

# 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 4, 2020

10:00 AM

Conference Room

---

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

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

*Chair Andes welcomed everyone and explained the logistics and planned course of action for the virtual meeting. She 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.*

- Present:** 38 - Chair Juliet Andes, Sandi Bailey, Paul Black, Jason Brown, Michael Clark, Bryan Coates, Shannon Cox, Luana Deans, Darcy Downs, Jimmy Eatmon, Michael Frangos, Tim Gardiner, Phil Geary, Joe Geigle, Hank Graham, Jay Heikes, John Hodges-Copple, Benjamin Howell, Danny Johnson, Justin Jorgensen, Paul Kallam, David Keilson, Erin Klinger, Catherine Knudson, Member Eric Lamb, Michael Landguth, Gaby Lawlor, Bill Marley, Thomas Marrow, Jason Myers, Branston Newton, Neil Perry, Patrick Pierce, Morgan Simmons, Tracy Stephenson, Darius Sturdivant, Courtney Tanner, and Vincent Gerry
- Absent:** 13 - Joshua Baird, Gregory Bethea, Bo Carlson, Davis Anita Davis, Scott Hammerbacher, Julie Maybee, Michael Moore, Terry Nolan, Kendra Parrish, Pamela Perry, Jay Sikes, John Vine-Hodge, and Kelly Blazey

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

*There were no adjustments to the agenda itself; however, Chair Andes requested that CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina explain the slate vote option, in order to expedite the meeting. Mr. Lukasina stated that the TCC had the option to vote once on all action items at the end of the presentations, instead of taking a roll call vote after each item. There were no objections.*

## **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 7, 2020 Meeting Draft Minutes

**Requested Action:** Approve the TCC May 7, 2020 Meeting Draft Minutes

**Attachments:** [May Meeting Minutes-DRAFT](#)

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

A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Member Ben Howell that the minutes from the May 2020 TCC Meeting be approved. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

**5. Regular Business**

**5.1 Public Participation Plan Update - Electronic Meetings**

Bonnie Parker, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Recommend the Executive Board approve the Public Participation Plan Update.

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

[Draft of proposed changes in RED. PPP Update](#)

[Draft PPP Update.clean copy](#)

*Ms. Bonnie Parker, CAMPO Staff reported on this item.*

*Ms. Parker reminded all that this information was presented at the May meeting.*

*Ms. Parker stated that CAMPO follows both the Federal Highway Administration and the North Carolina state law guidance for public participation standards for Open Meetings.*

*Ms. Parker expressed that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) released guidance in April stating that MPOs may hold public meetings and accept public comments during meetings that are solely held online, or electronically, and that such information should be reflected in the MPO's Public Participation Plan (PPP). She explained that, out of an abundance of caution, MPO staff are recommending adding language to the PPP that specifically mentions the permissibility of electronic meetings, which includes the requirement of public notifications and means to access (view or listen to) meetings and requires the publicly posting of meeting materials. Ms. Parker stressed that CAMPO's current PPP already has more extensive requirements for public comment periods and public notices.*

*Ms. Parker explained that the North Carolina Open Meetings Law, which the MPO also abides by as stated in the PPP, includes language enabling electronic meetings and voting. Also, in the fall of 2019, the Executive Board adopted an updated PPP that incorporated language related to online participation, however, that language did not address meetings that are solely held electronically - with no in-person option available. Ms. Parker reiterated that the state Law passed on May 4, 2020 requires CAMPO Public*

*Ms. Parker concluded by stating that a Public Comment period will be open from May 1 - June 18, 2020, as any update to the PPP requires a 45-day public comment period. A public hearing will be held on June 17, 2020 and this item is anticipated to be considered for adoption by the Executive Board at their 2020 July or August meeting. She added that materials are posted online.*

**A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Member Ben Howell to recommend approval of the Public Participation Plan Update - Electronic Meetings to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

**5.2 2020 NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Application**

Kenneth Withrow, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Adopt the Resolution of Support.

