

**TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE**  
**JANUARY 5, 2012**  
**MINUTES**

The Technical Coordinating Committee met on Thursday, January 5, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in the CAMPO Offices, Raleigh, NC with the following present:

**Member**

Danny Johnson, Presiding  
Juliet Andes  
Brad Bass  
Ray Boylston  
Jerry Bradley  
Skip Browder  
Anson Carpenter  
Candace Davis  
Carl Dawson  
Todd Delk  
Rupal Desai  
Jimmy Eatmon  
Mark Edmonson  
Fleming El-Amin  
Tim Gardiner  
Scott Hammerbacher  
Chris Hills  
John Hodges-Copple  
Joey Hopkins  
Reed Huegerich  
Ashley Kaade  
Mike Kennon  
Eric Lamb  
Thomas Lloyd  
Kendra Parrish  
James Lim  
Tim Maloney  
Jonathan Parker  
Teresa Piner  
Coley Price  
Chip Russell  
Jay Sikes  
Jill Stark  
Don Willis

**Representing**

Fuquay-Varina  
Cary  
Garner  
Cary  
NCDOT Div. 6  
Clayton  
NCSU  
Wake Forest  
Raleigh  
Cary  
NCDOT  
NCDOT Div. 4  
Wake County  
Raleigh  
Wake County  
Franklin County  
Knightdale  
TJCOG  
NCDOT Div. 5  
Apex  
Morrisville  
Raleigh  
Raleigh  
Rolesville  
Holly Springs  
RTF  
Wake County  
TTA  
Wendell  
Angier  
Wake Forest  
Harnett County  
FHWA  
Wake County

**Staff**

Ed Johnson  
Gerald Daniel

**Representing**

CAMPO Director  
CAMPO Staff

Richard Epps	CAMPO Staff
Valorie Lockhart	CAMPO Staff
Chris Lukasina	CAMPO Staff
Robert McCain	CAMPO Staff
Amy Ward	CAMPO Staff
Kyle Ward	CAMPO Staff
Diane Wilson	CAMPO Staff
Kenneth Withrow	CAMPO Staff

**Others**

Jeremy Gilostein

**Representing**

Gannett Fleming, Inc.

Chairman Johnson called the meeting to order. The following items were discussed with actions taken as shown:

**AGENDA – APPROVED AS AMENDED**

It was reported there would be an add-on item discussed after Item 5 relating to NC Bike/Ped Application endorsement and Mr. Parker would provide a handout from Triangle Transit following the Wake County Transit Financial Plan Update. Without objection the agenda was approved as amended.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS – NONE RECEIVED**

Chairman Johnson announced this was an opportunity for comments by those in attendance relating to items not included on the agenda. No one asked to be heard.

**MINUTES – NOVEMBER 3, 2011 – APPROVED AS PRESENTED**

Members had received a copy of the November 3, 2011 minutes in their agenda packets. Mr. Browder moved approval of the minutes as presented. His motion was seconded by Mr. Delk, unanimously passed. Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS – DANNY JOHNSON REAPPOINTED CHAIR; RAY BOYLSTON REAPPOINTED VICE-CHAIR**

Mr. Johnson explained CAMPO's Bylaws call for the TCC Chair and Vice-Chair to be elected annually at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the calendar year. The agenda also noted the Organizational Review committee will convene during January to review by laws as well as additional Title VI documents now being required for MPO planning. A report and recommendations will be brought to the TCC and TAC during the first quarter of the year.

Chairman Johnson turned the chair over to Mr. Johnson to conduct the election of the Chair. Mr. Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

Mr. Johnson opened the floor for nominations for chair. Mr. Maloney nominated Danny Johnson to serve as chair. His nomination was seconded by Mr. Huegerich, unanimously passed. Mr. Browder moved that nominations be closed and Danny Johnson appointed as chair by acclamation. His motion was seconded by Mr. Russell, unanimously passed. Mr. Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

Mr. Johnson returned the chair to Chairman Johnson.

Chairman Johnson opened the floor for nominations for vice-chair. Mr. Delk nominated Ray Boylston to serve as vice-chair. His nomination was seconded by Mr. Bass, unanimously passed. Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted. Mr. Bass moved that nominations be closed and Ray Boylston appointed as vice-chair by acclamation. His motion was seconded by Mr. Browder, unanimously passed. Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

**NC BIKE/PED APPLICATION – RESOLUTION OF ENDORSEMENT – RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL BY TAC**

This item was an add-on to the agenda. Mr. Withrow explained annually NCDOT issues a call for bike/ped panning grant initiatives. This year a committee from CAMPO including Angier, Fuquay-Varina and Wendell was formed to review the submittals. Projects have been submitted and have been received by NCDOT. He requested adoption of a Resolution of Endorsement for these initiatives. Stakeholders had met and approved these initiatives and the committee wanted the TCC to note that approval and forward the item to the TAC with a recommendation of endorsement of the resolution. Mr. Withrow explained since 2004, CAMPO has received over \$369,000 in grants for our area and hoped to have all areas awarded by 2014.

