

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 6, 2019

10:00 AM

Conference Room

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Andes welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked if there were any new member introductions. There were none.

Present: 27 - Member Juliet Andes, Sandi Bailey, Paul Black, Jason Brown, Bob Clark, Shannon Cox, Luana Deans, David DeYoung, Tim Gardiner, Phil Geary, Joe Geigle, Geoff Green, John Hodges-Copple, Benjamin Howell, Danny Johnson, Sean Johnson, David Keilson, David McRae, Suzette Morales, Jason Myers, Branston Newton, Morgan Simmons, Tracy Stephenson, Darius Sturdivant, Jimmy Eatmon, Michael Clark, and Tim Bender

Absent: 11 - David Bergmark, Gregory Bethea, Kelly Blazey, Tim Brock, Michael Frangos, Scott Hammerbacher, Justin Jorgensen, Mike Kennon, Michael Landguth, Kendra Parrish, and Pamela Perry

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

There were no adjustments to the agenda.

3. Public Comments

Chair Andes opened Public Comments. Ms. Jennifer Delcourt, Wake County Human Services Staff reported that although the current Active Routes to Schools project had ended, the NCDOT Bike Ped Division developed a grant program to fund coordination for local Safe Routes to Schools programs. Wake County's grant submission had been successful. Ms. Delcourt thanked everyone who submitted a letter of support for this project, and noted that she will stay on staff at Wake County to coordinate the program.

There were no other members of the public that requested to speak. Chair Andes closed Public Comments.

4. Minutes

4.1 Draft minutes from TCC May 2, 2019 meeting

Requested Action: Approval of the minutes.

Attachments: [Draft Minutes - May 2, 2019 TCC Meeting](#)

Draft minutes were included in the agenda.

A motion was made by Member Ben Howell, seconded by Member Geoff Green that the minutes from the previous May 2019 meeting be approved. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

5. Regular Business

5.1 FY 20 Unified Planning Work Program - Amendment #1

Shelby Powell, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Recommend the Executive Board adopt Amendment #1 to the FY 20 UPWP.

Attachments: [FY 2020 UPWP - Amendment #1](#)
[FY 2020 UPWP - Original](#)
[FY 2020 Member Dues - Amended](#)
[Resolution - Adoption of Amendment #1](#)

CAMPO Deputy Director Ms. Shelby Powell reported on this item.

Ms. Powell stated that, due to a redistribution of un-used planning funds by the NCDOT, CAMPO has received an additional \$481,601 in planning funds for FY 20. This funding will alleviate the need to utilize as much of the MPO's discretionary STBGDA funds to complete our FY 20 work program. These funds also will help cover a small adjustment in benefit costs. Ms. Powell explained that the scope of the FY 20 UPWP will not change; the funding sources for the work have been updated in the attached table. As a result of the increased planning funding, the anticipated member shares will also increase slightly. The attached Member Shares table outlines anticipated changes to the previous estimates.

Ms. Powell reported that the Amendment has been available for public comment between May 6, 2019 and June 5, 2019, and that no comments had been received. The Executive Board will consider adoption of the Amendment at its June 19, 2019 meeting.

A motion was made by Member Ben Howell, seconded by Alternate Paul Black that the FY 20 Unified Planning Work Program - Amendment #1 be recommended to the Executive Board for approval. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

5.2 2019 NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Applications

Kenneth Withrow, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Adoption of Resolution to Endorse the Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant application.

Attachments: [Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Grant MPO Resolution Clayton CAMPO 2019](#)
[Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Grant MPO Resolution Franklinton CAMPO 2019](#)

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, provides funding for grants to municipalities throughout the state for use in planning for bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Mr. Withrow reported that the Town of Franklinton and the Town of Clayton will be submitting an application directly to the Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation as of August 2, 2019 for the 2019 "Call" for projects. 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 Alternate Luana Deans that the 2019 NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Applications be recommended to the Executive Board for approval. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

5.3

FY 2020 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Consider recommending adoption of the TPAC-recommended FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan and approval of the corresponding project agreement structure to the Executive Board

Attachments: [Attachment A - Final Recommended FY 2020 Work Plan](#)
[Attachment B - Recommended Project Agreement Groupings](#)