**Attachments:** [Resolution Endorsing Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Grant-Fuquay Varina](#)

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

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

*Mr. Withrow stated that the Town of Garner, Town of Holly Springs, and Town of Rolesville submitted their applications during the month of April 2020. As the call for applications was extended to June 30, 2020, the Town of Fuquay-Varina desires to submit a pedestrian planning grant application to the Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation.*

**A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Member Ben Howell to recommend approval of the 2020 NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Application to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

## 5.3

**FY 2021 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan**

Bret Martin, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Consider: 1) Approval of the FY 2021 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan and its corresponding project agreement structure, with the revenue assumption modifications recommended by GoTriangle staff; and 2) Authorize the Executive Director to execute all FY 2021 Work Plan project-level agreements to which CAMPO is a party.

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

[Attachment A - FY 2021 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan](#)

[Attachment B - Agreement Groupings-Deliverables](#)

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

*Mr. Martin reminded all that there have been some significant changes from the original Draft FY 21 Work Plan presented in February, due to economic uncertainty brought on by the current CoVid-19 pandemic with its social distancing and 'stay-at-home' measures. Mr. Martin reviewed changes to the assumed and budgeted revenues and expenditures for the Work Plan as a comparison to what was originally included in the draft released for public comment in January. He reiterated that due to revenue reductions, it will not be possible to fund all projects in the FY 21 Work Plan, and that revenue assumptions now are now approximately \$71 million dollars less than originally projected. Mr. Martin stressed that this is currently the only data available to inform sales tax collections and is anecdotal versus empirical.*

*Mr. Martin reviewed data for the updated recommended revenue expenditure for FY 2021, which total approximately \$91 million dollars. The original total was \$150 million dollars. Mr. Martin reiterated that the Mr. Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff reported on this item.*

*Mr. Martin reminded everyone that a detailed presentation of the FY 2021 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan was presented to the TCC at its regular May 2020 meeting.*

*Mr. Martin reviewed the Next Steps necessary to carry the plan to completion, which includes CAMPO's 30-day public comment period (May 14-June 14), TCC consideration to recommend the Work Plan to the Executive Board (today's meeting, June 4), Executive Board approval (June 17) and finally, GoTriangle's Board of Trustees consideration of approval on June 24, 2020. Mr. Martin noted that the Executive Board did hold a Public Hearing during its May meeting, but did not receive any public comments.*

*Mr. Martin reviewed data for the updated recommended expenditures for FY 2021, which total approximately \$91 million dollars. The original total was \$150 million dollars. Mr. Martin reiterated that the focus of the TPAC was on determining which projects absolutely need to be authorized for funding with immediacy in FY 2021. Projects that met certain strict criteria, such as operating projects that were initiated in prior fiscal years, those that are time sensitive, those that involve external time-sensitive grants as part of their overall funding mechanism, and community funding area projects exhibiting a high degree of readiness, were selected for recommendation of funding beginning on July 1st. The remaining projects are assigned to an 'unbudgeted reserve' queue that will be revisited in the fall of 2020 when sales tax data for the period most immediately impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic will have been acquired to more cautiously inform investment decisions for the remainder of FY 2021 and future years.*

*Mr. Martin presented information for what is currently proposed to begin on July 1, 2020:*

*FY 21 Recommended Bus Service Expansion*

*Route 21: Caraleigh Improvements (South Raleigh)*

- *Existing Capacity Overloaded*
- *Increased Off-Peak Frequency*

*GoApex Route 1 (Town of Apex)*

- *Intra-Community Circulator*
- *All Day Hourly Frequencies*

*FY 21 Recommended Capital Investments*

- *Bus Stop Improvements for GoApex Route 1*
- *Bus Stop/Node Improvements for Morrisville Smart Shuttle*
- *Completion of New Bern Avenue BRT*

*Mr. Martin concluded by stating that the common themes of public comments received to date were: support for Holly Springs service, support for continued investment in BRT and other high-capacity projects as a priority, support for Route 21: Caraleigh improvements and Route 305 all-day service, need for transit improvements to support vulnerable populations impacted by COVID-19 economic downturn, support for Youth GoPass and Free Fares for Seniors and support for fare technology upgrades. The 140 previous comments received in response to the Draft Work Plan in February included several comments regarding bus service, proposed infrastructure and general investment.*

*As this item was the last action item presented, a slate vote was taken. Each TCC member or alternate was asked to individually confirm their agreement with the motion and second put forth to approve all action items.*

**A motion was made by Member Jason Myers, seconded by Member Ben Howell to recommend approval of the FY 2021 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan to the Executive Board. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

**5.4 CAMPO Projects and Programs Funding Update**

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.

