

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 20, 2010  
MINUTES

The Transportation Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, October 20, 2010, at 4:00 p.m. at the CAMPO Offices, Professional Building, 127 W. Hargett Street, Suite 800, with the following present:

Members

Chairman Bryan, presiding  
Dan Andrews  
Harold Broadwell  
John Byrne  
Frank Eagles  
R. H. Ellington  
Hubert Gooch  
Jackie Holcombe  
Joseph Johnson  
Vivian Jones  
Charles Meeker  
Darryl Moss  
Julie Robison  
Perry Safran  
Dick Sears  
Gus Tulloss  
Keith Weatherly  
Ronnie Williams

Representing

Wake County  
Harnett County  
Wendell  
Fuquay-Varina  
Rolesville  
Angier  
Granville County  
Morrisville  
Youngsville  
Wake Forest  
Raleigh  
Creedmoor  
Cary  
NC Turnpike Authority  
Holly Springs  
NCDOT  
Apex  
Garner

Staff

Ed Johnson  
Gerald Daniel  
Richard Epps  
Chris Lukasina  
Robert McCain  
Shelby Powell  
Amy Ward  
Kyle Ward  
Brandon Watson  
Diane Wilson  
Kenneth Withrow

Representing

CAMPO Director  
CAMPO Staff  
CAMPO Staff  
CAMPO Staff  
CAMPO Staff  
CAMPO Staff  
CAMPO Staff  
CAMPO Staff  
CAMPO Staff  
CAMPO Staff

Others

Mary Bell  
Wally Bowman  
Todd Delk

Representing

Attorney  
NCDOT - Div. 5  
Cary

Transportation Advisory Committee  
October 20, 2010

Rupal Desai	NCDOT - TPB
Steve DeWitt	NC Turnpike Authority
David Eatman	CAT
Tim Gardiner	Wake County
Damien Graham	TTA
Jennifer Harris	NC Turnpike Authority
John Hodges-Copple	TJ-COG
Danny Johnson	Fuquay-Varina
Mike Kennon	Raleigh
Tim Maloney	Wake County
Bill Martin	MBAB/TTA
Patrick McDonough	Triangle Transit
Greg Northcutt	TTA
Jonathan Parker	TTA
Chip Russell	TCC Chair
Joe Milazzo	RTA
Juanita Shearer-Swink	TTA
Tom Worth	Attorney

**STAFF REPORT - RECEIVED**

Mr. Johnson reported on some work being done. He indicated NCDOT has developed a data driven priority process they call SPOT and are doing version 2.0 and working with a group of MPOs, Julie White, etc. A meeting was held the previous day. He indicated Mr. Lukasina had been meeting with them. There have been public sessions on this.

Mr. Lukasina explained the next group of public sessions will occur in November at 4 locations - Raleigh on November 8 at 9:00 a.m. at the RDU Airport Authority building; Kinston on November 10 at 9:00 a.m.; November 15 in Greensboro at 9:00 a.m. and November 16 in Morganton at 10:00 a.m. These will be an opportunity to get a recap on what happened the first time around with state-wide prioritization looking at how it all worked in the end, looking at lessons learned and to receive feedback from everyone on the experience they received. They are looking for more input from the TCC and TAC members and the public. The input will be used by NCDOT to make 2.0 version better. Mr. Lukasina noted members should keep in mind with this version that it is an interim process so hopefully every time it is done it will get a little better. He requested that members advise staff if they will attend a session. Mr. Lukasina noted the working group is looking at a mobility fund and there was a preliminary report due to the legislature that was presented at the beginning of October. The full month of October will be open for public comment on the preliminary report and the 2 proposed approaches - one would be a needs based approach and one would be a cost/benefit analysis approach for determining which projects should use funding through the mobility fund. He explained at this point nothing is set in stone and they were open to

comments or recommendations. Either scoring mechanism would look at providing some sort of preference for inter-modal projects and insuring that, regardless of the size of the project, it is a good project that meets the requirements of the legislation.

Chairman Bryan called the meeting to order.

#### **AGENDA - APPROVED AS PRESENTED**

No changes were made to the agenda; therefore, the agenda was approved as presented.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS - NONE RECEIVED**

Chairman Bryan announced this was an opportunity for comments from those in attendance relating to non-agenda items. No one asked to be heard.

