklenburg Counties that would include a scope of 245 on-ramps that would be screened to determine if this treatment would be appropriate. He explained that a more detailed analysis would be conducted at as many of 50 of these locations. As part of this study, it is proposed that a steering committee would be formed with representatives from NCDOT, MPOs and local jurisdictions. The total estimated cost of the feasibility study is \$700,000. Mr. Cole mentioned that the NCDOT-Transportation Planning Branch has offered to fund \$525,000 (75%). NCDOT pro-rated the regional match by calculating 87% of the proposed ramp meter locations are located in CRTPO's planning area, thus NCDOT has proposed that CRTPO should

consider funding \$152,857 of the 25% regional match for the study. NCDOT has recommended that CRTPO consider allocating a portion of its planning funds to fund its share.

Mr. McDonald inquired if CRTPO could provide its share of the match using federal P.L. funds with NCDOT providing the match. Mr. Cole was unsure of the source of NCDOT's funds for this study, but he will investigate this and respond accordingly. Mr. Coxe referenced a similar ramp metering feasibility study underway in Wake and Durham Counties, and the study mentions arterial congestion and local street diversions as disadvantages to ramp metering without providing analyses of these factors.

Mr. Coxe suggested that the analysis of the impacts to the local roadway network should be analyzed as part of this study. Mr. Coxe also mentioned the prior managed lanes studies conducted in the Charlotte region, and the need to reference the recommendations of the prior work to ensure that ramp metering would not impede any future operations of managed lanes facilities on freeways. Mr. Coxe also noted the importance of NCDOT and CRTPO collaborating to initiate and complete an I-77 corridor study from Rock Hill to Statesville that would address the comprehensive multimodal mobility within this corridor. Mr. Pleasant mentioned the complexities involved with using CRTPO's P.L. funds for a regional feasibility study when routine MPO work is funding through this source, and all of the member jurisdictions now participate in funding the local match. Mr. Pleasant suggested that this matter should be discussed at a transportation staff meeting before action can be taken to enable CRTPO's participation.

9. FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

a. Update

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He re-visited the unobligated balance of \$580,383 within the UPWP budget that was initially discussed at the January TCC meeting. He explained that a decision would have to be made regarding how much of the unobligated balance to program, indicating that by programming more funding the MPO could accomplish more work, but that it will also increase the local shares paid by each CRTPO member jurisdiction.

At the January meeting, the TCC recommended issuing a second call for projects to determine if there is a need to program additional funding. The call for projects period ended on January 24. A recommendation was made at the January 29 Transportation Staff Meeting to program the remainder of the unobligated balance provided that these funds are appropriated to local projects. Mr. Cook explained that the impact of the increased local match share would only impact the project sponsors and not all member jurisdictions. There are now thirteen local projects in consideration for P.L. funding at a total estimated cost of \$869,525. With the total estimated cost to fund these projects exceeding the unobligated balance, Mr. Cook explained that the UPWP budget has a deficit of \$289,383. He indicated the UPWP review committee will meet on February 7 to evaluate each project to determine its eligibility, and then the committee must determine the projects that can be funded given the unobligated balance. Mr. Cook anticipates that a draft of the FY 2015 UPWP will be available for review at the March TCC meeting.

In addition, Mr. Cook mentioned that the committee has discussed transitioning from funding individual traffic counting studies in favor of providing an annual line item within the UPWP for a traffic counting program that would enable CRTPO to use its money regionally on a rotating basis.

b. FY 2014 UPWP Amendment

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook explained that a mid-year review of the UPWP was conducted and several minor amendments were needed. The first amendment involved the re-appropriation of \$40,000 that was initially programmed to a regional freight study that will not be pursued this year. The re-appropriated funds are recommended to be used for a traffic count program that would support the Metrolina regional travel demand model.

Mr. Cook stated that the second amendment to the UPWP is recommended to fund a CDOT crash data geo-location project in the amount of \$70,000 under the corridor protection and special projects task code. The City of Charlotte will supply the local match for this project. Mr. Panicker inquired if the estimated costs included staff time. Mr. Cook indicated that the estimated costs did include staff time, and he will request that the project sponsors attend an upcoming transportation staff meeting to provide a complete description of each project.

Mr. Cook explained that this item will be presented to the TCC at its March meeting to consider recommending that the MPO approve the amendments.

10. Tolling Policies in the Charlotte Region

Presenter: Norm Steinman and Tim Gibbs, CDOT

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Steinman provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). Mr. Steinman explained that this policy would cover High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes and express toll lanes. He proceeded to provide updates on the I-77 HOT lanes and the I-485 HOT lanes projects. He explained that a long-term goal of the managed lanes corridor projects is to eventually provide direct connections at system interchanges between managed lanes projects on separate freeways.

