

NC Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting Minutes - Draft

One City Plaza
421 Fayetteville Street
Suite 203
Raleigh, NC 27601

Technical Coordinating Committee

Thursday, August 6, 2020

10:00 AM

Conference Room

1. Welcome and Introductions

Notice: In order to protect the safety of the public, MPO partners, and staff during the COVID-19 States of Emergency, CAMPO is converting all meetings to a remote electronic format for the duration of the States of Emergency. The conference rooms and CAMPO Office are closed to meetings. Login information for each meeting can be found on both the homepage calendar and our Virtual Meeting Logistics webpage. This information was provided to the Executive Board Members and Alternates via email a week prior to the meeting.

Chair Andes welcomed everyone to the virtual meeting. She explained the logistics and planned course of action for the virtual meeting. Chair Andes reviewed the opportunities that would arise during the meeting for any member of the public who wished to speak.

Ms. Bonnie Parker, CAMPO Staff asked that each TCC member or alternate to orally confirm attendance.


- Present:** 31 - Chair Juliet Andes, Sandi Bailey, Joshua Baird, Paul Black, Michael Clark, Russell Dalton, Luana Deans, Bob Deaton, Michael Frangos, Tim Gardiner, Phil Geary, Joe Geigle, Hank Graham, Jay Heikes, Chris Hills, John Hodges-Copple, Benjamin Howell, Justin Jorgensen, David Keilson, Gaby Lawlor, Jason Myers, Branston Newton, Neil Perry, Patrick Pierce, Meg Scully, Jay Sikes, Morgan Simmons, Tracy Stephenson, Darius Sturdivant, Courtney Tanner, and Vincent Gerry
- Absent:** 23 - Gregory Bethea, Kelly Blazey, Ken Bowers, Bo Carlson, Phil Cordeiro, Davis Anita Davis, Neal Davis, Jimmy Eatmon, Scott Hammerbacher, Danny Johnson, Irene Johnson, Paul Kallam, Catherine Knudson, Member Eric Lamb, Michael Landguth, Thomas Marrow, Julie Maybee, Terry Nolan, Kendra Parrish, Pamela Perry, Larry Smith, John Vine-Hodge, and Than Austin

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina explained the parameters for the proposed 'slate vote', and reminded all that this would be the same procedure used during the June 2020 meeting.

3. Public Comments

Chair Andes opened Public Comments and explained the parameters of this format.

Regional Transportation Alliance Executive Director Mr. Joe Milazzo introduced himself and provided a brief overview of the FAST study being undertaken by RTA, GoTriangle and NCDOT. He stated that this freeway and street-based transit study is a public private partnership with the Triangle and NCDOT. Mr. Milazzo stated that the objective of the study is “to leverage the existing road network to quickly create multi-modal freeways and streets and to implement scalable transit advantages to keep buses moving on time”. He added that the findings were offered at a free webinar in July and provided the project website of 

www.letsgetmoving.org/FAST

He concluded by saying that the funding partners welcome comments by CAMPO and member governments on the initial findings released by the VHB consulting team by August 31, 2020.

Member Jay Heikes commented that he appreciated the partnership with RTA and NCDOT. He stated this conceptual study is aimed at changing thinking, finding better ways to leverage highway investments, to provide transit advantages and to ensure those get designed into those projects early in the process.

As there were no additional members of the public who wished to speak, Chair Andes closed Public Comments.

4. Minutes

4.1 TCC June 2020 Meeting Minutes Draft

Requested Action: Approve the June 2020 Meeting Minutes Draft

Attachments: [TCC June 2020 Meeting Minutes Draft](#)

The draft minutes were included in the agenda packet.

A motion was made by Member Ben Howell, seconded by Alternate Morgan Simmons that the minutes from the June 2020 TCC meeting be approved. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

5. Regular Business

5.1**R.E.D. Priority Bus Lanes Study**

Crystal Odum, MPO Staff

Alex Bell, Consultant, Renaissance Planning, Inc.

Requested Action: Receive as information.**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[CAMPO RED Lanes Study 072920](#)

Ms. Crystal Odum, CAMPO Staff introduced Mr. Alex Bell, Consultant, Renaissance Planning, Inc. who reported on this item.

Ms. Odum stated that this team, with input from a Core Technical Team (CTT) made up of regional transportation professionals, completed several items as part of the R.E.D. Priority Bus Lanes Study. This included a peer review of R.E.D. lanes applications and other bus priority implementations, a comprehensive review of past and ongoing regional planning efforts and developed an Existing Plans and Studies report, an Existing Conditions Report, finalized a Methodology Report, an evaluation Toolkit User guide, ten (10) Candidate Corridor Scoping Sheets and delivered the final reports. She then introduced Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bell provided an overview of the process involved and final products developed for the R.E.D. Priority Bus Lanes Study. He started by explaining the definition of a R.E.D. Lane, which is a transit-priority travel lane that often accommodates non-transit users. This encompasses:

- Right-turning vehicles*
- Emergency vehicles*
- Driveway access*
- Occasionally bicycles*
- Balance transit operations with the needs of all corridor users.*
- Specific designs vary based on context:*
- Other users*
- Supporting operational enhancements (TSP, e.g.)*
- Red paint aids enforcement but is not always necessary or appropriate*

Mr. Bell provided context and purpose information for a fixed-guideway in long-range transportation plans which include a regional commuter rail, BRT serving downtown Raleigh in four directions, and frequent, reliable bus services. Questions posed for this are: How can transit service in non-BRT corridors be made faster and more reliable with exclusive lanes, and how can the region systematically evaluate the best places for those lanes? Mr. Bell said that R.E.D. lanes are part of the answer.

