

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

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

Thursday, June 3, 2021

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 and asked if there were any new introductions to be made. There were no new members to be introduced. 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.

Each TCC member or alternate was asked to orally confirm attendance.

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

There was no adjustment to agenda.

3. Public Comments

Chair Andes opened Public Comments and explained the parameters of this format. As there were no members of the public who wished to speak, Chair Andes closed Public Comments.

4. Minutes

4.1 TCC May 2021 Meeting Minutes Draft

Requested Action: Approve the TCC May 2021 Meeting Minutes Draft

Attachments: [TCC May 2021 Meeting Minutes Draft](#)

A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Member Jason Brown to approve the TCC May 2021 Meeting Minutes Draft. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

5. Regular Business

5.1 Bus on Shoulder Study Report

Patrick McDonough, HDR

Requested Action: Receive as Information**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)
[BOSS Implementation Blueprint Report](#)

Mr. Patrick McDonough, HDR Senior Transit Planner / Transit-Oriented Development Lead and DHR Consultant Mr. Alpesh Patel reported on this item.

Mr. McDonough shared that the Triangle Region Bus on Shoulder System Expansion Study (BOSS) was guided by a Technical Steering Committee comprised of members from CAMPO, DCHC MPO, GoTriangle, NCDOT, NC State Highway Patrol, and the Regional Transportation Alliance.

He stated that the overall purpose of the study was to evaluate feasibility and the need for expanding Bus on Shoulder operations throughout the Triangle, create a blueprint for how other North Carolina regions can establish successful BOSS programs and document best practices and design criteria for BOSS that can be used statewide.

Mr. McDonough presented Peer Review Findings, which concluded that the Triangle / NC are already BOSS leaders, the BOSS has excellent safety record everywhere with regular maintenance supports operations/safety and that there is variety in BOSS Implementation. He presented a graphic for a project visualization in development for the Julia Tuttle Causeway in Miami, Florida.

Mr. McDonough reviewed information for the Criteria Development and Potential Facilities. He stated that BOSS documentation is almost non-existent (except FL, and now NC). The current study team created 24 minimum and recommended criteria for design and operations.

Mr. Alpesh Patel presented maps to showcase which facilities would benefit the most from BOSS and what facilities are opportunities based on existing plans and the STIP with a regional focus. He expressed that the most promising segments are as follows:

- US 1 from I-540 in Apex to I-40 in Raleigh, continuing along I-440 to Wade Avenue*
- I-40 from exit 289 to the Johnson County Line*
- I-440 from US 1 North to I-87 in East Raleigh*

Mr. McDonough said that future steps will be to continue active dialogue among Triangle BOSS team members, MPOs, transit agencies will engage NCDOT staff on which STIP projects could incorporate BOSS elements, and NCDOT will consider amendments to BOSS implementation and operating plan based on this study and additional NCDOT research.

Mr. McDonough concluded by provided contact information for this project:

CONTACTS

Shelby Powell – Deputy Director
CAMPO
Shelby.Powell@campo-nc.us

Patrick McDonough – Senior Transit Planner / Transit-Oriented Development Lead

HDR

Patrick.McDonough@hdrinc.com

Member Jason Myers asked where the current BOSS facilities are located. Mr. McDonough replied that it is currently 1-40 and asked GoTriangle staff for clarification on the status of the 540 project. Member Jay Heikes responded that they are in the process of signing an agreement with NCDOT for installation of signage that would allow deployment on 540 from NC 54 in Morrisville out to US-1 in both directions. The other facility that is operation now is at Wade Ave between 1-40 and the Beltline.

Member Jason Myers referred to the suitability analysis map and commented that there are a number of facilities that are not limited-access in multiple jurisdictions. He asked for clarification on how BOSS would work on an arterial surface street. Mr. McDonough responded that BOSS lives on a continuum. He cited an example in Minneapolis where there are BOSS modes that are more urban in context that have shoulder operations and are also arterial highways that are in arterial BOSS mode. He said he recognized that for certain selected roads some judgment calls were made. He added that the suitability level may change as roads change over time. He explained that some areas may technically score well, however may not be the right solution.

