

# NC Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting Minutes - Draft Executive Board

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

---

Wednesday, August 19, 2020

4:00 PM

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 Hutchinson welcomed everyone and asked if there were any new introductions to be made. There were no new members to be introduced. He explained the logistics and planned course of action for the virtual meeting. Chair Hutchinson reviewed the opportunities that would arise during the meeting for any member of the public who wished to speak.*

*Each Executive Board member or alternate was asked to orally confirm attendance.*

- Present:** 18 - William Allen III, Shannon Baxter, Scott Brame, Corey Branch, John Byrne, TJ Cawley, Ronnie Currin, Joe Geigle, Jacques Gilbert, Michael Grannis, Virginia Gray, Chair Sig Hutchinson, Vice Chair Vivian Jones, RS "Butch" Lawter, Ken Marshburn, Neena Nowell, James Roberson, and Board Member Harold Weinbrecht
- Absent:** 12 - Valerie Jordan, Timothy Karan, Matt Mulhollem, Howard Penny, Perry Safran, Michael Schriver, Dick Sears, Bob Smith, Terry Turner, Art Wright, Grady Hunt, and Melvin Mitchell

## 2. Adjustments to the Agenda

*There was no adjustment to agenda.*

**3. Ethics Statement:**

*Vice Chair Vivian Jones read the Ethics Statement "In accordance with the State Government Ethics Act, it is the duty of every Executive Board member to avoid conflicts of interest. Does any Executive Board member have any known conflict of interest with respect to matters coming before the Executive Board today? If so, please identify the conflict and refrain from any participation in the particular matter involved." No members of the Executive Board identified issues with conflicts during this meeting.*

*The following information from the Ethics Commission for 2020 was then shared via presentation slide:*

*Executive Board members and alternates are required by law to file certain financial disclosures called the Statement of Economic Interest (SEI) and Real Estate Disclosure (RED) forms with the State Ethics Commission.*

*These two forms are due within 60 days of appointment and then every year thereafter.*

*Failure to file may result in fines of up to \$500 annually for an Executive Board member.*

*As of 2019, the State Ethics Commission has a new electronic filing system:  
<https://ef.ncsbe.gov/>*

*This information was included in the previous agenda distribution emailing. A handout was also provided with full information and instructions for completing the forms.*

#### **4. Public Comments**

*Chair Hutchinson opened Public Comments. One member of the public wished to share his comments regarding the Fayetteville-Raleigh Rail Passenger Feasibility Study agenda item; however due to technical restraints was unable to speak for himself. He asked that CAMPO Staff Member Bonnie Parker read his comments aloud on his behalf.*

*My Name is Don Stewart. I am a resident of Fayetteville, NC*

*dmstewart2@aol.com  
910-583-5758*

*I have followed the progress of the Fayetteville to Raleigh Passenger Rail Study since its inception, mostly on line although I was able to participate in the Fayetteville Focus Group that met in March.*

*I have had a chance to review the most recent Draft Report (7.29). A lot of information but well organized and presented. The maps and other graphics are extremely well done and this lay person appreciates that. I was also able to watch and listen to the FAMPO Board presentation in July. This generated a few concerns/questions that I recently presented in writing to Scott lane. They are attached to this letter as an enclosure as well as his (and Ryan White's) replies and my subsequent responses.*

*Based on my experience in following this current study, as well as my active participation (with FAMPO) In the June 2002 SENC Passenger Rail Service Regional Plan Proposal and the the July 2005 SENC Passenger Study, I would like to submit the following recommendation for consideration in Phase Two design:*

*With the exception of the end points that both the Eastern and Western Routes serve - and will benefit from in terms of transportation, economy, land use, quality of life, etc. - each route consists of a completely separate set of communities, their dreams, potential and opportunities as they grow and expand within the shadow of the greater Raleigh/RTP (Mega) Region. Phase Two results need not be a winner take all scenario.*

*Suggested Phase Two Hybrid: Phase Two choices (Eastern or Western routes ) to be expanded to include a Hybrid that does not eliminate one of the routes but rather determines which route is to be build first and include a corollary implementation plan, on a separate timeline, for the future build of the second.*