Mr. Bell shared that the objectives of Study were to clearly define R.E.D. Lanes concepts and components, describe best practices for R.E.D. Lanes planning and implementation, develop a regional R.E.D. Lanes analysis process involving identifying metrics and supporting data sets, devising a comprehensive evaluation methodology, creating an analysis toolkit, and providing guidance on toolkit use and score interpretation.

Outcomes of the study:

- Regional R.E.D. Lanes Suitability Evaluation*
- Travel demand*
- Transit operations*
- Highway operations*
- Context and Design*

- Detailed differentiator measures
- Feasibility
- Communities of Concern
- Implementation guidance measures
- Full time vs. part time
- Transit signal priority (TSP)
- Non-motorized propensity

Mr. Bell provided a brief explanation of each of the above outcomes. He stated that study products and reports will be posted to the CAMPO website and that these were included in the meeting materials. This information includes the final report summary of the study, its findings, and key planning resources: R.E.D. Lanes fundamentals with key concepts; best planning practices; design features; bus operations; relationship to BRT; cost considerations; key plans in the CAMPO region with the relationship of R.E.D. Lanes to past and ongoing plans/studies affecting regional multimodal travel; and, finally existing conditions and trends to identify, analyze, and report key metrics and supporting datasets to inform the R.E.D. Lanes toolkit.

He further explained that part of the R.E.D. Lanes Evaluation Methodology involves a process to assess R.E.D. Lanes suitability based on existing conditions and trends. The R.E.D. Lanes Toolkit contains GIS tools to apply the R.E.D. Lanes Evaluation Methodology and links suitability, prioritization, and implementation. The R.E.D. Lanes Toolkit User Guide provides detailed documentation for the Toolkit.

Mr. Bell emphasized key take away points, that all of the study products are the result of a collaborative planning process. He added that local jurisdictions and transit agencies are encouraged to use the Toolkit for scenario analyses and project development. CAMPO will maintain the R.E.D. Lanes toolkit over time and use toolkit outputs, study products, and planning judgment to inform funding priorities. Scoping sheets frame study emphases and provide ballpark costs for suitable segments.

The R.E.D. Priority Bus Lanes Study Report was received as information.

5.2 Fayetteville-Raleigh Rail Passenger Feasibility Study

Crystal Odum, MPO Staff

Scott Lane, Consultant, MetroAnalytics, Inc.

Requested Action: Receive as information.


Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Fay-Ral Passenger Rail Study Draft Report \(7-29-2020\)](#)

Ms. Crystal Odum, CAMPO Staff introduced the study and Mr. Scott Lane, Consultant, MetroAnalytics, Inc and Mr. Ryan White, Consultant, Stantec, Inc., who reported on this item.

Ms. Odum stated that the yearlong Fayetteville-Raleigh Rail Passenger Study Project was conducted by FAMPO/CAMPO in cooperation with NCDOT and Metro Analytics / Stantec, and multiple other partners. This study was to determine the feasibility of passenger rail service between Raleigh and Fayetteville on one or two of the existing two rail line corridors. Given the rail service is deemed feasible, a Phase II of the study is recommended pending available funding. Ms. Odum stated the FAMPO will be utilizing the SPOT 6.0 process to learn which corridor . scores more favorably. She also advised the power point would be available along with all reports on the FAMPO and CAMPO websites and turned the presentation over to the consultants.

Mr. Scott Lane echoed this study was to examine the viability of passenger rail service between Raleigh and Fayetteville, North Carolina through travel market demand across various trip types, the viability of using one of the two existing rail corridors and a general analysis of economic feasibility of providing passenger rail between these cities.

He provided a high-level look at operational concerns for two routes, a passenger and revenue forecast  and preliminary determination of feasibility, and next steps.

Mr. Lane reviewed the key Takeaways from Peer Studies. These included:

- *Headways are consistently 30mins in peak and 60mins. In off-peak*
- *Weekend service is always reduced – sometimes non-existent*
- *Fares are typically arranged on a zonal basis so that the further you travel the higher the price*
- *These services typically connect with other rail and always with other bus services to provide first/last-mile support and connectivity*
- *Trackage ownership and use arrangements vary, from outright ownership to shared operations*

Mr. Ryan White provided a high level summary of Operations, and stated that this was an infrastructure assessment to help determine what was needed for Raleigh, Selma and Fayetteville. He stated that both routes have many at-grade crossings which increase crash exposure that impact speed and service reliability. He added that long sidings, better track geometry, and the traffic control system enables maximum track speeds along the eastern (Selma) route to be higher than the track speeds along the western (Fuquay-Varina) route. He provided operational assessment details for Raleigh, Selma and Fayetteville.

Operations Detail: Raleigh

- *Western Route Operational Assessment*

- o Lack of direct station access
- o Low authorized track speed (25 mph) Identify improvements to increase speed
- Eastern Route Operational Assessment
- o None – Station access via A-Line
- Common Operational Challenges
- o Locomotive and railcar storage location in Raleigh needs to be identified. No capacity at NCDOT Capital Yard

Operations Detail: Selma

- H-Lines runs east to west
- A-Line runs north to south (dual track section)
- Connections in the NW and NE quadrants
- o Selma Housing Authority property in SW quad
- Complex transition to accommodate Raleigh to Fayetteville train operations
- Platform access

Operations Detail: Fayetteville

- Western Route Issues
- o Lack of direct station access results in a multi-phase maneuver to transition between the A-Line and the AE-Line
- o Limited speeds along Hillsboro Street (10 mph)
- Eastern Route Issues
- o None – Station access via A-Line
- Common Operational Challenges
- o Downtown Fayetteville A-Line Capacity Impacts
- o Off-Site Parking Being Addressed
- o Fayetteville-area train storage
- o Connection between west route and new FAST transit center requires:
- o Crossing the A-line north of Cross Creek
- o Reversing the train
- o Proceeding north to near Webb St.
- o Reversing the train (again)
- o Proceeding south to Amtrak depot

