

# NC Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting Minutes - Final Technical Coordinating Committee

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

---

Thursday, March 5, 2020

10:00 AM

Conference Room

---

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

*Chair Andes welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked if there were any new introductions to be made. There were no new members to be introduced.*

**Present:** 32 - Chair Juliet Andes, Sandi Bailey, Joshua Baird, Paul Black, Jason Brown, Michael Clark, Bryan Coates, Shannon Cox, Luana Deans, Jimmy Eatmon, Tim Gardiner, Phil Geary, Hank Graham, Jay Heikes, John Hodges-Copple, Benjamin Howell, Danny Johnson, Sean Johnson, Justin Jorgensen, David Keilson, Erin Klinger, Member Eric Lamb, Aaron Levitt, Gaby Lawlor, Julie Maybee, Jason Myers, Terry Nolan, Meg Scully, Jay Sikes, Morgan Simmons, Tracy Stephenson, and Darius Sturdivant

**Absent:** 20 - Than Austin, Gregory Bethea, Kelly Blazey, Ken Bowers, Bo Carlson, Davis Anita Davis, Neal Davis, Michael Frangos, Scott Hammerbacher, Irene Johnson, Paul Kallam, Catherine Knudson, Michael Landguth, Thomas Marrow, Suzette Morales, Branston Newton, Neil Perry, Pamela Perry, Larry Smith, and John Vine-Hodge

## **2. Adjustments to the Agenda**

*Chair Andes stated that Item 5.9 - Safety Performance Measures and Targets FY20 was added after the first agenda was posted to the CAMPO website. The updated version was posted directly after the addition.*

## **3. Public Comments**

*Chair Andes opened Public Comments. There were no members of the public present to speak. Chair Andes closed Public Comments.*

## **4. Minutes**

**4.1** TCC February 6, 2020 Draft Minutes

**Requested Action:** Approve February 6, 2020 Draft Minutes

**Attachments:** [TCC Minutes - Feb. 6, 2020](#)

*The Draft Minutes were included in the agenda packet.*

**A motion was made by Alternate Luana Deans, seconded by Member Jason Myers to approve the minutes from the TCC February 2020 meeting. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

## **5. Regular Business**

**5.1 FY2018-2027 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #11**

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Recommend approval of Amendment #11 of FY2018-2027 Transportation Improvement Program.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[TIP Amendment #11](#)

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

*NCDOT's STIP Unit notified the MPO of amendments to the FY2018-2027 State TIP. The MPO should update the TIP to reflect these changes in order to meet federal regulations stating that the TIP and STIP must be identical. Amendments also include the addition of Wake Transit Funding and the FY21 LAPP Investment Program.*

*The FY2018-2027 TIP Amendment #11 has been posted for public comment from February 14, 2020 to March 15, 2020 and a public hearing is scheduled for the March 18, 2020 Executive Board meeting.*

*She added that these amendments also include the addition of Wake Transit Funding and the addition of the LAPP FFY2021 Investment Program.*

*She disclosed that this was opened for public review and comment from February 14-March 15, 2020, and that a Public Hearing is scheduled for the March 18, 2020 Executive Board meeting.*

*Ms. Vetter concluded by reviewing the updates since the Public Comment Opening, which include changing the funding source on 3 FFY2021 LAPP projects from CMAQ to STBGDA to allow more flexibility for FY2020 CMAQ projects.*

- *EB-6046*
- *EB-6047*
- *EB-6048*

**A motion was made by Member Jason Brown, seconded by Member Ben Howell to recommend approval of Amendment #11 of FY2018-2027 Transportation Improvement Program to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

**5.2 LAPP Program and Prior Year Projects Update**

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)

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

*Ms. Vetter provided an update on the now cancelled rescission of federal highway program funding scheduled for the end of federal fiscal year 2019. The following schedule and deadlines below have been presented to the CAMPO TCC and Executive Board:*

*At the August 21, 2019 Executive Board Meeting, the Executive Board made the following determination for outstanding LAPP projects:*