Mr. Price recommended forwarding a recommendation to the TAC for the adoption of the Resolution of Endorsement. His motion was seconded by Mr. Parker, unanimously passed. Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

**FY 2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM – AMENDMENT #1 – OPENING 30-DAY PUBLIC REVIEW RECOMMENDED – HEARING SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY 15, 2012 TAC MEETING**

Ms. Wilson reviewed this item reported members received in their packets a memo outlining a mid-year review of projects underway and planned for completion in the FY 2012 UPWP and staff's recommendations for adjustments to funding levels, project modifications to span two years and several projects to be added to this fiscal year's project list. Attachment 6 included in the packets was the memo outlining the amendments needed as well as reasons. Attachment 6A in the packet included a chart

outlining the currently programmed UPWP line items and the projected changes. These adjustments will allow better utilization of funding by allowing the obligation of additional LAPP projects. Ms. Wilson requested that the TCC forward a recommendation to the TAC to open a 30-day public review and comment period and scheduling of a public hearing to be conducted at the February 15, 2012 TAC meeting.

Ms. Wilson reviewed projects that with either not begin, be unable to be completed or not needed in this fiscal year including Roadway Speed Survey by Airspace, Communities/Regional Planning (TJCOG); US-1 North Phase 2, Triangle Regional Rail Infrastructure Partnership (TRIPP) and Western Boulevard Crossing Study. Ms. Wilson then reviewed projects that need to be added including:

- Triangle Regional Model Support – Consultant       \$45,000
- Hot Spot Study – Sam’s Branch                               30,000
- NEPA Coordination   30,000
- Swift Creek Area Network Study – Pt. 1               35,000

Ms. Wilson explained reductions total \$468,500; additions total \$140,000; reduction in rent contingency totals \$100,000 with a balance of \$428,500. The balance would be added to the operational contingency line item along with other small items such as additional member contributions and member dues match funds associated with the reductions. The total in operational contingency will be \$666,951.00. Staff recommended that the 80% federal share of this amount be “thrown over the wall” to allow better utilization.

Mr. Bass spoke regarding the NEPA Coordination item noting there had been two intense dialogues between Garner, CAMPO, the Turnpike Authority, NCDOT and FHWA to remove the “red route”. He indicated it was his understanding the Turnpike Authority will be making a case for that in March. He explained Garner would like to see this matter deferred until March when that decision is made. Mr. Bass stated he had discussed this with Mr. Johnson and there had been very good dialogue to find a solution and was encouraged by that dialogue. He stressed the fact the red route is highly sensitive and again asked that this process take place before voting on the NEPA item. In response to a question, Mr. Bass indicated there will be a Resource Agency meeting in March and will include discussion on removing the red route from consideration noting currently it is still being reviewed.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the history of this item and noted there were meetings last month to discuss trying to find a way to move forward without doing field investigation of the red route. DOT will be turning a report in sometime soon and then there will be a 6-10 week process involved. He noted they do not want to do field work or anything that will inflame controversy with the citizens. If this doesn’t work a Plan B will have to be determined. The purpose of this item is to say let’s work on Plan B in case Plan A doesn’t work and Garner wants to see how Plan A works out. Mr. Bass reiterated Garner was requesting holding the NEPA project. Mr. Russell suggested that the TCC “0” out

that line item and move the \$25,000 to the operational contingency and revise that after the decision is made in March. He noted at that point will be too late and will have to pick it up in the next UPWP.

Ms. Wilson then explained part 2 of this item relating to opening the 30 day comment period and scheduling the public hearing for the February TAC meeting.

Mr. Russell moved removal of the NEPA item from the 2012 projects and all other items remain as presented and that the TCC recommend to the TCC opening the 30-day public review period and scheduling a public hearing to be conducted at the February 15, 2012 TAC meeting. His motion was seconded by Mr. Browder, unanimously passed. Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

Mr. Boylston indicated \$666,000 for FY-12 for contingency is one quarter of the budget and questioned how that relates to FY-13 contingency of \$140,000 and if that would roll over. Mr. Lukasina responded some of that is available to roll over but a majority is delaying by one or two fiscal years before it is available to use again. The funds will be available for future use but DA funding would be available for 2014.

#### **FY 2013 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM – FUNDING PROPOSAL – VARIOUS ACTIONS TAKEN**

Ms. Wilson reviewed this item and explained each year CAMPO is required to adopt a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) outlining the tasks that will be performed by MPO staff in the coming fiscal year. Attachment 7 in the packet included a staff memo outlining projects proposed and included a narrative on each. Attachment 7A in the packet was a copy of the proposed funding table for FY 2012-2013. She stated it is anticipated that the complete draft UPWP and accompanying Self-Certification documents will be released for public review and comment during February. Staff is requesting that the TCC review the funding tables and provide comment or endorsement prior to final UPWP document development. Ms. Wilson indicated there is less money to deal with this year than in 2013. Last year there was additional money coming from the State for things not used in the past and rescission funds.

