



M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N  
**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

600 East Fourth Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853  
704-336-2205  
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE  
CORNELIUS  
DAVIDSON  
HUNTERSVILLE  
INDIAN TRAIL  
MATTHEWS  
MECKLENBURG  
COUNTY  
MINT HILL  
MONROE  
NCDOT  
PINEVILLE  
STALLINGS  
UNION  
COUNTY  
WAXHAW  
WEDDINGTON  
WESLEY CHAPEL  
WINGATE

**TO:** TCC Members  
**FROM:** Nicholas Polimeni  
MUMPO Principal Planner  
**DATE:** August 25, 2011  
**SUBJECT:** **Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Agenda  
September 2011 TCC Meeting—September 1, 2011**

The September 2011 TCC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, September 1 at 10:00 AM** in **Room 267** of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (600 East Fourth Street). Attached is a copy of the agenda.

Please call me at (704) 336-8309 if you have any questions.

**MUMPO TCC**  
**AGENDA**  
**September 1, 2011**

---

**1. Consideration of August Meeting Minutes**

Bill Coxe

*ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented, or with amendments.*

**2. Unified Planning Work Program**

Robert Cook

**a. FY 2012 Amendment** (5 minutes)

*ACTION REQUESTED: Request that the MPO amend the FY 2012 UPWP.*

*BACKGROUND: An additional \$809,767 is available to program in the FY 2012 UPWP. See the attached memorandum for more details.*

*ATTACHMENT: Memorandum and draft project list.*

**b. Local Projects Funding Allocation Process** (10 minutes)

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: MUMPO supports the efforts of its member jurisdictions to pursue transportation planning projects by providing financial support in the form of Planning (PL) funds. The number and complexity of projects seeking funding has increased in recent years, necessitating a more formal project evaluation and selection process. Staff recently requested TCC members to complete a survey on key questions regarding the allocation process. The survey results will be presented.*

**3. SPOT Prioritization 2.0** (15 minutes)

Nicholas Polimeni

**a. Highway Projects**

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: A subcommittee of the TCC is scheduled to meet on Wednesday, August 31 to begin discussing how to apply MUMPO's 1300 Local Input points to the highway projects in the P2.0 database. A summary of the meeting will be provided, as well as next steps.*

**b. Bicycle & Pedestrian Projects**

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: The TCC appointed bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee met on Wednesday, August 24 to continue ranking the bicycle and pedestrian projects submitted to NCDOT as part of the P2.0 process. An update on the status of the process, and next steps, will be provided.*

**c. CMAQ Projects**

*ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the TCC endorse for submittal to NCDOT the unfunded projects in the attached MUMPO P2.0 CMAQ Projects list.*

*BACKGROUND: See attached memorandum.*

*ATTACHMENT: CMAQ Memorandum and proposed project list*

**4. 2040 Statewide Plan** (15 minutes)

Tyler Bray

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: NCDOT will provide information regarding the new 2040 Statewide Plan, including background, process and timeline.*

**5. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)** (15 minutes)

Anil Panicker

*ACTION REQUESTED: Make recommendations regarding the following two items, related to the development of the CTP:*

- 1) Whether or not to designate a “development team,” represented by a smaller group of the TCC, to continue work on the CTP and report back to the full TCC as progress is made; and*
- 2) Determine if the bicycle and pedestrian components of the CTP for MUMPO will be represented as maps, or as policy statements.*

*BACKGROUND: A CTP meeting was held on Wednesday, August 17, at which time a number of CTP-related issues were discussed, including whether or not the CTP meetings should continue to consist of all TCC members willing to attend, or a more focused subgroup of the TCC; whether or not the bicycle and pedestrian components of the CTP should be represented on maps, or as policy statements; and, if a scope should be developed to help guide the process and identify significant milestones that need to be achieved in order to keep the process moving. Highlights from the meeting will be presented, and the TCC will be asked to weigh in on these issues.*