- *FFY2019 LAPP projects are granted a grace period through FFY2020 to request funding authorization (September 2020).*
- *FFY2018 and prior LAPP projects are granted a grace period through the first quarter of FFY2020 to request funding authorization (December 31, 2019).*
- *If a project wishes to request funding authorization after this deadline, the project must receive consideration and approval from the Executive Board prior to requesting funding authorization.*
- *Any project that does not reach their respective deadline and does not receive approval from the Executive Board to request funding authorization will be deprogrammed. That project is eligible to recompile for funding in future rounds of LAPP.*

*Ms. Vetter recapped the total prior year projects at the beginning of FFY2020 which totaled 26,675,113 million dollars, FFY2020 LAPP Projects totaling 24,999,999 million dollars. She also presented the available funding balances at the beginning of FFY2020 which included both the carry-forward funding and FY2020 apportionment funds. These balances were \$26.62m of STBGDA funding, \$6.46m of CMAQ funding, and \$890,157 of TAP funding. Ms. Vetter shared a chart that compared existing project totals to available funding. She noted that while the chart showed that CAMPO has more project funding programmed than there is available funding, some of that is due to overprogramming.*

*Ms. Vetter provided an explanation and rationale for overprogramming. She stated that CAMPO programs (awards) more funding for projects in a fiscal year than is actually received through allocation and that CAMPO overprograms to help obligate (protect) as much funding as possible in a fiscal year. She added that overprogramming allows a buffer in case projects fall behind schedule or are cancelled. CAMPO generally overprograms around 20% above anticipated STBGDA and TAP allocations. She stated that overprogramming is noted in the LAPP Handbook, and is another reason why projects are encouraged to obligate their funding as early as possible in their awarded fiscal year.*

*Alternate Aaron Levitt asked if the 20% overprogramming was accurate to what we currently overprogram. Ms. Vetter responded that the 20% overprogramming amount is utilized at the beginning of a call for projects when determining the amount to program for*

the call.

Ms. Vetter provided information regarding possible scenarios moving forward which include:

- *Scenario 1: All prior year and FFY2020 projects obligate in FFY2020. This is the least likely scenario, as NCDOT will probably not allow such a large deficit and current project schedules do not reflect this happening.*
- *Scenario 2: All prior year projects obligate and 33% of FFY2020 projects obligate in FFY2020. This is a more likely scenario, but Ms. Vetter reminded everyone that if one third of the current year project obligate on time, there will be a lower financial impact to the current health of the funding program, but it will bring the liability of the remaining two thirds of the projects into the following fiscal year.*
- *Scenario 3: Prior year projects are cancelled and 33% of FFY2020 projects obligate in FFY2020. Ms. Vetter noted the same concern as scenario 2, where the health of the funding program looks better, but the liability of 67% of the FY2020 projects are being brought into the next year.*

Ms. Vetter noted that the 33% is the average obligation rate based on prior year data.

She discussed potential options moving forward, to include:

- *Redistribute funding between funding sources*
- *Cancel or reprogram to the appropriate year some/all Prior Year LAPP projects that do not meet respective grace period deadlines*
- *Program lower funding amounts in future LAPP Call for Projects, which could be a gradual reduction over time or a significant reduction in 1 or 2 fiscal years*

Alternate Luanna Deans asked if CAMPO staff had any recommendations on which option to move forward with. CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina responded that Scenario 3 or a combination of options would be the most feasible, and that this information would be presented again towards the end of the fiscal year, and will ultimately be the decision of the Executive Board.

**Federal Rescission and Prior Year LAPP Projects Update Report was received as information.**

**5.3 Prioritization 6.0 Modal Candidate Project Lists**

Alex Rickard, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.