Mr. Delk questioned the \$30,000 proposed for Harrison Avenue Study and whether it was out of the \$505,276 for Regional Rail/Transit Planning funds. Ms. Wilson explained these are to separate items. Mr. Delk did not feel \$30,000 will be a realistic number for the Harrison Avenue Study and questioned leaving the \$30,000 in the big pot and determining how much the study will actually cost. He indicated Cary is developing the scope for the study. Mr. Johnson responded he did not have a problem rolling the funds as suggested by Mr. Delk but it was his understanding \$30,000 was what Cary was looking to CAMPO to pay. Ms. Wilson indicated the \$30,000 could be put in the overall Regional Rail/Transit Planning line item. Mr. Parker agreed with this proposal noting there was robust discussion in the sub-committee and the decision of the meeting was to take 4 different projects and put the funds into that 1 line item. Ms. Wilson explained if

all the funds are included in that line item, we can always break them out as the projects are identified but do need to get the funds in there in order to have a place holder. Mr. Parker indicated as he understood it, there are 4 projects included in the Regional Rail/Transit Planning line item and not enough funds for all of them. Mr. Johnson cautioned what is being discussed are studies that may or may not be appropriate for CAMPO funding and at the end, the entire TCC needs to ratify that thinking or over rule it. He suggested that all TCC members come to the next sub-committee meeting. Discussion followed regarding whether to place the \$30,000 in the Regional Rail/Transit Planning item (\$505,276) or Operational Contingency.

Mr. Lamb taking the \$30,000 out of Operational Contingency and added as a line item. His motion was seconded by Mr. Russell. Mr. Parker ask for a friendly amendment that the \$30,000 and be sure that is in the subcommittee and encouraged members to come to the meeting so a broader consensus be obtained. Mr. Lamb declined the friendly amendment.

Discussion followed relating to the Swift Creek Network Study with Ms. Wilson referring to Attachment 6 which explained funding is \$35,000 for this study and this is part one of a two part study with part 2 to be in FY 2013. This study is a technical analysis of current and future traffic conditions in the study area. The analysis will evaluate the impacts of projected future growth on the transportation network within the study area. It will include travel demand model analysis of various scenarios to identify feasible options for connectivity that will meet current and future multimodal travel patterns. Results will be used to identify options to advance into the Phase II study in 2013. Mr. Delk indicated this is from a request from the City of Raleigh and questions were brought up at the Cary Council for removal of Cary Parkway and Gorman Street Extension that would cross Tryon Road and cross Swift Creek above Yates Mill Pond. What would happen if that connection comes out has been discussed and Cary has asked for what the traffic ramifications would be. Mr. Johnson explained someone felt it was wise to change the name of the study to Swift Creek and it does have implications for large geographic areas and this is a plan that has complications and has been looked at from a network analysis standpoint and as necessary to connect it to the community. Mr. Boylston indicated this is a large line item and questioned if we are doing that with the understanding that the break down of final study costs comes back to the TCC for approval and then to be forwarded to the TAC. Ms. Wilson stated this would have to come back to the TCC and as projects are selected out they would come back to the TCC.

Chairman Johnson explained the motion would approve the UPWP as amended and authorize the release for public comment and recommend this to the TAC with Item 3.1 being referred to the UPWP Sub-committee with their recommendation coming back to the TCC and TAC. A vote on the motion was taken and unanimously passed. Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

**FY 2012-2018 TIP MODIFICATION – CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ) – APPROVED**

Ms. Powell reviewed this item noting during the call for CMAQ projects in 2009, Triangle Transit submitted an application to build a park and ride lot in Holly Springs and to receive operating assistance for three years. The application was successful and the projects were programmed as TD-4941B (park and ride lot) and TO-513B (operating assistance) in the 2012-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Due to recent developments in transit planning efforts in the region, Triangle Transit is no longer committed to the project at this time.

MPO staff recommends utilizing CMAQ funds originally committed to this project to assist the Capital Area Transit (CAT) with the purchase of additional biodiesel hybrid replacement buses in 2013, 2014 and 2015. CAT's original application requested funding for six buses, the use of this additional CMAQ funding, supplemented by \$90,000 in other federal funding, would allow the purchase of 12 buses. Attachment 8 in the packet outlined the funding table and requested TIP modification and will be distributed at the meeting. Ms. Powell indicated this has been discussed with NCDOT and they agree with this transfer as well.

Mr. Parker indicated since the original call for CMAQ projects took place in 2009, a lot has changed. He stated there is need to fill the backlog in bus replacements by CAT. He indicated Triangle Transit is still committed to the project but the issue is timing and funding and not being able to move that forward in advance of having the referendum complete. CAT has tremendous need for bus purchases. Ms. Powell indicated it is hoped this will be avoided in the future and we will be applying for and programming projects closer to when the projects come to fruition in the coming years.

Following discussion, Mr. Hopkins moved forwarding to the TAC a recommendation of approval for this modification. His motion was seconded by Mr. Delk, unanimously passed. Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

**FFY 2011-STP-DA INVESTMENT PROGRAM UPDATE – APPROVED**

Mr. Lukasina reviewed this item. He indicated the TAC programmed nearly \$17 million in FFY 2011 STP-DA funding for projects. Several projects have requested changes in scope or budget. Attachment 9 in the packet included requested changes by project. He explained this relates to Zebulon project U-5118FA – NC 96 at Pearces Road and is requested to meet higher than anticipated bid estimates. The increase is \$27,660.

Mr. Hills moved forwarding a recommendation to the TAC to approve the changes as outlined. His motion was seconded by Mr. Lamb, unanimously passed. Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

**FFY 2013 LOCALLY ADMINISTERED PROJECTS PROGRAM (LAPP) – APPROVED**

Mr. Lukasina reviewed this item noting the TAC directed staff to move forward with development of a list of projects in order to obligate FFY 2013 LAPP funds. The LAPP Committee has reviewed the submitted projects and provided a recommended project list based on the approved target investment mix. The list results in an approximate \$10 million multimodal investment program. Members received in their packets Attachment 10 the listed the projects recommended.