The framework of this policy will determine which users will be tolled on future managed lanes facilities throughout the Charlotte region. NCDOT has already made the determination that carpools with three or more passengers, transit buses, and motorcycles will be exempt from being charged a toll on the proposed I-77 HOT lane facility. Mr. Steinman explained that a regional tolling policy will provide toll recommendations for the future I-77 South, I-485, and US 74 managed lanes projects. Mr. Steinman mentioned that an agreement between the CRTPO and NCDOT will help set the organizational framework to conduct public involvement and form an organizational framework comprised of NCDOT, MPOs, transit organizations, and municipalities to craft the plan. Mr. Gibbs mentioned that the Charlotte region began the process of evaluating corridors for managed lanes in 1997, and it is encouraging to have a corridor with an active HOV facility and several corridors with plans in place. Mr. Coxe mentioned that CRTPO needs to be one of the deciding parties since they are the transportation policy coordination group for the Charlotte region. Mr. Coxe also suggested that the proposed Monroe Bypass corridor should be included within this policy framework because it is proposed to be a toll facility.

11. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM.

TCC BYLAWS

MECKLENBURG-UNION METROPOLITAN CHARLOTTE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MUMPOCRTPO) Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO) TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

BY LAWS

~~Amended September 2003~~ REVISION #IV 11-8-132-26-14

ARTICLE I – NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Mecklenburg Union Metropolitan Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization Technical Coordinating Committee, hereinafter referred to as the “TCC.”

ARTICLE II – PURPOSE & Responsibilities

The purpose and goals of the TCC shall be:

1. To provide general review, guidance and coordination of the continuing, cooperative, comprehensive transportation planning process for the planning area of the Mecklenburg Union Urban Area Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO).
2. To prepare and make recommendations to the Mecklenburg Union Metropolitan Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (MUMPOCRTPO) regarding matters related to transportation planning.
3. To facilitate coordination and communication between policy boards governing bodies and agencies represented on the MUMPOCRTPO and TCC
4. To facilitate coordination of transportation planning with other planning efforts such as those concerning land use, public utilities, and maintenance of air quality.
5. To facilitate public involvement regarding transportation planning issues.

Comment [rc1]: 11-8-13: Replaced “policy boards” with “governing bodies” for clarity.

ARTICLE III – MEMBERS

Section 1 – ~~Number Members~~ and Qualifications:

The TCC shall include one non-elected, technical representative from local, county, State and Federal governmental agencies directly related to and concerned with the

transportation planning process for the planning area. The chief administrative officer of each member agency shall designate that agency's representative, and may also designate an alternate. Elected officials representing jurisdictions within the MPO's boundary shall not serve as TCC members or alternates. TCC members or alternates must be employees (or contractors) of the jurisdiction they represent.

Comment [rwc2]: Text added 1-16-14

Comment [rc3]: 11-8-13: "within" replaced "with" to correct error.

Comment [rwc4]: NEW: "(or contractors)" added at Bylaws Subcommittee meeting.

TCC Membership

1. Charlotte Department of Transportation Director
2. Charlotte-Douglas International Airport Aviation Director
3. Charlotte Engineering and Property Management Director
4. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department Director
5. City of Monroe
6. City of Statesville
7. Iredell County
8. Mecklenburg County Air Quality
9. The Metropolitan Transit Commission's Chief Transit Officer
10. N.C. Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Division 10 - Division Engineer
11. N.C. Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Division 12- Division Engineer
12. NCDOT Public Transportation Division Director
13. NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch Manager
14. Town of Cornelius
15. Town of Davidson
16. Town of Fairview
17. Town of Huntersville
18. Town of Indian Trail
19. Town of Marshville
20. Town of Matthews
21. Town of Mint Hill
22. Town of Mineral Springs
23. Town of Mooresville
24. Town of Pineville
25. Town of Stallings
26. Town of Troutman
27. Town of Waxhaw
28. Town of Weddington
29. Town of Wingate
30. Union County
31. Village of Marvin
32. Village of Wesley Chapel

Comment [rc5]: Removed specific reference to county planning division. This is consistent with how Union County is listed, but not consistent with Mecklenburg County listing.

Comment [rc6]: Left out of original transmission to TCC. Oversight noted by Eric Moore.