Member Jason Myers stated that he is color blind and made reference to the maps. He asked if surface streets are BRT opportunities and if Creedmoor Road is the least suitable, which Mr. McDonough confirmed. Mr. Patel reviewed the formula for the travel inputs that led to the scoring. He said there was a lot of conversation with the steering committee to refine the percent weights, and how to balance demand-based opportunities with areas of congestion that may allow for BOSS.

Member Shannon Cox asked if missing continued connections were an issue for BOSS and if not available in some areas, were some other high capacity solutions considered. Mr. McDonough responded that when viewing outside of the first two suitable facilities categories they recognize that some of the benefits of BOSS are heavily dependent upon the service planning and routing of the buses. While these might be BOSS opportunities on a certain type of roadway, when looking at the urban fabric may not be the most appropriate method. He added that even if there is a bus not in BOSS mode for the entire trip there could still be many benefits. He said the BOSS toolbox can be paired with other tools to improve transit as well.

Member Akul Nishawala asked for clarification of the blue triangle. Mr. Patel said those were intended to be locations of termini.

Member Jay Heikes commented he felt it would be beneficial to see a map for how Red Lane streets would interact with the BOSS network.

In the chat:

Member Jason Myers (internal) suggested: "CAMPO staff and HDR: I encourage a different symbology for this map (and maps like them). A blue-red (cool-warm) color ramp is more effective for those of us that are red-green colorblind." Both Deputy Director Alex Rickard and Mr. McDonough responded that they will consider how to incorporate this insight going forward in future materials.

Bus on Shoulder Study Report was received as information.

5.2 2021 NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Applications

Kenneth Withrow, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Recommend adoption of the 2021 NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Applications to the Executive Board.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Grant - MPO Resolution Youngsville CAMPO 2021-06-03](#)

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

Mr. Withrow stated that the NCDOT Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation, along with the Transportation Planning Branch provide funding grants totaling \$400,000 to municipalities throughout the state. He said the funds for this program are from earmark funds specifically set aside for bicycle and pedestrian planning.

He explained that the funds for this program are from earmark funds specifically set aside for bicycle and pedestrian planning, and that the Town of Garner and Town of Youngsville will be submitting pedestrian planning grant applications directly to the Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation for the 2021 "Call" for projects. He reminded all that an endorsement by the CAMPO Executive Board is required before NCDOT will consider the application.

A motion was made by Member Ben Howell, seconded by Member Sandi Bailey to recommend approval of the 2021 NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Applications. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.3

Sub-Allocation of American Rescue Plan Act Transit Formula Funds

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Approve the sub-allocation of American Rescue Plan Act transit formula funds in the amounts shown in the attached split letter to the Federal Transit Administration.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Attachment 1 - 2021 American Rescue Plan Sub-Allocation Split Letter - Draft](#)

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

Mr. Martin stated that in March of 2021, a total of \$32,723,559 in transit formula funding was made available for use in the Raleigh Urbanized Area (UZA) by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) through the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act. He said that this funding was made available for use by eligible federal formula transit grant recipients to aid in their recovery from revenue and cost impacts associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and is in addition to prior funding made available under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act and the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA). He explained that the eligible recipients for this funding in the Raleigh UZA are the City of Raleigh, Town of Cary, GoTriangle, and Wake County.

Mr. Martin said that while the prior CARES Act and CRRSAA formula apportionments to the Raleigh UZA were distributed among the UZA's eligible recipients using the same percentage shares they each receive from the distribution of regular annual Section 5307 apportionments, the City of Raleigh (as the designated recipient of federal formula transit grants to the Raleigh UZA) and CAMPO (which must concur with the distribution of formula grant funding) proposed to use a portion of the funds to support the continued suspension of fares across transit services provided in the region through FY 2022.