Mr. Lukasina reported roadway projects total \$6,380,750; bike/ped projects total \$1,965,220 and transit projects total \$1,500,000. The ticketing machine for CTrans will be added in the amount of \$45,000 resulting in transit total increasing to \$1,545,000. Mr. Lukasina reported we received 16 bike/ped projects, 11 roadway projects and 4 transit projects that were eligible.

Mr. Huegerich moved recommending the list as presented including the \$45,000 for the ticketing machine to the TAC for approval. His motion was seconded by Ms. Andes, unanimously passed. Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

Mr. Lukasina advised LAPP project training will be on February 2 which is done in the afternoon after the TCC meeting.

**2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – RECEIVED AS INFORMATION**

Mr. Lukasina reviewed this item noting the item was on the agenda to receive an update on development of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (2040 LRTP/CTP). Attachment 11 in the packet provided a current schedule for the projects. The next steps include:

- TAC release of Socioeconomic Data for public comment at January 2012 meeting (including 2010 and 2040 forecast values by TAZ);
- Public hearing and TAC approval of Socioeconomic Data for use in the development of the 2040 LRTP at February 2012 meeting.

The update was received as information.

**WAKE COUNTY TRANSIT FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE – RECEIVED AS INFORMATION**

Mr. Lukasina indicated this item was on the agenda for the TCC to receive an update on development of the Wake County Transit Financial Plan. The TAC opened a public comment period on December 5, 2011 and scheduled a public hearing on January 18, 2012 to receive comments on the draft plan. The draft includes rail and bus elements

derived from the recently completed 2030 Bus Transit Plan and the Triangle Regional Transit Program's Alternatives Analysis (rail). Attachment 12 in the packet included a current schedule for the process to prepare for approval of the Plan and a possible referendum in the fall of 2012. Mr. Lukasina indicated there is ongoing coordination with all Wake County municipalities for the next several months and there would be meetings going through the beginning of April. The TAC will hold a public hearing at their January 18 meeting and at that point will decide what action to take and when to take action on the plan. He indicated we are trying to coordinate the schedule with what Wake County Commissioners will be doing as well.

The update was received as information.

### **TRIANGLE REGIONAL TRANSIT PROGRAM – VARIOUS ACTIONS TAKEN**

This item was an add-on to the agenda. Mr. Parker provided a printed copy of his PowerPoint presentation relating to this item.

#### **(Beginning of Verbatim)**

Mr. Parker: The reason why we are coming to you today is the issue of commuter rail, the Durham Wake Corridor, and the locally preferred alternative. Obviously there has been a lot of work that has taken place really over the last two years on all the rail corridor studies and the overall transit plan for Wake County in addition to the other counties and hopefully you see the presentation. In terms of the background, just a reminder that we have been at this for almost two years and we are getting close here to decision time. Move forward to slide #3 on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page...In term of the overall Locally Preferred Alternative, we have been briefed on that before, and just as a reminder what is the locally preferred alternative...it is essentially the project the community seeks to build and move forward. In terms of process, it is a FTA term for that and the decision on the locally preferred alternative is required at the completion of the alternatives analysis and prior to being moved forward and the New Starts for preliminary engineering. Other requirements are that NEPA Scoping similar to a highway project or any other major transportation project, that is required and also the completion of New Starts reports. As we have talked about before, there is an important date in terms of the overall project development timeline and that is even following the locally preferred alternative adoption, and that is the August deadline for projects to be submitted, and included in the President's budget the following year. So that is January 2013. So that's an important date to keep in mind. The locally preferred alternative decision is important as it relates to the other activities because essentially once that decision is made it defines and summarizes all the work that has taken place on those corridors. So the LPA decision essentially defined the corridor that's advanced into preliminary engineering and into the Environmental Impact Statement. So the decision is important and again the August 2012 deadline is very important to be able to move that project forward and essentially position it for potential funding when the local funding becomes available and those decisions are made. Now, why are we coming to you today? Essentially the TAC