Mr. White reviewed the key operational takeaways, which include both corridors will require significant investment in upgrading the track infrastructure and capacity in order to implement intercity passenger rail service between Raleigh and Fayetteville, track improvements in Downtown Fayetteville and Selma can significantly reduce delays likely to be incurred by passenger trains when they are transitioning between NS and CSX lines, and based on Amtrak's Station Program and Planning Guide, ridership projections at most of the proposed stations do not meet the criterion for the construction of a station building with restrooms and a waiting area. Stations with Quik-Track ticketing kiosks and covered shelters are recommended, reducing upfront costs until ridership increases drive demand for improved station facilities. Mr. White provided the Corridor Level cost comparison. He stated that track improvements would involve considerable cost as the Eastern Corridor would require double tracking.

Mr. Scott Lane shared that there was an economic focus group meeting held on May 14, 2020. A potential benefits qualitative summary was generated, which included:

- Could provide economic benefits to several communities along the Eastern and Western Corridors.

- Would serve to provide relief to congested highways, thus providing a quality of life benefit.
- Could spark Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) near the corridors and proposed stations with additional, local employment opportunities, new business opportunities, and provide nearby residents with retail and commercial service opportunities
- Serve to better connect the Region and open travel to those who might not have reliable transportation.
- It could provide job, health, and education opportunities to citizens of the region, connecting the region to medical and academic facilities throughout the region.
- It could help workers commute to major employers, such as Ft. Bragg, Goodyear, Food Lion and others in the area.
- Plenty of areas for residential housing opportunities and future development along both the Eastern and Western Corridors that could see increased development activity.
- Create a possible connection to Wilmington and points east, further expanding growth opportunities.
- Could potentially jump-start areas of stagnant or declining growth along the corridors.

Mr. Lane provided information on the purposes of the recommended Phase II Design-Oriented Study and explained what is proposed for this study, which are:

- Single Corridor Determination depending on which corridor has the most overall support
- Project Coordination
- Explore use/ownership agreements with CSXT, Norfolk-Southern, and/or NCRR:
- Obtain Detailed Data on Vertical-Horizontal Curvature of Track
- Preliminary Operations Plan
- Maintenance Shed Location and Necessary Amenities
- Transportation Simulation and Modeling:
- Documentation and Reporting

Mr. Lane provided contact information for himself, and project managers Ms. Crystal Odum and Joel Strickland. He included the project portal link as well.

Project Portal: www.ral2fayrail.com
J. Scott Lane AICP, CPTED
1167 Harp Street
Raleigh, NC | 27604
919.601.9098 | jslane@metroanalytics.com

Project Manager Contacts
Crystal Odum, Project Manager
Capital Area MPO
421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203
Raleigh, NC 27601
Tel: 919-996-4400

Joel Strickland, Project Manager
Fayetteville Area MPO
130 Gillespie Street
Fayetteville, NC 28301
Tel: 910-678-7622

Mr. Lane thanked everyone for their hard work and dedication during this study.

Member Jason Myers asked if the project team ever considered the option of not adding service to Fayetteville, but to consider adding additional train service to the service that already transfers in Selma. Mr. Lane responded by saying no the study did not consider that option at this time. Mr. Myers suggested FAMPO and CAMPO consider this lower cost option or implementation strategy to increase ridership until funds can be obtained or support to build rail down to Fayetteville.

Mr. Myers inquired if the study participants considered using the southeast quadrant for a connection between the H and A-Lines. Mr. White responded by offering the following considerations:

- Bailey Feed Mill: Source a considerable amount of freight traffic from both CSX and NS. A separate track for passenger trains would need to be constructed outside of the freight yard trackage as to not impact switching operations within the mill and the NS Selma Rail Yard along the eastern side of I-95.*
- I-95: The bridges carrying I-95 over the NCRR also limit where the tracks for the connector track would sign in.*
- Right of Way: The focus was on recommending undeveloped land for any new tracks as a means to reduce construction and right-of-way costs.*

The Fayetteville-Raleigh Rail Passenger Study Report was received as information.

5.3

DRAFT MTP 2050 Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

Chris Lukasina, MPO Executive Director

Requested Action: Receive as information and consider recommendation to the Executive Board to approve the draft goals, objectives, and performance measures for use in the development of the 2050 MTP.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[2050 MTP Schedule](#)
[2050 MTP Goals & Objectives](#)
[2050 MTP Public Engagement Strategy](#)

CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina and Ms. Bonnie Parker, CAMPO staff reported on this item.

Mr. Lukasina stated that the draft revision of the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Goals and Objectives was provided in the agenda packets. He shared that due to an ongoing effort to coordinate with the DCHC MPO, the goals, objectives and performance measures have been largely unified, many of which align with the State targets as well. This unification is useful for the public, who may not see the delineation between CAMPO and DCHC MPO.

Mr. Lukasina provided an overview of the goals, objectives and performance measures for the 2050 MTP. He explained that during the development process of the draft 2050 MTP a review of existing goals, objectives and measures incorporates data analysis, and review of current planning principles in our region which results in updated goals and associated objectives. He added that performance measures and any targets will follow later in the MTP development process.