**Attachments:** [P6\\_candidatesv3](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Public Comments for Exec Board UPDATE 04.15.2020](#)

*CAMPO Deputy Director Alex Rickard reported on this item.*

*Mr. Rickard reported that CAMPO staff and the TIP/SPOT subcommittee have developed the lists of candidate projects for Prioritization 6.0 (SPOT 6). Mr. Rickard reviewed the three action items for MPOs in NCDOT's prioritization process, and some of the project submittal changes from second project submittal list.*

*2023-2032 TIP/STIP Development*

*SPOT Actions - MPOs*

- 1. Select Projects to Submit for Scoring  
(44 projects per mode)*
- 2. Assign Local Input points  
Regional Impact Points (2500 pts)  
Division Needs Points (2500 pts)*
- 3. Adopt TIP*

*Mr. Rickard provided a brief schedule update and reiterated that the SPOT project submittal deadline to NCDOT is May 1, 2020. He stated that a Public Hearing is scheduled for the Executive Board meeting on April 15, 2020. After April 15th, the usual process has been that Board approves this list, which gives CAMPO staff flexibility to modify the list as needed, in coordination with Division engineers, with final Chair approval before we submit. Mr. Rickard noted if MPOs and RPOs in Divisions 4,5,6 and Regions A and C can agree, we will also need to look at alternate criteria weights also being approved by May 1, 2020.*

*He reviewed the current CAMPO projects and provided updates for Bicycle/Pedestrian, Rail, Transit and Roadway. He stated that there was no change to the Bike/Ped list. A handout with a complete list was provided prior to the meeting. He said there were three new projects added for Rail. For Roadway, Mr. Rickard reviewed the changes from the first version of the project list. Mr. Rickard reviewed the transit list and noted that certain BRT projects had been removed from the list.*

*Member Jay Heikes inquired about the western terminus of the BRT projects. Mr. Rickard responded that the MPO was testing several BRT corridors including a combination of services starting in Durham, Chapel Hill, and RTP and going to North Hills or Triangle Town Center in Wake County.*

**The Prioritization 6.0 Modal Candidate Project Lists Report was received as information.**

**5.4 NC 540 Bonus Allocation Programming**

Alex Rickard /MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Review the project candidate list and recommend the Executive Board release the list for public review and comment with a public hearing scheduled on April 15, 2020.

**Attachments:** [BA Programming Recommendation](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

CAMPO Deputy Director Alex Rickard reported on this item.

*Mr. Rickard stated the Bonus Allocation is meant as an incentive for tolling and also for local contribution to roadway projects. He provided a brief review of the bonus allocation provision in the STI law, the adopted guiding principles, the proposed methodology for selecting transportation projects for programming with STI bonus allocation funds, and the draft list of projects recommended for programming with NC 540 bonus allocation funds based on the proposed methodology. Mr. Rickard stated that as a result of this provision, the MPO has received an allocation of one hundred million dollars for the tolling of NC 540 project.*

*He stated that the methodology has been on the CAMPO website for public comment and review and is expected to be adopted by the Executive board in April.*

*Mr. Rickard reviewed the top Regional Impact candidate projects and stated that the US 401 superstreet (A644 2035) from Lake Wheeler to Hilltop Needmore and NC 55 & Technology Drive grade separation (A98c 2045) were the top two candidates to be recommended for programming. The three other projects are the NC 55 & Holly Springs Road interchange, NC 55 & Main Street interchange and NC 50 widening and intersection improvements from Timber Drive to Rand Road. For the Division Needs category, Mr. Rickard reviewed the prioritized list of intersection improvements in the study area. Mr. Rickard commented that the recommendation was to program and construct as many of the projects as funding would allow in order.*

*Mr. Rickard requested that the TCC Members make a recommendation to the Executive Board to release these projects for public review and comment, with a public hearing and adoption on April 15, following the adoption of Methodology.*

*Member Jay Heikes asked if there were any Wake Transit corridors that would benefit from these funds. CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina responded that bonus allocation funds are only permitted to be used on roadway projects but that ancillary bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements could be included in those programmed roadway projects.*

**A motion was made by Member Shannon Cox, seconded by Member Jay Heikes to recommend the Executive Board release the project candidate list for public review and comment with a public hearing scheduled on April 15, 2020. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

## 5.5 FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Request - Commuter Rail Early Project Development

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Consider approval of the FY20 Wake Transit Work Plan amendment request to fund early project development activities for commuter rail, with the condition that no funds will be spent until an MOU detailing the cost share is approved by the appropriate boards.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Attachment 1 - FY20 Work Plan Amendment - Commuter Rail Early Project Development](#)

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

*Mr. Martin presented a brief overview of the FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Request - Commuter Rail Early Project Development. The proposed scope of work includes:*