has requested, actually as Chris mentioned, that, he had mentioned one part of it. The TAC has requested that the plan, the overall Wake County Transit Plan approval follow closely with the Wake County Commissioners' approval for the Transit Plan. The other piece of that they have requested, because it's a part of the plan, they have requested that previously the LPA decision follow along with the County Transit Plan decision. In terms of prior schedules, that actually worked fine in terms of future actions that need to be taken with regard to the scoping activities and the New Starts report to meet the August deadline. But what has occurred over the last several months is the approval date has moved probably into the May timeframe and, of course, we hope that that happens. The issue here is if the LPA decision moves with that date from February to May to not jeopardize and essentially makes impossible our ability to continue those activities in the coming year in support of advancing the project. So essentially, in summary, if the LPA decision by CAMPO and also on the DCHC side, if that decision is delayed past February, the implication is we will not be able to submit, complete the work that I talked about, the New Starts reporting and also the environmental scoping in this coming year in time for that August deadline and, of course, the other piece of that is it delays the overall implementation of that project potentially by up to a year, which of course, when you are talking about \$650 million project, the time certainly is of the essence. Now, some of the concerns that we've heard and that have been expressed, are definitely worth noting and I wanted to cover those on the following page, if you are following along. The concerns seems to be that any activities that could be seen as advancing the project while the Transit Plan is being debated within the community, those concerns have been raised. The principal activity that people would see in the community would be the scoping activity. What does scoping entail? It's just like I said, it's just like any other transportation project or highway project. It encompasses resource agency meetings, review and comment on the work that has taken place in addition to elected officials, local communities, agency staff and also the public. So, in terms of public activities, those are the things that would take place and roughly those would take place about one month or so after a LPA decision is made. So there have been some concerns about that. The other concern is that, about make the LPA decision prior to the Transit Plan approval is over, well if either the County Commissioners do not approve the Transit Plan or do not call for a referendum and concerns about advancing that work somewhat at risk. I think that is a legitimate concern but we feel like it is easily mitigated as, even after a LPA decision is made, if the Wake County Commissioners were to not authorize the referendum or not approve the plan, the work could be stopped essentially. But essentially what we are saying is we want to position ourselves so that if those decisions are made as we hope they will be made, we will be put in a good position to be able to advance the project and enable it for funding. Just a reminder, the alternatives analysis documents were released in July of last year so they have been on the street for 6 months. Plenty of opportunity for the public and others to review. The community support for the project appears to be strong and the CAMPO TAC, I think it was in June or July, took an action in support of the concept of commuter rail, in support of the Durham County referendum. We feel like the risk to taking the action in advance of the plan approval are relatively low and the benefits are relatively high. So our recommendation to the TCC would be that the TCC recommends to the TAC two things. One thing, one action would

be to separate the adoption of the LPA for the commuter rail, and that's all we're talking about is Durham/Wake Commuter Rail Project, separate that decision from the plan decision, that is expected to come in May and that the TCC recommend to the TAC that the decision take place no later than February of this year following the public comment period. As Chris noted, in terms of public review, the public review period, CAMPO opened in early December and I think it is scheduled to close at the end of January. So a recommendation from the TCC and a decision by the TAC would be consistent with the public review notice and comment period for both the plan and the LPA. That's all I have and I will certainly take any comments or questions about it.

A question was raised about the amount of money we are talking about and the funding source that would be covering the work you are suggesting start after the LPA was adopted.

Mr. Parker: The alternatives analysis work that has taken place to date has been paid for by the Triangle Transit, the major transit investment fund. The major investment fund is the car rental tax that has been in place since February 1998. Half of that fund is authorized for transit operations and the other half pays for staff salaries and work such as this. So the major transit investment fund that the Triangle Transit Board of Trustees controls would be paying for this work. The exact amount of dollars for the specific work on this corridor, I would have to guess. I don't know the exact amount of money. I know our Board approved at their last meeting a, I believe a contract, I'm not sure but I think it was in the range of \$2 million but that also includes work on the Durham Orange corridor as well. So those would be the corridors that would be proposed to be advanced during 2012.

Mr. Hodges-Copple: I just wanted to check – be the Durham Wake Corridor part of the enhanced plan or core plan. I thought the commuter rail was in the core plan.

Mr. Parker: Well, just to explain, and I know there has been a lot of confusion about that. The enhanced plan is really the plan that says all the projects, and specifically the projects that are included within the CAMPO area, the Durham Wake Corridor, the commuter rail and the Wake Corridor assumed to be funded 50% by federal sources (New Starts), 25% by State sources. So essentially that plan dictates these activities—the activities that will be pursued. In other words, the project will be submitted based on that plan for New Starts funding. The core plan says if that funding is not received, then we can afford to do commuter rail with local money only. So, just an important note there, the enhanced plan, we are pursuing federal money from both projects. And actually including the project in Durham and Orange as well. The core plan simply represents that if that money did not come forward, in addition to State money, if that money does not come forward, we can still afford the Durham Wake commuter rail corridor with local money.

Mr. Hodges-Copple: So, I'm still not clear. So the commuter rail.....

Mr. Parker: It's in both.

Mr. Hodges-Copple: Oh, okay. So it is in the core plan.  
Mr. Johnson: It is in both.

Chairman Johnson: The inference here is that the state transit plan is enterprised without federal funding or state funding and what Jonathan has indicated here is they would like to pursue a New Starts application to get federal funding for the commuter rail between Durham and Wake County. (inaudible)

Mr. Boylston: So the risk factor is the money you spend on proceeding on the scoping work and that money is defined as Triangle Transit funds that you generate already for your normal sources. Is that right?

Mr. Parker: Right. And, again, there is some risk but I think the risk is generally low because there appears to be, given prior actions and general support that has been indicated, there appears to be generally broad support for commuter rail and advancing that corridor. So, again, even if we proceeded with...if the TAC adopts the LPA in February and scoping activities begin in March, and we get to let's say May or even June and we find out that the County Commissioners do not approve the plan or do not call for the referendum or for whatever reason, we can, we have the option of stopping the work and not proceeding with submitting the New Starts because it probably wouldn't make sense to do so if we know a vote is not going to take place in November. All we are saying is by taking the action sooner we are positioning ourselves to say we don't want to lose a year should the activities and decisions occur in the time we expect them to occur.

Mr. Boylston: So those delayed costs could be in the range of \$5 to \$10 million?

Mr. Parker: I don't want to be an alarmist but, if you are talking about \$650 million project and you are talking about let's say 3% inflation, per year that's \$20 million. You know, clearly, if the plan is moved forward as is, the enhanced plan calls for pursuing New Starts funding and we know that with the local money we can pay for commuter rail even without it so that's a nice safety net to have. But, what we are saying is we want to be able to pursue that money and position ourselves for that and if we are going to do that it makes sense to go ahead and take action to be able to do that sooner rather than later. Again, from our perspective, the risks appear to be relatively low.

