

Charlotte Regional Alliance For Transportation

Technical Committee

Meeting Notes

10/29/14

Mt. Holly Town Hall

Attendees: Dana Stoogenke, RRRPO; Bjorn Hansen, GCLMPO; Hank Graham, GCLMPO; Bernie Yacobucci, GCLMPO; Bret Baronak, GCLMPO; Robert Moody, Catawba Regional COG; Bob Cook, CRTPO; Stuart Basham, NCDOT- Division 12; Neil Burke, CRTPO; Curtis Bridges, CRTPO; Loretta Barren, FHWA; Danny Pleasant, CDOT; Nancy Ross, City of Gastonia; Phil Conrad, CRMPO; Brian DuPont, City of Mt. Holly; Jonathan Wilson, City of Mt. Holly; Jamal Alavi, NCDOT-TPB, Linda Dosse, NCDOT-TPB, Anil Paniker, NCDOT-TPB, Reuben Crummy, NCDOT-TPB; David Hooper, RFATS; Michelle Nance, CCOG, James Lim, NCDOT, Anna Gallup, CDOT, Candice Leonard, CRTPO, Brian Wert, NCDOT, David Williams, Gaston County, Sara Familian, CDOT.

Welcome & Introductions: Hank Graham, GCLMPO, opened the meeting at 10:05 AM, welcomed everyone in attendance and introduced new MPO/RPO staff, Bjorn Hansen and Bret Baronak with the GCLMPO and Ms. Candice Leonard with CRTPO. Everyone present then introduced themselves.

Minutes: Mr. Graham asked if there were any corrections, additions and/or deletions to the May 27, 2014 minutes. Hearing none, Dana Stoogenke moved to approve the minutes as presented and Robert Cook seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as presented.

Regional Boundary Agreements: David Hooper asked for a status update on the regional boundary agreements between each of the affected MPOs in the region as a result of the 2010 census. Mr. Cook acknowledged this has not been a priority of CRTPO recently, but they believe they can have the agreements approved by their board at their January 2015 meeting. Mr. Graham stated they have been waiting on final language from FHWA and CRTPO, and are prepared to process approvals in January 2015 as well. Mr. Conrad said CRMPO has approved its agreements with the High Point MPO, and has sent an approved agreement to CRTPO for approval. Mr. Hooper stated that resolving this issue in a timely manner is important for FTA Section 5307 funding allocation from CATS to flow to SC, which can help address a lack of transit in the Fort Mill area and Lancaster County, SC. At present, RFATS has not moved forward with either one of its two agreements with the GCLMPO and CRTPO. He hopes FTA will approve a funding methodology between CATS and RFATS soon. January 2015 will be the adoption goal for all Boundary contiguous Regional Boundary Agreements between MPO's.

Community Viz & Socio-Economic: Michelle Nance provided an update on the status of CommunityViz implementation and use by area MPOs. She began by stating the overall goal of CommunityViz is to have a bottom up method to generate and distribute SE data within the region. She stated that MAP21 encourages Scenario Planning and FHWA continues to search for regional coordination projects to highlight as best practices nationally. CRTPO is contracting with Centralina COG to develop the methodology for such a program. The GCLMPO intends to adopt a resolution committing to participate with financial participation to begin July 1, 2015

(FY 15-16). RFATS and RRRPO welcome a presentation to their TCCs. Phil Conrad said CRMPO had not discussed participating, but also was not planning to participate.

For clarification purposes Bob Cook asked if the proposed Community Viz contract would lay the ground work for Scenario Planning. Michelle responded that CCOG, in this first year, would be building the model for scenario planning. Danny Pleasant expressed that the data would be better and logical which should benefit outputs for everyone. Bjorn stated that currently MPO's use County totals but use a variety of different scenario methods for population and employment distribution.

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning: Loretta Barren provided information about the Every Day Counts (EDC) program from the Federal Highway Administration. The EDC program is in its third round of identifying and implementing strategies to help DOTs implement projects more quickly. The program has been expanded to include transportation planning organizations. The region's MPO's and RPO's participated in an August workshop to highlight local multi-jurisdictional initiatives, and they are each invited to a southeastern US meeting of state DOTs and transportation planning organizations, to be held in December in Charlotte. Loretta mentioned that each state has an allocation of \$100,000 to fund initiatives that have a high potential for improving project delivery.

The MPO and RPO representatives asked for examples of initiatives and action plans that had been funded elsewhere. Ms. Barren said she would have to research that, but she did state that the Raleigh MPO had been prominently featured on the EDC web page for having a joint MTP with its neighboring MPO, as well as for using CommunityViz.