Comment [rwc7]: NEW: Bylaws Subcommittee recommended keeping PTD as voting member pending comments from PTD director. 2-26-14

The TCC shall also include members -representing the following four focus areas.
Alternates may be named to these positions:

Comment [rwc8]: Text added 1-16-14

1. Bicycle transportation planner

2. Greenway transportation planner
3. Pedestrian transportation planner
4. Public health planner

The above members must be employed by a municipal or county government that is a voting member of the CRTPO. Persons considered as qualified for the positions must be able to demonstrate a reasonable level of experience and knowledge of the issues associated with the position being sought. The CRTPO Secretary is responsible for coordinating the candidate solicitation process. Persons interested in serving as a focus area representative shall notify the CRTPO Secretary no later than November 30 of the preceding year. The TCC shall determine who will fill each position, doing so by voting in a manner consistent with Article V Section 6 of this document.

Comment [rc9]: 11-8-13: New text for focus area representatives.

The TCC shall also consist of the following non-voting members:

1. Federal Highway Administration

~~As specified in the Memorandum of Understanding, the TCC shall include one non-elected, technical representatives from each local, State and Federal governmental agency directly related to and concerned with the transportation planning process for the planning area. The chief administrative officer of each member agency shall designate that agency's representative.~~

Section 2 – Terms of Office:

The term of members representing the four focus areas shall be one calendar year, beginning in January. There shall not be a limit on the number of terms focus area representatives may serve. For all other members, there shall be no limitation on the length of time members they may serve on the TCC subject to the authorization to do so by their respective agencies' chief administrative officers (CAO).

Comment [rc10]: 11-8-13: New text for focus area representatives.

Section 3 – Alternates:

Each member agency ~~shall~~ may appoint an alternate to its representative. That alternate member may serve as a full voting member during any meeting where that agency's representative is not in attendance. Proxy and absentee voting are not permitted.

Comment [rwc11]: Text added 1-16-14

ARTICLE IV – OFFICERS

Section 1 – Officers Defined:

The officers of the TCC shall consist of a Chairperson, and Vice-Chairperson, who shall be elected by and from amongst voting TCC members.

Section 2 – Elections:

The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be elected annually at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the calendar year. The newly elected Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall take office immediately following the election. The Chair must have served as a TCC member (delegate or alternate) for one full year immediately prior to election.

Additional elections may be held if either the Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson cannot carry out his/her duties and complete the remainder of the elected term.

Section 3 – Terms of Office:

The term of office for officers shall be one year. Each officer shall hold office until a successor has been duly elected. ~~Time served in officer positions prior to calendar year 2002 shall not be considered in determining eligibility.~~

Section 4 – Duties of Officers:

The Chairperson shall call and preside at meetings and sub-committee meetings, and shall set the order of business (agenda) for each meeting. In the Chairperson's absence, the Vice-Chairperson shall preside and complete all other duties of the Chairperson. In the event that the Chairperson is unable to carry out his/her duties for the remainder of his/her term, the Vice-Chairperson shall carry out the functions of the Chairperson for the remainder of the term and a new Vice-Chairperson shall be elected.

Section 5 – Duties of the Secretary:

The Secretary will be designated by the Lead Planning Agency and also serve in the same capacity to the MUMPCRTPO's governing body. The Secretary shall provide or otherwise delegate staff service for the TCC, as needed, and will be responsible for taking summary minutes of the Committee's proceedings. The Secretary will maintain a current copy of these Bylaws as an addendum to the Memorandum of Understanding, to be distributed to the public upon request.

Comment [rc12]: Staff recommendation: add "governing body" for clarity.

ARTICLE V – MEETINGS

Section 1 – Regular Meetings:

Meetings will be held on the first Thursday of each month. The Chairperson may cancel regular meetings if there is insufficient business on the TCC's tentative agenda or reschedule meetings as appropriate.

Section 2 – Special Meetings:

Special meetings may be called by the Chairperson with three (3) business days notice, or at the request of the majority of the eligible voting members with three (3) business days' notice. The purpose of the meeting shall be stated in the call, with no other agenda items permissible

Section 3 – Quorums:

A Quorum shall consist of:

- at least ~~fifty~~ forty percent (~~50~~ 40%) of the ~~total voting~~ membership for regular or special meetings, ~~and~~
- ~~at least fifty percent (50%) of the total membership for special meetings.~~

In calculating quorum, the number of TCC representatives, not the number of agencies represented, shall be the determining factor. Quorum shall be determined at the beginning of meetings. During meetings (or portions of meetings) during which no quorum is present, members may present and receive reports and information, and communication may be shared; however actions and decisions can only be taken and made in meetings at which a quorum is present. Voting members, or their alternates, who have had voting privileges suspended due to lack of attendance will count toward establishing a quorum at the first meeting they attend.