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

[Triangle TDM Business Case](#)

[CAMPO TDM Resolution June 2020](#)

[COVID19 TIP Project Schedule Delays Released April 21](#)

[NCDOT Projects Authorized to Move Forward 5/5/2020](#)

[LAPP Project Guidance](#)

[CARES Act Talking Points](#)

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

*Ms. Vetter provided an overview of the LAPP and SPOT projects and programs.*

*Ms. Vetter reviewed information from the NCDOT May 4, 2020 press release regarding the revenue decline due to COVID-19 which has depleted NCDOT cash reserves and has affected funding streams dedicated to transportation infrastructure, operations, service, and maintenance. She stated that NCDOT's legally-required minimum cash balance has been reached and according to state law, once the department falls below the cash floor, they can no longer enter into new contracts that spend money on transportation projects.*

*Ms. Vetter reviewed what NCDOT currently can and cannot do, which includes:*

*What NCDOT CAN do while below the cash floor:*

- *Continue active projects*
- *Maintain existing infrastructure with existing supplies and staff*
- *Pay incoming invoices from private sector companies as long as funds exist*
- *Continue operating DMV functions*
- *Respond to emergency situations (with existing staff and materials)*
- *Hire new employees for critical, safety-related positions or DMV functions*

*What NCDOT CANNOT do while below the cash floor:*

- *Negotiate right of way purchases on projects not underway*
- *Purchase additional equipment, supplies or services for transportation projects unless obligated to make such a purchase in an existing contract*
- *Award new construction, engineering or repair contracts*

*Ms. Vetter presented information regarding the current Move Forward list from NCDOT, which was a response to the NCDOT cash flow requirements. Ms. Vetter explained that this list, which is a living document, shows all of the SPOT projects that can move forward. Any project not listed has been put on hold. The current list contains SPOT projects already under contract, because if work were to stop on these, NCDOT would be forced to pay a fine to the contractor. Ms. Vetter provided the link to this current Move Forward list which is released every week:*

*<https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/Project-Management/Pages/default.aspx>*

*The Weekly NCDOT Cash Balance Reports can be found by visiting this link:*

<https://www.ncdot.gov/about-us/how-we-operate/finance-budget/Pages/cash-watch-numbers.aspx>

Ms. Vetter expressed that the LAPP Project guidance from NCDOT includes:

- All work associated should stop if it can be stopped, even if previous approvals were given to defer payments.
- If construction contract has not been awarded, delay advertisement & stop work.
- If a consultant has not been procured to perform PE work, stop PE procurement.
- If ROW activities have not begun, do not start them.
- For any projects that have been awarded, consultants procured and work is moving forward, understand the deferral period is now indeterminate.
- Local jurisdictions need to understand they proceed at their own risk if they continue to move forward with any project phases after NCDOT has recommended they stop, as NCDOT is not sure when they can reimburse.
- No new or supplemental Municipal Agreements can be executed at this time.

Ms. Vetter added that FY21 LAPP projects will not be able to get their agreements started at this time, and that if CAMPO desires to award additional funding to any existing LAPP project, an agreement could not be executed at this time. She expressed that NCDOT has volunteered to provide a funding report to the Executive Board on June 17, 2020.

Ms. Vetter shared information for the financial impact to LAPP with regards to annual LAPP allocation, delayed LAPP funding previously obligated, LAPP funding programmed but not obligated in FY20 and LAPP funding programmed in FY21 without Municipal Agreements.