*("Make no little plans." DHB)*

*A possible scenario for the hybrid alternative would be to start with the Eastern Route as its already passenger compliant and can provide park and ride access for the Goldsboro area\* and bus connections from the east and southeast. This will allow time to plan the Western Route in coordination with the future widening of US 401 to include possible routing of some of the rail within the median of dual lanes (see NM Railrunner Express within Interstate-25 vicinity of Sante Fe or I-195/VA 76 in Richmond), especially if the highway alignment should include bypasses of Fuquay-Varina and/or Lillington. As part of an integrated and balanced approach the Fuquay-Varina to Raleigh segment could be initially planned and built perhaps as far south as a temporary park and ride lot in the vicinity of NC 42 (Willow Springs). A subsequent phase would be built once the planning and ROW acquisition have been completed. [ Although perhaps not current, I have attached a map of potential US 401 corridor alignments options for examples of what they*

could be. ]

*\* The Selma station is a relatively easy drive from most of Goldsboro and basically directly west towards Raleigh and the RTP. I expect than many commuters in this country make similar drives each day as the issue is not the first 15 or so miles of the overall commute but rather the final 15 or so.*

*Long range implications. In addition to facilitating future Raleigh to Wilmington and Wilmington to Charlotte service either route has the potential to eventually become a de facto third leg of the SEHSR south of Raleigh and serving the A line cities of Florence (Myrtle Beach), Charleston, Savannah and eventually Florida. This potential should be kept in mind during design and engineering, especially in terms of track geometry to support speeds above the initially planned 60 mph in the Western Route.*

#### *Fayetteville to Winston-Salem Passenger Rail*

*For Information purposes I have attached a map that was part of a recently released (March 2020) FRA study (in which NCDOT staff were involved) of regional passenger rail corridors in the Southeast. Fayetteville and Winston-Salem, the two largest cities in NC without state passenger rail service are the endpoints of the route which passes thru the RTP and Raleigh. In addition to a short segment of active track between Winston-Salem and Greensboro the route follows the route of the Piedmonts to Raleigh and then from there to Fayetteville - obviously on one of the two routes we are now studying. Wilmington, of course, would be a natural extension of this route.*

*Vice Chair Vivian Jones and Member John Byrne stated that they wished to receive his full comments and attachments. Ms. Parker replied that these would be shared with all members.*

#### 4.1 Public Comments

**Requested Action:** Receive as information

**Attachments:** [Highway 401 Widening Options](#)  
[SE Rail Plan \(FRA2\) Carolinas March 20](#)  
[Enclosure to Comments to CAMPO Board \(19 Aug 2020\)\(3\)](#)  
[Comments to CAMPO Board \(19 Aug 2020\) Fayetteville to Raleigh Passenger Rail Study](#)

*(see attachments)*

#### **5. Consent Agenda**

**A motion was made by Alternate Corey Branch, seconded by Member Will Allen III to approve all items on the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by unanimous vote.**

**5.1** Executive Board July 2020 Meeting Minutes Draft

**Requested Action:** Approve the Executive Board July 2020 Meeting Minutes Draft

**Attachments:** [Executive Board July 2020 Meeting Minutes Draft](#)

The Executive Board July 2020 Meeting Minutes Draft were approved.

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

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Consider approval of the LAPP FY2022 Proposed Changes and Target Modal Investment Mix. Open the “One Call for All” call for projects through October 30, 2020.

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

The Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) FY2022 Proposed Changes and Target Modal Investment Mix was approved.

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

Gretchen Vetter, CAMPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.

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

The FY2020-2029 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #2 was approved.

**5.4** **Capital Area MPO Complete Streets Resolution**

Kenneth Withrow, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Adopt the Complete Streets Resolution.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[Complete Streets Resolution of Continued Support](#)

The Capital Area MPO Complete Streets Resolution was approved.

**5.5** **CAMPO SRTS Program - Data Sharing MOA**

Kenneth Withrow, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Approve the Memorandum of Agreement for Signature.

**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)  
[CAMPO-WCPSS-Data Collection ILA \(SRTS revisions\)  
-Final-2020-07-20](#)

The CAMPO SRTS Program - Data Sharing MOA was approved.