Mr. Martin expressed that the eligible recipients of the funding concurred with this proposal, agreed to suspend fare collection through FY 22, and propose to use a portion of the total \$32,723,559 apportionment to backfill budget shortfalls that would manifest by removing an assumption of fare revenues from their respective FY 2022 budgets. The total funding made available to the eligible recipients for this purpose totals \$723,094, and the breakdown of those funds among the eligible recipients are as follows:

Agency FY 22 Budgeted/Projected Fare Revenues

<i>City of Raleigh</i>	<i>\$0 (Using prior CARES Act apportionment to cover FY 22 fare suspension)</i>
<i>Town of Cary</i>	<i>\$220,996</i>
<i>Wake County</i>	<i>\$82,098</i>
<i>GoTriangle</i>	<i>\$420,000</i>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>\$723,094</i>

Mr. Martin explained that for the remaining \$32,000,465 of the total apportionment, CAMPO and the eligible funding recipients agreed to distribute the funds using the same percentage shares as the normal sub-allocation formula used to distribute the standard annual federal formula transit grant allocations to the Raleigh UZA, with one exception. If any of the eligible recipients could show that the particular recipient has experienced shortfalls of other normal and prevailing funding sources from the 4th quarter of FY 2020 projected through FY 2022 as a result of the pandemic that exceed the total amount of

revenue the respective recipient has received from the CARES Act and CRRSAA and would otherwise receive from the ARP, additional funds could be made available through the ARP apportionment. In response to this proposal, GoTriangle made a request to receive additional funds from the ARP apportionment beyond what GoTriangle would otherwise receive. Through verification of the request, CAMPO staff found that GoTriangle's total shortfall of its other normal and prevailing funding sources during the referenced period exceeds the total amount of revenue GoTriangle would receive from the aforementioned federal funding apportionments by approximately \$1.94 million. Accordingly, the proposed sub-allocation of funds makes this additional amount available to GoTriangle and distributes the remaining funds to the City of Raleigh, Town of Cary, and Wake County in accordance with the respective remaining percentage shares they each represent. Mr. Martin then shared the final proposed sub-allocation amounts for each of the recipient transit agencies.

Member Shannon Cox asked if the total of the coronavirus relief funding over the past year and a half is more than what was actually lost due to COVID-19. Mr. Martin responded that all of the transit agencies have experienced revenue shortfalls and additional pandemic-related costs to maintain health and safety protocols over the past year and a half. He mentioned that, while the distribution of funding has probably been disproportionate to what the needs are across the recipient transit agencies, basically it is an overall net positive gain of transit funds to the Raleigh Urbanized Area.

A motion was made by Alternate Morgan Simmons, seconded by Member Shannon Cox to recommend approval of the sub-allocation of American Rescue Plan Act transit formula funds in the amounts shown in the attached split letter to the Federal Transit Administration to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.4 Locally Preferred Alternative for Wake BRT: Southern Corridor

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Adopt the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Wake BRT: Southern Corridor.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment A - Wake BRT - Southern Corridor Alternatives](#)

[Attachment B - Wake BRT Southern Corridor LPA](#)

[Attachment C - Southern BRT LPA Draft Executive Board Resolution](#)

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

Mr. Martin reminded all that this information was presented in detail at last month's May TCC meeting. He gave a brief overview of the six potential alternatives for the Northern and Section sections. The alignments within the Northern Section would use a combination of Wilmington, Salisbury, Blount, South, and Morgan Streets in downtown Raleigh and either S. Wilmington Street, S. McDowell Street or S. Saunders Street from downtown Raleigh to the convergence of S. Saunders Street and S. Wilmington Street at US 70. He said the alignments within the Southern Section would use either Fayetteville Road (US 70/US 401) or S. Wilmington Street Extension (proposed new roadway) and Garner Station Boulevard to connect to Purser Drive in Garner.

Mr. Martin reviewed that consideration of a locally preferred alternative (LPA) for a high-capacity, fixed-guideway transit project involves three characteristics of a proposed project: mode, alignment, and termini. In its evaluation of modes, alignments, and termini along the corridor and between downtown Raleigh and Purser Drive in Garner, the City of Raleigh, in cooperation with the Town of Garner, determined that the Wilmington Street to Wilmington Street Extension and Garner Station Boulevard alternative (identified in Attachment B) is the most suitable alternative for adequately serving the travel market identified in the MIS and that satisfies the purpose and need for the project.

Mr. Martin presented the rationale for the support of the LPA which involves 1) Purpose and Need for Project (Improve transit service, accommodate projected growth, bypass major congestion points and improve attractiveness of service to result in ridership growth) and 2) Analysis of potential alternatives (alignment: Most suitable alternative that serves the identified travel market that satisfies project purpose and need; Mode: Most cost-effective and least intrusive mode that satisfies purpose and need; and Termini: Provides direct access to major origins and destinations that shape the travel market.)