Section 4 – Attendance:

Each voting member shall be expected to attend each regular meeting. Voting members (or their authorized alternates) not attending three (3) consecutive regular meetings will ~~be considered non-voting members for the purpose of determining a quorum as of the fourth meeting not be eligible to vote until the second of two consecutive regular meetings that they attend.~~ A member's or alternate's voting privileges will be reinstated automatically by his/her attendance at a subsequent TCC meeting.

Section 5 – Agenda:

The agenda is a list of considerations for discussion at a meeting. Items on the agenda originate as a carryover from previous TCC meetings, or are placed on the agenda prior to its distribution by any voting member of the TCC, by request from any jurisdiction party to the Memorandum of Understanding, or by the request of the MUMPOCRTPO Chairperson. Additional items may be placed on the agenda by any voting member following discussion of the last item on the agenda, as long as a majority concurrence of the present and eligible voting members is received.

The TCC ~~and all sub-committees~~ shall conduct their business in compliance with the State of North Carolina's Open Meetings law.

Section 6 – Voting Procedures:

The Chairperson and any present voting member (or alternate eligible to vote) may call for a vote on any issue, provided that it is seconded and within the purposes set forth in

Comment [rwc13]: NEW 2-24-14:
Reformatting to state quorum as single sentence.
UPDATE: Bylaws Subcommittee approved change 2-26-14.

Comment [rc14]: 11-8-13: changes were made at meeting.

Comment [rwc15]: NEW 2-24-14: Propose to remove.
UPDATE: Bylaws Subcommittee approved change 2-26-14.

Article II and provided the issue is on the agenda as outlined in Section 5 of this article. Each voting member of the TCC shall have one vote. If a single individual represents more than one agency or jurisdiction, the designated representative shall cast one vote for each agency/jurisdiction represented. Jurisdictions that are to share TCC member representation must send a letter from the jurisdiction's MUMPOCRTPO representative or from the CAO of the agency to the TCC Chair approving this arrangement.

Jurisdictions desiring to designate a proxy due to unforeseen circumstances must provide written documentation to their proxy and the Chairperson.

Comment [rwc16]: NEW: Text added by Bylaws Subcommittee 2-26-14.

A majority vote of the members (or their authorized alternates) present and eligible to vote shall be sufficient for approval of matters coming before the TCC. The Chairperson is permitted to vote. Non-voting members and unauthorized alternates cannot vote. Abstentions shall be considered as affirmative votes. By approval of the voting membership of the TCC present, a voting member may be allowed to withdraw from voting on an issue. In the absence pursuant of any direction from these Bylaws or other duly adopted voting procedures pursuant to certain approval actions, the most current edition of *Robert's Rules of Order* will designate procedures governing voting.

Section 67 – Comprehensive Transportation Plan Alignments Amendments:

Comment [rwc17]: NEW 2-24-14: Recommended by B. Cox. UPDATE: change approved by Bylaws Subcommittee 2-26-14.

The TCC may approve an amendment to an alignment shown on the Comprehensive Transportation Plan if the following conditions are met:

Comment [rwc18]: NEW 2-24-14: Recommended by B. Cox. UPDATE: change approved by Bylaws Subcommittee 2-26-14.

- i. The TCC finds the proposed alignment to be technically reasonable; and,
- ii. The proposed alignment enters and exits the affected property at the officially approved location and angle or curvature; and
- iii. The TCC finds that the proposed alignment does not move closer than 400 feet to an adjacent land owner's property boundary; or
- iv. If the proposed alignment is already within 400 feet of an adjacent property, the shift in the alignment is either away from the property. or;
- v. If the shift moves the proposed alignment no more than 25% closer to the property.

Comment [rwc19]: NEW 2-24-14: B. Cox. has suggested iv and v be combined into a single sentence and that the word "either" be inserted before the word "away" in iv. UPDATE: change approved by Bylaws Subcommittee 2-26-14.

ARTICLE VI – PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURES

The rules contained in the most current edition of *Robert's Rules of Order* shall govern the TCC in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the Memorandum of Understanding, the MUMPOCRTPO Bylaws, these Bylaws, or any special rules of order the TCC may adopt.

ARTICLE VII – AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS

The MUMPO shall adopt a set of Bylaws for the MUMPO and the TCC. Amendments to either set of the Bylaws shall occur by a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote of the MUMPO/TCC. The MPO shall be informed of all changes to the TCC bylaws.

Comment [rwc20]: NEW: Text added by Bylaws Subcommittee 2-26-14.