Member Shannon Cox asked if this applies to the LAPP Bike Ped projects that come out of SPOT. Ms. Vetter replied that although she had not specifically heard from NCDOT regarding Bike Ped projects, she assumed they would be included under this clause as well. Member Ben Howell added that they have a project underway with PE under contract and will need to do a supplemental agreement, but NCDOT is not processing any supplemental agreements currently. They have also been told to wait on Bike Ped projects and not to complete any work on them.

Member Shannon Cox inquired whether the previously extended grace periods approved by the Board would be revisited, due to the CoVid pandemic. Ms. Vetter reminded everyone that the back in August 2019, the Executive Board ruled that all LAPP projects that are prior year ones have until the end of September to ensure projects are obligated. If not completed by then, those projects may have their funding taken away unless the Executive Board decides otherwise. To date, they have not taken any action to remove this rule. CAMPO's goal is to provide the Board with a very clear financial picture, which may be shaped from the NCDOT presentation later this month.

Alternate Luana Deans asked if the funds for projects that are on hold will be exposed and therefore subject to rescission. Ms. Vetter stated that if they are not allowed to move forward then yes. Ms. Deans inquired if there was a plan to reprogram or keep them in the current fiscal year. Ms. Vetter stated that the action of reprogramming a project is done at the CAMPO level TIP and state level the STIP. This would require the CAMPO Executive Board approval to move that project forward with the understanding that they are approving a policy decision to allow reprogramming. Care will need to be taken so the LAPP balance availability remains positive.

Member Jason Myers requested clarification for the reasoning behind NCDOT not wanting to move forward with LAPP projects due to reimbursement issues, and if there have been any discussions or might be other ways for NCDOT to request reimbursement from FHWA or other avenues. Ms. Vetter responded that NCDOT's reimbursement for LAPP projects is partly the reason for the delay, but there is also the issue of obligation limitation which affects this situation, as NCDOT might be close to reaching their obligation limitation for this fiscal year. CAMPO is in discussions with NCDOT regarding streamlining reimbursement issues.

Member Jason Myers said it was his understanding that projects which have already been obligated with construction funding authorized would not be affected by the obligation limitation issue. Ms. Vetter responded that was partly accurate; however, there was a caveat of "Advance Construction" to this as well. In this scenario, NCDOT receives the greenlight from FHWA for construction, but they do not actually obligate that funding yet, so from an accounting perspective the funding is not obligated at this point. Mr. Myers asked for a 'big picture' number for other projects in this same situation and the what would be the best method for ascertaining whether their specific project could move forward. Ms. Vetter said that most projects that have received their funding authorization since the middle of last fiscal year have been in the advance construction status because of the obligation limitation issue. Due to last year's rescission NCDOT drew down funding as much as possible to protect it. The ones on hold now are the projects with phases more recently authorized. Ms. Vetter stated she can see which projects are using advanced construction by checking the NCDOT Weekly Funding Report and stated to the best of her knowledge there were at least ten projects in this status. Member Joe Geigle from FHWA added that this is a completely new and unique situation for NCDOT falling below the cash floor, and that they are working diligently on solutions to limit the impacts and ensure it does not happen again.

CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina said that a group of MPO representatives will be meeting with NCDOT and FHWA this week. Although there is no set timeline, they are considering different options and working to find solutions that will allow projects to move forward and support NCDOT, including issues of the impact of obligation deadlines on these projects and what this means for LAPP in the future. These recommendations will be brought to the TCC for consideration to recommend to the Executive Board. The biggest issue now is that NCDOT's revenue picture is unknown, and plans to get above the cash floor and allow projects to move forward have yet to be shared.