**6. Northwest Huntersville Transportation Study** (15 minutes)

Bill Coxe

*ACTION REQUESTED: Consider recommendation of an alternative for the connection of the Vance Road Extension with NC 73, and what to do with NC 73 from that point west to the Catawba River.*

*BACKGROUND: Background information is available on the Huntersville website, or by clicking on the following link: [http://www.huntersville.org/trans\\_13.asp](http://www.huntersville.org/trans_13.asp). Additional information will be provided prior to the TCC meeting.*

**7. Title VI Analysis** (15 minutes)

Robert Cook

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: MUMPO is conducting an analysis of its outreach to low-income and minority communities. The quantitative analysis is examining how the MPO has allocated past funds, and will be used as part of the long range and TIP planning processes. The qualitative analysis will assist in future outreach to environmental justice groups.*

*ATTACHMENT: Memorandum and quantitative assessment methodology*

**8. 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan** (10 minutes)

Robert Cook

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: MUMPO’s long range transportation plan must be updated no later than early 2014. Work on several aspects of the plan has already begun. One important task that must begin soon is the revision to the project ranking methodology.*

**9. Eastfield/I-485 Development Proposal** (15 minutes)

Jonathan Crowder

*ACTION REQUESTED: FYI*

*BACKGROUND: Gandy Development proposes to develop approximately 75 acres along Eastfield Road near the NC 115 interchange with I-485. As part of this project, the developer proposes to realign the western end of Eastfield Road through the project area.*

**10. October Meeting Date** (5 minutes)

Bill Coxe

*ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the TCC consider changing the date of the October TCC meeting, currently scheduled on Thursday, October 6.*

*BACKGROUND: The North Carolina American Planning Association conference will be held in Charlotte the week of the currently scheduled October TCC meeting, which could cause a conflict for several TCC members. It is recommended that the meeting date be changed to avoid losing a quorum at the October TCC meeting.*

**11. Upcoming Issues**

**12. Adjourn**

**MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE**  
**Summary Meeting Minutes**  
**Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center**  
**Room 267**  
**August 4, 2011**

---

**Voting Members:** Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Danny Pleasant (CDOT), George Berger (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Ken Tippet (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Jonathan Wells – alt for Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe), Jack Flaherty (NCDOT-Public Transportation Division), Anil Panicker (NCDOT-TPB), Karen Floyd – alt for Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Lauren Blackburn (Davidson), Adam McLamb – alt for Scott Kaufhold (Indian Trail), Ralph Messera (Matthews), John Hoard (Mint Hill), Kevin Icard (Pineville), Shannon Martel (Stallings), Jordon Cook (Weddington), Amy Helms (Union County)

**Staff:** Robert Cook (MUMPO), Stuart Basham (MUMPO), Nick Polimeni (MUMPO), Tim Gibbs (CDOT), Andy Grzymyski (CDOT), Norm Steinman (CDOT), Louis Mitchell (NCDOT-Div. 10), Gwen Cook (Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation), Keith Sorensen (Indian Trail), Brandon Watson (Cornelius)

**Guests:** Greg Boulanger (HNTB), Padam Singh (HNTB), Scott Lane (JS Lane)

---

Bill Coxe opened the meeting at 10:00 AM. Before getting started with the items on the agenda, Mr. Coxe announced that item three would be moved to the September TCC agenda. He also stated that an item to discuss upcoming issues would be added to the end of the agenda, and that it would become a regular item to be included on all future TCC agendas.

**1. Consideration of July Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Coxe asked if there were any changes to the minutes needed. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Wells made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Berger seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the July minutes were approved unanimously.