Summary of Proposed TCC Bylaws Changes

The following summarizes proposed changes to the TCC bylaws. See Bylaws Revision V, dated 2-26-14, for more details.

Article	Section	Proposed Change
III-Members	1-Members & Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update the TCC membership list to reflect new members resulting from expansion • Add text stating that contractors employed by jurisdictions are eligible to be TCC members • Keep NCDOT Public Transportation Division (PTD) representative as voting member pending response from PTD director • Focus area representatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ add members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ bicycle ▪ greenway ▪ pedestrian ▪ public health ○ add selection process • Add FHWA as non-voting member
III-Members	2-Terms of Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State focus area representatives' terms of office
III-Members	3-Alternates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State that each alternate "may" appoint an alternate vs. "shall"
IV-Officers	3-Terms of Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete "<i>Time served in officer positions prior to calendar year 2002 shall not be considered in determining eligibility.</i>"
V-Meetings	3-Quorums	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise quorum requirements from 50% of voting membership to 40% and combine regular and special meeting references into single sentence • Add following text: <i>Voting members, or their alternates, who have had voting privileges suspended due to lack of attendance will count toward establishing a quorum at the first meeting they attend.</i>
V-Meetings	Attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise text regarding voting eligibility
V-Meetings	5-Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete reference stating that subcommittees are subject to the NC Open Meetings Law
V-Meetings	6-Voting Procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add text establishing how a proxy is named
V-Meetings	7-CTP Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor text changes for clarity
VII-Amendments to Bylaws	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add text stating that the MPO will be updated when the TCC bylaws are changed



600 East Fourth Street
 Charlotte, NC 28202
 704-336-2205
 www.crtpo.org

TO: CRTPO Delegates & Alternates
 FROM: Neil Burke, AICP, PTP
 Senior Principal Planner
 DATE: February 12, 2014
 SUBJECT: **SPOT Prioritization 3.0 (P3.0)**
Local points methodology – summary of public comments received

As part of NCDOT’s SPOT project prioritization P3.0 process, each MPO in North Carolina was required to develop a methodology to assign local input points to candidate projects, and public involvement was also a requirement of this effort. A press release was issued on Tuesday, January 28 announcing the beginning of a two-week comment period ending on Wednesday, February 12. The local input points methodology was posted to the CRTPO website along with a comment card where users could provide their input on the draft methodology.

The following comments were received between the afternoon of January 28 and the close of business on Wednesday, February 12. Responses were received from Alta Planning and Design and the Southern Environmental Law Center.

Mr. John Cock
 Principal, Southeast Region
 Alta Planning + Design
johncock@altaplanning.com
 (Received on Saturday, February 1)

A. Questions regarding project submittal and categorization

ID	Comment	Staff Response
1	The intention of the green category (“to be added to database”) in the highway projects list is not clear in the P3.0 Endorsed Highway Project Recommendations spreadsheet...these seem to be most of the complete streets projects. Are these 2nd tier projects or will they also be ranked with all other projects?	The projects that were marked “green” within the CRTPO P3.0 Endorsed Project Spreadsheet were not included in SPOT 2.0 and CRTPO approved their entry this fall as part of SPOT 3.0. MPO’s were given the opportunity to submit new projects and remove existing projects from the list. Of the 22 new projects, eight are classified as Statewide Mobility tier (mostly interstate highways), ten are categorized as Regional Impact tier (US and NC highways), with the remaining four projects labelled as Division Needs projects (SR system). Once NCDOT calculates the SPOT scores for the existing projects in the CRTPO database as well as the new projects (marked green), staff will rank the existing (2.0) and new (3.0) projects in consideration of local input points for the Regional Impact and Division Needs categories. In summary, all of the Regional Impact and Division Needs projects within the spreadsheet you referenced will be ranked simultaneously in CRTPO’s local points assignment process once the final project scores are available from NCDOT.

