

Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization

CTP Work Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Location: Virtual Meeting

Meeting Date / Time: September 3, 2020; 12:30 - 2 PM

Meeting Participants:

Dana Stoogenke (Matthews)
Andrew Grzymiski (CDOT)
Erika Martin (Mooresville)
Julio Paredes (GCLMPO)
Lisa Thompson (Weddington)
Richard Hoffman (Iredell Co.)
Stuart Basham (NCDOT Div 10)

CRTPO staff: Agustin Rodriguez, Bob Cook, Judy Dellert-O’Keef, and Jerrel Leonard

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

Items Discussed:

Review Comments Received from the PIP

Two additional options for the CTP description for page 30 of the PIP were discussed. The WG selected option C and some aspects of option B will be incorporated in other sections.

The WG discussed the statement about preserving ROW: *“Another important aspect of the CTP is that many jurisdictions reference the CTP in their development regulations in order to reserve right-of-way for future transportation improvements.”* This is an important statement and needs to remain in the CTP amendment guidelines. The WG agreed to modify it to read *“The CTP is often used by many jurisdictions to reserve ROW.”*

The WG discussed the definition for “Minor Change.” It makes sense to use a percentage instead of the number of parcels impacted to classify the level of change. It was decided, a few WG members would test the percentage over number of parcels impacts on recent amendments to determine if the minor change definition works. It was also determined that the text needs to be updated using the word “alignment” not “project” for the CTP. Do the guidelines need to include a disclaimer that some cases may require an Administrative decision to determine the classification – major vs. minor?

The WG discussed changes in facility types. Do we need to be as specific about the type of facility change for bicycle and pedestrian facilities? For example, will a change from a sidewalk to a multiuse path require a CTP amendment? The WG reviewed what is considered a classification change on the Bike/Ped Administrative Amendment table. An example was provided that a change from 6-foot sidewalk to 8-foot multi path requires an amendment because of the increase in cost and possible

funding changes. As bicycle and pedestrian plans are adopted, the Town of Matthews forwards these changes to CRTPO for CRTPO staff to handle as an Administrative Amendment.

The WG determined there should be a section specifically for public involvement. The definitions for public engagement and notification will be included here in relation to the amendment type (administrative or CRTPO Board level). The procedures to move an amendment through the CRTPO process will be included under the public involvement session. Each task will include the responsible party in the description (member jurisdictions, CRTPO staff, CRTPO Board, etc.).

The WG reviewed the examples provided and recommended changing the dates to a general timeframe, such as first Wednesday of the month, instead of actual dates.

CRTPO staff was asked to review the use of some words and/or phrases for consistency, not only in the CTP Amendment section, but throughout the whole PIP document. Examples include the use of public notification, public involvement, residents, stakeholder, property owners, and impacted party.

PIP revisions and possible impacts on other documents such as MOU, TCC bylaws, local ordinances

Once the updates to the PIP are complete, other documents will need to be reviewed for updates as well. Member jurisdictions will need to use the same language when referencing the CTP. Jurisdictions may also need to look at their local ordinances to ensure they reflect the updated PIP.

One Year of this Work Group

With the one-year mark of the WG, an update was presented to TCC and CRTPO Board in August. Staff also conducted random interviews with several WG members to determine if the WG was satisfied with the progress to date and the upcoming tasks for the next phase of the WG.

The WG was reminded, the CTP WG was formed at the direction of the CRTPO Board and was stated in the 2017 PIP that a WG would be formed to develop the CTP guidelines and public involvement requirements. As we get close to completing the PIP updates, the WG needs to think about questions the CRTPO Board and TCC may have about the rewrite when it is presented to them for adoption. The WG agreed visuals will be needed to show the differences between minor vs. major amendments.

Next Steps / Action Items:

- Update the CTP Amendment Guidelines in the PIP as discussed - (CRTPO staff)
- Test the minor change percentage vs. number of parcels on recent alignment changes - (Agustin, Andy, Stuart, Lisa)

Next Meeting:

Virtual meeting: October 1, 2020, 12:30 – 2 p.m.