#### **MINUTES - SEPTEMBER 15, 2010 - APPROVED AS PRESENTED**

Members had received a copy of the September 15, 2010 Minutes in their agenda packets. Mr. Williams moved approval of the Minutes as presented. His motion was seconded by Mr. Gooch, unanimously passed. Chairman Bryan ruled the motion adopted.

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **LOCALLY ADMINISTERED PROJECTS PROGRAM (LAPP) - HEARING HELD -**

Mr. Lukasina reviewed this item and explained the TAC directed staff to develop a long term program to manage locally administered projects. Staff has worked with the LAPP Committee in over 20 hours of meetings to develop a recommended program and project prioritization system. Draft LAPP eligibility requirements, annual program schedule, project scoring and prioritization criteria were provided at the meeting in Attachments 4A-4D. The TAC released the LAPP process and prioritization system for a public review and comment period beginning August 18, 2010 and concluding on October 20, 2010. A public hearing was opened at the September 15, 2010 TAC meeting and left open through today's meeting. The TCC recommended adoption of the LAPP program on August 5, 2010.

Chairman Bryan announced the hearing continued.

No one asked to be heard, thus the hearing was closed.

Ms. Jones moved approval of the LAPP program as presented. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Meeker, unanimously passed. Chairman Bryan ruled the motion adopted.

**THIS CONCLUDES THE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**2009-2015 MTIP AMENDMENT #7 - RELEASED FOR 30-DAY COMMENT PERIOD  
UNTIL NOVEMBER 18, 2010**

Mr. Lukasina indicated the TAC directed MPO staff to move forward the development of a list of projects that could be used to obligate FY 2011-STP-DA funds. The FY 2011 Modal Investment Mix calls for an approximately \$1.5 million transit program. STP-DA funds are being flexed to FTA and used as Section 5307 funds. The list of projects was provided in Attachment 5A and was presented to the TCC at their October 7 meeting and forwarded to the TAC for endorsement. The public involvement policy requires a 30-day public review and comment period for these amendments. The TAC was requested to release the 2009-2015 MTIP Amendment #7 for the 30-day public review and comment period and schedule the public hearing for the November 17, 2010 TAC meeting. The comment period would open on October 20, 2010 and close November 18, 2010.

Mr. Lukasina explained there are a variety of projects including 2 projects for the Cary CTran, several projects for CAT and 2 projects for Triangle Transit.

Mr. Meeker moved that this amendment be released for a 30-day comment period to begin October 20, 2010 and closed November 18, 2010. His motion was seconded by Mr. Broadwell, unanimously passed. Chairman Bryan ruled the motion adopted.

**NC TURNPIKE AUTHORITY - TRIANGLE EXPRESSWAY - SOUTHEAST EXTENSION  
- RESOLUTION ADOPTED**

Mr. Lukasina reviewed this item. At the September TAC meeting, a presentation on the NC Turnpike Authority's Triangle Expressway - Southeast Extension project was provided. Since that time, elected officials have received emails and verbal presentations from citizens concerned about the Turnpike's many alternatives for the project. The Turnpike Authority was invited to the October 18 Wake County Commissioner's meeting to discuss the project. Members received maps of the study corridor in Attachment 6A and a recent news article quoting several MPO members on this project. Chairman Bryan indicated the TAC received a presentation on this item at their last meeting. He reported the Wake County Commissioners discussed this item at their last meeting and a report received from Steve Dewitt, the chief engineer for this project. The towns of Garner, Fuquay and Holly Springs are taking some action and there is a proposed resolution provided for consideration from CAMPO.

Steve DeWitt, NC Turnpike Authority, noted there had been a lot of talk and concern about this project and what has transpired the last month regarding corridors under consideration. He referred to the protected corridor and the growth that has occurred around that corridor and how the development goes up to the corridor but not inside the protected corridor area. He explained they are following NEPA that dictates what they do and how they do it and under NEPA guidelines they must look at a reasonable range of alternatives. They are trying to assure the right road is built for transportation needs and the right road for the community. He explained a month ago they went before the public and showed the various corridors and the public concern has come out which is exactly what they wanted. He noted they do want public comment and this is an opportunity and a key part for private development, given the magnitude of this project, that they hear what the public desires, the impacts, their preferences, etc. He noted 2,000 comments have been received in writing since the workshops. In regard to the protected corridor, he explained it has been protected, it is protected. The logic that existed here to protect this corridor in the 90's exists here today. He noted the increased development around this corridor reaffirms this logic. The process required will be followed to determine the final alignment for this project which will be a year from now. Mr. DeWitt explained over the next 45 days some of the alternatives will start to disappear. He indicated the orange corridor will continue to be seen and another new location corridor may not be seen. He emphasized the process is continuing to do what it should do by insuring the public has the opportunity to have a voice in this process.

