

**TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 3, 2005
MINUTES**

The Technical Coordinating Committee met on Thursday, November 3, 2005 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 110, 301 Hillsborough Street, Raleigh, N.C. The following were present:

Member

Chairman Russell, presiding
Juliet Andes
Brad Bass
Wally Bowman
Ray Boylston
Skip Browder
Tim Clark
Jimmy Cook
Russell Dalton
Eddie Dancausse
Carl Dawson
David Eatman
Mike Frangos
Tim Gauss
Berry Gray
Michele Hane
Howard Harrell
John Hodges-Copple
Joe Huegy
Tom Kendig
Mike Kennon
Teresa Piner
Tamra Shaw
Sarah Smith
Kendra Stephenson
Scott Walston
Don Willis
Julie Woosley

Lead Planning Agency Staff

John Burris
Ed Johnson
Jake Petrosky
Diane Wilson
Kenneth Withrow

Others Present

Julie Hund

Representing

Town of Wake Forest
Town of Cary
Town of Garner
NCDOT
Town of Cary
Town of Clayton
Wake County
Town of Angier
Town of Apex
Federal Highway Administration
City of Raleigh
City of Raleigh
Town of Knightdale
Town of Morrisville
Johnston County
City of Raleigh
NCSU
Triangle J COG
Triangle Transit Authority
NCSU
City of Raleigh
Town of Wendell
NCDOT, Public Transportation Div.
NCDOT
Town of Holly Springs
NCDOT
Wake County
Smart Commute/RTF

Representing

CAMPO Staff
CAMPO Director
CAMPO Staff
CAMPO Staff
CAMPO Staff

Representing

Moffatt & Nichol

Chairman Russell called the meeting to order with discussion and actions taken as follows:

AGENDA ADJUSTMENT – AGENDA APPROVED

There were no adjustments made to the agenda; therefore, the agenda was approved as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – NONE RECEIVED

Chairman Russell invited comments from those in attendance. No one asked to be heard.

ACTION ITEMS

MINUTES – OCTOBER 6, 2005 – APPROVED AS SUBMITTED

Members had received copies of the October 6, 2005 minutes in their agenda packets. Mr. Huegy moved approval of the minutes as presented. His motion, seconded by Mr. Browder, unanimously passed. Chairman Russell ruled the motion adopted.

CAPITAL AREA MPO 2007-2013 TIP PROJECT PRIORITY LIST – APPROVED

Mr. Johnson reviewed the history of this item as included in the agenda. Members received a schedule of activity for development of the 2007-2013 Project Priority List. He explained analysis of roadway projects had been completed and factors considered included total user benefits, benefits per mile and years for a project to pay for itself in terms of user benefits. He provided members with a copy of Appendix A outlining recommended priority roadway projects with user benefits and technical scores. Mr. Johnson noted that geographic equity was addressed by reordering of project priorities. The TCC TIP Subcommittee met on September 13, 2005 to review this proposed list and endorsed recommendation of approval by the TCC and TAC. Subsequent to this recommendation further review of the list was performed and, based on member inputs the list was finalized. Members received a complete prioritized list of project requests for roadway, advance planning, bicycle and pedestrian, ITS and transit improvements. The TAC authorized a 30-day public comment period on the list beginning August 17, 2005. During the comment period, the list was reviewed by the subcommittee and was provided to the TCC at this meeting for recommendation to the TAC. The TAC received the list at its September 21, 2005 meeting, held a public hearing and extended the public comment period to conclude with a public hearing and consideration of final approval at its November 16, 2005 meeting. The list was being provided to the TCC at this meeting for final review and a recommendation of approval to the TAC.

At this point Mr. Johnson reviewed the listing of recommended priority roadway projects and referred to the 3 top projects (Raleigh Signal System Upgrade, Timber Drive and Falls of Neuse Road) which are projects whose funding was addressed by coordination with NCDOT in a variety of ways. The top line on the list is blanket endorsement of the