- Community Engagement and Impacted Agency Coordination Activities*
- NEPA and Constructability Scoping*
- Preliminary Engineering in High Risk Areas*
- Concurrence Process and Locally Preferred Alternative*
- Land Availability for Park-and-Rides, Stations, Maintenance Facilities*
- Network Capacity Modeling*
- Refine Schedule and Cost Estimates*
- Determine Railroad Owner Requirements*
- Cost Share for Project Design, Construction, Operation*

*Mr. Martin shared financial information regarding the proposed Wake County share for the next phase of study, and stated that due to funding already being set aside for commuter rail alternatives refinement and project development, there would technically be no financial impact to the FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan. He mentioned that the total amount of funding being requested from Wake Transit sources is \$6 million, with the total budget for the early project development phase being \$9.2 million with the balance coming from other county funding sources and North Carolina Railroad.*

*Mr. Martin disclosed that the amendment would allow GoTriangle to carry-over funds for the RTC study (originally allocated in FY19) totaling \$333,333; the allocation of FY18 CRT Reserve funds of \$2,303,038; and \$3,363,269 from reserves set aside in the FY20 Work Plan.*

*He stated that TPAC has already recommended approval of this request, and that Mr. Jay Heikes from GoTriangle would be providing a more in depth presentation on early project development activities in the next item on the agenda that will cover the associated Memorandum of Understanding.*

**A motion was made by Member Ben Howell, seconded by Member John Hodges-Copple to recommend approval of the FY20 Wake Transit Work Plan amendment request to fund early project development activities for commuter rail to the Executive Board, with the condition that no funds will be spent until an MOU detailing the cost share is approved by the appropriate Boards. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

## 5.6 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in Support of Continued Development of the Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Project

Bret Martin, MPO Staff and Katharine Eggleston, GoTriangle Staff

**Requested Action:** Consider approval of CAMPO's participation in the MOU in Support of Continued Development of the Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Project and authorize the Executive Director to sign the MOU.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment 1 - CRT Early Project Development MOU](#)

*Mr. Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff and Mr. Jay Heikes, GoTriangle staff reported on this item.*

*Mr. Martin explained that, building upon the findings of the completed alternatives analysis/feasibility study, GoTriangle, in cooperation with project management committee partners, developed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that details the scope and roles and responsibilities of partners for commuter rail early project development activities. A draft of the MOU is included as Attachment 1. The TCC's and Executive Board's consideration of this MOU, in conjunction with the related Wake Transit Work Plan amendment request on the TCC's March agenda, is ultimately a decision point for when, how, and to what extent a project within the commuter rail corridor will be studied further or will progress further toward project implementation. The contents of the MOU include:*

- Roles/Responsibilities of Agencies for Early Project Development*
- Tasks to be Completed for Early Project Development*
- Tasks to Lay Foundation for Potential Future Implementation*
- Cost Share for Early Project Development*
- Define Project Concept to Carry Forward (if Viable and Desired)*

*Mr. Jay Heikes provided a detailed Commuter Rail update and study findings. The study evaluated 8 service and termini scenarios in terms of projected construction and operating/ maintenance costs as well as projected ridership. From this information the project was evaluated against FTA Capital Investment Grant criteria to determine, based on planning level work done to date, whether or not any of the scenarios would be eligible for federal funding. This evaluation was applied to a variety of project termini scenarios along the North Carolina Railroad corridor between Selma in Johnston County and Mebane in Alamance County. The ultimate goal of the study was to equip GoTriangle and its regional partners with more detailed information on the productivity, feasibility, and project delivery requirements of a commuter rail project within the corridor. Mr. Heikes presented a map representing the regional connections in the current three county transit plans. He explained these include bus connections between cities/towns. From Durham there are regional bus connections to/from Duke, Hillsborough, Mebane, Chapel Hill, RTP, RDU, and Raleigh.*

*Mr. Heikes reviewed the study findings and expected Federal score for each service scenario and set of termini. The Durham to Garner and Durham to Clayton 8-2-8-2 scenarios were the most likely to have minimum scores necessary to be eligible for federal funding.*