Member Jason Myers asked what the risk was for non-reimbursement or severely delayed reimbursement for towns or municipalities that wish to move forward on already approved projects by using their own funds. Alternate Luana Deans expressed that the Town of Cary was in the same situation. Member Geigle stated that he had attended an MPO meeting with Mike Stanley, who will be presenting to the Executive Board later this month and can hopefully address that question more fully. Member Shannon Cox stated that the Town of Apex had already agreed to an indefinite reimbursement for projects they wished to fund and move forward but were not allowed to do so. Alternate Luana Deans inquired about the word 'recommending' from NCDOT with regards to stopping work, and if they moved forward would they risk losing funding. Ms. Vetter responded that the language came directly from NCDOT, and that CAMPO hoped to get a better understanding from NCDOT at the Executive Board June 2020 meeting.

**The CAMPO Projects and Programs Funding Update iReport was received as information.**

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

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Issue #2: Revisiting Submittal Reduction for Delayed Projects Policy*

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

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

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

*Issue #3: Modal Submittal Cap*

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

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

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

*Issue #4: Target Modal Investment Mix*

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

*Issue #5: Transit Scoring*

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

Ms. Vetter reminded the TCC of the current scoring methodology for Transit projects:

*Transit Effectiveness Score: 50 Total Points*

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

*Planning Consistency: 10 Points*

*Local Priority Points: 10 Points*

*Prior Agency Funding: 10 Points*

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

*Proposal #1: Reliability Improvements Measure*

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

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

Ms. Vetter explained the reason to address this issue now is because the intended effect of this scoring criterion was to have a cascading arrangement of scores based on the scaled value of travel-time savings. Since most projects do not have travel-time savings, most projects receive 0 points for this criterion, while 1 or 2 projects in a given round receive 10 points. This results in minimal variability in scoring for the projects. Accurately scoring these projects has also raised issues, since a lack of standardization for calculating the travel time savings for reliability improvement projects create difficulty in fairly scoring each improvement.

Ms. Vetter shared the proposed change: Change reliability improvements from a quantitative formula to a tiered score based on impact by project type. This would allow more variation in scoring compared to the scaled cascading model that is currently in place. This would also allow for more consistency and clarity when scoring this criterion.

*High Impact projects would receive 10 points, medium impact projects would receive 5 points, low impact projects would receive 1 point, and no impact projects would receive 0 points for the criteria. (A detailed chart of all project types and impacts can be found in the agenda attachments).*

*Proposal #2: Safety and Security Concerns Measure*

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

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

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

*Proposal #3: Rider Experience Measure*

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

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

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

*Proposal #4: Minimum requirements for bus stop improvements*

*Ms. Vetter announced that LAPP currently does not have minimum requirements in place for bus stop improvement projects. To maintain consistent levels of expectations for all bus stop improvement projects, CAMPO proposes imposing minimum requirements for these projects. If an applicant's local policy has stricter requirements for these criteria,*

*the applicant should follow their local policy. Bus stop improvements should at a minimum:*

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

*Ms. Vetter stated that these proposed changes and Target Modal Investment Mix will be posted for Public Comment from June 12, 2020 through July 16, 2020. She added that a Public Hearing is tentatively scheduled for the July 15, 2020 Executive Board Meeting, and the CAMPO Executive Board will consider approving the proposed changes to the program and the Target Modal Investment Mix, and open the One Call for All Call for Projects at their August 19, 2020 meeting.*

*TCC GoRaleigh Alternate Morgan Simmons expressed her appreciation for all the hard work and research accomplished by the CAMPO staff. Ms. Vetter added her thanks for the steering committee and their engagement efforts.*

**The Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) FY2022 Proposed Changes and Target Modal Investment Mix Report was received as information.**

**5.6****DRAFT MTP 2050 Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures**

Chris Lukasina, MPO Executive Director

**Requested Action:** Receive and review the DRAFT MTP 2050 Goals and Objectives for discussion, comments, and feedback with MPO staff.