current TIP projects which have no requested adjustments. He explained that staff would like to include STP DA allocations but it appears that will not be possible. In December of 2004, the TAC came up with a way to allocate those funds; approximately \$6 million per year. The funding was distributed to the Wake Forest Bypass, Falls of Neuse realignment, Timber Drive and the Bike/Ped grant. As of yesterday, Mr. Johnson could not get NCDOT to indicate what will be done to change the allocation to our area. Mr. Johnson noted that the number may increase but until he could get that number, allocation of money could not be completed. NCDOT is aware of that fact and will work on it as soon as information is available - in the next 30-60 days. He was aware the cost estimate for the last piece of "Part A" of the Wake Forest Bypass has increased substantially noting \$8 million was allocated towards that project; however, indications are that this project may cost as much as \$16 million. STP DA funds committed to that may need to be adjusted which will affect others. Mr. Johnson indicated he would share that information with members as soon as it is available. This is subject to final conclusion of the hearing opened in September and continued through the November TAC meeting. Based on this recommendation, the TAC will approve this for submittal to NCDOT. This proposal has been studied a long time and represents the best thinking that can be done.

Mr. Parajon noted in reviewing the 2007-2013 and 2006-2012 MTIPs, there are some projects that do not have a ranking that he thought were previously ranked. Mr. Johnson responded that the 2006-2012 MTIP reflected a ranking for only the top 20 projects but had many more projects shown in the document that were not in the top 20. For the 2007-2013 MTIP, it is proposed to reflect the top 45 priorities. Mr. Petrosky indicated the handout provided listed all projects noting 76 were submitted but only the top 45 will go in the project priority list forwarded to NCDOT. Mr. Johnson stated the large version in the appendix will be included in the report. Mr. Parajon questioned the recommending ranking and the relationship to the technical ranking. Mr. Johnson indicated the recommended rankings are staff's recommendations based on a number of different things including technical ranking, geographic equity, etc. The new members also had to be considered and staff manually implanted the most important projects both in Wake County and other areas. He reviewed the criteria used in establishing the rankings. In response to a question from Mr. Parajon, Mr. Johnson indicated staff was asking for the TCC's approval of the priority rankings at this meeting and the recommendation needs to go to the TAC at their next meeting. Mr. Parajon expressed concern that the guidance to the subcommittee reviewing this item was to utilize the technical ranking. Mr. Johnson stated that could be done but emphasized a decision should be made today. He noted the recommendations are not fundamentally different that what the committee had been looking at for the last 30 days. He noted this item is already late going to NCDOT. Mr. Frangos, a member of the subcommittee that reviewed the rankings, explained they did show the technical ranking so everyone would be aware but there was a "fairy dust" element as well. Mr. Parajon thought the "fairy dust" would preside at the political level rather than at the technical level.

Mr. Petrosky referred to the documents in the appendix that outlined how the rankings were accomplished from the technical aspect as well as the methodology used by staff

and the subcommittee to rank those projects. Enhancement projects and transportation systems that had not been included previously were also considered. With regard to the bike/ped projects, there were some slight changes made to evaluation criteria based on input from the TCC and the bike/ped stakeholders group. He noted that the only 2 projects added were items 20 and 32. Chairman Russell indicated there were recommendations from members to include projects from the new members and they suggested they may need help on how to include these projects on the list. He felt what staff had done addresses that concern. Mr. Parajon indicated the concern was how the list was generated, how the list came forward and if that was consistent or not. He noted he was hearing perhaps it was – perhaps it wasn't. Mr. Parajon stated at some point we should grapple with how to put everyone on an equal playing field. He stated this has significant effects. He noted technical criteria are easy to grasp and it was the subjective items that bothered him. He spoke to the need that everyone was clear that the recommendations were a combination of technical and non-technical best judgment. Mr. Walston suggested the possibility of adding a column showing the division numbers with Mr. Johnson agreeing to make this change.

Mr. Frangos moved recommending that the TAC adopt the FFY 2007-2013 Project Priority List. His motion was seconded by Mr. Browder, with all members voting in the affirmative with the exception of Mr. Parajon who voted in opposition. Chairman Russell ruled the motion adopted.

Chairman Russell spoke to the need for involvement of all members in determining priorities as the next project priority list is developed noting the subcommittee would continue to meet. He stated he was interested in having as a part of the next round a review of the CTP and determining how those projections work systematically. He spoke to the need to determine how to tier these projects and to be sure we are comparing equal projects to equal projects.

Mr. Johnson indicated that Scotty Cornett from Granville County had sent him information from Kentucky noting they have a very well organized process that includes a standard set of information for all projects and providing a lot of criteria that should be considered. He hoped to borrow as much of that as possible in order to someday have every project have the same information driving it. This information will be provided to members when received. Ms. Andes spoke to the need to talk to other municipalities when the forums are held in order to get everyone on the same page.