A robust Public Engagement Strategy is a major factor in this process and is customized to each milestone. Ms. Bonnie Parker, CAMPO reported on this section. Ms. Parker stated that community feedback has and will be elicited through a public comment period and a Joint DCHC MPO and CAMPO survey using MetroQuest. The survey is available in both English and Spanish. Both the public comment period and survey end on August 13. The survey content attempts to gauge public support for proposed goals, policy priorities and collects demographics data of respondents. This survey was promoted via:

- *News and Observer article*
- *Press Release in English & Spanish*
- *E-newsletters*
- *Partners and Stakeholders (i.e. GoTriangle, RTA, Blind Lions)*
- *Digital Posts and Ads:*
- *Social Media Twitter, Facebook, Instagram*
- *News & Observer; Que Pasa (printed ads in both, as well)*
- *Websites of MPOs, Jurisdictions*
- *Jurisdictions' public affairs & social media announcements (i.e. Durham, Raleigh)*

Ms. Parker thanked everyone for their participation and proactive efforts. To date the official count of completed surveys is 1,362 as of August 4, 2020, with higher numbers expected. This survey will remain open until August 13, 2020.

Ms. Parker provided a survey Breakdown of Goals which asked people to rate their level

of support (1-5)

Preliminary Results show the following areas had the highest support:

- *Promote Multimodal and Affordable choices 4.6*
- *Connect People and Places 4.6*
- *Protect the Human and Natural Environment and Minimize Climate Change 4.5*
- *Ensure Equity and Participation 4.4*

Preliminary Results – Goals (not so highly supported)

- *Promote Safety and Health 4.3*
- *Improve Infrastructure and Resilience 4.2*
- *Manage Congestion and System Reliability 4.0*
- *Stimulate Economic Vitality 3.6*

Preliminary Results for Policy Rankings show high support of non-auto modes and more dense, mixed land uses. The issue of Encouraging Driving has by far the least support.

The comments themes for suggestions for goals include:

Transportation System in General – Focus on:

- 12% *Reduce Personal Vehicle Dependence (SOVs; use of VMT as measure) (51)*
- 10% *Protect Environment/Sustainability = (43)*
- 7.5% *Equity (Low-income; Minority; Geography) = (31)*
- 6% *Multi-modal/System with Mode Choices = (25 suggestions)*
- 5% *Technology - Plan for Electric, Autonomous Vehicles, E-bikes = (20)*
- 4% *Technology - General Investments in Technology = (16)*
- 3% *Safety Across System = (11)*
- 2% *Disabled Access = (8)*

Connectivity – Support for:

- 13% *Regional Connectivity via Transit = (54)*
- 5% *Regional Connectivity via Bike lanes/Greenways = (21)*

Growth – Support for:

- 6% *More Targeted, Oriented to Density and Developed Areas = (25)*
- 3% *Slower Growth = (14)*

Modes

Transit/Rail – Support for:

- 21% *Fixed Guideways/Rail = (87)*
- 19% *Transit Investments in General = (78)*
- 2% *On-demand Service = (9)*

Bicycle/Pedestrian:

- 19% *Increase Bike/Ped Infrastructure in General = (78)*
- 10% *Safety - Focus on Bike/Ped Safety; Vision Zero = (40)*

Roadways

- 4% *Focus on Roadway improvements, traffic congestion locations = (16)*

Ms. Parker stated that survey numbers will be updated and an attempt will be made to target all of our municipalities next week. She added that, due to delays and crises communications related to COVID, we are competing with other significant community

engagements projects. Ms. Parker concluded by providing a CAMPO area demographics breakdown of respondents based on home zip code, age, income, race, and disability.

Mr. Lukasina briefly reviewed the eight (8) draft goals and objectives which include clarifying language. He stated that some minor changes and updates have occurred since the last presentation of information and that these are recommendations to be presented to the Executive Board at their meeting on August 19, 2020.

GOAL 1: Protect the Human and Natural Environment and Minimize Climate Change – addition of Objective C:

Obj. A: Reduce mobile source emissions, GHG, and energy consumption

Obj. B: Reduce negative impacts on natural and cultural environment

Obj. C Addition: Connect transportation and land use.

Mr. Lukasina explained For Objective C, there have been discussions with the DCHC MPO about where this objective best fits.

GOAL 2: Connect People & Places – no change

Obj. A: Connect people to jobs, education and other important destinations using all modes

Obj. B: Ensure transportation needs are met for all populations (especially the aging and youth, economically disadvantaged, mobility impaired, and minorities)

GOAL 3: Promote and Expand Multimodal & Affordable Choices – no change

Obj. A: Enhance transit services, amenities and facilities

Obj. B: Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities

Obj. C: Increase utilization of affordable non-auto travel modes

Goal 4: Manage Congestion & System Reliability – no change

Obj. A: Allow people and goods to move with minimal congestion, time delay, and greater reliability.

Obj. B: Promote Travel Demand Management (TDM, such as carpool, vanpool and park-and-ride)

Obj. C: Enhance Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS, such as ramp metering, dynamic signal phasing and vehicle detection systems)

GOAL 5: Improve Infrastructure Condition & Resilience – addition of Objective E:

Obj. A: Increase proportion of highways and highway assets in 'Good' condition

Obj. B: Maintain transit vehicles, facilities and amenities in the best operating condition

Obj. C: Improve the condition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities

Obj. D: Promote resilience planning and practices

*Obj. E: Support autonomous, connected, and electric vehicles

GOAL 6: Ensure Equity & Participation – language modification and addition:

Obj. A: Ensure that transportation investments do not create disproportionate negative impacts for any community, especially communities of concern.

Obj. B: Promote equitable public participation among all communities, especially communities of concern.