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

Mr. Martin stated that at its April 23, 2019, regular meeting, the Wake County Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC) recommended a FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan to CAMPO and the GoTriangle Board of Trustees for their consideration of adoption in June. A draft of the TPAC-recommended FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan is provided as Attachment A. Annual Wake Transit Work Plans contain a number of elements that work to authorize and institutionalize Wake County Transit Plan implementation investment decisions, including:

- 1) Annual operating and capital budgets and corresponding ordinances;*
- 2) Annual updates to a 10-year multi-year operating program for future operating expenditures;*
- 3) Annual updates to a 10-year capital improvement plan (CIP) for future capital expenditures;*
- 4) Annual updates to the transit plan's supporting financial plan and model assumptions; and*
- 5) Capital and operating funding agreements that support and are supported by the annual budgets.*

Mr. Martin explained that for the TPAC-recommended FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan, all of the aforementioned elements are included in Attachment A with the exception of the annual capital and operating funding agreements. The TPAC-recommended project agreement structure, including groupings of projects for each agreement and required reporting deliverables for each project type, is provided as Attachment B.

In transitioning from the Draft FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan released by the TPAC for public comment in February to the TPAC-recommended FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan provided as Attachment A, the TPAC made a number of changes to the work plan based on public comment and further consideration of project needs and associated cost estimates. These changes include:

- 1) An overall reduction in recurring expenses and refined/updated scope detail for staff resources;*
- 2) Adjustments for the addition of external revenue sources (e.g., federal and state grants);*
- 3) Schedule adjustments for delivery of some capital projects;*
- 4) Inclusion of individual funded FY 2020 Community Funding Area Program projects;*
- 5) Minor scope changes to bus service projects (e.g., increased frequency on the North Raleigh Express); and*
- 6) Programming the New Bern BRT as a separate discrete project in the multi-year CIP.*

Mr. Martin reported that the TPAC-recommended FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan was released for a 30-day public comment period from May 2nd through June 1st. While no

public comments were received, minor comments were received from FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan project sponsors to update cost and schedule information that came to light after the TPAC's recommendation action on the work plan.

Member John Hodges-Copple asked whether the costs listed were total costs, or federal shares only. Mr. Martin responded that it was the total cost reflected in the work program, and that it may be broken out more when a TIP amendment happens. Member Jason Myers inquired about the rationale for stretching the construction funding over three years instead of encumbering it all up front. Mr. Martin explained that these were programming numbers only, so they were based on estimated reimbursement. Mr. Lukasina added that it is standard procedure to program things out over the life of a project since reimbursement occurs over a period of time.

Mr. Martin added that the agreement structure in the agenda packet is also part of the requested action.

A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Alternate Tim Bender that the FY 2020 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan be recommended to the Executive Board for approval. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

5.4

Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Project Management Structure

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Consider approval of the Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Project Management Structure

Attachments: [Attachment A - Commuter Rail Project Management Structure](#)
[Attachment B - FAQs-AA Update Schedule-Technical Advisory Group](#)

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

Mr. Martin stated that in its preparation for entering into the next phase of pre-project development (i.e., 2011 alternatives analysis update) to study the commuter rail corridor identified in the Wake Transit Plan and the 2045 CAMPO and DCHC MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plans, GoTriangle, in consultation with CAMPO, North Carolina Railroad, Wake County, Durham County, Research Triangle Park Foundation, and the DCHC MPO, negotiated and prepared a draft project management structure to serve as a blueprint for implementing any future phases of commuter rail project implementation. The draft project management structure contains the following elements:

- 1) Defined members of a project management committee (PMC) that will provide technical and project management direction to the project sponsor;*
- 2) Formation of a technical advisory group, comprised of representatives from local/municipal governments along the corridor, that will provide input at key milestones throughout the alternatives analysis update and future phases of implementation;*
- 3) Defined relationships between the project sponsor and the PMC for interfacing with stakeholders, consultants, the Wake County Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC), and cooperating and participating agencies involved in the Wake Transit Concurrence Process;*
- 4) Defined relationships between the project sponsor and the PMC for developing and furthering project-level recommendations; and*
- 5) Roles and responsibilities for communications related to commuter rail project development and design.*

Mr. Martin explained the draft document detailing these elements is provided as Attachment A and provided an overview of the scope elements of the commuter rail alternatives analysis update, the proposed schedule for working through the scope elements, proposed membership on the technical advisory group, and the key milestones proposed by GoTriangle to involve participation and input from the technical advisory group.