In response to questioning, Mr. DeWitt explained everything that has occurred over the past month and all the things done by elected officials, are helping the Authority to make a decision on which routes make some sense, to stay on their study as things move forward and to take those and do a much more detailed look at the alternatives. He explained they have received a lot of comments and had a sense of where some of these alignments are in terms of public acceptance and any other issues that relate to them. All the public comments and data collected becomes part of the decision making process as this moves forward.

Mr. Byrne questioned if comments had been received from anyone opposed to the existing corridor noting everything he had heard. He noted people have come to expect the orange alternative to be the corridor. Mr. DeWitt noted approximately 90% of respondents were in favor of the protected corridor.

Mr. Sears indicated members received a resolution expressing CAMPO's position regarding the alignment and completion of the future NC 540 Turnpike aka Triangle Expressway. Mr. Sears moved adoption of the resolution as proposed. Mr. Byrne seconded the motion which was passed unanimously. Chairman Bryan ruled the motion adopted.

Mr. Meeker requested a report on projections that were used for the Western Wake growth in that area at the time this was done in 2007 or 2008 compared to the natural growth that has occurred. He indicated with the recession, there was more growth projected than has actually occurred. Mr. DeWitt indicated when the bond market crashed and all the economic issues came up, they stepped back and redid their traffic and revenue to reflect a depressed economy. He did not have the data available at the meeting but could provide that information. He noted the numbers had been tempered to reflect the economy and other things that have occurred. Mr. Meeker explained he would like the report to reflect the initial projections, revised projections and development that actually has occurred.

At this point, Chairman Bryan reported Mr Killen, Knightdale, would be having surgery for potentially having pancreatic cancer, and asked members to keep Mr. Killen and his family in their prayers.

#### **TRIANGLE REGIONAL TRANSIT PROGRAM - ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS - INFORMATION RECEIVED**

The agenda outlined the history of this item noting the TCC and TAC heard presentations at their June meetings on the Triangle Regional Transit Program Alternatives Analysis. Since that time two rounds of public workshops were held by the consultant, URS. On September 28, the Transitional Analysis document was released for public review. The consultant team and Triangle Transit staff were present to provide information on the corridor screening results. Attachment 7A was provided to the members which was a copy of the executive summary of the document. The results of the alternatives analysis is scheduled to be presented to the TAC in early 2011. Triangle Transit is seeking any input or guidance the TAC may wish to give at this time. At the Joint TAC meeting held on September 29, the NC Rail Road Company (NCRR) presented an overview of their Commuter Rail Ridership and Market Study. The study matches the recommended configuration of the 2008 Shared Corridor Commuter Rail Capacity Study and includes trains every 40 minutes during the AM and PM peak periods on the four routes studied on a 140 mile segment of the NCRR between Greensboro and Goldsboro.

Greg Northcutt, Triangle Transit, reviewed the alternatives analysis process. He indicated the Transitional Analysis document is an interim report on a process that will take at least 6 to 10 more months. This report was to make the TAC aware of what has occurred and where it goes from here. He reviewed the background and the overall objective of the study, what progress has been to date, items that still remain, next steps, etc. The overall objective is to provide the decision makers with enough information about the total investment package in order for the TAC to make decisions on which they assume the first part of that is going to be the initial bus service expansion