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

*Executive Director Mr. Chris Lukasina reported on this item.*

*Mr. Lukasina stated that a more active phase of the 2050 MTP began last December 2019, and that the pace and level of activity will increase in the upcoming months.*

*Mr. Lukasina reminded all that there is a link to the current schedule in the agenda packets for MTP related activities. He emphasized that this is a tentative schedule which is subject to change and encouraged everyone to pay attention to this list.*

*Mr. Lukasina provided a list of current and anticipated major milestones for the 2050 MTP, which include:*

- 1. Vision – Goals & Objectives review*
- 2. Travel Model and Socio-Economic Data*
- 3. Alternatives Analysis*
- 4. Preferred Option Review*
- 5. Fiscal Constraint*
- 6. Initial 2050 MTP Adoption*

*The initial 2050 MTP Adoption is currently slated for next December 2021, with final adoption anticipated in late Winter/early Spring of 2022. The Public Engagement Strategy for each phase will be customized to individual milestones.*

*Mr. Lukasina provided an overview of the goals, objectives and performance measures for the 2050 MTP. The development of the draft incorporated a review of existing goals, objectives and measures which included data analysis and a review of current planning principles in the region. This resulted in updated language and enhancements to goals and objectives. Mr. Lukasina stated that performance measures and any associated targets will follow later in the MTP development process.*

*Mr. Lukasina shared that the Federal government requires stated minimum performance measures and targets. He added that anything beyond these minimums is up to the Board's discretion as an MPO; however, the Federal government will hold the MPO accountable for any target measures adopted. The decision was made over the last four years to adopt the minimum requirements, with the provision to approve measures for monitoring and further analysis. One issue has been the lack of updated available data with regard to effort versus reward - how much effort is needed to obtain and maintain the data for a particular measure and to monitor targets versus what the actual benefit is for the region.*

*Mr. Lukasina stated that the draft revision of the MTP was provided in the agenda packets. He shared that due to an ongoing effort to coordinate with the Triangle DHCH*

*MPO, the goals, objectives and performance measures have been largely unified, many of which align with the State targets as well. This unification is useful for the public, who may not see the delineation between CAMPO and DHCH MPOs.*

*Mr. Lukasina divulged the draft goals and objects which include clarifying language, which are:*

*GOAL 1: Protect the Human and Natural Environment and Minimize Climate Change*

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

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

*GOAL 2: Connect People & Places*

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

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

*GOAL 3: Promote and Expand Multimodal & Affordable Choices*

*Obj. A: Enhance transit services, amenities and facilities*

*Obj. B: Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities*

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

*Goal 4: Manage Congestion & System Reliability*

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

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

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

*GOAL 5: Improve Infrastructure Condition & Resilience*

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

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

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

*Obj. D: Promote resilience planning and practices*

*GOAL 6: Ensure Equity & Participation*

*Obj. A: Ensure that transportation investments do not create a disproportionate burden for any community*

*Obj. B: Promote equitable public participation among all communities*

*GOAL 7: Promote Safety and Health*

*Obj. A: Increase safety of travelers and residents*

*Obj. B: Promote public health through transportation choices*

*GOAL 8: Stimulate Economic Vitality*

*Obj. A: Improve freight movement*

*Obj. B: Coordinate land use and transportation*

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

*Obj. D: Improve project delivery for all modes*

*Mr. Lukasina provided the Next Steps necessary for 2050 MTP Goals & Objectives, which include the continued refinement of draft goals, objectives, and preliminary*

*performance measures with DCHC and subsequent release for public comment, continued development of socioeconomic data guide totals and subsequent release for public comment, and Executive Board approval of socioeconomic data guide totals, goals, objectives and performance measures for use in the development the 2045 MTP. The final adoption of the 2050 MTP is anticipated to occur in approximately one year to a year and a half from now.*

*Mr. Lukasina expressed that any questions or concerns may be addressed to CAMPO staff.*

*TCC Member Jason Myers asked when the engagement with the public would begin, if there would be a dedicated website and where the information would be located. Mr. Lukasina responded that the MTP information can be found on the CAMPO main website under the MTP link, and that the 2050 MTP information should be available later this summer, beginning with Goals and Objectives.*

*TCC Member Jay Heikes reported that DCHC MPO had discussed these goals and objectives at their meeting earlier in the month. They determined that reliability should be the primary focus of Goal 4A, and that by removing the words "minimal delay" there is more balance in the way the goal is stated.*