GOAL 7: Promote Safety and Health – addition of “and Well-Being” to Goal Title

Obj. A: Increase safety of travelers and residents

Obj. B: Promote public health through transportation choices

GOAL 8: Stimulate Economic Vitality – addition of “And Opportunity” to Goal Title

Obj. A: Improve freight movement

Obj. B: Coordinate land use and transportation

Obj. C: Target funding to the most cost-effective solutions

Obj. D: Improve project delivery for all modes

Mr. Lukasina explained the next steps necessary for approval of the 2050 MTP Goals & Objectives, which are the conclusion of the public survey and analysis of responses, presentation to the Executive Board on August 19, 2020 for Goals & Objectives, continued development of socioeconomic data guide totals and subsequent release for public comment, which will be considered by the Executive Board in the Fall or Winter, and final adoption of goals, socioeconomic data, performance measures when the 2050 MTP is adopted. He stated that future information will be provided regarding the socioeconomic guide totals, future population and employment growth which will be used in the development of the MTP. Following that, that the focus will shift to deficiency analysis, and establishing and analyzing alternatives in terms of fiscal restraint.

Consultant Matt Miller asked if any weighting of survey response data was done by income. Ms. Parker responded that, while analysis will be done comparing demographic responses to goal question responses, weighting by any of the answers is not currently planned.

A motion was made by Member Jay Sikes, seconded by Alternate Paul Black to recommend approval of the DRAFT MTP 2050 Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.4 Capital Area MPO Complete Streets Resolution

Kenneth Withrow, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Adopt the Complete Streets Resolution.**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[Complete Streets Resolution of Continued Support](#)

Mr. Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO Staff reported on this item.

Mr. Withrow reminded TCC members that on June 19, 2019 the CAMPO Executive Board adopted a resolution of support for the implementation of NCDOT's Complete Streets Policy in North Carolina. Strategies from the Complete Streets Policy would serve to implement strong multi-modal networks as the region's highway network is being constructed.

Mr. Withrow stated that staff has drafted a renewed Complete Street resolution specifically for CAMPO that: (1) encompasses recognition of past related policies, (2) shows support for complete streets history (i.e. the 2019 Resolution of Support), and (3) clearly states CAMPO's position on complete streets in modern terms (i.e. using "complete streets" instead of "universal access").

He added that the resolution was introduced to the CAMPO Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Subcommittee at their July 17, 2020 meeting. The CAMPO SRTS Subcommittee approved the resolution. He concluded by saying that the resolution is being presented to the Executive Board for adoption.

A motion was made by Member Mike Frangos, seconded by Member Gaby Lawlor to recommend approval of Capital Area MPO Complete Streets Resolution to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.5 CAMPO SRTS Program - Data Sharing MOA

Kenneth Withrow, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Approve the Memorandum of Agreement for Signature.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[CAMPO-WCPSS-Data Collection ILA \(SRTS revisions\)
-Final-2020-07-20](#)

Mr. Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO Staff reported on this item.

Mr. Withrow stated that CAMPO staff addressed the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Subcommittee at their September 20, 2019 meeting to inform them that the SRTS Program will be working with the Wake County Public School System (WCPSS) to conduct and collect bicycle and pedestrian count data in accordance with Task II-B-11 of the UPWP. He explained that during the first quarter of FY 2020, a meeting was held with staff representatives from CAMPO, Wake County Public Schools, and Wake County administration to begin work on data collection and creating a data collection agreement to benefit SRTS projects in NCDOT's SPOT process.

Mr. Withrow noted that the significant issue concerning the data collection process was that CAMPO is subject to the NC Public Records Statute. The Public Records (PR) Statute defines as a "Public Record" just about any information held by CAMPO in pursuance of its official work. Any requesting party is entitled to inspect and copy a public record. If the information provided by WCPSS may not be (arguably) exempted from the NC Public Records Statute and (even if there is a Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act {FERPA} pre-emption), CAMPO cannot agree to not disclose or share, if requested. As a result, before suggesting some qualifying language for the agreement, the CAMPO attorney needed to meet with the School System's attorney familiar with the student records privacy issue in order to draft an agreement between the two agencies.

Mr. Withrow said that the attorneys for both the Wake County Public School System and the Capital Area MPO have worked to complete an initial draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for data sharing. CAMPO staff provided further details concerning the draft MOA to the CAMPO Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Subcommittee at their July 17, 2020 meeting for their review and approval. Following their review, the CAMPO SRTS Subcommittee approved the MOA with some suggested modifications. Mr. Withrow stated that the MOA with its suggested modifications was presented to the CAMPO attorney; who forwarded the document to the WCPSS attorney for review and approval. The WCPSS attorney has reviewed and approved the modifications to the MOA. Mr. Withrow stressed that if students are not in the classroom for the full semester, accounting will not be done in that specific semester, and that active steps are being implemented to protect students' privacy. He added that although the emphasis of the MOU is mainly bicycle and pedestrian issues, this does not necessarily preclude issues such as transit and carpool. He concluded by saying that the MOA is being presented to the Executive Board for approval for signature by the Executive Director.

A motion was made by Member Ben Howell, seconded by Member Sandi Bailey to recommend approval of CAMPO SRTS Program - Data Sharing MOA to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.6 Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) FY2022 Proposed Changes and Target Modal Investment Mix

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

Requested Action: Recommend approval of the LAPP FY2022 Proposed Changes and Target Modal Investment Mix.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[FY2022 LAPP Potential Changes Memo](#)

Ms. Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff reported on this item.