along with what extent they will be studying and implementing in terms of rail investments and phasing of each. He reviewed the process for development of the Transitional Analysis document noting what that is trying to do is with all the studies being done for the last 8 months, it would take the LRTP definitions and move it into an alternatives analysis and highlight what has changed or how did we implement this with respect to the LRTP. Two rounds of public workshops have been completed and they have determined the highest performing corridors for presentation at this meeting. The final draft of the Alternatives Analysis is essentially complete and the only thing to add is the document for the historical basis to include some of the questions that were raised by stakeholders that are not necessarily a part of the first round but were addressed anyway. Remaining tasks were reviewed with Mr. Northcutt explaining once the recommended corridor is recommended, then they will move into the next phase of the Alternatives Analysis which requires a much more in-depth technical analysis. A determination needs to be made of what is the alignment, the termini, what are the station locations, how many are there and the technology (mode - light rail, commuter rail). A final round of public workshops will occur in late February or early March, 2011 and at that point they need to be providing CAMPO with enough information to approve the locally preferred alternative. That is the product produced in the spring that says this is what the decision has been in terms of what corridor we are going forward with which is referred to as the locally preferred alternative. The evaluation process was reviewed and 80 miles of rail corridor were extracted from the 2035 Long-Range Plan. Screening criteria was determined which were applied to each corridor with the objective to figure out which corridor is better than the next. The first criteria used was mobility, the second criteria was socio-economic and the third criteria was land use. Other items considered were whether the regulatory support in place up front to foster transit oriented development; growth factor and the financials. He explained each criteria in detail. He explained other things also taken into account were the FTA New Start process which was reviewed. When our project is submitted to the FTA, they are going to look at "the sweet spots" and they look very closely at the minimal optimum segment so if a project is picked that is 18 miles long, we are going to have to defend why we think the full 18 miles meets all the criteria for funding. Mr. Byrne questioned the length of the Seattle project (14 miles).

The corridors were reviewed in detail by Mr. Northcutt. Wake #8 extending from northwest Cary to Northeast Regional Center which is felt to be the best one to start setting as the initial high performing corridor. It was also decided to study northwest Cary to Northeast Regional Center and imbedded in that is a subset of Wake #9 and #10 since it is not an exact science. He reviewed the proposals for Durham and Orange Counties. The regional corridor in West Durham was reviewed. He noted the light rail projects being recommended are not contiguous. He indicated the comparative study being conducted does not lead directly to any assessments, direction or decisions on which projects go

first but the information generated is a comparative study to take a look at the future of light rail between Durham and Raleigh and determine a head to head analysis and try to provide enough information so when we get to the point of making a decision on the financial plan, part of this could be used as the foundation for making a decision as to whether or not the rail should go first or do something different initially.

Mr. Northcutt explained the Special Alternatives Analysis is really going to be conducted between Durham and Raleigh that is not exactly the same end points that we have in commuter rail. He reviewed public involvement opportunities including 12 public hearings with 6 more in February. Meetings have been held throughout the region in every county in several locations. Over 700 people participated and 300 comments were received. Input has been favorable toward the project. Outreach has been targeted into minority community transit users and the website has received a significant amount of activity. He spoke to the commuter rail between Wake Forest and Apex which was not part of the initial highest performing corridor but was worthy of study for the possibility of future extensions. He indicated comments were included relating to the Hillsborough to Zebulon possibility and why it should not be considered for the initial decision but could be at a later date. How Garner would be treated was discussed with Mr. Northcutt noting Garner will be handled initially through the commuter rail project and at the same time they wanted to make sure whatever concept is approved in the Downtown Raleigh "Y" would not preclude the further extension at a later date of light rail, for example, going to Garner. Mr. Northcutt explained basically a corridor has been identified that goes from point A to point B and applied the evaluation criteria. He stated the question is what will be done with that corridor in the next 6-8 months and there may be up to 3 alternatives on how to get there and used examples to explain this point. The final objective is to identify the locally preferred alternative which is a single alignment from Point A to Point B with a designated number and locations of stations to include technology (light or commuter rail). Next steps were reviewed in detail. Mr. Northcutt referred to the bond referendum noting 6 months is needed to campaign for the referendum and in order for that to happen they need to have MPO and County Commissioner approval in the March/April timeframe and potentially making the decision from the LPA in the May timeframe. He discussed the tight schedule noting they will be sharing information continuously with the MPO and County Commissioners.

The report was received as information.

#### **TRIANGLE TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) PROGRAM - RECEIVED AS INFORMATION**

In 2006-2007, the Triangle Transit Authority brought together the Triangle organizations that were currently working on and/or funding Transportation

Demand Management projects with the goal of creating a long-term plan for improving TDM efforts. The result was the Triangle Region 7-Year Long Range Travel Demand Management Plan. This plan called for the two Metropolitan Planning Organizations and the NCDOT to pool their funds and have a competitive call for TDM projects. The CAMPO has committed CMAQ funds to this program in previous and current TIPs. Triangle J is charged with staffing this effort on behalf of the funding organizations. In response, the TDM Program was developed to coordinate and evaluate regional TDM activities, including efforts by numerous partners to reduce traffic and air pollution by promoting commute alternatives such as mass transit, carpooling, biking, telework and vanpooling. To ensure the most efficient use of resources and to be able to track progress, Triangle J is taking the lead in coordinating funding for marketing activities and then evaluating the effectiveness of these projects. The Triangle J Council of Governments administers the regional TDM program.