Mr. Martin stated that the LPA has been proposed by the City of Raleigh for concurrence by the Cooperating Agencies of NCDOT, CAMPO, SHPO, Town of Garner, NCDEQ, and USACE. All have been received except for SHPO, which they hope to secure before the Executive Board meeting later this month.

Mr. Martin concluded by presenting the LPA Consideration Schedule. The proposed LPA was posted for a public comment period on May 6th and will close on June 13th. The Executive Board held a public hearing on the LPA at its May 19th regular meeting. No members of the public came forward to speak on the item at the public hearing. Executive Board approval will be sought at its regular June 16th meeting.

A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Alternate Morgan Simmons to recommend adoption of the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Wake BRT: Southern Corridor to the Executive Board, pending no adverse and actionable public comment. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.5 Policy Framework for Use of Wake Transit Funds to Acquire Real Property

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Approve the Policy Framework for Use of Wake Transit Funds to Acquire Real Property.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Attachment 1 - Policy Framework for Use of Wake Transit Funds to Acquire Real Property](#)

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

Mr. Martin said that at its May 12th regular meeting, the Wake County Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC) recommended approval to CAMPO and the GoTriangle Board of Trustees of a policy framework for the use of Wake Transit funds to acquire real property.

He stated that the primary purpose of the policy framework is to clarify the requirements and responsibilities of Wake Transit Plan implementation project sponsors and assigned lead agencies. Mr. Martin provided a detailed breakdown for the following: Purpose, Applicability, Submission of Information for Consideration of Funding Real Property Acquisition, Real Property Inventory and Utilization Plan and Further Methods of Institutionalization.

1. Purpose

Clarify Requirements and Responsibilities of Project Sponsors and Lead Agencies For:

- *Submission of Information for TPAC Review of Requests*
- *Maintaining and Reporting Certain Information for Applicable Real Property*
- *Allowable Methods for Disposal and Use of Applicable Proceeds*
- *Methods for Incorporating Tenets of Policy Framework into Program-Level Processes for Transit Plan Implementation*

2. Applicability

- *Acquisition and management, use and disposition of real property acquired using Wake Transit Tax Revenues*
- *Does not apply to real property leasing or acquisition of personal property, real property easements, or other nonpossessory interests*
- *Transit centers, maintenance facilities, transit stations, park-and-ride facilities, laydown areas, admin offices, ROW for fixed-guideway facilities*
- *Applicable federal/state law controls in any instances of conflict*

Applicability Threshold(s)

All Individual Parcels or Combination of Contiguous Parcels That Exceed:

- *0.10 acre (~4,350 square feet) AND >\$50,000 value*

EXCEPT

- *Real property to exclusively support street side bus stop or bus transfer point infrastructure that does not exceed 0.50 acre (~21,780 square feet) AND >\$75,000*

3. Submission of Information for Consideration of Funding Real Property Acquisition

Mr. Martin shared that the following information for TPAC Review should be submitted with project funding request forms or applicable amendment request forms beginning July

1st: Necessity, Location and Size, Property Value, Funding Sources, Title Issues, Environmental Issues, Displacements and Incidental Uses.

He said that the TPAC's Standard of Review when a funding request for real property is submitted includes:

- Need – Is acquisition necessary as opposed to other alternatives?*
- Cost – Are the costs reasonable for the project's relative level of priority and compared to other options?*
- Location – Does the location comport with the needs of the project and its role in implementing the Wake Transit Plan*

4. Real Property Inventory and Utilization Plan

(Information required to be maintained and reported for Wake Transit-funded real property)

- a) Work Plan Project ID*
- b) Property Location*
- c) Summary of Conditions on Title*
- d) Original Acquisition Cost*
- e) Appraised/Assessed Value and Appraisal Date*
- f) Wake Transit Financial Participation Percentage and of Other Funding Partners*
- g) Description of Existing Improvements*
- h) Current and Planned Use of Property and Proposal for Disposition, if Applicable*

He said this is minimally updated and reported annually with 4th Quarter Progress Report and applies to all Wake Transit-funded property, regardless of when funding was requested.