**End of Consent Agenda**

**6. Public Hearing**

*(none)*

**End of Public Hearings**

**7. Regular Agenda**

## 7.1

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

Shelby Powell, MPO Staff

Alex Bell, Consultant, Renaissance Planning, Inc.

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

*CAMPO Deputy Director Shelby Powell introduced Mr. Alex Bell, Consultant, Renaissance Planning, Inc. who reported on this item.*

*Ms. Powell provided some context for the study, explaining that RED Lanes are transit priority lanes that also allow for right turns, emergency vehicle access and driveway access. The intent of this study is to look at which corridors across the region might be suitable for additional study for RED Lanes, not necessarily to look at feasibility and implementation of those improvements at a detailed level.*

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

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

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

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

*Outcomes of the study:*

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

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

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

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

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

Member Will Allen III questioned whether the study took into account the possible implication on traffic by removing or restricting and not replacing lanes. Mr. Bell replied that this issue is beyond the scope of the current study but could be examined in the future.

CAMPO Deputy Director Shelby Powell added that the consulting team provided a map with corridor sample sheets to examine the implications of adding or removing lanes in various corridors, which generated many discussions with the technical team. She reiterated that this study was not meant to examine the feasibility of adding or removing lanes, only if it would be appropriate for further study in a project development phase.

Chair Hutchinson agreed that the study is a worthwhile endeavor and asked what the next steps might be to move forward. He mentioned discussions with Mr. Lukasina regarding Joe Milazzo's FAST study and how it might be coordinated in conjunction with the R.E.D study.

Ms. Powell responded that the study concluded approximately six weeks ago and final documentation has just been completed. Mr. Bell had mentioned that a tool kit had been assembled and discussion on how best to transmit it to a broader audience is underway. This would allow communities looking for project development to explore weights and suitability options. Mr. Will Allen noted that he is in favor of this type of improvement and hoped to see implementation move forward.

CAMPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina stated that the key takeaway to remember is that RTA is completing the FAST study throughout the region, and is utilizing a variety of tools and solutions to help transit network and systems. The preliminary report was



*released in July 2020 and the comment period is currently open. The full FAST study preliminary report is available at the following link: [letsgetmoving.org](https://letsgetmoving.org). Mr. Lukasina emphasized that there is a lot of overlap in corridors where RED lines may be useful, and that it is a positive sign when two independent studies have similar findings and solutions.*

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

## 7.2

**Fayetteville-Raleigh Rail Passenger Feasibility Study**

Shelby Powell, MPO Staff

Scott Lane, Consultant, MetroAnalytics, Inc.

Ryan White, Stantec, Inc.

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.

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

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

CAMPO Deputy Director Shelby Powell introduced Mr. Scott Lane, Consultant, MetroAnalytics, Inc and Mr. Ryan White, Consultant, Stantec, Inc., who reported on this item.

*Ms. Powell stated that the yearlong Fayetteville-Raleigh Rail Passenger Study Project was conducted by FAMPO/CAMPO in cooperation with NCDOT and Metro Analytics / Stantec, and multiple other partners. This study was to determine the feasibility of passenger rail service between Raleigh and Fayetteville on one or two of the existing two rail line corridors. This study did not identify which corridor would be a better fit for future passenger rail, and the study partners determined that additional qualitative conversation is required in order to identify one corridor for further study before additional detailed study is done. There is also opportunity to explore other scenarios in a follow up study, including things like extending the Wake Transit Commuter Rail project, expanding Amtrak service, or looking at a longer service scenario. Also, NCDOT would be an integral partner for the second phase of study, and they do not currently have funding available to participate.*

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

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

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

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

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

and Fayetteville.

*Operations Detail: Raleigh*

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

*Operations Detail: Selma*

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

*Operations Detail: Fayetteville*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project Portal: [www.ral2fayrail.com](http://www.ral2fayrail.com)  
J. Scott Lane AICP, CPTED  
1167 Harp Street  
Raleigh, NC | 27604  
919.601.9098 | [jslane@metroanalytics.com](mailto:jslane@metroanalytics.com)

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

Joel Strickland, Project Manager  
Fayetteville Area MPO

130 Gillespie Street  
Fayetteville, NC 28301  
Tel: 910-678-7622

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

Member Will Allen III commented that it was important to keep in perspective that this was a very preliminary study which was not meant to be in depth, nor would it be taking place in the near future. Projected ridership numbers for 2035 would not score high enough in a proposal to FTA to secure federal dollars. He added that this study was a good first step.