*The study also concluded that there is a need for additional study with focus on proactive and comprehensive community engagement to share information and elicit feedback from the public needed to update transit plans in all three counties, evaluation of what railroad infrastructure improvements and construction would be needed and further*



*evaluation of potential risks to the project and their potential solutions.*

*Mr. Heikes added that the commuter rail would connect four of the five "downtowns" in our region: Duke / Duke and VA Medical Centers, Downtown Durham, NCSU, and Downtown Raleigh. The project in the county transit plans calls for up to eight trips in each direction during peak hours with up to two trips each way during midday and evening hours, for a total of 20 weekday roundtrips.*

*Mr. Heikes stated that we are between the Pre Planning and Planning phase of development. Mr. Heikes reiterated that the critical next steps are the Memorandum of Understanding for the next phase (early project development activities) with NCCR, NCDOT, GoTriangle, Counties, and MPOs. Mr. Heikes covered the cost-share breakdown for the proposed early project development activities covered by the MOU:*

*-Wake:       \$6,000,000  
-Durham:     \$2,700,000  
-Johnston:   \$250,000*

*Member Shannon Cox asked for clarification regarding the Durham Garner and Durham Clayton selected projects, and asked if any of the other scenarios evaluated were still under consideration. Mr. Heikes responded that for this next phase of study under consideration now and that which is tied to the MOU just focuses on these scenarios. However, Orange County has asked for it to be noted that it is interested in a potential future phase.*

*Member Jason Myers said that from what he inferred from the chart that perhaps the project would be even more competitive if it were shortened to focus on travel between the Raleigh and Durham urban cores. Mr. Heikes said that what they gained from the first study is that ridership in western Durham and in Garner along the corridor is significant enough to warrant having the project expansive enough to serve these areas.*

*Member Jason Myers commented that this does not all have to be implemented at the same time. Mr. Heikes said that the rail network capacity modeling provides an opportunity to evaluate other scenarios.*

*Vice Chair Eric Lamb asked if the MOU would in theory force a decision from Durham to invest in a project after hearing that Durham County may be waffling on a decision to proceed. Mr. Heikes stated that Durham County is seemingly on board with proceeding to the next phase of study, which is really when a decision will need to be made to progress an actual project. This will occur in approximately 18 months.*

*Member John Hodge-Copple commented that, as a lesson learned from the Durham-Orange light rail project, Durham County is cautious and is looking for a more piecemeal approach to understanding project viability before deciding to fully invest.*

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Eric Lamb, seconded by Member Michael Clark to recommend approval of CAMPO's participation in the MOU in Support of Continued Development of the Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Project to the Executive Board and authorization for the Executive Director to sign the MOU. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

**5.7 Wake Transit Plan Update Status Report**

Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)

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

*Mr. Martin stated that in early August, CAMPO kicked off the development of the Wake Transit Vision Plan Update, which will be a tune-up to certain assumptions made in the original Wake County Transit Plan and an extension of the planning horizon for the Wake County Transit Plan from 2027 to 2030. He stated that progress to date on tasks associated with the plan update include substantial completion of the reassessment of cost and schedule feasibility assumptions for major capital projects and a countywide transit market reassessment. Mr. Martin explained the stages of the task schedule, and reviewed the timeline for each.*

- 1. Refine Costs/Schedule: October - February*
- 2. Transit Market: October - December*
- 3. Financial Capacity: Early 2020*
- 4. Choices and Tradeoffs: Early 2020*
- 5. Develop and Evaluate Alternatives: Mid 2020*
- 6. Select Preferred/ Final Alternative: Late 2020*

*Mr. Martin shared that, following up on these tasks, in cooperation with a Core Technical Team (CTT) comprised of Wake Transit Plan implementation partner staff representatives, CAMPO is working to evaluate scenarios of remaining financial capacity identified through 2030. He also provided a schedule for the overall plan update engagement schedule.*

*Phase 1: Update Kickoff – Fall 2019*

*Phase 2: Choices and Tradeoffs – Early 2020*

*Phase 3: Investment Alternatives – Mid 2020*

*Phase 4: Final Plan Review/ Late 2020*

*Mr. Martin explained that the financial capacity scenarios will set the stage for an evaluation of high-level investment tradeoffs, and that it is anticipated the next touchpoint to solicit input from stakeholders and the public will occur in the mid-April to mid-May timeframe. The referenced core design retreats to draw up and evaluate alternatives will also be informed by the market reassessment and transit-related recommendations from other regional and sub-regional plans that have been completed.*