PROCESS FOR 2006-2012 STP-DA BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN AND TRANSIT PROJECTS – RECEIVED AS INFORMATION

Mr. Petrosky reviewed this item. He reviewed the history of the item as outlined in the agenda. In December, 2004, CAMPO approved a funding allocation plan for STP-DA funds which included reservation of \$750,000 annually beginning in 2006 for bicycle, pedestrian and transit improvements. This reservation, done annually, provides a means to fund projects designed to enhance the inter-regional connectivity of the alternative modes of transportation. The TCC TIP subcommittee previously discussed a process and

schedule for selection and award of these funds to MPO members and possibly others. The consensus was rather than having these funds distributed through a competitive award process, it would be preferable to develop a grant style distribution system so each member government could have the opportunity to fund a project if they so chose. The agenda outlined pertinent considerations in doing this including:

- Distribution formula – pro rated by population, equal share or combination
- Non-federal matching funds requirement
- Should MPO members that are not local or county governments such as TTA and NCSSU, who do not financially participate in direct funding of the MPO's work program, be included in the fund distribution, and if so, how?
- What method should be used for the award of these funds, to ensure the projects selected are fully consistent with the MPO's goals and objectives?
- What happens to funds that are not utilized in a timely fashion?

The chairman of the CAMPO Bike/Ped Committee noted that the committee had recommended using STP-DA funds to fund a new position to work on these items. Members received a copy of a Letter to the Editor showing interest for funding for more of these projects.

Mr. Petrosky explained bike/ped planning is a requirement of the MPO noting there are a number of things in this area the MPO should be doing. He explained CAMPO's staff is concerned with many other responsibilities. Mr. Petrosky explained he devotes a portion of his time to the Bike/Ped Stakeholders meeting and one day per week. He indicated he cannot devote enough time for this purpose. He noted that the agenda packet included information on what other cities are doing, how many have full time bike/ped employees, etc. He indicated DCHC has a full time bike/ped coordinator and they are able to do more things in this area. Mr. Johnson spoke to the challenge this presents noting CAMPO has 5 people and a part-time person working on fiscal issues. With the recent expansion, the geographic area covered has greatly increased. He had hoped that this issue would have been discussed during the retreat in October. Unfortunately there was not enough time. .. He reported the TAC did indicate that transit, and the need for it in the future, is important. He also explained there seems to be support in having district meetings in the future. He indicated that this is a matter of resources and STP-DA is the only other source of funding that could possibly grow by 25% . The budget sessions have already started in the City of Raleigh and they have requested input before Christmas. He pointed out some staff changes were shown in the 2nd year work program. He stated staff would be working on this and come up with information at the January meeting. City of Raleigh management has indicated their preference for the TAC to talk about staffing rather than the City. Since this is multi-county funding it would be appropriate for the TAC to recommend and the City would carry out the decision with no further discussion. He noted this presents some challenges. He stated a lot of work would be taking place in the next 60 days.

Mr. Johnson noted they are showing \$600,000 per year of federal funding being available over the next 7 years for bike/ped projects and if a staff person is desired, it should come from that money.

Members were provided with a handout including alternatives for distributing STP-DA funds for Bike/Ped Projects and reviewed the information in detail. He reported he had talked to Mr. Leggett who urged CAMPO to be cautious about doing this. It is likely we will not get \$600,000 this year and therefore may have the luxury of time to think through this. He felt the quicker we get thoughts together, the better off we will be. He noted the information provided was done in order for members to have time to consider this. Mr. Frangos questioned how much a Bike/Ped employee for CAMPO would be. Mr. Johnson responded this would involve \$75,000 - \$100,000 including benefits.

Mr. Hodges-Copple stated if we don't go with the allocation, how to build in a mechanism should be considered so all the money isn't sucked into the large cities and noted the smaller communities have to be considered. He did not know if something like this is best way to address this concern. In regard to staffing, he indicated before thinking about if we want to have a bike/ped person, everyone should think about the role they play and the difference between someone dealing with planning and programming side of things and it is different if they work on specific projects. He noted the DCHC bike/ped employee does both of those things and she is shared with the City. If someone is going to be at the planning and programming side, we may want to approach DCHC to have a single bike/ped person for both MPOs that works at that level. He questioned whether it makes sense to approach DCHC about combining that function at the planning and programming level.