**2. NCDOT Complete Streets Planning and Design Guidelines**

**Presenter:** Jack Flaherty, NCDOT

**Summary/Action Requested:**

Mr. Flaherty provided a summary of the Complete Streets subcommittee process, which included highlighting several specific comments related to zoning, lighting, bicycle lanes and design build projects, among others. He noted that overall the comments were positive regarding the framework that has been laid out thus far. Mr. Flaherty concluded by stating that the comments are due August 17, and that NCDOT hopes to have a completed document for review by December 2011. Mr. Steinman asked if there would be a general positive comment included with MUMPO's submission, and Mr. Flaherty indicated that it would be included in a memo that is being sent with the comments. Mr. Wells asked how NCDOT will respond with regard to implementing Complete Streets in the absence of local responsibility. He also asked how the guidelines will address transition, both linear and lateral. Mr. Flaherty stated that he would revise the comments to include what was discussed at the TCC meeting, and that a memo would be prepared to send to NCDOT with the comments, prior to the deadline.

**Motion:**

Mr. Wells made a motion to recommend that the TCC endorse the comments with the slight modifications

discussed, and that a memo be drafted to send to NCDOT, signed by the TCC Chairman, with the comments attached. Ms. Blackburn seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

### **3. 2040 Statewide Plan**

Item was moved to the September TCC meeting.

### **4. SPOT Prioritization 2.0**

Presenter: Nicholas Polimeni

#### Summary/FYI:

Mr. Polimeni provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). Mr. Polimeni updated the TCC about what has been completed thus far in relation to the P2.0 process, including that the highway, bicycle & pedestrian, and transit projects have been submitted to NCDOT. He reminded the TCC that the Problem Statements are due in August and he discussed next steps in the process, as follows:

- Highway Projects
  - Local input ranking needs to be submitted to SPOT in October-November 2011
  - Form a TCC subcommittee to evaluate projects and determine how to allocate the 1300 points available to MUMPO (Mr. Steinman and Ms. Martel volunteered – Mr. Polimeni stated that an email would be sent out to request a few more volunteers, and that he would lead the subcommittee process)
  - TCC and MPO action will be needed in November
- Bicycle & Pedestrian Projects
  - The previously formed bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee will reconvene to rank the remaining bicycle and pedestrian projects
  - An email will be sent to TCC members requesting the information necessary for the subcommittee to complete the ranking process
  - TCC and MPO action will be needed in November
- Transit Projects
  - CATS will be asked to explain how the transit projects are prioritized (MTC approval, if necessary)
  - TCC and MPO action will be needed in November

Mr. Polimeni also provided an update on the P2.0 CMAQ process, as follows:

- CMAQ Projects
  - New application has been released by NCDOT; all CMAQ candidate projects will need to be submitted through Partner Connect using the new application
  - CMAQ projects must be submitted in October 2011, each MPO is responsible for determining how many projects to submit based on previous target allocations
  - Suggest that the TCC review the existing endorsed list of MUMPO CMAQ projects to determine which projects to consider for P2.0
  - Projects to be submitted are for funding in FY 2016 and FY 2017 only
  - Three tiers of projects (% of total allocation) – Statewide (5%), Regional (35%) and Subregional (60%)

Mr. Steinman had concerns with the apportionment percentages as they relate to Statewide and Regional projects, stating that perhaps they should be flipped (Statewide – 35% and Regional – 5%). Mr. Coxe expressed his concern about the uncertainty of CMAQ dollars due to the recent rescission, and that CMAQ

projects are the only category of projects in the P2.0 process that are financially capped. Mr. Polimeni suggested that this be an agenda item at a future transportation staff meeting, for further discussion.

## **5. Unified Planning Work Program**

### **a. FY 2012 Amendment**

Presenter: Robert Cook

#### Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He described the reason for the amendment, and stated that the MPO would be receiving additional funding to be programmed. He then highlighted the MPO project needs, followed by the local projects that have been proposed for PL funding. The following seven projects have been proposed:

- 1) US 74 Corridor Study (Union County)
- 2) Brookshire Bl/W.T. Harris Bl Study (Charlotte)
- 3) I-277 Loop Analysis (Charlotte)
- 4) M L King Jr Bl Extension Analysis (Charlotte)
- 5) I-77 Exit 28 Analysis (Cornelius)
- 6) Matthews-Stallings Transportation Study (Matthews/Stallings)
- 7) Old Dowd Rd/NS Railroad Grade Separation Study (Charlotte)

Mr. Cook concluded by stating the next steps, which includes MPO approval anticipated in September.