*Mr. Martin provided information for the cost and timeline estimates for commuter rail and bus rapid transit projects with associated updated assumptions and potential financial impact and showed some illustrative factors that could change the assumptions while asserting that it is a financial exercise at a specific snapshot in time. He mentioned that the assumptions will continue to change just like they did from the original Wake County Transit Plan.*

*He said that the purpose of the market assessment approach is to understand where there is demand for transit, evaluate the appropriateness of planned services and to identify new and emerging opportunities for transit investment.*

*Mr. Martin stated that the composite density findings from combined population and employment focused on the following MTP High Capacity Transit Corridors:*

- Downtown Raleigh and the area immediately surrounding downtown*
- Northwestern Raleigh along Capital Boulevard*
- Eastern Raleigh along New Bern Avenue*
- Southern Raleigh along Wilmington Street*
- Northern Raleigh along I-440 loop*
- Between Raleigh and Cary along Western Boulevard*
- Between Cary and Morrisville/RTP*
- Parts of Apex, Garner, and far northern Raleigh*

*Additionally, areas that show increased density, but were not along MTP High Capacity Transit Corridors include Northern Raleigh and along I-440, Along U.S. Route 1 between Raleigh and Apex, Along I-40 from Raleigh to RTP and North of RDU.*

*Member John Hodges Copple mentioned that it would be worthwhile for the slide that covers what can change the cost assumptions to mention changes in cost-share assumptions between Wake and Durham Counties. He also mentioned that, if Wake County is taking on debt to finance major projects, it would also be worthwhile to mention changes to financing expenses. Mr. Martin responded that there are way more things that could be listed on the slide, including cost share assumptions and financing costs. However, the slide is meant to merely be illustrative to make a general point. Currently, we are attempting to keep this presentation straightforward and simplified.*

*Member Jason Myers asked whether the reassessment of cost assumptions focused on bus services. Mr. Martin said that it did not. He explained that we are refining the costs of programmed bus services every Wake Transit Work Plan development cycle, which is resulting in overall budgets for services decreasing, but we are keeping those budgets conservative until we have a track record of actual costs for them. Mr. Martin also mentioned that the magnitude of the financial impact associated with bus services is minor compared to the impact of the high capacity transit capital projects, as they are the "elephant in the room" when it comes to consumption of financial capacity.*

**Wake Transit Plan Update Status Report item was received as information.**

**5.8 S-Line/SA-Line Resolution of Support**

Julie White, NCDOT Deputy Sec. for Multimodal Transportation

**Requested Action:** Consider approval of S-Line/SA-Line Resolution of Support.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[2020 S-Line Status](#)  
[Handout: About the S-Line](#)  
[CAMPO S-Line Resolution](#)

Mr. Brandon Watson, CAMPO Staff reported on this item.

Mr. Watson explained that NCDOT was not able to be here today to present but will be presenting at the Executive Board on March 18. NCDOT is looking to purchase the S-Line and SA-Line corridors with support from local governments and organizations in the area. The S-Line is a key segment of the southeast rail corridor between Raleigh and Petersburg, connecting our region to the northeast rail corridor. The SA-Line is a smaller segment between Ridgeway and Weldon.

Mr. Watson continued that Class 1 Railroads, such as CSX in this corridor, are rationalizing their networks which means they are focusing on core routes that carry large volumes of freight and selling off stub ended and redundant rail corridors that aren't being used to full potential. These lower volume and inactive corridors need to be preserved to serve existing and future industries providing passenger rail expansion opportunities.