CAMPO Deputy Director Shelby Powell said that when this study was first envisioned, phase one's focus was more of a general one; which of the two corridors might be most feasible or suitable. At the end of this study the team did not feel ready to move directly into phase two until more information was secured and further questions answered. She stated there is an internal running list of topics and conversations that need to occur in preparation for phase two. NCDOT Rail Division will be heavily involved; however, given their funding situation due to the pandemic, they are currently unable to participate financially in a phase two study. Ms. Powell encouraged feedback and suggestions for the study. She added that over the fiscal year CAMPO hopes to have additional conversations with FAMPO and board members to discuss possible next steps and if it makes sense to examine regions beyond just the passenger rail.

Member John Byrne asked how much emphasis was placed on the large amount of growth occurring along each corridor, because Fuquay-Varina and surrounding areas were experiencing tremendous growth that is expected to continue. Mr. Lane responded that the 2035 projections have tended to be low which may not match the actual rapid growth patterns, and that CAMPO will continue to study these and other aspects to drive the scope of the next phase. Ms. Powell added that there have been some good discussions regarding what ridership numbers might be if the service extended beyond just that corridor, and that the report shows what might be contemplated eventually.

Member Butch Lawter inquired if any consideration had been given to the eastern route that goes to Clayton from the existing Commuter Rail project. Ms. Powell responded that the study did not look at a continuation of the existing commuter rail project, but that it was a distinct service with the purpose of examining viability between Raleigh and Fayetteville. She said she was aware that plans for the commuter rail study between Clayton and Durham were underway but that specific route was not one of the alternates this study examined. She added that it could be added to a future phase two study. Mr. Lane stated that there had been good discussions with the Town of Clayton regarding the Clayton- Durham study. He said that part of discussion included the possibility that this project could be completed earlier.

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

## 7.3

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

Chris Lukasina, MPO Executive Director

**Requested Action:** Receive as information and consider approval of the draft goals, objectives, and performance measures for use in the development of the 2050 MTP.

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

[2050 MTP Schedule](#)

[2050 MTP Goals & Objectives](#)

[2050 MTP Public Engagement Strategy](#)

[2050 MTP-GoalsPublicEngagementPlan - Compilation Comments](#)

[August 14 2020](#)

[Comments.Goal Suggestions.ALL](#)

[Comments.Goal1 Environment.ALL](#)

[Comments.Goal2 Connect.ALL](#)

[Comments.Goal3 Mode choice ALL](#)

[Comments.Goal4 Congestion Reliability.ALL](#)

[Comments.Goal5 Infrastructure.ALL](#)

[Comments.Goal6 Equity Participation.ALL](#)

[Comments.Goal7 Safety Health.ALL](#)

[Comments.Goal8 Economic Vitality.ALL](#)

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

Mr. Lukasina stated that in the upcoming year and a half, the development of the 2050 MTP will be in a more active phase. He shared that due to an ongoing effort to coordinate with the DCHC MPO, the goals, objectives and performance measures have been largely unified, many of which align with the State targets as well. This unification is useful for the public, who may not see the delineation between CAMPO and DCHC MPO.

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

A robust Public Engagement Strategy is a major factor in this process and is customized to each milestone. Ms. Bonnie Parker, CAMPO reported on this section. Ms. Parker stated that community feedback was elicited through a public comment period and a Joint DCHC MPO and CAMPO survey using MetroQuest. The survey was available in both English and Spanish. Both the public comment period and survey ended on August 13, 2020. The survey content attempted to gauge public support for proposed goals, policy priorities and collected demographics data of respondents. This survey was promoted through print and digital media, as well as word of mouth by member partners and community stakeholder groups. Ms. Parker thanked everyone for their participation and proactive efforts.

To date the official count of completed surveys is 2,169. On a scale of 1-5 for Level of

Support, CAMPO area survey responses scored 3.9 or above for all goals. She noted a slight difference between the two MPOs although both scored highest for Connections and Mode Choice.

