



**CRAFT Technical Committee
Meeting Notes
March 27, 2018**

Attendees: Bob Cook (CRTPO); Curtis Bridges (CRTPO); Erin Kinne (CRTPO); Neil Burke (CRTPO); Randi Gates (GCLMPO); David Williams (Gaston County); Robby Moody (CRCOG); Andy Bailey (NCDOT); Reuben Crummy (NCDOT); Ahmad ElKhatib (NCDOT); Michelle Nance (CCOG); Anna Gallup (CDOT); Dana Stoogenke (RRRPO); Steve Allen (York County); Chris Stephens (York County); Loretta Barren (FHWA); Eddie Dancausse (FHWA); Chris Herrmann (RFATS); and David Hooper (RFATS).

Conference Call Attendees: Phil Conrad (CRMPO) and Bill Jordan (SCDOT).

1. **Welcome & Introduction:** Mr. Hooper began the meeting at 10:02 AM and welcomed everyone in attendance.
2. **Approval of January 30, 2018 Minutes:** Mr. Hooper asked if there were any corrections, additions and / or deletions to the January 30, 2018 minutes. Hearing none, Ms. Stoogenke made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Mr. Hooper seconded the motion. The minutes were then approved.
3. **Transportation Performance Management:**
 - A. **CMAQ Performance Measures** – Mr. Cook provided an overview of the CMAQ performance measures; specifically, the Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) and the percentage of Non-SOV travel. As a point of reference, Mr. Cook noted that these two performance measures for the Charlotte UZA required the designation of a single unified target for this portion of the Metrolina Region. With this in mind, a recent meeting had occurred where relevant performance information was reviewed by NCDOT, SCDOT, FHWA and appropriate MPO partners.

Mr. Cook then reviewed more detailed information associated with the PHED measure; specifically, that it applies during weekday peak hours from 6:00am to 10:00am and again from 3:00pm to 7:00pm. As a point of reference, it was noted that there was an option for the evening peak period from 4:00pm to 8:00pm, but that agreement was reached that the 3:00pm to 7:00pm time period was the most appropriate. Discussion then followed regarding NPMRDS data that was reviewed. Items of particular note included the current trendline and projected growth rates.

Discussion then focused on the appropriate range for performance measurement target setting. It was then noted that all of the agencies involved reached agreement on the high

end of the range identified by NCDOT as an advisable initial target. Mr. Hooper then noted that the pace of growth within the applicable area, combined with the relatively limited number of meaningful projects anticipated for completion before the end of the initial reporting period, seemed consistent with selecting the higher end of the range. Lastly, it was noted that the target could always be adjusted should conditions be materially different.

Mr. Cook then reviewed the Non-SOV travel performance data from the American Community Survey, and noted that utilization of the ACS data is a broadly applied approach based on feedback from FHWA. As a point of reference, Mr. Cook noted that alternative methods using local surveys and modal counts did not meet with applicable criteria set by FHWA for this reporting period. Additionally, it was noted that the ACS data was suitable as it provides 5-year estimates for “commuting to work” totaled by mode, as of August 15 of the year the Performance Report is due for the measure. Mr. Cook then highlighted that an agreement was reached to use the target of 21% for both the two-year reporting period to end in 2020 and the four-year reporting period to end in 2022. This decision was also made based on the current trendline.

Discussion then followed regarding next steps in the process with this information being shared with each MPO for their review and concurrence. In terms of scheduling, CRTPO is set to present their information on May 16th; GCLMPO completed their presentation in late March; CRMPO is scheduled for April; and RFATS will review this information on May 18th. Lastly, it was noted that following the submission by the State DOTs on May 20, 2018 – all MPOs will have six months to amend their planning documents and formally adopt these targets later this year.

Mr. Herrmann then asked if there was any guidance available for the CMAQ Performance Plan that the MPOs are required to submit to FHWA? Mr. Dancausse responded that he has reviewed a second draft on the guidance that will be released by FHWA and this guidance should be made available soon. As a point of reference, Mr. Dancausse noted that MPOs can expect the guidance to include a template to follow; also highlighting that the Performance Plan should not be extensive based on the template he reviewed.

4. **FY 18 – FY 21 UPWP CRAFT Planning Focus:** Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed recent discussions regarding appropriate UPWP coordination and the identification of priority tasks over the next few years. While the July meeting is slated for further agenda planning matters, it is recommended that CRAFT move forward with the development of an updated ITS / Incident Management Strategic Action Plan as a follow-up item from the Greater Charlotte Regional Freight Study. As a point of reference, Ms. Nance highlighted that the last full ITS plan for NCDOT was completed in 2001; noting that the plan has been updated incrementally since then. Discussion then followed regarding a possible budgetary range for this initiative.