Member Shannon Cox commented that although Apex is not in the commuter rail project, she had concerns moving forward without more specific information. Member John Hodges-Copple agreed, and said interested parties such as Town of Cary and City of Raleigh should take note of the short timeframe to weigh in, and that they should make it a priority to react quickly. Member Ben Howell inquired about the reasoning for RTF on PMC. Mr. Martin responded that the Research Triangle Foundation had expressed interest in becoming a funding participant. Member John Hodges-Copple added that the RTP has authority to levy a local property tax that can be used for transportation improvements, so they could contribute funding to the project.

Mr. Hodges-Copple reiterated that decisions being made in this process would be a foundation to future decisions down the road, and that Cary, Raleigh, NC State and others along the corridor should pay close attention to these discussions. Member Geoff

Green noted that Jeff Man was serving as project manager for the AA Update and all questions should be directed to him. Other members agreed that it might be difficult to move forward without more clarification on how the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) would be involved and questioned the timing. Mr. Martin responded that he understood that there was a need to get it right and for the TCC to be comfortable. Ms. Cox added that she was concerned about this moving forward without community or agency engagement, and questioned why some agencies were invited to participate on a Project Management Committee while others were not. Chair Andes asked Mr. Martin to discuss the timing associated with this item. Mr. Martin responded that the TCC needs to be comfortable with this, and that is more important than doing it quickly. The AA Update is already underway, so this decision will not hold that up necessarily. Mr. Lukasina added that the projected schedule has the AA Update ending in October or November, and that the TCC will not meet again until August, so he advised the group to consider any requests for additional information in the action at today's meeting that could help clarify things over the summer. Member Tim Gardiner noted that everyone's comments are valid and said there has been discussion at the Project Management Committee level about when and how to engage the towns. From a technical standpoint, the engagement is more important at the staff level than the Board level. He agreed the TCC should outline its concerns today and forward a request for more information. Member Jason Myers asked for clarification on what is contained in the Locally Preferred Alternative, and questioned whether Raleigh really needed to be involved in that discussion. Mr. Martin said it includes the mode, alignment and termini. The termini is what is being studied through the AA update primarily, since mode and alignment are relatively set. Mr. Myers asked to clarify other members' concerns because he did not see why Raleigh would care whether the train runs to Selma or Mebane as long as it stops in Raleigh. Mr. Lukasina informed him that the LPA discussions would serve as a foundation to other decisions that would come at other points in the project. Mr. Hodges-Copple agreed, noting that once the project development clock starts, there will be small windows of time for any input to influence some of the project decisions moving forward. It will be harder to change previous decisions the further into project development the project gets. This process will discuss how competitive this project looks like it will be. Costs will be a big part of the competitiveness. NCRR will dictate some of those costs. This was not nailed down early enough on the Durham-Orange Light Rail project, and the excessive costs imposed by NCRR helped derail that project. The team should be focused on getting confirmation on some of those points before the project development clock starts.

Chair Andes stated that it looked like there were too many questions for the TCC to take action on this today. Mr. Hodges-Copple clarified that he did not take issue with the Project Management Committee structure that the TCC was being asked to act on today, but thought it would be valuable to get more information on the technical steering committee before the Executive Board issues approval on the Project Management Committee. Mr. Martin noted that the project schedule does include time in June and July for the consultant to develop a public outreach plan.

Mr. Gardiner asked if the MPO staff could draft a list of things we should request to see in the LPA development, including costs, so the Executive Board could act on setting expectations. Mr. Martin stated the AA Update itself will not get into costs; however, the MPO staff developed a set of expectations for Raleigh to deliver on the BRT project alongside the LPA, so that can be used as a starting point. Mr. Lukasina added that this is not the first time CAMPO has considered an LPA, and that he saw several items that will need to be agreed upon before the project enters project development, including entry costs to operate in the corridor, liability insurance required, and liquidated damages for which GoTriangle would be responsible. He urged the TCC to think through what their Board members might like to have assurance on before allowing a project sponsor to

move into project development, as that is when the process will move quickly.