ID	Comment	Staff Response
2	<p>Why aren't all of the non-interstate/non-expressway highway projects defined as complete street projects by default? Are complete street enhancements only applied if requested by local requesting agency? And, if so, why wouldn't NCDOT CS standards apply to all eligible NCDOT projects automatically?</p>	<p>The classification of the Regional Impact and Division Needs categories was determined by the Strategic Transportation Investments legislation. Complete streets treatments are a consideration when determining the cross-section for the proposed projects when an agency enters a Regional Impact or Division Needs project.</p> <p>CRTPO assumes a "complete streets" cross-section on virtually all non-interstate/non-expressway projects. NCDOT divisions, MPOs, and RPOs can enter new projects as part of the SPOT P 3.0 process.</p>
3	<p>Disappointing that no transit projects are included, but I guess that is due to no local projects being submitted by local agencies?</p>	<p>The transit agencies within the CRTPO planning jurisdiction did not submit any new projects as part of P3.0; however, there are existing transit projects entered as part of P2.0 that will be ranked as part of P3.0. NCDOT can also submit new transit projects within the CRTPO planning area as part of P3.0.</p>
4	<p>Regarding highway projects, most seem related to responding to projected "capacity" (supply) needs. However, there are no proposed projects that intend to mitigate the roadway "needs" through demand mitigation strategies.</p>	<p>The highway projects shown in the spreadsheet that you referenced have been included in CRTPO's Draft 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (formerly known as our LRTP). Since the CRTPO region is identified as a Transportation Management Area (TMA) by the Federal Highway Administration, we must complete a Congestion Management Process that has pre-screened many of the projects in the spreadsheet for demand mitigation strategies.</p> <p>While some of the projects do address vehicular capacity issues, there are twenty new bicycle and pedestrian projects that CRTPO will submit for P3.0 in a separate spreadsheet that address multimodal transportation needs. These new bicycle and pedestrian projects were submitted to CRTPO from its member jurisdictions with the understanding that if the project is selected by NCDOT for inclusion in a future year TIP, a local match of at least 20% must be provided by this community.</p>

ID	Comment	Staff Response
5	<p>The draft prioritization process seems close to unintelligible, especially for the general public. I say that as a former MPO staffer and transportation planner. Now, I know that there are many, many folks in the public who are far smarter about these matters than I, but I'm afraid that still many others in the public would find, like I did, that the prioritization methodology is quite opaque and difficult to provide intelligent comments on without much prior understanding or long hours of study and research. As such, asking the general public to provide input feels like a token effort. I realize that CRTPO is somewhat hamstrung by NCDOT/legislative and federal requirements, but it does seem that the process needs to be more transparent and intelligible if genuine public input is desired.</p>	<p>Staff is in agreement that the presentation of the local points methodology needs some clarification in order for all readers to understand CRTPO's process. There was a short timeframe for CRTPO staff to understand the new STI legislation, develop a draft methodology, and seek public input. A similar local input points methodology will be required for Prioritization 4.0, and CRTPO staff will continue to refine the document to ensure it is understood by all stakeholders within the region.</p>
6	<p>It is not clear from the website how the projects were chosen. That would be helpful to explain to the public. My recollection from my MUMPO days is that the projects are submitted by local agencies, but this is not clear from the project list.</p>	<p>The highway projects were chosen from the 2016-2025 horizon of the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.</p> <p>The bicycle and pedestrian projects were submitted from CRTPO member jurisdictions, with each project ranked based upon a methodology approved by the CRTPO board. Some of these projects were submitted as part of P2.0 in 2011 and others will be entered for the first time as part of P3.0. The twenty bicycle and pedestrian projects with the highest cumulative scores based upon CRTPO's bicycle and pedestrian ranking methodology will be entered by CRTPO staff as part of the P3.0 process.</p>
7	<p>I seem to recall from previous MPO public input processes that there were maps that showed the location of projects. Are there maps of the projects that could be provided on the website?</p>	<p>CRTPO staff is currently working on maps that will show the location of the proposed projects that we have submitted as part of P3.0. These maps will be posted to our website in the near future.</p>
8	<p>Regarding specific projects, I was surprised that the Mooresville-Charlotte Trail was NOT listed on the bike/ped projects list.</p>	<p>CRTPO had an existing list of bicycle and pedestrian projects that was scored for consideration of the highest ranking twenty projects for submittal in consideration for P3.0 funding. There will be an opportunity during P4.0 to submit new bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p>