5. Disposal Methods /Use of Proceeds

(Allowable methods for the disposal and use of proceeds for Wake Transit-funded real property)

- No Remaining Eligible Use = Dispose of Property Within 3 Years in Accordance With Available Methods*
- Method #1: Sell and Reimburse Wake Capital Fund*
- Method #2: Offset Within Same Distinct Wake Transit-Funded Project*
- Method #3: Sell and Keep Net Proceeds in Open Project*
- Method #4: Transfer Property to Other Eligible Project*
- Method #5: Retain Title with Buyout*
- Applicable federal/state rules control in any instances of conflict when there is a federal/state interest in subject property*

6. Further Methods of Institutionalization

Mr. Martin explained that applicable project-level agreements will require compliance with the adopted policy framework.

A motion was made by Alternate Morgan Simmons, seconded by Member Jason Myers to recommend approval of the Policy Framework for Use of Wake Transit Funds to Acquire Real Property to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.6**Wake Transit Financial Policies & Guidelines Amendments**

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Approve the proposed amendments to the Wake Transit Financial Policies & Guidelines.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment 1 - 2021 Amendments to Wake Transit Financial Policies and Guidelines](#)

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

Mr. Martin shared that at its April 21st regular meeting, the TPAC recommended two (2) amendments to the Wake Transit Financial Policies & Guidelines originally adopted in 2017. The language resulting from these amendments is highlighted in yellow in Attachment 1, which is the proposed updated/amended Wake Transit Financial Policies & Guidelines document. The first amendment (page 4 in Attachment 1) incorporates updated language in the 'Wake Operating and Capital Funding Sources' section that is based on a recommendation from the Government Finance Officers Association and the Triangle Tax District auditors.

Mr. Martin explained this language change requires the respective ordinances for both the Wake Operating Fund and Wake Capital Fund to show the tax revenues being used to balance against each respective category of expenditures. Previously, all tax revenues for both the Wake Operating Fund and Wake Capital Fund were shown as revenues to balance expenses in both funds in just the ordinance for the Wake Operating Fund.

Mr. Martin said that the second amendment (page 8 in Attachment 1) restricts the types of Wake Transit operating projects for which funds may be encumbered in a fiscal year and carried over for use in the subsequent fiscal year. Under the currently adopted policies and guidelines, there is no restriction for the types of operating projects for which project sponsors can encumber and carry forward funds. He stated that the proposed amendment allows operating projects that are categorized in annual Wake Transit Work Plans as contracted or administrative expenses to have unused funds encumbered and carried forward to a subsequent fiscal year. The amendment would restrict this for such expenses as staffing, bus operations, site leasing, bus infrastructure maintenance, and so forth.

A motion was made by Member Ben Howell, seconded by Alternate Morgan Simmons to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Wake Transit Financial Policies & Guidelines to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.7**FY 2022 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan**

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

Requested Action: 1) Approve the FY 2022 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan and its corresponding project agreement structure; and 2) Authorize the Executive Director to execute any applicable project-level agreements to which CAMPO is a party.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment 1 - FY 22 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan](#)

[Attachment 2 - Project Agreement Groupings and Reporting Deliverables](#)

[Attachment 3 - FY22 Wake Transit Work Plan Engagement Summary Report](#)

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

Mr. Martin stated that this information had been presented in detail during previous meetings, and reviewed the adoption schedule.

Mr. Martin reminded all that at its April 21, 2021 regular meeting, the Wake County Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC) recommended a FY 2022 Wake Transit Work Plan to CAMPO and the GoTriangle Board of Trustees for their consideration of adoption in June. A public comment period was held in late April through late May and the Executive Board held a public hearing and received this as information at its regular May meeting as well. Today the TCC is being asked to consider recommendation of adoption, and the Executive will consider adoption on June 16, 2021. Consideration of adoption is expected from the GoTriangle Board of Trustees on June 23, 2021.

Mr. Martin briefly reviewed the numerous FY22 Wake Transit Work Plan Public Engagement outreach efforts analytics. He shared that for the FY22 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan, there were seven (7) separate commenters that shared comments. Comments included: a need for more bus service with flexible schedules in Raleigh; excitement about the DRX service enhancement, improved bus stops and larger transit hubs/centers, and continued development of BRT corridors; implementation of plan needs to move faster to break subservience to the automobile; excitement with investment in mobile ticketing; the need to extend the GoCary Route 5 to Ten Ten Road; and that there should be no increase in taxes for transit and that road improvements are more important.