Lastly, Mr. Hooper then stated that it is hoped that by designating the July meeting for annual agenda planning purposes – that a more structured approach should further

strengthen our ability to advance identified priorities with greater clarity and efficiency in implementation; and thereby free up limited time to take account of newly emerging priorities during the year – an ability that will take on increased importance in the years ahead.

5. CRAFT MOA:

A. Annual Agenda Development – Mr. Hooper briefly reviewed previous discussions regarding the importance of undertaking a more structured approach to agenda development. Mr. Hooper then reviewed core planning responsibilities that should be reflected as recurring agenda items for CRAFT meetings. These responsibilities include administrative tasks, planning and project coordination, planning studies / regional initiatives, legislative decisions that have a regional impact, and grant planning opportunities.

Within these broad categories, appropriate coordination needs were cited in the following areas – MTPs, Travel Demand Modeling, Socio-Economic Data Assumptions and Updates, CommunityViz Applications, Project Transparency through ArcGIS Online Mapping and Transportation Performance Management. Additionally, Mr. Burke noted that the TIP Development Process should also be included. Discussion then followed regarding the importance to focus on these key areas (in addition to other regional initiatives such as CONNECT; Greater Charlotte Regional Freight Study, etc.); with those in attendance agreeing that this approach is acceptable.

Mr. Hooper then suggested that in terms of administrative planning, a coordination meeting could be scheduled in July to review the sequence in which recurring agenda items should be structured during the upcoming year consistent with federal and state planning requirements as well as being positioned (in terms of time management) to respond to newly identified priorities that might emerge during the year. Lastly, Mr. Hooper noted that a follow-up meeting should occur in the fall (preferably November) regarding budgetary matters so that appropriate coordination and concurrence could occur during the annual budget development process in.

Mr. Moody then emphasized the importance of reviewing CRAFT coordination with the respective boards and the CRAFT Executive Committee. Mr. Hooper noted that he reviews this information with the RFATS Technical Committee as well as the RFATS Policy Committee after each meeting. Ms. Stoogenke then stated that providing an annual report to the respective boards might be a good approach for all to take, such as a one-page Executive Summary. Mr. Burke added that an annual newsletter to summarize activities from all CRAFT members would also make sense as a possible venue to provide information to governing boards and the CRAFT Executive Committee.

B. Meeting Format – Consensus was that meetings should continue to rotate and be hosted by each member agency of CRAFT and the current frequency of meeting every other month was acceptable.

C. Amended MOA Draft – Ms. Stoogenke reviewed the updates made to the amended MOA Draft. Ms. Barren noted that UPWP coordination should be referenced. Ms. Nance then asked about the updated affiliate member list (i.e., removal of all agencies other than the federal and state regulatory agencies)? Mr. Hooper noted that the change was intended to simply and focus on the core agencies with oversight responsibilities such as FHWA, FTA, EPA NCDOT / SCDOT – rather than try to capture the more expansive and often changing list of other stakeholder agencies / groups. Mr. Hooper then noted that this change is not intended to discourage involvement and/or continued participation by anyone. Ms. Nance then stated that this clarification sufficiently answers her question. Ms. Stoogenke then noted that the recommended changes will be made and shared with the voting members for final review in May. Mr. Cook then made a motion to finalize the MOA based on the recommendations made today; seconded by Ms. Gates. The motion was then unanimously approved.

6. Transportation Conformity – DC Circuit Court Decision

A. South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA – Mr. Dancausse briefly summarized the court ruling, noting that the revocation of the 1997 Air Quality Standard was overturned. Mr. Dancausse highlighted that EPA has been granted a two-week extension regarding whether a re-hearing will be requested. Discussion then followed regarding potential impacts to the conformity process. Ms. Barren recommended that even if the revocation stands and the maintenance classification is removed, it would still be beneficial to continue the process for evaluating conformity due to the uncertainty. Mr. Dancausse then explained that he will seek further information from FHWA and EPA as things progress.

7. Next Meeting Date – Mr. Hooper noted that the next meeting is scheduled for May 22, 2018 and will be hosted by CRMPO.

8. Adjournment: The meeting was then adjourned at 11:54 PM.