**This MTP Item was received as information.**

**5.7****Northeast Area Study Update**

Brandon Watson, CAMPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Northeast Area Study Update](#)  
[NEAS Update Virtual Meeting Flyer](#)

*Northeast Area Study Update**Mr. Brandon Watson, CAMPO Staff reported on this item.*

*Mr. Watson stated that the basic purpose of these types of studies is to help achieve robust public engagement and to examine network issues in a smaller area more closely. Recommendations from the North Area Study Update will inform the 2050 MTP and prioritization of projects, and refresh and update policies and priorities that have evolved since the original study.*

*Mr. Watson explained that the previous Northeast Area Study (NEAS) was completed in FY 2014. That study evaluated land use and transportation issues in the northeastern section of CAMPO's planning area. The study covered parts of Wake and Franklin Counties, the municipalities of Knightdale, Wendell, Zebulon, Bunn, Rolesville, and parts of Wake Forest, Youngsville, Raleigh, and Franklinton. As with the Southwest Area Study in FY 18 and 19, the NEAS needs to be updated in order to prepare for the 2050 MTP. Mr. Watson emphasized that the current study will include all the areas of interest from the 2014 study, with the important addition of the US-1 study area to ensure the frontage and backage roads for the US 1 Freeway Project (U-5307) are incorporated.*

*Mr. Watson shared that there was great feedback from the 2014 study. Comments included issues pertaining to safety and congestion issues along specific roadways, preservation of farmland, economic development, as well as bicycle and pedestrian concerns and missing links in the area.*

*Mr. Watson stated that Stantec was contracted as the lead consultant by a selection committee team of members from around the northeast area; subconsultants include Alta Planning & Design, City Explained, Inc., Nealon Planning, J S Lane Company, and LK Consulting Solutions. As a part of this study (similar to 2014) a Stakeholder Oversight Team (SOT) was created, including decision-makers and community leaders, to provide oversight direction and valuable feedback on the study findings and recommendations. They will meet 3-4 times during the study to provide local context more on the policy making and stakeholder engagement side, key decision-making on priorities and recommendations, and encourage others to participate. Also, through partnership with all communities in the study area another committee was created, a Core Technical Team, made of local planning/engineering municipal staff. They will focus on key deliverables for the study providing local context, integrating planning efforts, and meeting more frequently (about 10 times) during the study. The next combined CTT and SOT meeting is June 15.*

*Mr. Watson provided information for the specific study update tasks which include starting with the discovery and inventory of existing conditions, building off of the 2014 NEAS. Next would be developing the vision and guiding principles through public*

outreach. Also, conducting some land use scenario planning starting with base conditions and exploring two alternatives. Policy updates using best practices will be recommended leading into the exploration and assessment of current and future needs. During this process draft recommendations for all modes will be made, looking at performance standards and implementation of those projects, and concluding with the review of all recommendations leading to final documents being approved.

Mr. Watson reviewed the project work plan timeline schedule. He expressed that it is a 16 month process, with additional anticipated Executive Board and local board updates in in the fall of 2020 and spring of 2021. The completion date is June 2021.

Mr. Watson announced that outreach efforts include a project website, survey, interactive map, e-newsletters, virtual public project symposiums, small group interviews, traveling roadshow "pop-ups", board briefings, and a final project workshop. He added that deliverables for this study include a project workbook, best practices/policy guidebook, public outreach and collaboration, and hot spots and concept designs.

Mr. Watson disclosed that there is an interactive map on the CAMPO website which allows an individual to pinpoint a place of interest or concern to be addressed such as a physical issue of intersections or corridors, connections needed, barriers to overcome and streams / railroad / highways. The project team is also looking for feedback on non-physical challenges such as policies, demographics / outreach to specific communities, growth strategies, and other coordination needed.

Mr. Watson concluded by sharing information regarding how to become involved. This includes visiting the project website: [www.NEASUpdate.com](http://www.NEASUpdate.com), taking the online survey, utilizing the interactive mapping tool, encouraging others to do the same, and attending the virtual public meetings. The next scheduled virtual public meetings will be held on Tuesday, June 9th at 5:30 PM and Saturday June 13th at 10:00 AM. Mr. Watson provided his contact information for any follow up questions.

