



**Chair/Vice Chair Meeting
Triangle J COG
December 18, 2006**

Agenda

1. Charge to the Joint MPO Advisory Committee
2. Establishment of the Committee
 - a. Interests to be represented on the committee
 - b. Selection of members
3. Tasks
4. Uses of the Committee's Work

Notes from the meeting

Officials: Joe Bryan, Chair, CAMPO TAC
Alice Gordon, Chair, DCHC MPO TAC
Becky Heron, Vice Chair, DCHC MPO TAC
Charles Meeker, Vice Chair, CAMPO TAC

Staff: Mark Ahrendsen, DCHC MPO
Ellen Beckmann, DCHC MPO
David Bonk, DCHC MPO
John Hodges-Copple, TJ COG
Ed Johnson, CAMPO
Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO

1. Charge to the Joint MPO Advisory Committee

Both CAMPO and DCHC MPO agreed that the charge to the committee should be as stated in the handout with one addition as noted below:

The DCHC MPO and CAMPO have concluded that major transit investments will be crucial to the Triangle's future economic success and mobility. In this regard the two MPOs have proposed the development of a Vision for Transit in the Triangle. The development of this

Vision for Transit in the Triangle would include a robust public outreach/community engagement effort and a process for establishing priorities for regional transit investments. The two MPOs have also proposed the creation of a Joint MPO Advisory Committee to assist them in the development of the Vision for Transit in the Triangle. The Joint MPO Advisory Committee shall deliver to the region's two MPOs a set of recommended major transit investments to serve the Triangle based on:

- Addition: Guiding principles for transit investments
- The *Transit Infrastructure Blueprint Project* analysis
- Priorities for transit investments
- A community engagement process

2. Establishment of the Committee

a. Interests to be represented on the committee

Both CAMPO and DCHC MPO agreed that the following list includes the interests that should be represented on the committee.

1. Neighborhood/Community
2. Environment
3. Business
4. University
5. Government
6. At Large

The number of representatives from each of these interests was not discussed. In addition, there was discussion that there may not be space for all the representatives from each of the interest areas, and that could include representatives from the major universities.

b. Selection of members

Several issues were raised regarding the selection of members for the committee.

Geographic Balance

Alice proposed that the committee have equal representation from CAMPO and DCHC MPO. The CAMPO DCHC MPO Memorandum of Agreement that establishes the Joint TAC meetings and the Executive Committee is based on equal representation from both MPOs for joint planning activities. The two MPOs have equal authority to make transportation decisions. In addition, the committee is proposed to be advisory so the balance of representation may not be an important issue.

Joe pointed out that since CAMPO has expanded into Granville, Franklin, Johnston, and Harnett Counties, CAMPO needs more membership on the committee to represent the different counties. Charles stated that since CAMPO has twice the population of DCHC MPO equal representation would not be fair. It would be more true to democratic principles to have representation on the committee based on population. In addition, since a major transit investment will likely require local funding which would be provided by the counties

based on their populations, CAMPO should have more representation on the committee. Charles initially suggested that the committee consist of 12 CAMPO representatives and 8 DCHC representatives. Charles's "final offer" was for the committee to consist of 14 CAMPO representatives and 10 DCHC representatives.

Alice also pointed out that the desire is to appoint a regional committee with region-wide interests. The best way to ensure this is for the Chairs and Vice Chairs to jointly propose one list of committee members that both MPOs agree upon. There are some potential committee members whose interests span the two MPOs and that both MPOs would probably agree upon. Becky added that there are several common interests between the two MPOs and that working together may not be as difficult as it is perceived. In addition, having each MPO independently appoint an agreed upon number of committee members would make balancing the committee for diversity and interests more difficult.

CAMPO proposed that if the Chairs and Vice Chairs could not agree upon the geographic distribution of members, that each MPO should appoint their own committee. The two committees would operate independently but could meet together periodically and staff could facilitate discussion between the two committees. DCHC MPO responded that having two committees would not be conducive to the development of regional transit priorities and this option should be avoided if possible.

Select Individuals or Organizations

DCHC MPO suggested soliciting candidates for the committee from a list of organizations. Becky proposed an initial list of organizations that should be contacted. CAMPO responded that the DCHC MPO could select their members however they saw fit, and that CAMPO would do likewise.

Size of the Committee

CAMPO and DCHC MPO agreed that the size of the committee should be limited to 15 to 25 people.

Timing

CAMPO suggested that the committee members be appointed in January and start meeting in February. DCHC MPO indicated that it could take longer to solicit committee candidates and make the appointments.

Committee Members

Charles suggested that the committee consist of "high powered people". Joe added that the member should be as high up in the chain of command as possible.

Becky said that there should be room for both high powered people and regular citizens with good ideas and regional interests.

Charles suggested that TTA and the transit agencies should not be on the committee, but could serve as ex-officio members. Joe added that staff people whose job is to represent the

interest of an organization should not serve on the committee. Board members of organizations would be acceptable.

3. Tasks

Tasks for the committee were not discussed.

4. Uses of the Committee's Work

Use of the committee's work was not discussed.

Next Steps –

The Chairs/Vice Chairs will take this matter back to their respective TACs in January for further discussion and guidance. The options to be considered include (1) the joint appointment of a single committee of approximately 25 members from among a list of candidates suggested by each MPO, (2) the establishment of a single committee of approximately 25 members with each MPO appointing a specific number, and (3) each MPO appoint its own advisory committee with the two committees working together.

The Chairs/Vice Chairs will get back together after the matter has been discussed further by each MPO.