A motion was made by Alternate Morgan Simmons, seconded by Member Jason Myers to 1) Recommend approval to the Executive Board of the TPAC-recommended FY 2022 Wake Transit Work Plan and its corresponding project agreement structure; and 2) Recommend that the Executive Board authorize the Executive Director to execute any applicable project-level agreements to which CAMPO is a party. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.8 FYs 2022 and 2023 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310) Program Project Selection

Crystal Odum, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Recommend the approval of the 5310 program of projects in Attachment A to the Executive Board.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Attachment A - FY22-23 5310 Program of Projects](#)

Ms. Crystal Odum, MPO Staff reported on this item.

Ms. Crystal Odum reminded all that each year, the Raleigh Urbanized Area (UZA) is apportioned formula grant funding by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities program. Section 5310 funds are available for capital and operating expenses that support the provision of enhanced transportation services to meet the specific needs of elderly persons and persons with disabilities outlined in the region's coordinated public transit and human services transportation plan. The City of Raleigh/GoRaleigh, the federally recognized designated recipient of Section 5310 funding for the Raleigh UZA, and CAMPO developed and adopted a program management plan in June 2015 that lays out the policies and procedures for project selection, funding distribution and administration of projects supported by the funding.

Ms. Odum shared that in accordance with the 2020 updated program management plan that was adopted by the RTA and endorsed by the CAMPO Executive Board on last year September, GoRaleigh administered a 2021 call for eligible projects February 26 to March 26, 2021 soliciting applications for projects that are scheduled to occur within a two-year period from October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2023 that would make use of the Raleigh UZA's Section 5310 funding.

Ms. Odum said that in response to the call for projects, a total of seven (7) applications were received from various agencies. A project selection committee made recommendation on which projects should be awarded funding based on selection criteria outlined in the adopted program management plan. She provided a schedule for the Call for Projects:

- *Applications accepted February 26 – March 26*
- *Approximately 200 agency, non-profit, and providers were contacted by the City of Raleigh*
- *Virtual grant webinar and recorded presentation:*
- *Webinar: March 9, 2021*
- *Recorded Webinar: Posted March 12 on GoRaleigh's website*
- *Applications evaluated by TCC Scoring Subcommittee on April 9 & April 16*
- *Public comment period April 26 – May 27*
- *Public hearing May 19 held at the Executive Board Meeting*
- *Program of Projects approval in June*

She shared that six (6) of the seven (7) applications were determined to be eligible for the available funding and are recommended for funding. One applicant was deemed ineligible and eliminated from funding consideration for a variety of reasons, including that the proposed project (a grocery delivery service) does not actually provide transportation services and that the submitted match letter was invalid.

Ms. Odum concluded by saying a thirty (30) day public comment period was held April 26, 2021 to May 27, 2021 advising of the 5310 Section Recommended Program of Projects for FY 2022- 2023 and that no comments were received. A Public Hearing was held at the May 19, 2021 CAMPO Executive Board meeting.

A motion was made by Member Ben Howell, seconded by Alternate Larry Smith to recommend approval of the 5310 program of projects in Attachment A to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5.9**Amendment #5 to FY2020-2029 Transportation Improvement Program**

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[CAMPO TIP Amendment #5](#)

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

Ms. Vetter explained that CAMPO has received notification from NCDOT of changes to regional projects that require amending the Transportation Improvement Program. She said this amendment will also include changes submitted from transit providers to reflect their current budgets.

Ms. Vetter presented information for the new format and said the Amendment #5 will be posted for public comment from June 1st-August 15th, with a public hearing scheduled for the June 16th Executive Board Meeting.

The Amendment #5 to FY2020-2029 Transportation Improvement Program Report was received as information.

5.10 Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) FFY2023 Proposed Changes and Target Modal Investment Mix

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[FY2023 LAPP Potential Changes Memo](#)

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

Ms. Vetter explained the Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) FFY2023 Call for Projects is anticipated to open in August of 2021. The LAPP Steering Committee has provided recommendations for changes to the Program and the Target Modal Investment Mix. She said this was posted for public comment on June 1st and will run through August 15th. Ms. Vetter stated that a public hearing is scheduled for June 16th Executive Board meeting and that the One-Call-For-All (LAPP & UPWP) is anticipated to open at the August 18th Executive Board Meeting.