Ms. Parker provided a breakdown of the survey demographics for the eight goals by race, ethnicity, household income, language, disability, age and gender.

Mr. Lukasina briefly reviewed the eight (8) draft goals and objectives which include clarifying language. He stated that some minor changes and updates have occurred since the last presentation of information.

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

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

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

Obj. C Addition: Connect transportation and land use.

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

GOAL 2: Connect People & Places – no change

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

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

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

Obj. A: Enhance transit services, amenities and facilities

Obj. B: Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities

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

Goal 4: Manage Congestion & System Reliability – no change

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Obj. D: Promote resilience planning and practices

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

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

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

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

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

- Obj. A: Increase safety of travelers and residents*  
*Obj. B: Promote public health through transportation choices*

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

- Obj. A: Improve freight movement*  
*Obj. B: Coordinate land use and transportation*  
*Obj. C: Target funding to the most cost-effective solutions*  
*Obj. D: Improve project delivery for all modes*

*Chair Hutchinson and Member Michael Grannis praised this effort. Mr. Lukasina expressed deep appreciation to Ms. Bonnie Parker for her hard work for data collection and statistical analysis.*

*Mr. Lukasina provided a breakdown of survey results for CAMPO Area investment priority policies that are most important to serve a growing Triangle population:*

|                             |               |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Leverage Investments</i> | <i>52.61%</i> |
| <i>Land Use</i>             | <i>45.36%</i> |
| <i>Increase Transit</i>     | <i>44.20%</i> |
| <i>Encourage Walking</i>    | <i>42.61%</i> |
| <i>TDM Carpool</i>          | <i>31.74%</i> |
| <i>Discourage Driving</i>   | <i>16.09%</i> |
| <i>Encourage Driving</i>    | <i>12.17%</i> |
| <i>Raise Taxes or Fees</i>  | <i>10.29%</i> |

*Mr. Lukasina stated that results for Policy Rankings show high support of non-auto modes and more dense, mixed land uses. The issue of Encouraging Driving has by far the least support. He added that the comments are available for view via links to PDF documents and are sorted by goal.*

*Ms. Parker then reviewed a summary of the comments themes and suggestions for goals. She stated that these comments are posted on the CAMPO website and that they will help drive the development of the 2050 MTP. She explained that the themes and survey data will be shared with Wake Transit staff as well as other interested parties.*

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

*A roll call was taken for each Member or Alternate to confirm agreement.*

**A motion was made by Member Michael Grannis, seconded by Member Vivian Jones to approve the DRAFT MTP 2050 Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures. The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

## **8. Informational Item: Budget**



- 8.1**                      **Operating Budget - FY 2020**  
Lisa Blackburn, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.

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

*The Operating Budget Report was included in the agenda packet.*

**The Operating Budget Report was received as information.**

- 8.2**                      **Member Shares FY 2020**  
Lisa Blackburn, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as Information

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

*The Member Shares Report was included in the agenda packet.*

**The Member Shares Report was received as information.**

## **9. Informational Item: Project Updates**

- 9.1**                      Executive Board August 2020 Project Updates

**Requested Action:** Receive as information

**Attachments:** [Executive Board August 2020 Project Updates](#)

*The Project Updates were included in the agenda packet.*

**The Project Updates item was received as information.**

- 9.2**                      **Public Engagement Updates**  
Bonnie Parker, MPO Staff

**Requested Action:** Receive as information.

**Attachments:** [Public Engagement Updates Exec Board Aug 2020](#)

*The Public Engagement Updates were included in the agenda packet.*

**The Public Engagement Updates item was received as information.**

**10. Informational Item: Staff Reports**

*MPO Executive Director Chris Lukasina stated that:*

*-The FAST Study is in progress, and information is available on the website: [letsgetmoving.org](https://letsgetmoving.org). RTA questions may be sent to Joe Milazzo or Natalie Ridout.*