**The Northeast Area Study iReport was received as information.**

**5.8 Natural gas pipeline under the American Tobacco Trail**

Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.*Mr. Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO Staff reported on this item.**Mr. Withrow explained that in August 2018 NCDOT notified various stakeholders along the American Tobacco Trail (ATT) that the proposed 7.6 -mile, 12-inch gas line project by PSNC Energy will address the goal of supporting the growing demand in Cary, Chatham, Durham, and Wake counties.**Mr. Withrow stated that on May 7, 2020 the NC Board of Transportation approved this pipeline; with a \$3.0 million payment from Dominion/PSNC to NCDOT; however no additional discussions had taken place between the original August 16, 2018 notification and the May 7, 2020 approval.**Mr. Withrow stated that concerns raised by the public and elected officials involved issues of lack of communication, safety, public access to the trail, trail appearance following project completion, and impact upon existing trail agreements along with maintenance responsibilities. As a result of these concerns, NCDOT had stated their intention to attend various board meetings to address these concerns; however, on June 1, 2020 NCDOT learned that Dominion Energy rescinded the request to utilize NCDOT right of way along the ATT for a pipeline. To date, Dominion has not provided the NCDOT Rail Division any additional information about the proposed alternatives.***The Natural Gas Pipeline under the American Tobacco Trail Report was received as information.****6. Informational Item: Budget****6.1 Member Shares FY 2020**

Lisa Blackburn, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as Information**Attachments:** [FY 20 Projected Member Dues QTR 3](#)*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 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** TCC June 2020 Project Updates

**Requested Action:** Receive as information

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

**This Informational Report was received as information.**

## **8. Informational Item: Staff Reports**

*CAMPO Executive Director Mr. Lukasina stated that:*

*-the third of the three big data entry inputs for the MTP, which centers around employment analysis, will occur in the near future. This provides a six week opportunity to review employee data for individual jurisdictions and communities and to give input. CAMPO is hopeful that this will begin this month.*

*-at this point, a July meeting may be needed, but this decision is at the Chair's discretion, and will depend on other actions needed and whether the State of Emergency for NC is still in effect. Staff will keep members posted with updates via the digital newsletter and website.*

*-the NCDOT funding issue does not just affect the LAPP program. The TDM program administered by TJCOG is a multi-year one; however, the funding itself is on an annual basis. It is historically funded by two MPO's and NCDOT. CAMPO is currently working towards possible solutions for this funding issue with the two MPO chairs who are in contact with the Board of Transportation. Assistance from the Executive Board may be requested later this month.*

*-In the House, the Federal "Invest Act" has been presented, and information is available online. Many entities are reviewing this bill and there are only preliminary reports to date. CAMPO will send updates when possible.*

*Mr. Lukasina requested that everyone take note of the MPO newsletters and email updates that are sent out periodically.*

*TCC Chair - no report.*

*NCDOT Transportation Planning Division - no report.*

*NCDOT Division 4 - no report.*

*NCDOT Division 5 - no report.*

*NCDOT Division 6 - no report.*

*NCDOT Rail Division - absent.*

*NC Turnpike Authority - absent.*

*NCDOT Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning Division - absent.*

**The Staff Reports item was received as information.**

## **9. Adjournment**

## Upcoming Meetings/Events

*Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting* *June 17, 2020*  
*One Bank of America Plaza* *4:00 - 6:00*  
*421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203*  
*Raleigh, NC 27601*

*Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting* *July 2, 2020*  
*One Bank of America Plaza* *10:00 - noon*  
*421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203*  
*Raleigh, NC 27601*

*Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting* *July 15, 2020*  
*One Bank of America Plaza* *4:00 - 6:00*  
*421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203*  
*Raleigh, NC 27601*

*Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting* *August 6, 2020*  
*One Bank of America Plaza* *10:00 - noon*  
*421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203*  
*Raleigh, NC 27601*