Ms. Vetter announced that there were 7 issues for either action (1-5) or discussion (6-7), which include:

- 1. Buffer for Bicycle and Pedestrian Connection Criteria*
- 2. Parallel Route Selection Requirement*
- 3. Project Cost Application Fields (Administrative)*
- 4. Location Requirements for Bundled Transit Projects*
- 5. Target Modal Investment Mix*
- 6. Including Equity in LAPP Scoring Criteria*
- 7. LAPP Selection Panel Policy Recommendations*

Ms. Vetter provided a breakdown for each issue along with staff recommendations, which are as follows:

Issue #1: Buffer for Bicycle and Pedestrian connection criteria

Ms. Vetter explained that with regards to Network Connections the project must be within approximately ¼-mile of activity centers, high density residential development, or government facilities. To qualify for these points, the activity centers, etc. must be existing, under construction at the time of application, or obligated for federal or state construction funding at the time of application. The project will receive one point for each connection made, up to a maximum of 15 points. To receive these points, network connections must be identified on the project map and/or listed in the application. She stated the proposal is to increase buffer to ½ mile for greenway projects, due to isolated nature of greenway projects relative to sidewalk/complete streets/bike lane projects. Ms. Vetter stated CAMPO staff recommendation for Issue #1 is to keep buffer distances consistent between bike/ped project types because 1) the program evaluates projects on their service of a transportation purpose, rather than recreation, 2) different buffers would imply different standards of measuring connectivity between project types and 3) the program uses a balanced scoring system.

Issue #2: Parallel Route Selection requirement

Ms. Vetter explained that roadway projects on new locations are evaluated using a "parallel route". Elements of TEAAS (Safety), V/C Ratio and Travel Time Savings are considered. She said that the current selection process is informal. These are submitted by the applicant and reviewed by CAMPO. Ms. Vetter expressed that the

CAMPO Staff Staff Recommendation for Issue #2 is to add a field to the application for parallel route and require submittal prior to pre-submittal meetings. This will allow time for discussion and collection of TEAAS reports prior to submittal window deadline.

Issue #3: Project Cost Application Fields (Administrative

Ms. Vetter said that LAPP applicants are required to submit the following cost and match information as a part of their application:

- Cost by phase of work*
- Total project cost*
- Total cost requested from CAMPO*
- Local match*

She stated that all fields are individual and do not have any consistency checks in place to ensure costs and match are accurate. Ms. Vetter said the CAMPO staff recommendation is to update the LAPP application to include consistency checks as part of cost and match information.

Issue #4: Location requirements for bundled transit projects

Ms. Vetter stated the current policy is that LAPP transit applications are not required to include locations of bundled projects Ex: bus stop improvements, enhanced transfer points. She said this Issue was raised by the LAPP Selection Panel after the FFY22 round and is intended to help evaluate projects similar to each other and also to assist with tracking projects after funding awarded. Ms. Vetter shared that the CAMPO staff recommendation for Issue #4 is to require locations to be identified for bundled transit projects.

Issue #5: Target Modal Investment Mix

Ms. Vetter reviewed the following information:

FFY 2022 Target Modal Investment Mix

- Roadway 65% \$16,250,000*
- Bike/Ped 27% \$6,750,000*
- Transit 8% \$2,000,000*

She said for the Modal Investment Mix there is a general need for additional funding in all modes but the Committee cannot justify increasing one mode at the expense of others. She added there are future funding uncertainties and thought should be given to Federal funding reauthorization, over-programming and existing LAPP projects cost overruns. She expressed that the CAMPO staff recommendation for Issue #5 is to keep the same target modal investment mix and tentative programming amount (\$25m) as prior round of LAPP. If new funding information is made available, CAMPO Staff or LAPP Selection Panel may recommend revising programming amount.

Issue #6: Equity in LAPP Scoring

Ms. Vetter stated that Equity in Scoring Criteria has been discussed through multiple LAPP iterations. She noted that equity has not been added to the program yet because there are concerns on how to properly include equity in scoring and nuances on how equity is measured. She presented the CAMPO staff recommendation for Issue #6 which is to use the next two LAPP cycles to introduce equity in LAPP scoring criteria through a 2 year process.

