

**Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization
CRTPO CTP Work Group Meeting Summary**

Meeting Location: CMGC Room 801
Meeting Date / Time: December 2, 2019; 12 to 1:30 p.m.
Meeting Participants: see sign-in sheet.

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

1. Review November 7, 2019 Meeting Summary:

The November 7 meeting summary were reviewed, and discussed the approval of the scope of work and schedule which was updated based on the November 7 discussions.

2. Approval of Scope of Work and Schedule:

When looking at the schedule, you can see we have already completed Task 3, the prioritization of the recommendations. We are now moving to Task 1, amendment guidelines for roadway projects. Task 2 is amendment guidelines for other modes. Task 2 can be split into 2A (bike/ped) and 2B (transit). It was noted that Task 2A and 2B can be done at the same time. Bob reminded the committee that the Transit Planner will be starting in early January and can assist the transit guidelines.

There were questions about Task 5, consolidating alternatives. Who do we report to (TCC and/or CRTPO Board)? Will the guidelines need to be adopted? It was decided to keep TCC informed by adding this as an information item to the agenda starting in February.

3. Review Existing Amendment Guidelines:

A copy of the current Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was sent after the November 7 meeting. Does the current plan work in practice? Who has amendments that are in progress right now? Are they working?

CDOT has three CTP amendments right now. There is no guidelines on who initiates the amendment process (the jurisdiction, the developer, land development, etc.).

After some discussion it was noted that we are trying to complete two different tasks, update the current PIP guidelines and develop guidelines for the CTP amendment process. Creating more clear guidelines and processes is a carryover from the 2017 PIP development. We need to streamline who kicks off the CTP process. We need to provide a clear timeline. Developers don't know the process for taking an amendment to CRTPO Board for information one month, then for action another month. NCDOT takes amendments to the NC Board of Transportation annually.

CRTPO jurisdictions need to bring CTP amendments forward more than once or twice a year. The jurisdictions need to work within the rezoning timelines. Once the CTP process is defined, we will need to educate developers on the process and timeline to get an amendment to the CRTPO Board for review and approval, in addition to the time required for public engagement. One question was whether municipalities must adopt an amendment or resolution before the amendment comes to CRTPO. If needed, does it slow the current process? If needed, could it be done concurrently with rezoning?

Stuart commented that NCDOT meets monthly and amendments can be put on the agenda if there is a time sensitive amendment that needs to go before the NCBOT prior to the annual approval. Agenda

items can be submitted by the 10th of the month to be on the agenda for the following month. The NCDOT meetings are the first week of every month.

Right of way:

What level of ROW is a CTP alignment? Has it been studied? Is there money already in it or funding allocated? Do we need to determine levels of amendments in the document we are creating? Do any of the current CTPs show the level of ROW? It was mentioned that CTP alignments are vague because any change would require going back to the Board for approval. Can additional information be added online, like a file cabinet, to see extra information about a project without it being specified in the CTP alignment?

We looked at the TCC bylaws. There is an exception in the bylaws for passing a CTP amendment. Is it needed in the TCC bylaws?

A project in the NEPA process would not require changes to the CTP until the alignment was fully approved. So, those types of projects may be built before they are changed on the CTP map. At this point, who initiates the amendment process so the CTP map is accurate? Is public involvement required? GCLMPO requests CAD files from the developer to add to their maps.

We need to discuss several items:

- Process
- Public involvement guidelines
- Administrative vs Amendment
- Tiers

Bob would like the workgroup to start with a blank slate and look at this with fresh eyes. Dana asked whether the group needs a consultant or our own resources. Bob said he thinks we can do this in-house. At a high-level, we need to determine what should be vague and what should be specific.

Julio gave a brief description of the process used by GCLMPO. Do other MPOs have language for the CTP amendment process? The CTP is a requirement by NCDOT, other states don't have this process. We haven't seen any other MPO with CTP amendment guidelines.

Dana asked what if we don't have any CTP guidelines? There are several alignments that would have benefited from some guidelines or additional coordination. For example, development in the University area, as well as around Fred D. Alexander Boulevard, rendered the CTP alignment unviable. How do we preserve ROW for a corridor that may be 30+ years out? Do our CTP alignments need to be like a 'bubble' encompassing the full area that could be used? Someone is always impacted, no matter how much or how little you shift a conceptual alignment. When is the alignment more concrete when the build is 30 years away?

Subdivision ordinances are written based on right of way. How would this work with a 'bubble' alignment? Does the bubble narrow over time as development is more defined, as a project is designed? Is anyone looking at the topography when CTP alignments are adopted? Are we looking at wetlands, large watermain pipes and other items that will impact the ability to construct along the alignment? Can you even tell if there are any of these challenges on the map? All the CTP's from the different jurisdictions are different, projects are at different levels and alignments are determined different ways. For example, the lines on the old thoroughfare plan were long, straight, solid lines with no regard to topography.

4. Identify Action Items:

Agustin and Jennifer will research other organizations for CTP or similar guidelines and send samples to the work group for review by December 19, 2019. The workgroup will review the samples and the current PIP and provide comments to Agustin by January 15, 2020. In addition to comments, the work group should send their needs, how their jurisdiction works with developers, town boards etc.

5. Next Meeting:

With the workgroup reviewing documents and providing comments, and the holidays, we are cancelling the January 2, 2020 meeting. The next meeting will be February 6, 2020.

6. Next Steps for the Work Group:

The CTP workgroup will be added as an information item on the February or March TCC agenda.

ACTION ITEMS:

| ACTIONS | RESPONSIBILITY |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Research other organizations amendment guidelines and distribute samples by Dec. 19. | Agustin & Jennifer |
| 2. Review amendment samples and provide comments to Agustin by Jan. 15 (if any from action #1) | All |
| 3. Review CTP PIP and provide comments on current amendment process and needs to Agustin by Jan. 15. | All |
| 4. Add CTP Work Group as an information item to the February or March TCC agenda. | Agustin |
| 5. Next meeting for Feb 6, 2020 (no meeting in January) | Agustin |