Ms. Cox proposed a motion to recommend the Executive Board approve the PMC structure pending explanation of why the agencies were chosen to serve on the PMC and a description of the technical advisory group composition and role, including assurance that the composition and role will be vetted by local agencies along the corridor. Mr. Howell offered a friendly amendment to add that the TCC believes this information needs to be provided to the Executive Board prior to action, and that this should be strongly conveyed to GoTriangle and the Executive Board.

Mr. Gardiner asked that the MPO look at the LPA information requested from the City of Raleigh and provide that information to the communities. Mr. Lukasina noted that there may be other items individual jurisdictions want that are not actually required for the LPA. Member Tracy Stephenson urged MPO staff to obtain this information as quickly as possible which would allow TCC members to update their respective Board members prior to the June Executive Board meeting. Mr. Lukasina stated the staff would do their best to accommodate this request.

An amended motion was made by Member Shannon Cox, seconded by Member Ben Howell

Member Shannon Cox offered a motion to recommend the Executive Board approve the PMC structure pending explanation of why the agencies were chosen to serve on the PMC and a description of the technical advisory group composition and role, including assurance that the composition and role will be vetted by local agencies along the corridor, and Member Benjamin Howell offered a friendly amendment to add that the TCC believes this information needs to be provided to the Executive Board prior to action, and that this should be strongly conveyed to GoTriangle and the Executive Board. The Amendment was agreed to by Ms. Cox. The motion was seconded by Mr. Howell. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

5.5

Wake Transit Implementation Update

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

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

Mr. Martin provided an update on the progress of ongoing Wake Transit projects and CAMPO's involvement in those projects, including:

- 1) An update of and extension to the planning horizon for the Wake Transit Plan (also known as the Wake Transit Vision Plan);*
- 2) New Bern corridor bus rapid transit implementation and upcoming CAMPO TCC and Executive Board actions; and*
- 3) Development of an online dashboard and mapping interface for Wake Transit projects.*

The Wake Transit Implementation Update report was received as information.

5.6 FY2018-2027 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #8

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as Information.**Attachments:** [TIP Amendment #8.pdf](#)*Ms. Gretchen Vetter, MPO Staff reported on this item.**Ms. Vetter stated that the 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 the New Bern Bus Rapid Transit Project as well as an amendment to an existing LAPP Project. The amendment handout will be provided at the June 6 TCC meeting.**Ms. Vetter reported that the FY2018-2027 TIP Amendment #8 will be posted for public comment from June 6, 2019 to July 7, 2019 and a public hearing is scheduled for the August 21, 2019 Executive Board meeting.***The FY2018-2027 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #8 report was received as information.**

5.7 FY2021 Locally Administered Projects Program

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.**Attachments:** [Memorandum FFY21 Locally Administered Projects Program](#)

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

Ms. Vetter stated that as part of the LAPP Program, an annual modal investment mix is established to guide how available LAPP funding is programmed to meet the variety of needs in our region's multi-modal transportation network. Federal legislation provides for the continuation of federal transportation funds directly attributable to the Capital Area MPO. Ms. Vetter reported that additionally, the MPO receives an allocation from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) which is appropriated to the State of North Carolina. These federal sources will be incorporated into the funding program for FFY 2021.

Ms. Vetter reviewed two issues, including the Target Modal Investment Mix, the LAPP Steering Committee has recommended changing for the FY2021 round of LAPP. Issue 1) increased measures to avoid unnecessary exposed funding to future rescissions, and Issue 2) Revisit the target modal mix. The first issue discussed focused primarily on ways to lessen the impact of future rescissions to the LAPP Program. The LAPP Selection Panel recommended a twofold approach including stricter enforcement of June reprogramming exercise and enhanced communication for missed project deadlines. Stricter enforcement of the June reprogramming exercise would give the LAPP Steering Committee the opportunity to discuss all projects that have not requested funding authorization by the end of June. The Committee would provide a formal recommendation to the TCC and Executive Board on whether projects that do not reach the deadline should be allowed to move forward or if the need to recompile for funding. Enhanced communication for missed project deadlines would allow CAMPO Staff to reach out directly to not only project managers, but associated TCC and Executive Board members if the project were to miss significant deadlines or reach an increased level of concern. Ms. Vetter reminded all that the target modal mix is determined annually and decisions for the modal mix this year do not necessarily affect future years. The final modal investment mix does not have to match the target and is determined by the quantity and quality of projects submitted during the application process. Final investment mix must be adopted by CAMPO Executive Board. Ms. Vetter stated that the anticipated Programming Amount for FY2021 is approximately 25 million.