Mr. Maloney: Jonathan, what formal action has your Board of Trustees taken on moving this item forward?

Mr. Parker: I believe they approved, I think it was a contract amendment that would fund the activities for the coming year.

Mr. Maloney: Activities that would move toward the August submittal?

Mr. Parker: That's right. So the funding through the major transit investment fund that the Triangle Transit's Board of Trustees controls has been authorized. So that's not an obstacle.

Mr. Russell: Jonathan, could this move forward without the TCC weighing in on this?

Mr. Parker: Theoretically yes but given that the normal approval process dictates the TCC makes a recommendation to the TAC then approves the recommendation...that's the typical...

Mr. Russell: That's what gives me heartburn on this. The TCC is advisory body of staff. Our present task is the Wake Transit Plan and that pretty much is our policy statement...that's our recommendations to the TAC and that hasn't gone through its full process. It's presumptuous on our part to assume that doing this is going to be okay but it really hasn't been fully vetted and hasn't been acted on by our leaders. They're to have that role, not us. To go beyond recommending the expenditure of funds for something that hasn't even been vetted and approved, that's beyond us. I don't think it's appropriate for this group to actually consider that although I think, if it's of concern to Triangle Transit, is to take it straight to the TAC because they are the decision making body.

Mr. Parker: As far as the TCC recommending or not recommending, I think it is up to the group to decide whether it is appropriate or not. Certainly I think from a technical perspective, again, the information has been available for a considerable amount of time and we've tried to communicate consistently, although there's been a lot of, pretty much a majority of the attention has been on the overall plan and the LPA decision. I think we have always indicated there were other activities that needed to take place following that and those were important timelines to meet and then so we are kind of at a situation where we feel like we are at some risk to not be able to move some of these things forward. Really, again, we are not talking about a considerable amount of work. We are talking about doing the NEPA scoping activities and we are talking about completing New Starts reports to be in position for the region to receive potential funding for the project when those decisions are made. Again, as I said, if the decision is made in February in advance of the plan and either the MPO or either of the communities within Wake County or the Board of Commissioners decide that they do not want to approve the plan or call for a vote, there is really minimal risk because the work can be stopped and not proceed any further until other decisions are made.

Mr. Russell: I understand that completely. It is more what I think my role is here. I wouldn't do it at my local level and I'm not going to advocate that here. But I'm not saying you shouldn't move forward and ask the TAC. I would be moot on the subject.

Mr. Parker: I don't ...I think from our perspective this is a component of the plan but it is also a heart of the New Starts process that is required. It's a process that needs to be followed if we're going to proceed and seek those funds. And, so, based on that process,

what we are saying is if the decisions are not made, we are going to lose some time and that has some consequences.

Mr. Lamb: I think I need to whiter down what's on the table here specifically. We are talking about the request from Triangle Transit is to endorse by February the AA...the LPA which effectively sets the scope of a commuter rail project. Correct?

Mr. Parker: Yes

Mr. Lamb: It doesn't guarantee funding. That's to be handled through the financial plan, the Transit Plan itself. But, in terms of what's on the table with this, it doesn't...it locks us into talking about the specific corridor, the general limits of the overall project but not necessarily where the stations are located. It gives us a scope, in effect. Correct?

Mr. Parker: Yes

Mr. Lamb: Okay. In approving the scope, we are not necessarily approving the funding plan. That will come later with the financial plan before the County Commissioners.

Mr. Parker: Absolutely. And, again, it's essentially sets the scope for the project the community wants to build and certainly we understand there's a lot more that needs to be done. There's a lot of vetting for the overall plan that needs to be done. Those decisions are yet to come. We just feel like this piece is positioning the region to be able to move forward should those decisions be affirmative and support the overall plan moving forward.

Mr. Delk: So, Jonathan, would it be appropriate if we made a motion to open the public comment period, since this is pretty new to us, that at least gives the public comment period the opportunity to take place before the February discussion and then we can actually make a more informed decision with out local bodies at the February TCC meeting.

Mr. Parker: The public comment period, and Chris correct me if I'm wrong, the public comment period was open for all of the alternatives analysis studies including the Durham Wake Corridor and the overall County plan back in December. So in terms of the specific alternative decision it is essentially embedded within the public review that was established in December and it's ending in January. So, unless the staff disagrees, I think we should be covered as far as the overall public review for those public documents. And, again, the documents in terms, as Eric said, we are talking about defining the scope for the project and the documents were made available initially in July of last year. So, we are not talking about anything nobody knows about or hasn't been available for a considerable amount of time. It should not be new to anybody.

Mr. Lukasina: That's right. The public comment period is ongoing and the TAC has a public hearing on all this in January. They haven't scheduled any action. They're just

holding the hearing so that the process can continue in support of both any LPA decision and the Wake Transit Plan.

Mr. Delk: I move that we table this until February.

Mr. Lamb: Second.

Mr. Johnson: The TCC or TAC February meeting?

Chairman Johnson: The TCC.

Mr. Delk: There could be a TAC meeting prior to that.