*-The 2050 MTP is in progress, with focus on developing socioeconomic data. The MTP is in the base year for population and employment. Data is being collected through the online portal Employee Analyst Tool, which was made available to all Members' staff. The deadline for entering data is September 18, 2020. Currently, there is lower than desired participation, and CAMPO is tracking this. Members are encouraged to reach out to their staff. As the deadline approaches a report can be generated to show those who have not completed any work.*

*-An annual Member Share letter for the last fiscal year has been sent to each clerk or finance director, as well as TCC members. CAMPO is hopeful that these will all be paid over the next month so the book may be closed for the fiscal year.*

*-The FY 2022 LAPP applicant training will be held tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. The UPWP call for projects is open until the end of October. Questions may be directed to CAMPO Deputy Director Shelby Powell.*

*-There are Wake transit stakeholder meetings occurring in September. Questions regarding registration may be directed to CAMPO staff members Stephanie Plancich or Bret Martin or Mr. Lukasina.*

*-CAMPO received a letter from AMPO, requesting support. The letter calls for Congress to consider action regarding the 2020 census in three key areas that could adversely affect transportation funding. These are 1) the reduction by one month's time for data collection, 2) implementation of differential privacy factors and 3) treatment of data collection for colleges and universities, which could be greatly affected due to the pandemic. Mr. Lukasina asked whether any members had concerns about signing the letter of support. No members disagreed.*

*-The Triangle Bikeway study team will be meeting with the Town of Cary, Town of Morrisville and the City of Raleigh in the next week or two, and future meetings will be scheduled with the respective mayors of those areas, as well as other communities along the corridors.*

*TCC Chair - no report.*

*NCDOT Transportation Planning Division - no report.*

*NCDOT Division 4 - no report.*

*NCDOT Division 5 – Mr. Joey Hopkins stated that NCDOT has performed a reprogramming exercise to ensure that the STIP remains fiscally constrained. The results of this were shared with the MPO today, and NCDOT plans to work with CAMPO staff towards this effort in the upcoming weeks. He stated that the State Board of Transportation would most likely see this during their September 2020 meeting, with a request for action in October 2020.*

*NCDOT Division 6 - no report.*

*NCDOT Rail Division no report.*

*NC Turnpike Authority - Mr. Lukasina said they would be presenting information on the 540 project next month.*

*NCDOT Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning Division – no report.*

*Executive Board Members – no report.*

*TCC Chair - no report.*

*NCDOT Transportation Planning Division - no report.*

*NCDOT Division 4 - no report.*

*NCDOT Division 5 – Mr. Joey Hopkins stated that NCDOT has performed a reprogramming exercise to ensure that the STIP remains fiscally constrained. The results of this were shared with the MPO today, and NCDOT plans to work with CAMPO staff towards this effort in the upcoming weeks. He stated that their (NCDOT's?) board would most likely see this during their September 2020 meeting, with a request for action in October 2020.*

*NCDOT Division 6 - no report.*

*NCDOT Rail Division no report.*

*NC Turnpike Authority - Mr. Lukasina said they would be presenting information on the 540 project next month.*

*NCDOT Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning Division – no report.*

*Executive Board Members – no report.*

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

## **11. Adjournment**

## Upcoming Meetings/Events

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <i>Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting</i>       | <i>September 3, 2020</i>  |
| <i>One Bank of America Plaza</i>          | <i>10:00 - noon</i>       |
| <i>421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203</i> |                           |
| <i>Raleigh, NC 27601</i>                  |                           |
| <br>                                      |                           |
| <i>Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting</i>       | <i>September 16, 2020</i> |
| <i>One Bank of America Plaza</i>          | <i>4:00 - 6:00</i>        |
| <i>421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203</i> |                           |
| <i>Raleigh, NC 27601</i>                  |                           |
| <br>                                      |                           |
| <i>Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting</i>       | <i>October 1, 2020</i>    |
| <i>One Bank of America Plaza</i>          | <i>10:00 - noon</i>       |
| <i>421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203</i> |                           |
| <i>Raleigh, NC 27601</i>                  |                           |
| <br>                                      |                           |
| <i>Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting</i>       | <i>October 21, 2020</i>   |
| <i>One Bank of America Plaza</i>          | <i>4:00 - 6:00</i>        |
| <i>421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 203</i> |                           |
| <i>Raleigh, NC 27601</i>                  |                           |