Mr. Watson provided background information regarding the Virginia & CSX Landmark Rail Agreement from this past December as it relates to the current proposal. The State of Virginia purchased 225 miles of track and 350 miles of railroad ROW, part of which is the S-Line from Petersburg, Virginia to Ridgeway, North Carolina. Mr. Watson explained that state ownership allows for control of land and access, on-time service, implementation of future technologies and strategic economic development along the corridors. NCDOT views the S-Line Acquisition as an opportunity to connect rural and urban communities, expand access for freight and mega-sites and provide economic development opportunities. In addition, it would provide faster more reliable connectivity to the northeast, provide network resiliency, reduce passenger trip times, connect manufacturing and job centers to population centers, and free capacity for additional freight traffic on the CSX A-line.

Mr. Watson reviewed some of the existing conditions on the S-Line which include

- Petersburg to Ridgeway: Out of service, tracks removed, recently purchased by Virginia
- Ridgeway to Raleigh: 25 mph, local freight traffic only
- Raleigh to Hamlet: 60 mph, local freight + passenger service
- The SA-Line is currently inactive from Ridgeway to Weldon that runs east-west

Mr. Watson provided information regarding the status of the grant opportunity. NC and Virginia completed NEPA documentation back in 2017 for the Raleigh to Richmond corridor which means ROW and construction can proceed with funding. NCDOT is now looking to pursue funding to purchase its portion of the corridor through a Federal Railroad Administration grant program for Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements, or CRISI. This year in particular, CRISI's program allows for an additional funding category for ROW acquisition, reserving \$45 M. North Carolina sees this as an

opportunity to apply for this funding, with a federal/local match of 80/20 minimum. They are looking for resolutions of support from local governments and agencies.

Mr. Watson stressed that a Resolution of Support will make the grant application stronger. He stated that resolutions in support of the development of the S-Line and SA-Line have been passed by Wake County Commission, TARPO, Town of Franklinton, Town of Sanford, Town of Wake Forest, Lee County Commission and Wake Forest Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Watson also provided background information for the CRISI Program, which highlighted how successful NCDOT has been to date, such as grade separation projects along rail corridors. He stated that the CRISI 2020 Release of Funding Opportunity has the target date of late Spring / early Summer so they are hoping to have Resolutions of Support by April.

Mr. Watson concluded by reiterating the opportunity to build on Virginia's success and provided the proposed Next Steps, which include encouraging local government and others to pass resolutions of support, seeking matching non-Federal funds for CRISI application, competing for CRISI 2020, partnering with MPOs, RPOs, and communities to advance corridor development and planning, and securing funding for incremental projects through STI and federal discretionary grants to improve rail infrastructure for new rail services.

Member Jay Heikes asked if the slide showing different rail lines in the Southeast Corridor shows station locations. Mr. Watson replied he believed that the map is showing current and potential locations which would be worked out in more detail after further study.

Vice Chair Eric Lamb inquired if there would be opportunity to add language regarding Rails to Trails consideration. Mr. Watson responded that this was not within the current Resolution of Support, but something NCDOT could consider in the future.

Member Jason Myers asked for clarification if the Resolution of Support was written by CAMPO or given as an example from NCDOT. Mr. Watson answered that we started with what was suggested from NCDOT, added two suggestions from CAMPO staff regarding the 2045 MTP and identifying the corridor as integral to the region's freight network.

CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina stated that NCDOT is asking for the resolution of support to help with their application and suggested that the TCC may want to have a discussion at another time regarding our vision for the corridor, and local desires regarding future services on the corridors. Vice Chair Eric Lamb said that there was enthusiastic support for the current proposed resolution, but he would appreciate a discussion about those items. Mr. Lukasina noted that we could do an additional resolution about that in the future.

**A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Member Jay Heikes to recommend approval of S-Line Resolution of Support to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

## 5.9

**Safety Performance Measures and Targets FY20**

Alex Rickard, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Review safety performance targets and recommend Executive Board agree to plan and program projects that contribute toward the accomplishment of the State's targets.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[CAMPO PM1 FY20](#)

CAMPO Deputy Director Alex Rickard reported on this item.

Mr. Rickard provided a brief background. He stated that CAMPO is required by federal law through the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act to adopt 18 specific transportation performance measures. These measures are divided into four categories: Safety, Pavement/Bridge, System Performance, and Transit Assets.