Mr. Johnson noted members were provided with handheld voting devices and were requested to respond to questions presented by Sean Flaherty, Triangle J COG. Members were advised to ask questions prior to responding to the questions. Members were provided explanations of any questions relating to the questions presented. Results were then reviewed and discussed. Chairman Bryan indicated this was a good exercise and there seems to be clear support for the direction CAMPO is heading. He asked if members would like to have discussion at this meeting relating to any items of concern or have staff capture all the data and send it out to members and have a more detailed discussion at the next meeting. Ms. Robison indicated it would be interesting to hear back from those that are doing the transitional analysis to see if they got the feedback they were looking for and felt it would be interesting to discuss it more thoroughly at another time. She questioned if there are red flags in this in terms of feedback received, are there any responses that were unexpected or that had not been heard previously.

It was agreed that staff would compile the data and provide this information to members for discussion at the next meeting and obtain Triangle Transit's response back on how they perceive the responses. Mr. Flaherty indicated this process was a screening exercise and at this point saw no red flags. Mr. Johnson referred to the question about getting additional information on the commuter train options on Raleigh to Wake Forest and Apex to Cary and indicated both of those received the majority of votes but yet the regional corridor right now does not include that. He questioned if members were in a position to be responsive one way or another as to what members were willing to do on this. Mr. Johnson indicated he was fearful of the fiscal constraint part of this project and FTA cutting whatever is requested down to some smaller size. He noted in the last study we went in with the idea of going all the way to Durant Road and then it got cut back 3 or 4 times. He stated that will happen in some or fashion with these corridors being reviewed now and what

we may be able to get FTA to agree to fund may not go north of Downtown Raleigh in which case there is no Plan B. He emphasized the idea of looking at commuter trains connecting Raleigh to Wake Forest may be something that becomes not just nice information but essential to have to make an informed decision down the road. He indicated it seemed that would be good information. He noted he had been convinced that running as many as 40 express trains per day all over the Triangle just can't be done because of Raleigh and Cary not being able to do that with tracks that are only on one level. Two level tracks would have to be built. He stated there could be several commuter trains that run from, as an example, Apex to Cary and from Wake Forest to Raleigh and that's all they do - just meet up with something that's just running on the trunk which might be an appealing idea to get trains sooner rather than later or maybe not. He stated right now that is not really. He was trying to reaffirm that members do feel this is useful information however staff can pull it together. Ms. Robison stated that doesn't necessarily mean it is or isn't a part of the commuter corridor with Mr. Johnson indicating it is just being looked at as a possible element that might be put out in the initial phase or at some subsequent phase and just the idea of exploring it will be useful. Mr. Flaherty explained they have tried to connect the region in an environment where the numbers weren't there and that is what happened to the 35 mile project. Mr. Eagles indicated Rolesville wanted to see about routing a bus from Wake Forest that goes to Triangle Town Center through Rolesville and down to Wake Tech. Ms. Jones indicated Wake Forest representatives had talked to Triangle Transit about this possibility and they are going to be looking at that. Mr. Eagles spoke to the lack of response received relating to this possibility. Chairman Bryan requested that someone get in touch with Mr. Eagles relating to this item. Mr. Byrne referred to a bus route relating to Holly Springs, Fuquay and Angier. Mr. Johnson explained that will be looked at in the bus study that has just kicked off.

Ms. Jones indicated she heard this presentation at the TCC meeting and it was her understanding that when we started this process, at the end of this process, we would be able to choose an alternative of the light rail or perhaps the commuter rail or perhaps just simply bus service. She wanted to be sure that is going to be and felt the answers to the questions at this meeting confirm that is what everyone would like to have. Ms. Jones stated she hoped that is the choice members have at the end of this process.

#### **NCDOT REPORT - RECEIVED**

Mr. Bowman reported on the closing of the bridge on Battle Bridge Road near Wendell. He indicated a meeting is scheduled for November 4 at Hephzibah Baptist Church from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Bowman indicated the representative from Division 4 called and advised him there was no report any different that the report the previous month.

Transportation Advisory Committee  
October 20, 2010

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Hunt