Ms. Vetter presented both historical patterns and proposed funding for Roadway, Bicycle and Pedestrian and Transit programs. Ms. Vetter introduced the proposed Target Modal Investment Mix for FY2021 is 65% roadway, 27% bicycle and pedestrian, and 8% transit. This is a slight change from FY2020, which was 68% roadway, 24% bicycle and pedestrian, and 8% transit.

Ms. Vetter noted that staff will release the FFY 2021 Target Modal Investment Mix and the Recommended Changes to the FFY 2021 LAPP Program for public review and comment from June 6th through July 7th, 2019 and schedule a public hearing for the regular Executive Board meeting on August 21st, 2019.

The FY 2021 Locally Administered Projects Program report was received as information.

5.8

Federal Rescission Update

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as Information.**Attachments:** [June TCC Funding Request Status](#)

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

Ms. Vetter provided an update on the rescission of federal highway program funding scheduled for the end of federal fiscal year 2019.

The upcoming schedule and deadlines were reviewed:

June

- Deadline to Flex Funds to FTA.*
- Target deadline for all LAPP projects to request funding authorization from FHWA (in LAPP handbook). The status of all outstanding LAPP funding authorization requests will be presented at June meeting.*

August

- Decision from Executive Board on whether to reprogram or deprogram exposed projects that did not reach deadline. Decision determines how much funding available for LAPP FY2021 Call for Projects, which generally begins in August.*

Ms. Vetter reviewed the status of funding exposed to the upcoming federal rescission. She noted projects that have requested funding authorization and those that have not. STP funds are not subject to the current rescission and TAP funding has all been secured for the fiscal year- the primary focus of the presentation was on CMAQ funding. Of the CMAQ projects that have not received funding authorization, MS. Vetter presented a list of projects that have a relatively good chance of receiving funding authorization this year, a list of projects that had a possibility of receiving funding authorization this year, and the projects that would likely not receive funding authorization this year. Ms. Vetter noted that if all the projects that had a relatively good chance of receiving authorization this year were to obligate, roughly \$300,000 of CMAQ funding would still be exposed.

Ms. Vetter explained 2 options the TCC could recommend to the Executive Board to protect the anticipated \$300,000 in exposed funding. The first option would be to transfer the \$300,000 to a transit project that has competed through previous rounds of LAPP. CAMPO staff reached out to participating transit systems for a list of any projects that could utilize this funding. Ms. Vetter stated that GoRaleigh submitted their East Raleigh Transit Station as a potential recipient and GoCary submitted their Downtown Cary Multimodal Facility. The second option would be to not flex the funds and give one of the projects that could possibly receive funding authorization this year the opportunity to do so. MS. Vetter noted that the CAMPO Staff recommendation was the second option, because flexing \$300,000 is a relatively small dollar amount in relation to the total project costs and it might be worth taking the risk to see if one project can draw down the remaining funds.

Member Het Patel inquired what would happen if a project were to miss the September 30, 2019 rescission deadline but authorize funds prior to the July 1, 2020 date in which the rescission will actually occur. Ms. Vetter stated that the Federal Government will review funding balances at the end of September and how much each state contributes to the total amount of exposed funding will be proportional to the amount that will be

rescinded; therefore, the amount of funding affected by the rescission will be determined at the end of September. It will be up to the Executive Board on whether projects can continue past this fiscal year if the September 30, 2019 deadline is not met. CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina added that and that there is no July 2020 deadline, this is the date the funding will be rescinded. He further explained that new information received indicates that the total amount of funding required to be rescinded by FHWA will exceed the total amount of exposed funding nationwide. Since the FAST ACT has a specific dollar amount it is required to rescind, funding will likely be taken out of future apportionments, which means the rescission could continue in to the next fiscal year.