Ms. Vetter stated that the LAPP program is still moving forward, and preparations for FY 2022 have begun. The call for projects is anticipated to open during the August 2020 Executive Board Meeting. There have been three LAPP Steering Committee meetings, during which recommendations for any proposed changes to the program and the Target Modal Investment Mix have occurred. The FY 2022 LAPP Committee addressed four issues and the Target Modal Investment Mix. These issues include:

Issue #1: Roadway Travel Time Savings Calculation (For Information Only)

Benefit/Cost: 20 Points: Travel time savings anticipated by the implementation of the project, as identified using the regional travel demand model compared to the cost of the project to the LAPP program.

Travel Time Savings / LAPP Cost: CAMPO Staff is enhancing the methodology in which Travel Time Savings for roadway projects is calculated in order to normalize specific data sets, including segment length and speed limits.

Issue #2: Revisiting Submittal Reduction for Delayed Projects Policy

The current policy aims to hold jurisdictions accountable for existing LAPP Projects behind schedule:

“For applicants with prior projects that have not obligated funds, the applicant must reduce the number of allowable new applications per agency per mode by the number of that agency’s prior LAPP projects (by mode) that did not meet authorization prior to the end of the federal fiscal year.”

Ms. Vetter stated that the recommended change to this policy would be to remove the language “by mode” from the existing policy. The new policy would still allow all LAPP applications to submit a minimum of one project per year. The policy would go into effect in FY2023 round of LAPP.

Issue #3: Modal Submittal Cap

The current policy states that LAPP applications will not be accepted for LAPP funds exceeding the modal target dollar figure as set by the target modal investment mix.

In FFY2021 one roadway project was awarded 65% of total investment in roadway category. Members of the Steering and Selection Panel requested that this subject be discussed to ensure mutual agreement. A discussion was also held during the FFY2015 program development period, during which it was decided not to make any changes to this policy.

There is no recommended change for this issue. The LAPP Steering Committee ultimately agreed that the score of the project should have a higher significance when considering funding, compared to the total cost. The LAPP Selection Panel would also

have the opportunity to address situations in which this concern arises.

Issue #4: Target Modal Investment Mix

The recommended Target Modal Investment Mix is the same as FFY 2021. The recommended mix is 65% Roadway, 8% Transit, 27% Bicycle and Pedestrian. The Steering Committee noted a need for funding in all three modes funded through LAPP, and could not justify adding more funding to one mode at the expense of another.

Issue #5: Transit Scoring

Ms. Vetter shared a brief history of the LAPP scoring process for transit projects, noting that a formal quantitative scoring methodology was implemented in FFY2016 Round of LAPP. Since then: Wake Transit Tax District Funding has become available, the Wake Transit Plan is under Implementation, and Transit coverage and service has increased in the Region. Ms. Vetter noted this was an appropriate time to check in on the Transit scoring criteria and make sure the scoring methodology was meeting its intended effect. Ms. Vetter reminded the TCC of the current scoring methodology for Transit projects:

Transit Effectiveness Score: 50 Total Points

- Safety and Security Concerns: 5 Points*
- Rider Experience: 5 Points*
- Connectivity: 10 Points*
- Improves Facilities: 10 Points*
- Reliability Improvements: 10 Points*
- Benefit Cost: 10 Points*

Planning Consistency: 10 Points

Local Priority Points: 10 Points

Prior Agency Funding: 10 Points

Ms. Vetter expressed that there are four recommended changes to LAPP Transit Scoring: 1) Reliability Improvements Measure, 2) Safety and Security Measure, 3) Rider Experience Measure and 4) Minimum Requirements for Bus Stop Improvements.

Proposal #1: Reliability Improvements Measure

Ms. Vetter stated that the current approach focuses on improving time reliability and reducing delays across the system. Scores will be awarded on a scaled basis for all submitted projects with the top project receiving 10 points, and the project will be scored based on the following formula:

*(travel time on the route after the improvement – travel time on the route before improvement) * # average daily ridership on the route anticipated 12 months after the improvement is completed.*

Ms. Vetter explained the reason to address this issue now is because the intended effect of this scoring criterion was to have a cascading arrangement of scores based on the scaled value of travel-time savings. Since most projects do not have travel-time savings, most projects receive 0 points for this criterion, while 1 or 2 projects in a given round receive 10 points. This results in minimal variability in scoring for the projects.

Accurately scoring these projects has also raised issues, since a lack of standardization for calculating the travel time savings for reliability improvement projects create difficulty in fairly scoring each improvement.

Ms. Vetter shared the proposed change: Change reliability improvements from a

quantitative formula to a tiered score based on impact by project type. This would allow more variation in scoring compared to the scaled cascading model that is currently in place. This would also allow for more consistency and clarity when scoring this criterion. High Impact projects would receive 10 points, medium impact projects would receive 5 points, low impact projects would receive 1 point, and no impact projects would receive 0 points for the criteria. (A detailed chart of all project types and impacts can be found in the agenda attachments).

Proposal #2: Safety and Security Concerns Measure

Ms. Vetter explained that the current approach enhances safety and security of the system, rider or user. The proposed project must address a documented safety or security concern or policy. If the project sponsor effectively demonstrates improved safety and security resulting from the project, the project will receive 5 points.

Ms. Vetter explained the reason to address this issue now is because the intention of the current scoring method is to award projects that address a safety and security issue. Since most transit projects submitted to CAMPO can justify having a safety and/or security component, these points are usually awarded to all projects and does not increase competition and variability between projects. The types of projects funded through LAPP have a significant opportunity to affect the safety and security of the transit network and its users.

Ms. Vetter shared the proposed change: Change scoring criterion from binary (yes/no) evaluation to tiered evaluation based on impact by project type. This would allow for variation in the scoring, increasing the competition in this criterion. This tiered approach scoring for safety and security is consistent with how many other MPOs and DOTs address this subject. High impact projects would receive 5 points, medium impact projects would receive 3 points, low impact projects would receive 1 point, and no impact project would receive 0 points. (A detailed chart of all project types and impacts can be found in the agenda attachments).