Mr. Hodges-Copple: We have sort of two options here. One which we may be headed towards which is the TCC is simply not going to act on it but that does not, though, preclude the TAC from making whatever decision they want. That's Chip's view of the appropriate process. I just want to clarify that if we approve this tabling motion, that does not preclude the TAC from doing whatever it wants. The second option would be to simply say with very sort of limited scope since I understand the LPA, all it needs to speak to is alignment and points of technology. We can simply say based on our past discussion and review that we are comfortable with an alignment from Garner in Wake County to West Durham in Durham County to end points as shown in the AA documents in Garner to the vicinity of Duke in Durham and a technology that uses rail vehicles capable of operating on new or existing tracks also used by passenger and freight rail...that we are comfortable advancing that to the TAC. So I'm easy either way. I just want to make sure that anything we are doing here does not preclude the TAC from proceeding.

Chairman Johnson: Yes, they can take action without our recommendation.

Mr. Johnson: The bylaws allow agenda items to be established by the members of each board. So, if the TAC representative wants to make this an agenda item they can do so at the January meeting regardless of the action the TCC decides.

Mr. Hodges-Copple: I just wanted to make sure. So obviously there is a federal process we are following here. I just wanted to make sure that there is nothing in the federal process that indicates the TCC has to act.

Mr. Johnson: No. I do want to make an observation here and these are facts and not opinions. I called Charlotte MPO which is the Mecklenburg Union MPO. They have three projects. One which was completed a couple of years ago. One of which has just been green lighted by FTA which is an extension of that light rail line and a third which is a commuter rail line that they have chosen not to seek New Starts funding from FTA and the reason expressed is they did not want to dilute favorable attention being given to the blue line extension. They said specifically on the blue line extension, the MPO was

not asked to take action on the LPA; however, it was in their long range plan. All three of those projects are in their long range plan so the statement of support is there. Analogous to us, we do not have a commuter rail line in our plan. There is a light rail project that goes from Durham to Raleigh and also Apex to Cary. So there is a mismatch between what is in our plans which is problematic because we can't just say well, look, it's in our plan so we have already endorsed it. So that's the issue we have to deal with. The other thing is the whole thing about schedule and inflationary cost, you need to remember that the likelihood of getting federal and state funding is iffy at best. The mobility fund which is supposed to be 25% of our funding pact, if you've been watching that closely you see it's morphed into something that's more like a gubernatorial discretionary fund that's going to be spread all over the state which jeopardizes whether that funding is going to be available when we ask for it or not. Let's hope it will be. And then the federal funding could be through TIGER or through some other form that might be 80% rather than 50%. The New Starts is a decision that has been made by Triangle Transit as what they think is the best way to proceed with at this time so the process they are recommending is appropriate for that strategy. And, Patrick, I see you in the back of the room. Is there anything I misstated or anything you want to elaborate on about that. Since you made the trip, you might as well talk.

Mr. McDonough: With regard to the issue about the commuter rail and light rail issue, we had a rather robust discussion about that with staff yesterday. The issue has definitely been identified, and we understand that's an issue. The key point here is FTA's determination and agreement that the LPA decision by the MPO does not constitute an LRTP amendment and we believe that is not the case. This type of things happens very frequently all over the country where corridors that are in MPO plans are advanced. Sometimes the technologies remain the same and are confirmed and other times the technologies and alignments and things change when studies are undertaken. It is not in FTA's interest to make our lives more difficult by requiring these approvals especially when the 2040 update is coming within the year. So, though we haven't got a 100% confirmation on that. Our best advice is that FTA is going to work with us on that and that the decision will be able to move forward without triggering that LRTP amendment process requirement. I came in at the last half of the item so I missed a good deal of it. The only thing I wanted to add in response to Ed's remarks...when we look at the concern about the schedule slipping a year, I think that when we think whether or not federal or state funds are involved, is really immaterial to the question of cost escalation. Inflation occurs whether the project is built with 100% local or 100% federal or 100% state funds or any mix thereof. So, if we look at losing a year and we look at inflationary cost increase, whether or not feds or whether or not the state participates, we are still going to experience cost increase on inflation if we lose a year. I think Jonathan did a good job outlining the ability to have the opportunity to go forward if we are able to get a New Starts application in and if the TAC is comfortable with what we have put on the table today. Again, if for any reason there needs to be a halt, the work can be halted at really minimal impact but we would like to keep that window open. He's doing a good job, I'm not going to add anything.

Mr. Maloney: So, if we go back and look at the connection between the FTA and the New Starts application, and when you're talking about the work can be halted, what stage will the TAC, that's whose decision this really is...be asked whether or not we are submitting that New Starts application.

Mr. Lukasina: At what stage will they be asked? Essentially when they approve a LPA, they have approved the ability, in this case, for Triangle Transit to move forward with a New Starts application. By approving the LPA, they have given their go ahead for the project to move forward.