- Year 1: Initial discussions and completion of LAPP Strategic Plan Update and Public Participation Plan*
- Year 2: Use feedback to develop scoring criteria, weights, and measures*

Issue #7: LAPP Selection Panel Recommendations

Ms. Vetter stated that the LAPP Selection Panel provided policy-level recommendations as part of their FFY22 meetings and that there is not a consensus on actionable items for policy issues for the following:

- 1. Logical Termini*
- 2. Conscious Development*
- 3. Accessibility and Environmental Justice in Transit Scoring*
- 4. Inclusion of Dedicated Access to Transit Funds in Wake County Transit Plan*

She said that the CAMPO staff recommendation is to review policy concerns with LAPP Selection Panel and at future LAPP trainings.

Ms. Vetter concluded by saying that this presentation today was for information only, and that action will be requested during the August meetings.

Member Shannon Cox commented that there is never enough funding and if additional funding for transit was available would the TCC want to revisit the modal mix based on that.

Alternate Sandi Bailey added that she felt the focus for Issue #1 should be less on recreation and transportation and more on the on reach of bike projects versus pedestrian projects when considering a buffer distance.

In the chat:

Alternate Margaret Scully stated "If reviewing funding for transit, I encourage the group to review and consider all funding available for roadway improvements in the region whether distributed by CAMPO or directly by state. I would also recommend a review of the formula used for distribution of formula FTA funds before removing transit from LAPP funding." Ms. Vetter thanked her for the comment. CAMPO staff member Bret Martin said that CAMPO is currently locked into an MOU that dictates the distribution of federal formula funds through the FFY 22 apportionment, but that CAMPO will have to revisit and renegotiate it before the FFY 2023 apportionment.

The Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) FFY2023 Proposed Changes and Target Modal Investment Mix Report was received as information.

5.11**2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP/CTP) Update**

Chris Lukasina, CAMPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[2050 MTP Schedule](#)

The 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP/CTP) Update Report was received as information.

6. Informational Item: Budget

6.1 **Member Shares FY 2021**
Lisa Blackburn, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as Information

Attachments: [FY 2021 Projected Member Dues Q3](#)

The Member Shares Report was included in the agenda packet.

The Member Shares Report was received as information.

6.2

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [FY 2021 Projected Budget Q3](#)

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 June 2021 Project Updates

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [TCC June 2021 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: [TCC Public Engagement Updates June 2021](#)

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 Strategic Plan Update has begun this month and that everyone should anticipate being contacted soon by either CAMPO staff or the consultant firm Fountainworks. He said that in person retreats for both the TCC and Executive Board were being discussed, and could be held virtually, depending on pandemic conditions.

-Mr. Lukasina stated that CAMPO has hired a new part time employee, Mr. Daniel Spruill who will begin on June 14, 2021.

-Mr. Lukasina said that currently there are no July action items scheduled. TCC Chair Juliette Andes stated that they will wait to see what the Executive Board decides regarding cancelling July meetings and follow suit.

NCDOT Transportation Planning Division – no report.

NCDOT Division 4 – no report.

NCDOT Division 5 – no report.

NCDOT Division 6 – no report.

NCDOT Rail Division – no report.

NC Turnpike Authority – no report.

NCDOT Integrated Mobility Division – absent.

TCC Members - Member Hank Graham announced that he would be leaving the Research Triangle Foundation on June 11, 2021, and that he will inform all for his replacement when he/she is named.

Chair Andes thanked everyone for their participation.

The Staff Reports item was received as information.

9. Adjournment

Upcoming Meetings/Events

Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting *June 16, 2021*
One Bank of America Plaza *4:00 - 6:00*
421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203
Raleigh, NC 27601

Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting *July 1, 2021*
One Bank of America Plaza *10:00 - noon*
421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203
Raleigh, NC 27601

Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting *July 21, 2021*
One Bank of America Plaza *4:00 - 6:00*
421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203
Raleigh, NC 27601

Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting *August 5, 2021*
One Bank of America Plaza *10:00 - noon*
421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203
Raleigh, NC 27601