Loretta stated that there was a 14 member council established to review and promote EDC action item/initiatives. She stated that the CAMPO Executive Director was on the council. Bob Cook will coordinate a meeting with Metrolina Coordinators in advance of the December workshop to define future initiatives to work on and potentially obtain some additional funding. Ms. Barren referenced T2 Grants and Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRPS), and the Grow America Act as it talks about high performing MPO's as "independent but flexible".

On-Line Data Presentation Tools: Bjorn Hansen conducted a presentation exploring the possibilities and limitations of regional interactive or linked on-line data presentation tools. He explained that the City of Gastonia and the GCLMPO are using ArcGIS on line (AGOL) to create a range of web-based mapping services available to the general public. He noted that there is not a single location where a person can look view regional traffic counts, MTPs, STIPs, or demographic information. He noted that some of the area MPOs and RPOs do post some information on line, but it is inconsistent and not available in one location to allow analysis across adjacent organization boundaries. Those present did agree this was an issue. He expressed the need for adjoining transportation organizations to be more inclusive when making major changes to projects that are on the border of planning regions. The group discussed having one central site to host this information versus each organization hosting information from adjacent transportation planning organization's websites. Mr. Conrad said he preferred hosting his own site so he would not be limited with any data posting restrictions.

Bob Cook asked who would be the primary audience for the interactive mapping and data site. Bjorn responded Realtors, Elected Officials, the general public, and staff technicians. Bob mentioned that the subcommittee should think about whether anyone in Cleveland County would care about traffic counts in Cabarrus County. Dana stated that she thought a site such as this would be extremely important to elected officials if the site was designed for well. Discussion ensued around data types including crash data, land use, SE data, TAZ', and who is serving up what data specifically.

Bob moved to create a subcommittee to address this issue with a second from Dana. The group decided to appoint a subcommittee to develop options to address this issue. The subcommittee would be comprised of Mr. Hansen Curtis Bridges from CRTPO, Robby Moody from CRCOG, Phil Conrad from CRMPO, Dana Stoogenke from RRRPO, Elena Talenker from NCDOT-TPB, Chuck Chorak from Rock Hill, and a representative of ESRI in Charlotte.

Meeting Schedule: The group discussed the need for more frequent meetings, and the group decided to add two meetings in May- August timeframe, with meetings held on the fourth Tuesdays.

SPOT 4.0: As CRAFT and Metrolina committee representatives, Neil Burke and Dana Stoogenke conducted a presentation on efforts and discussions of the SPOT 4.0 Study Committee.

Mr. Burke informed that group that the SPOT Committee is working towards getting a schedule developed by early November. There are two primary issues on which the 4.0 schedule depends – The number of local input assignment periods and extent of changes made to the new SPOT schedule.

The Committee discussed the pros and cons of the Local Input Assignment schedule options. The single 90 day period is less complex and allows for the public to better understand the process information. Additionally, it gives a better representation of priorities, allows for test scoring of project, and is consistent local input methodologies. The downside is this approach does not allow for seeing which projects will cascade down before assigning division points. Having two 60-day periods allows for seeing which projects cascade down before assigning Division level points. The downside of this approach is possible confusion to the public given that it will require two public comment periods. It also may require that local input methodologies may have to be modified.

It was also reported that the GIS-based SPOT Online application will require some modifications to the way it was applied to SPOT 3.0 in preparation for SPOT 4.0. Necessary changes are still being discussed by the SPOT 4.0 oversight Committee. Another target items discussed regarding SPOT 4.0 was the schedule of committed projects vs. projects subject to reprioritization. The group discussed a variety of options related to committed projects being based upon construction date or R/W date and whether that committed timeframe is 7 or 8 years.

A summary of the options:

1. First 7 Years committed based upon Construction Date
 - Consistent with previous SPOT efforts

- Large projects requiring EEP that take a lengthy 5+ years before reaching let date could fall subject to new ranking criteria, jeopardizing pre-construction costs and efforts
2. First 7 Years committed based upon R/W Date
 - Most stability, low chance of losing PE efforts
 - Fewer dollars available for overall projects in 4.0 due to funds being consumed by large projects with R/W earlier than 2022
 3. First 8 Years committed based upon Construction Date
 - Large projects with let date in 24 or 25 (R/W 22 or 23 may not make the cut if SPOT criteria or scores change – potential for losing PE efforts.

The group did not decided on any one option but asked that Neil and Dana keep the group abreast of any additional information and decision making necessary by the group in the future.

CTP Map Boundaries

Robert Cook of CRTPO provided a list of concerns on why the CTP Map Boundaries. The group and NCDOT committed to sharing CTP maps for the purpose of consolidation and coordination of projects across MPO/RPO boundaries.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be in January and hosted by **RFATS (January 27, 2015)**

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 PM.