Mr. Maloney: And so, for me, this is the type of thing...what we're really doing is saying yes we agree we are going to submit a New Starts application and I will...I think it is very, very clear that the current draft financial plan in the Wake County Plan calls for a New Starts application to be requested and that money to at least be considered. The problem is that is only a draft plan and so we've really got to come back to is we are not just adopting an LPA that allows us to do work, we are also getting to a point where we also saying yes, it would be okay to be submitting a New Start application. And, so, the question would be when you talk about you backing off, and I think it's good, what we really need to be....I think that the kind of the non position on the TCC is the appropriate action at this point and putting it over to the TAC to decide because it is a complex decision. The concern is we need to make sure that, at least for me, we need to make sure that the TAC is given all the information they need to have to understand the decision they are actually making and I think some of the points that CAMPO staff are bring up need to be addressed when they are being asked this decision. It comes back to that maybe what we want to do is say we need to be able to move forward with this so that we can still be in the game if everybody decides that...and we are hearing this right now...that there are some people that are 100% on board with commuter rail, we have people that are slightly have concerns about things that are really just going to be slight tweaks and then we have people that are saying this is the silliest thing ever. I would say it's probably the larger percentage on the positive side as you have identified in your PowerPoint but that doesn't mean that decision has been made.

Mr. Parker: Again, that decision is up to the TAC and we wanted to bring it forward this month so that there was at least a month's advance to take it forward. We didn't want to take it forward in February. Again, a lot of this stuff has been occurring again in December and over the prior month or so. I did want to add in terms of the activities that are...that would be taking place, particularly the scoping activities...those activities would be required even if we didn't pursue federal funding. In other words, any transportation project, even if it only requires state money, would have to comply with state environmental regulations which would necessitate scoping the project out. So those type of activities would be required regardless of whether New Starts funding would be pursued. But again, just wanted to emphasize we wanted to bring forward the urgency of making the decision but, again, ultimately it's up to....we wanted to bring it forward a month early and so it wasn't a surprise in February but we have talked about the importance of these dates in prior months. It is not anything new but again,

ultimately if the TAC is comfortable with it, it can take action. If they are not, totally up to them.

Mr. Browder: Call the question.

Chairman Johnson: We have a call for the question and that is to table the matter until the February meeting of the TCC. Do we have a second?

Mr. Delk: Second

Chairman Johnson: All in favor say aye.

Ayes: All members

Chairman Johnson: All opposed

No one voted in opposition.

Chairman Johnson ruled the motion adopted.

**(End of Verbatim)**

#### **MOBILITY FUND – RECEIVED AS INFORMATION**

Amy Ward reviewed this item noting the North Carolina 2009-2010 Appropriation Act was approved to fund transportation projects, selected by NCDOT, of statewide and regional significance that relieve congestion and enhance mobility across all modes of transportation. Funding from unexpended gap funds and monies identified as a result of the reduction in the amount of funds being transferred from the Highway Trust Fund to the General Fund will be used for Mobility Projects. NCDOT is currently soliciting candidate Mobility Fund transportation projects. The MPO plans to submit five projects, the maximum number allowed. Projects that meet the criteria will be selected from the MPO's LRTP for submittal. Selected projects will then be ranked based on the Mobility Fund scoring criteria. Attachment 13 in the packet included information on criteria and scoring. It is anticipated that candidate projects will be available for TCC review and TAC approval in February 2012.

Mr. Lamb questioned if there was any idea what those projects might be. Mr. Lukasina indicated there are several staff is scoring and staff is taking the same set of projects based on eligibility and trying to replicate mobility fund scoring. Mr. Lamb requested that project 307 – Capital Boulevard – be included. Mr. Delk requested that Carpenter Road intersection improvements be included. Mr. Lukasina requested that members develop their lists and provide them to Ms. Ward.

The item was received as information.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – RECEIVED**

Chairman Johnson recognized Mayor Williams, Vice-Chair of the TAC and Mike Gordon, Mayor of Archer Lodge

Members received information in the agenda relating to Operating Budget Update for 2012 and Member Shares.

The items were received as information.

### **MPO STAFF REPORTS – RECEIVED**

Mr. Johnson reported Ms. Wilson will confirm who TCC and TAC members will be. He explained current population defines membership on the TCC. He also requested that members should reaffirm with Ms. Wilson their members. He indicated some municipalities have newly elected officials who may be interested in the MPO one-on-one training. This training has not been scheduled at this time but staff will be putting together a 2 ½ to 3 hour training program that will be held in the morning toward the end of the month. Mr. Russell suggested holding the training in February since there are many elected official training requirements in January.

Mr. Johnson explained there had been consideration relating to options for relocating CAMPO and this is being evaluated. He indicated the room where meetings are currently held is difficult. He suggested that the TCC and TAC may want to meet in the interim at the Capital Area Transit Maintenance Facility conference room noting he had already reserved the room for meetings in 2012. Mr. Johnson indicated if CAMPO does stay in the current location and adds staff, the meeting room may have to be turned into offices.

Without objection, it was agreed that the TCC would meet at the CAT Maintenance Facility beginning with the February meeting.

Mr. Johnson recognized Todd Stroupe, as the new intern from NCSU.

### **NCDOT REPORTS – RECEIVED**

Discussion took place relating to a question raised by the DCHC TAC relating to free use of transit vehicles on the Turnpike at no charge. Mr. Johnson indicated it was his understanding that only authorized emergency vehicles could use the facility at no cost. Transit vehicles would pay some nominal toll and get reimbursed from NCDOT. He indicated he would check into this and provide additional information.

Mr. Hopkins, NCDOT Division 5, reported last month the Timber Drive project opened ten months ahead of schedule.

Technical Coordinating Committee  
January 5, 2012

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, upon motion of Mr. Huegerich, seconded by Mr. Parker, unanimously passed, the meeting adjourned at 12 Noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Hunt