Proposal #3: Rider Experience Measure

Ms. Vetter expressed that the current approach enhances amenities that contribute to a more comfortable and convenient user experience. The proposed project must improve or enhance the rider experience. If the project sponsor effectively demonstrates enhanced comfort or convenience of the rider, the project will receive 5 points.

Ms. Vetter revealed that the reason to address this issue now is because, similar to safety and security concerns, CAMPO wishes to address the rider experience measure to expand the scoring variation from either 5 points or 0 points. Since most projects can justify their project improves the rider experience, most projects receive 5 points for this criterion. Changing the way this measure is scored would allow more competition and variation between scores.

Ms. Vetter shared the proposed change: Change scoring criterion from binary (yes/no) evaluation to tiered evaluation based on impact by project type. This would allow for variation in the scoring, increasing the competition in this measure. High impact projects would receive 5 points, medium impact projects would receive 3 points, low impact projects would receive 1 point, and no impact projects would receive 0 points. (A detailed chart of all project types and impacts can be found in the agenda attachments).

Proposal #4: Minimum requirements for bus stop improvements

Ms. Vetter announced that LAPP currently does not have minimum requirements in place for bus stop improvement projects. To maintain consistent levels of expectations for all

bus stop improvement projects, CAMPO proposes imposing minimum requirements for these projects. If an applicant's local policy has stricter requirements for these criteria, the applicant should follow their local policy. Bus stop improvements should at a minimum:

- Identify all bus stops with clear signage*
- Ensure new bus stops are accessible and meet the federal Americans with Disabilities (ADA) standards, where practical.*
- Upgrade existing bus stops to meet federal ADA standards, where practical.*
- Provide passenger amenities such as shelters and benches, depending on the level of passenger activity. Generally speaking, stops with more than 25 daily passenger boarding's or more will be equipped with a shelter.*

Ms. Vetter provided information for the potential Impacts to FFY2022 Call for Projects. Currently the policy on delayed projects is that one submittal is removed for each late project in the respective mode. The current funding uncertainty could impact total \$25 million in programming recommendation based on NCDOT's cash situation, COVID-19 revenue impacts, funding reauthorization or continuing resolution(s).

She stated that more information is expected in the next few months due to 1) August redistribution and 2) Federal transportation reauthorizations or continuing resolutions. She added that CAMPO is hopeful that all will work out, and that there will be time before call for projects to take action.

Ms. Vetter concluded by provided a summary of key dates. The proposed changes and Target Modal Investment Mix were posted for Public Comment from June 12, 2020 to July 16, 2020, a Public Hearing occurred at the July 15, 2020 Executive Board Meeting, and the Executive Board will consider approving the proposed changes to the program and the Target Modal Investment Mix, and open the One Call for All Call for Projects at their August 19, 2020 Meeting. She reminded all that the online only LAPP applicant training will be held on August 20, 2020 from 0900-1200 and that this information is available on the CAMPO website.

Member Tracy Stephenson expressed concern about projects that are on hold by NCDOT that were not issued municipal agreements so cannot start, and that Jurisdictions should not lose submittal capacity in these situations. CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina responded that CAMPO had discussed this issue with NCDOT this summer with regards to the budget and concerns around items such as gas tax and travel revenues. He added that an August redistribution is expected, and that Federal level discussions are encouraging. He added that CAMPO is hopeful that funding for projects should get moving in the next few months, which would allow some of the paused projects to begin again. He stated that currently a decision does not need to be made since the submittal rule is not enforced until the end of October. CAMPO's intent is to examine this and if uncertainty still exists CAMPO would come back with recommendations in September or October 2020 to waive or modify the rule for this round. At this point a blank waiving of the rule is inappropriate. Mr. Lukasina stated that CAMPO wishes to move forward as the situation evolves, and that no punitive measures were expected for those with projects not yet started without municipal agreements. He added that we could end up extremely over programmed or over extended and not having the budget in the needed time frame, but reiterated that no decision is needed now and expects the Executive Board to be sympathetic to this issue.

A slate vote was taken for all previous action items. Each member or alternate was asked to confirm their agreement.

A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Member Jay Heikes to recommend approval of Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) FY2022 Proposed Changes and Target Modal Investment Mix to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.7**FY2020-2029 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #2**

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

Ms. Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO staff reported on this item.

Ms. Vetter stated that CAMPO has received notification from NCDOT of changes to regional projects that require amending the Transportation Improvement Program. This amendment will also include changes from the updated Wake Transit Work Plan.

Ms. Vetter expressed that the FY2020-2029 TIP Amendment #2 will be posted for public comment from August 14, 2020 to September 13, 2020 and a public hearing is scheduled for the September 14, 2020 Executive Board meeting. A recently-passed State Law requires all public hearings occurring during a State of Emergency to allow public comment for 24 hours after the public hearing closes. She added that if a State of Emergency is still in effect in September, CAMPO may need to continue the Public Comment Period move the approval of Amendment #2 to the October Executive Board Meeting to adhere with this law.

The FY2020-2029 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #2 Report was received as information.

5.8 Update on Wake Transit Vision Plan Development and FY 21 Work Plan Reassessment

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

Mr. Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff reported on this item.

Mr. Martin reminded all that there have been some significant changes to Wake Transit revenue assumptions since February, due to economic uncertainty and decreases in sales tax collections brought on by the current CoVid-19 pandemic with its social distancing and 'stay-at-home' measures. Mr. Martin reviewed changes to the assumed budgeted revenues and compared the current fiscal situation to hurricane forecasting.