The Chairman of the stakeholders committee noted they talked about the fact it may not need to be a full time person and could be part time, could be part of a new staff member position. She felt it is good to start dialogue and consider how we want to address bike/ped issues on a regional level. She noted there are ways this could be helpful for smaller communities even though it takes some of their money. Mr. Johnson indicated this is Mr. Petrosky's number 1 priority but the challenge is to free up his time to work on this. Mr. Hodges-Copple stated if that person is to be looking at specific projects, he could easily be busy 40 hours per week but if he is at higher level, he was not sure that would be a 40 hour position. He questioned whether they would be working at planning and programming at a general tech level or working on specific facility plans and projects.

Mr. Petrosky suggested that the TIP committee be asked to review this as they look at refining the program for distribution and allocation of funds. Mr. Browder questioned the possibility of not adding a staff position but retain a professional consultant with expertise in this area on an as needed basis and the cost could be allocated partly to areas that need the service. Ms. Andes noted there are some areas that this rate of return would be different.

Chairman Russell indicated there would be a subcommittee meeting on November 18 at 10:00 a.m. and discussion could be held about the position at that time. Mr. Frangos stated he is in favor of the accumulation of these funds and they should remain on the books and not be lost. He noted the match should be in the area of 20% if the goal is to spread it around and make the match reasonable. Mr. Andes suggested this should be related to bike/ped CTP projects.

OCTOBER 19, 2005 TAC STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT – RECEIVED AS INFORMATION

Chairman Russell reported on the TAC Strategic Planning Retreat at Lake Wheeler Park held on October 19, 2005 to bring TAC members together to share information, learn about key issues throughout the CAMPO region and to think collectively on an action plan for CAMPO. He indicated the retreat was well attended. Ms. Wilson indicated the report from the retreat would be available the following week. Mr. Johnson reviewed information from the retreat noting the big item for discussion related to what the TAC wants to do in transit, how important is it to the TAC, how much is the TAC willing to put into it, etc. The large group broke out into smaller work groups and then received a summary of what was discussed. A large majority stated transit is very important and there is a need to spend substantial money on transit. Concern largely seemed to be expansion of fixed route bus services to larger geographic areas that we don't currently serve. The TAC also desires to have a greater coordination of transit service and interest was shown in rail where possible. He noted the budget this year will answer many questions. The TAC also felt getting thoughts together on where we want to be in 50 years on transit is very important.

The report was received as information.

COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – STATUS REPORT RECEIVED

Mr. Petrosky reviewed provided an overview and reported there had been 2 subcommittee meetings on this item. They are in the process of updating the draft map and would be starting district meetings next week. The area is being divided into north and northeastern portions of Wake County, south and eastern portions and southwest and northwest. He reported the transit subcommittee has been holding regular meetings with representatives from transit agencies working toward updating and expanding what we have now. Mr. Petrosky indicated they are finding we don't have a lot of vision projects identified in the LRTP, i.e., EastTrans, express bus service, etc. He spoke to the need to document routes and get to a more specific level of detail. He noted they are moving forward and would be having another meeting in December. He reported the bicycle element had not been discussed at this point and that it is hoped they will begin work on that in January/February. He provided the dates and locations of the district meetings.

This report was received as information.

FY 2006 SPECIAL STUDIES – US-1 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY – STATUS REPORT RECEIVED

Mr. Withrow reviewed this item and stated that the U.S. 1 North Corridor Study is now actively underway. Members received an attachment in their packets listing US 1 Corridor Study Oversight Team participants. The Team and the consulting firm of RS&H Engineers, Inc., will be conducting their first study technical workshop meeting on December 13, 2005 from 9:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. in the Campbell Lodge at Durant Nature Park. He anticipated a smaller working group that will oversee progress and direction of the project will be created to assist with the day-to-day coordination between the larger Oversight Team and study project managers. Mr. Johnson stated he was pleased to find that Wake County people were able to determine a way to accelerate delivery of aerial photographs and these would be available in January.

The report was received as information.