Mr. Rickard explained that MPOs are required to establish performance targets for each of these measures on an annual basis by either:

1. Agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute towards the accomplishment of the State DOT targets or
2. Develop their own quantifiable targets for their metropolitan planning area by a methodology consistent with federal reporting requirements

Mr. Rickard reviewed that MPOs are further required to establish their targets not later than 180 days after the State DOT establishes and reports targets. NCDOT establishes and reports their targets in August. CAMPO must establish and adopt these by February. He stated these should have been released last month but they are now posted to the MPO's website for public review and comment and will be presented to the Executive Board during their March meeting. Targets include the number of fatalities, Fatality rate (per 100 million VMT), number of serious injuries, serious injury rate (per 100 million VMT) and the number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries.

Mr. Rickard requested that the TCC recommend to the Executive Board that they agree to continue to plan and program projects to support the NCDOT Safety and Performance Targets.

Mr. Rickard presented targets for these categories from 2014-2018, and 2016-2020. The current targets require a slight reduction in each category.

Safety Performance Measure	2014-2018	2016-2018
Total Fatalities	1,396.4	1,227.8
Rate of Fatalities	1.211	1.084
Total Serious Injuries	3,362.6	2,812.8
Rate Serious Injuries	2.886	2.462
Total Non-motorized Fatalities & Serious Injuries	494.6	426.6

Mr. Rickard stated that it may not be possible to develop our own performance measures due to limitations of data and resources. Mr. Rickard stated that the MPO will continue to work with the state and other regional partners to obtain statistics and trends for the CAMPO region.

*Chair Juliet Andes asked about the ramifications if we missed those targets, and if it would affect funding. CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina stated that if we do not meet a specific target, possible steps would be taken to adjust programming in TIP to better meet that target, and/or adjust the targets themselves. Mr. Joe Geigle, FHWA staff commented that if the MPO were to select their own targets that would be the case. If the MPO adopts the state's targets there would be no foreseeable ramifications for missing the targets.*

*Vice Chair Lamb stated that he felt the information was lacking and could be more useful if it provided a more detailed breakdown of crashes. Mr. Rickard agreed and reported that the MPO will continue to try to retrieve more information specific to CAMPO.*

**A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Member John Hodges-Copple to approve the minutes from the TCC February 2020 meeting. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

## **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 2](#)

*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 2](#)

*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 March 2020 Project Updates**

**Requested Action:** Receive as information

**Attachments:** [TCC Project Updates March 2020](#)

*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 Mar 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***MPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina stated that:**-The NCAMPO conference will be held in Greenville from April 22-24, 2020, registration is open, and encouraged everyone to attend.**-MPO 101 has been rescheduled due to previous inclement weather for March 23, 2020 at 8:30 a.m. at CAMPO.**-NCDOT's Bike/Ped Planning Grant application period is now open and will close May 19, 2020. If any jurisdiction needs MPO Action, via letters of support, it must occur at the April Executive Board meeting. Please contact MPO staff as soon as possible to start coordinating.**-LAPP awardee training is on March 16 at CAMPO.**-Joe Huegy retired from ITRE. His position was filled by Leta Huntsinger.**TCC Chair - no report.**NCDOT Transportation Planning Division - Mr. Phil Geary said that the CTP 2.0 process development continues with a current focus on the mapping segment. The MPO will be involved in reviewing.**NCDOT Division 4 - no report.**NCDOT Division 5 - no report.**NCDOT Division 6 - Mr. Darius Sturdivant stated that project 5705, for NC 55 in Angier, was previously suspended and has been removed from the list. That project is moving forward with project development.**NCDOT Rail Division - absent.**NC Turnpike Authority - absent.**NCDOT Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning Division - absent. Alternate Paul Black added that the Triangle Bike & Ped workshop will be held on March 26, 2020 in Raleigh.***The Staff Reports item was received as information.**



**9. Adjournment**

## Upcoming Meetings/Events

<i>Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting</i>	<i>March 18, 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>MPO 101 Training</i>	<i>March 23, 2020</i>
<i>One Bank of America Plaza</i>	<i>8:30 - noon</i>
<i>421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203</i>	
<i>Raleigh, NC 27601</i>	
<i>Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting</i>	<i>April 2, 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>April 15, 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>May 7, 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>	