B. Mr. John Cock, Alta Planning + Design – Questions regarding the proposed prioritization process:

ID	Comment	Staff Response
9	If public input and local ranking is part of the criteria, then would it make sense for the public to have a chance to rank the proposed projects? It is not clear what is intended “local ranking” and how public ranking would be obtained and if public input would be qualitative or quantitative or both. An explanation of how local ranking is to be measured would be helpful.	There will be an additional public comment period in the Spring/Summer of 2014 once CRTPO has a draft list of projects recommended for local input points. NCDOT needs to finalize the SPOT scores for all submitted projects before CRTPO can assign its local points. All public comments received on the local points methodology and the assignment of points will be presented to CRTPO’s Technical Coordinating Committee, and Policy Board for their consideration, and the policy board does have the authority to reallocate points based upon the public input received. Need additional clarification from commenter regarding public comment being qualitative, quantitative or both.
10	The proposed prioritization process doesn’t seem to directly address the STI objectives of “projects focused on easing congestion and enhancing safety, while allowing small towns to invest in projects that help improve access to medical services, economic centers, education and recreation” Why couldn’t these objectives be directly quantified and projects ranked on these very clear (albeit, incomplete) criteria? Or if these objectives are being addressed, it is not clear from the draft criteria.	CRTPO’s 2040 MTP was the primary source of the projects submitted for P3.0 and the ranking criteria for this plan considered job access, economic development, environmental justice, natural resource impacts and community resources as some of the factors to select projects. It is apparent from your comments that we need to provide additional descriptions on the linkages between our MTP project selection process and NCDOT’s project prioritization process.
11	Criteria for air quality, public health, and other environmental impacts (which could fall under the objective of “safety”) are noticeably absent from the proposed criteria. (The Nashville MPO does a great job of including public health and equity impacts in its project ranking process.)	CRTPO’s MTP did consider air quality and environmental impacts in the selection of projects. A greater emphasis on public health will be considered in the development of the next MTP.
12	Equity impacts (for seniors, youth, 0-car households, and disabled), access to transit, and ability of a project to reduce VMT are also absent from the prioritization criteria.	These factors were considered in the development of the 2040 MTP and the Congestion Management Process.
13	Also, projects that serve multiple modes should also receive extra consideration in the criteria.	Good comment. While many of our projects do serve multiple (current or future) modes, we can discuss this as a potential stand-alone criteria as part of the development of a local points methodology for P4.0. CRTPO assumes a “complete streets” cross-section on virtually all non-interstate/non-expressway projects. NCDOT divisions, MPOs, and RPOs can enter new projects as part of the SPOT P 3.0 process.

Ms. Kym Hunter
 Staff Attorney
 Southern Environmental Law Center
 khunter@selcnc.org
 (Received on Wednesday, February 12)

ID	Comment	Staff Response
1	We agree with CRTPO's decision to screen out projects that do not have any reasonable chance for funding under the STI. Through this screening exercise, CRTPO will ensure that its local input points will not be wasted on projects that would not be funded even with the local point allocation.	Comment noted.
2	We also agree with CRTPO's suggestion to rely on its MTP scoring system for the ranking of highway projects. The MTP scoring system takes a comprehensive look at the merit of road projects. We do remain concerned that the "congestion" metric receives an overly heavy weight in the scoring system, and may not ultimately lead to the congestion relief desired by the MPO due to, among other factors, Braess's paradox, by which the addition of lanes to heavily congested roads leads only to additional trips, and not, ultimately, to congestion relief.	Comment noted.
3	Nonetheless, we appreciate that the MTP scoring system includes a Tier II evaluation that considers how projects address the sustainability of the overall transportation system. We particularly like that the Tier II evaluation considers environmental justice impacts, as well as impacts to natural, cultural, and historic resources.	Comment noted.
4	We are disappointed to see that the local input methodology for non-highway projects relies wholly on the P3.0 project scores. This decision essentially eliminates the purpose of having local input scores.	A methodology to prioritize non-highway projects was not developed within the 2040 MTP as it was for roadway projects. The use of the P3.0 score as the only metric to rank non-highway projects is consistent with MPO's throughout North Carolina.
5	Unlike CRTPO's MTP scoring process, the P3.0 methodology includes no "sustainability" evaluation, often a key consideration in non-highway projects. As such, we urge CRTPO to develop its own system for ranking non-highway projects in order to get the most out of the local input points it has been assigned.	CRTPO does have an approved bicycle and pedestrian project scoring methodology that ranks each project based upon a comprehensive and technically-oriented project ranking process. CRTPO staff used the Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Ranking Methodology to screen the highest twenty projects to submit for SPOT 3.0.

ID	Comment	Staff Response
6	To ensure these comments are taken into full consideration, we encourage CRTPO to further articulate how public comments will be considered in the process. We are also concerned that CRTPO is only allocating a minimum of two weeks for public comment; we believe 30 days would be more appropriate.	Comment noted. The comment period to be provided for the draft assignment of CRTPO's local points will be a minimum of two weeks. Our goal will be to provide more time depending upon the release of the scores by NCDOT and the TCC and MPO meeting schedules.