FY 2007 SPECIAL STUDIES – REFINEMENT OF LOCATIONS, SCOPE AND PARTICIPANTS – RECEIVED AS INFORMATION

Mr. Johnson reviewed this item noting on September 26, 2005, staff members from Apex, Cary, Holly Springs, the MPO and NCDOT met to discuss refining plans for one or more special studies in the Southwest district. These studies would build upon the results of the recently completed first phase of NCDOT's US 64-NC 49 Strategic Highway Corridor Study. These studies (or phased single study) are intended to develop more detailed plans to enhance transportation connectivity and mobility choices in the southwest district of the Wake County region, to improve safety and to support local and regional transit plans. The current schedule calls for the TCC and TAC to approve moving forward on the recommended studies in early 2006 in order for the consultant selection process to begin and work to commence early in the 2007 fiscal year beginning July 1, 2006.

Mr. Johnson referred to the September 26 meeting attended by David Wasserman of NCDOT, and discussed things we would like to do in that corridor study area. It was summarized as looking at US 64 from US 1 to the Pittsboro Bypass with the intent of upgrading it to Expressway inside the Outer Loop and freeway outside the Outer Loop and the area where I-540 crosses US 1 and Highway 55 could be another Crossroads area for which a planned circulation network is needed. Discussion also took place at that meeting relating to looking at US 1 and the Beltline near Crossroads and it was decided that would go with the I-40 widening project pointing out Cary has done a lot of study on that. Mr. Johnson reported he had spoken to Mr. Wasserman earlier this week and committed to Mr. Wasserman working on the US 64 project and Mr. Johnson on the other one since the RFP needs to be put out as soon as possible in 2006 in order to select a consultant in February. All paper work would be taken care of and by July 1 they would be working. He spoke to the need to decide how much Cary, Holly Springs and Apex are willing to partner on this. Ms. Andes noted Chatham County had someone at

that meeting and questioned if they are interested in anything. Mr. Johnson responded that Chatham County had deferred to DOT.

NCDOT/MPO/RPO INITIATIVE TO IMPROVE COLLABORATION – INFORMATION RECEIVED

Mr. Johnson reported meetings had been held recently between staffs of several MPOs, RPOs and NCDOT to develop a process for improving the coordination, cooperation and collaboration between all three planning partners. The team's recommendations were discussed at this year's MPO conference in Greenville on October 26-28. Mr. Johnson indicated the conference was an outstanding success and had good attendance. Warren Miller facilitated the portion of the meeting relating to work he had been involved in with the MPOs and RPOs on how to collaborate better. Information was presented at that meeting and Mr. Johnson indicated copies would be provided to members. The idea is all of these groups can always benefit from improving the way they work together. He explained discussion took place on how much DOT is willing to allow MPOs and RPOs to determine where funds will go and right now that is not much. He explained the question is where we go from here, how fast and who is involved. He noted further information would be coming later. Mr. Johnson reported the MPOs were looking at how money was distributed among the MPOs and after much debate they came up with something that was implemented by NCDOT last month. Mr. Johnson stated there are many items on which the MPOs, RPOs and NCDOT are working together but there are other areas they are not.

The report was received as information.

NCDOT REPORT – RECEIVED

Mr. Bowman reported on the Knightdale Connector between I-540 and US 64 which is 76% complete. The Outer Loop on the east side is a little behind schedule. I-540 to Highway 55 is 66% complete. US 1/64 in the Cary area is 36% complete.

Mr. Johnson questioned if the status of projects is available on the Web. Mr. Bowman responded it is available on NCDOT's website.

WENDELL BYPASS – REPORT RECEIVED

Ms. Piner reported that a meeting was held relating to the Wendell Bypass; however, a resolution has not been reached. Everyone was brought up to speed on the history of this proposal at the meeting. Mr. Johnson reported Mr. Petrosky put together an updated map showing rooftops in this area and hoped to make an on site inspection this week. He stated there was some feeling continuity across the south side of Wendell is important. He requested that the developer provide, to staff, a master plan showing what they want to do.. Ms. Piner noted the developers are also meeting with Wake County officials and the Wake County School System. Mr. Johnson indicated this project would be a public/private project and at the last meeting he told them we would not have the money

to spend on this and we have other priorities. He indicated we should think about if we want to have a special way to deal with these public/private projects.

The report was received as information.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Frangos moved adjournment of the meeting at 11:45 a.m. His motion, seconded by Mr. Browder, unanimously passed. Chairman Russell declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Hunt