Mr. Martin stated that, as with an impending hurricane, there is a 'cone of uncertainty' surrounding the possible fiscal picture and future involving Wake Transit finances. This cone combines both known information and educated guesses for what might occur and attempts to prepare for both best and worst case scenarios. Mr. Martin compared data from February 2020 to June 2020 to show the expected range of revenue reductions, from the most conservative to least/more optimistic scenarios. He reminded all that these forecasts can change with the arrival of new information. He stated that the cost side remains largely unchanged, but the revenue side has changed quite a bit.

Mr. Martin expressed that before the COVID impact, the projected revenue forecast from dedicated sales taxes through 2030 in February 2020 was approximately \$1.2 billion dollars. Post COVID, in June 2020, the projected revenue was approximately \$921 million – \$1.1 billion dollars. This is a reduction of approximately \$107 million – \$248 million dollars.

Mr. Martin said that potentially difficult choices may need to be made concerning capital programming: - which projects can still be completed and which may need to be postponed.

Mr. Martin stressed important takeaways from the financial analysis conducted, which include:

- *Use Additional 3 Years of Tax Collections Through 2030 to Support Already Programmed Expenditures*
- *Low Chance of Capacity for New Investment in Additional 3 Years of Planning Horizon*
- *Some Programmed Expenditures Delayed*
- *Likely Need Cuts to Overall Expenditures (if only looking through 2030)*
- *Will Revisit in October with Updated Revenue Data*
- *Public/Stakeholder Messaging and Input Help Set Priorities*

Mr. Martin provided an updated task schedule which does not include an assumption that there will be capacity for new projects. He stressed that the next step of reprioritizing investments is a critical one, and that there is a need to understand public priorities within the set of already programmed projects. This will include a Public Engagement Period from August 3rd – 28th, and a Stakeholder Engagement Period in mid-September. The focus will remain on implementing the 4 Big Moves and the 2016 Wake Transit Plan. There will be a survey to help better understand travel priorities and

to prioritize future projects in a multi-year investment strategy. Mr. Martin shared that Virtual Stakeholder Input Sessions will be held Monday, September 14th – 1:30-3:00pm, Tuesday, September 15th – 9:30-11:00am and Thursday, September 17th – 6:30-8:00pm.

The Update on Wake Transit Vision Plan Development and FY 21 Work Plan Reassessment Report was received as information.

6. Informational Item: Budget

6.1 Member Shares FY 2020 Lisa Blackburn, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as Information

Attachments: [FY 20 Projected Member Dues QTR 4](#)

The Member Shares Report was included in the agenda packet.

The Member Shares Report was received as information.

6.2 Operating Budget - FY 2020 Lisa Blackburn, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [FY 20 Projected Budget QTR 4](#)

The Operating Budget Report was included in the agenda packet.

The Operating Budget Report was received as information.

7. Informational Item: Project Updates

7.1 TCC August 2020 Project Updates

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [August Project Updates](#)

The Project Updates were included in the agenda packet.

The Project Updates item was received as information.

7.2 Public Engagement Updates Bonnie Parker, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Public Engagement Updates TCC Aug 2020](#)

The Public Engagement Updates were included in the agenda packet.

The Public Engagement Updates item was received as information.

8. Informational Item: Staff Reports

CAMPO Executive Director stated that:

-The Triangle Bikeway is well underway. The consultant is actively working to establish community engagement meetings with elected officials and staff for each municipality along the proposed corridor. For those directly affected in this area, communication from the consultant on ways to become engaged will be coming.

-CAMPO has had many positive discussions with NCDOT with regards to the August redistribution issue. Mr. Lukasina reminded all that the Federal government asks all of the states for unused fund balances, which allows reallocation to other states in need. Historically, North Carolina has received between \$30-50 million dollars, up to \$100 million dollars plus. With all the projects that are on hold currently, a request may be made for double that amount. This could greatly benefit major TIP projects and the LAPP program projects.

-The Federal reauthorization issue is currently under review, and both Houses of Congress propose increases in Transportation funding. CAMPO is hopeful that by late fall we will have a reauthorization of funds as opposed to a continuing resolution.

-CAMPO offices remain closed to the public during the pandemic, staff is working remotely, and there are no in person meetings. With the extension of Phase 2 by Governor Cooper, as well as guidance from the Executive Board, we expect to continue to operate under these conditions through at least August 2020.

TCC Chair - no report.

NCDOT Transportation Planning Division - no report.

NCDOT Division 4 - absent.

NCDOT Division 5 - no report.

NCDOT Division 6 - no report.

NCDOT Rail Division - absent.

NC Turnpike Authority - absent.

NCDOT Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning Division - absent.

TCC Members - no members requested to add information.

Chair Andes thanked everyone for their participation.

The Staff Reports item was received as information.

9. Adjournment

Upcoming Meetings/Events

<i>Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting</i>	<i>August 19, 2020</i>
<i>One Bank of America Plaza</i>	<i>4:00 - 6:00</i>
<i>421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203</i>	
<i>Raleigh, NC 27601</i>	
<i>Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting</i>	<i>September 3, 2020</i>
<i>One Bank of America Plaza</i>	<i>10:00 - noon</i>
<i>421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203</i>	
<i>Raleigh, NC 27601</i>	
<i>Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting</i>	<i>September 16, 2020</i>
<i>One Bank of America Plaza</i>	<i>4:00 - 6:00</i>
<i>421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203</i>	
<i>Raleigh, NC 27601</i>	
<i>Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting</i>	<i>October 1, 2020</i>
<i>One Bank of America Plaza</i>	<i>10:00 - noon</i>
<i>421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203</i>	
<i>Raleigh, NC 27601</i>	