600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202
704-336-2205
www.crtpo.org

TO: TCC Members
FROM: Neil Burke, AICP, PTP
Senior Principal Planner
DATE: February 24, 2014
SUBJECT: **CRTPO P3.0 Local Points Allocation Process**

BACKGROUND

The MPO Board approved the CRTPO local points methodology at its February 19, 2014 meeting, and the document has been submitted to NCDOT SPOT office for final approval. The purpose of this memorandum is to outline a process to assign CRTPO's local input points that incorporates the SPOT office requirements as well as the methodology that has been adopted by the MPO board. All dates and timeframes listed in this memorandum are approximate as it is understood that the completion date for scoring P3.0 projects is subject to change.

LOCAL INPUT METHODOLOGY COMMITTEE

A subcommittee of TCC members was convened in the fall of 2013 to develop the local input points methodology for the CRTPO. Since this committee is already familiar with the methodology and process to meet NCDOT's requirements, it is recommended that the local input methodology group transitions to become the local input points allocation subcommittee. Staff will schedule 2-3 meetings with this subcommittee to ensure that the process in which local points are being assigned is consistent with the methodology. This subcommittee will also provide technical guidance to staff if an unforeseen issue arises in the points allocation process.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Once the final quantitative project scores have been received from NCDOT, staff will determine the length of public involvement based upon P3.0 specific deadlines, and the TCC and MPO meeting schedules. While a two-week public comment period is the minimum, it is recognized that a 30-day public comment period is desirable.

The next public comment period will be targeted at the assignment of CRTPO's local input points to highway and non-highway projects. A press release will announce the start of the public comment period indicating that the draft points allocation spreadsheet has been posted to the CRTPO website. Public comments can be made via the CRTPO website as well as at an MPO board meeting.

The CRTPO received three public comment submittals during its public comment period on the local points methodology.

It is recommended that staff contact the previous public commenters and offer to facilitate stakeholder meetings to ensure that their questions have been answered. Additional stakeholder meetings with other entities can be arranged on a case-by-case basis.

ANTICIPATED PROCESS FOR LOCAL POINTS ASSIGNMENT

- End of March 2014 – NCDOT expects to release the preliminary project scores for existing projects already in NCDOT's SPOT database
 - The CRTPO's preliminary scores for existing projects will be posted to the website and shared with the TCC and MPO.
 - The local input points allocation subcommittee will be convened to review a trial run of CRTPO's local points methodology for the preliminary scores that were received.
 - The preliminary assignment of points will be shared with the TCC with the clarification that its purpose was to test the methodology, and not to score all projects.
- End of April 2014 – CRTPO receives final project scores for all projects
 - The SPOT final project scores are provided to the TCC, MPO, and posted to the website with the clarification that the scores do not include CRTPO ranking for assignment of local input points and are to be used for information only.
 - Staff uses the local points methodology to assign draft allocations of points to highway and non-highway projects
 - The local input points allocation subcommittee will be convened to review the allocation of points to ensure it is consistent with the methodology.
 - The allocation of local points to highway and non-highway projects will be presented to the TCC and MPO along with a recommendation to open the public comment period.
 - The draft allocation of CRTPO's local input points will be posted to the website and a press release will be issued to notify the public the opportunity offer comments.
 - All comments received will be presented to the TCC and the MPO, and the MPO meeting will serve as an opportunity for public comment.
 - The allocation of local points for highway and non-highway projects will be presented to the TCC and MPO for consideration of adoption.
 - Public comments that are specific to the assignment of points to projects will be shared with the TCC and the MPO. As part of the adoption process, the MPO can recommend the modification of assigned points based upon the public comments.
 - Once the MPO has approved the allocation of points, staff will submit the list to NCDOT, and the final allocation of points will be posted on the CRTPO website.



600 East Fourth Street
 Charlotte, NC 28202
 704-336-2205
 www.crtpo.org

TO: TCC Members
 FROM: Robert W. Cook, AICP
 CRTPO Secretary
 DATE: February 27, 2014
 SUBJECT: **FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment**

ACTION REQUESTED

Recommend to the MPO that it amend the FY 2014 UPWP as presented.

BACKGROUND

A mid-year review of the FY 2014 UPWP was conducted and found that two minor amendments are needed. The two amendments were addressed at the February TCC meeting.

Amendment	Proposed Change	Reason	Amount
1	Shift funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> from IV-8, Freight Movement/Mobility to II-1, Traffic Volume Counts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional freight study will not be conducted in FY 14 Additional funding for traffic counts needed 	\$40,000
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add new project in VI-10, Corridor Protection & Special Studies: "Crash Data Geo-location & Validation" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding available in task code VI-10 to support project without shifting funds from other task code Project will be local project conducted by City of Charlotte City will be responsible for local match 	\$70,000