A motion was made by Member Ben Howell, seconded by Member Danny Johnson to recommend to the Executive Board the adoption of Option 2 of the Federal Rescission CMAQ Funds item, which is to not flex funding to FTA in response to the rescission.

5.9

Statewide Prioritization (SPOT 6.0) Update

Alex Rickard, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information

Attachments: [P6.0 Schedule 5-10-2019](#)

CAMPO Deputy Director Mr. Alex Rickard, reported on this item.

Mr. Rickard stated that SPOT is delayed by three months. The MPO is scheduled to adopt the 2020-2029 TIP in August 2019.

The MPO is now beginning the process of developing the 2022-2031 STIP through the SPOT 6.0 process. The SPOT process involves three specific actions by the MPO:

- the selection of project to be submitted into the prioritization process for scoring*
- assignment of local input points to Regional Impact and Division Needs category projects*
- adoption of the corresponding Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*

Mr. Rickard reviewed SPOT Next Steps and Schedule:

Subcommittee Meetings: now July / August

CAMPO Call for Projects: April 18 – June 28

Bike/Ped: Project Details, Cost, Letter of Support

Transit: Project Details, Cost, Ridership, Letter of Support

Aviation – Triangle North Executive Airport

TCC/Executive Board Approve Project Lists for Public Review: Sept.

Project List adjustments – September / October

Public Hearing – November 20

Exec Board Project List approval – November 20

CAMPO Submits Projects in SPOT Online by December 20

Alternate Criteria Weights due – December 20

The Statewide Prioritization (SPOT 6.0) Update report was received as information.

5.10 Public Participation Plan Update

Bonnie Parker, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.**Attachments:** [CAMPO Public Participation Plan - 2019 Update - Draft](#)

CAMPO Deputy Director Ms. Shelby Powell reported on this item on behalf of Ms. Bonnie Parker, MPO Staff.

Ms. Powell stated that the Capital Area MPO has a Public Involvement Plan that describes how the MPO involves the public in developing transportation plans and related policy documents. This plan includes the MPO's Title VI (Civil Rights)/Minority/Low-income/Limited English Proficiency Outreach Plan.

The MPO staff reviewed the existing plan and looked at other plans from around the state and similar MPOs around the nation. This updated document:

- Includes changes to the MPO's Title VI/LEP Outreach Plan to be consistent with the recent NCDOT Office of Civil Rights and Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) requirements released in 2018,*
- Integrates related elements from the Wake Transit Public Engagement Policy, which was approved by the Executive Board in January, and,*
- Includes revisions to the format and some of the content in order to be more user-friendly and easy to understand.*

Ms. Powell explained that updates to the adopted Public Participation Plan (2016) require a 45-day public comment period and a public hearing. MPO staff anticipate releasing the draft update for public comment on July 1 (closing on August 14), with a public hearing tentatively scheduled for the August 21, 2019 Executive Board Meeting.

The Public Participation Plan Update report was received as information.

6. Informational Item: Budget**6.1 Member Shares FY 2019**

Lisa Blackburn, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as Information**Attachments:** [FY 19 Projected Member Dues QTR 3](#)

The Member Shares report was included in the agenda packet.

The Member Shares report was received as information.

6.2 **Operating Budget - FY 2019**
Lisa Blackburn, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [FY 19 Projected Budget QTR 3](#)

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 **Project Updates**

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Project-Updates-2019-06-06-2019-TCC](#)

The Project Updates report was included in the agenda packet.

The Project Update report was received as information.

8. Informational Item: Staff Reports

CAMPO Executive Director:

In order to be counted for attendance, Mr. Lukasina requested that all members remember to sign in.

Mr. Lukasina reiterated that the 2020 Census is less than a year away, which will require CAMPO to review boundaries with reference to urbanized areas and possible additional funding. CAMPO is due for a Strategic Plan Update, which will involve two phases: 1) Will be updates with the existing membership within the defined Raleigh Urbanized Area and those who previously voluntarily joined the MPO, and, 2) Invite new jurisdictions that are now eligible to join the MPO.

TCC Chair: no report.

NCDOT Transportation Planning Division:

NCDOT Division 4: no report

NCDOT Division 5: no report

NCDOT Division 6: no report

NCDOT Rail Division: absent

NC Turnpike Authority: absent

The Staff Reports was received as information.