### **b. Local Transportation Planning Project Evaluation & Selection**

Presenter: Robert Cook

#### Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He began by describing what Planning (PL) Funds are used for, and MUMPO's process for allocating funds has generally been fairly informal. He continued by stating that recently more requests have been submitted and suggested that the TCC and MPO consider formalizing the process by which funds are allocated. Mr. Cook posed some possible changes and asked if the TCC would be agreeable to completing a survey, in which feedback could be provided to staff. There was general consensus to send a survey by email to all TCC members. Ms. Blackburn suggested that another objective of reviewing the project allocation process could be to define what projects are eligible to receive PL funds.

## **6. Northwest Huntersville Transportation Study**

Presenter: Bill Coxe, Town of Huntersville

#### Summary/FYI:

Mr. Coxe provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He outlined the project history, including a timeline of events and major public comments. The project is on the TCC agenda because it would require a Thoroughfare amendment, which must be endorsed by the MPO. Mr. Coxe provided details regarding the review process for four alternatives for improvements along the NC 73 corridor in the western region of Huntersville. He also highlighted the major components of each proposed alternative, and addressed the remaining issues, which include:

- McGuire Nuclear Station access
- Shopping Center access at Beatties Ford Rd (Option 3)

- Access management along a new road (Options 3 & 4)
- Hubbard Road impacts (Option 3)
- Alteration of NC 73 Corridor Plan
- Justification of new road on new alignment

Mr. Coxe also stated that Option 2 is no longer an option, and he informed the TCC that action is expected at the September TCC and MPO meetings regarding which alignment is recommended.

## **7. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)**

Presenter: Anil Panicker, NCDOT

### Summary/FYI:

Mr. Panicker stated that the highway CTP maps are almost complete, and that the draft maps will be sent out for review when they are finished. He noted that one issue that has consistently been raised relates to roads that cross jurisdictional boundaries, and determining how to classify those roads. He also stated that he is beginning to develop the transit CTP maps. Mr. Coxe asked if there could be a CTP subcommittee meeting the third Wednesday in August to discuss issues such as public involvement, among other CTP-related issues. Mr. Panicker confirmed that a meeting could be scheduled for August 17.

Mr. Coxe announced that there would be an update on upcoming TCC issues, and that this item would be included on future TCC agendas. Mr. Cook provided an update regarding the 2040 LRTP development, stating that it would be kicking off soon and that a scope is currently being developed. He also noted that revising the ranking criteria would be one of the major undertakings. It was also noted that Mr. Scott Lane, of JS Lane, was retained as a consultant to assist with the development of MUMPO's Congestion Management Process (CMP). Mr. Cook announced that there would be a lunch discussion directly following the TCC meeting to begin discussing the CMP, and encouraged the TCC members to participate.

**8. Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM.





M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N  
**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

600 East Fourth Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853  
704-336-2205  
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE  
CORNELIUS  
DAVIDSON  
HUNTERSVILLE  
INDIAN TRAIL  
MATTHEWS  
MECKLENBURG  
COUNTY  
MINT HILL  
MONROE  
NCDOT  
PINEVILLE  
STALLINGS  
UNION  
COUNTY  
WAXHAW  
WEDDINGTON  
WESLEY CHAPEL  
WINGATE

TO: Technical Coordinating Committee  
FROM: Robert W. Cook, AICP  
MUMPO Secretary  
DATE: August 24, 2011  
SUBJECT: **FY 12 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment**

**REQUESTED ACTION**

The TCC is requested to recommend to the MPO that it amend the FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

**BACKGROUND**

The UPWP amendment is necessary in order to allocate \$809,767 in additional Planning (PL) funds. The MPO's FY 2012 allocation was not made known until after the UPWP's adoption in May. While developing the UPWP, MUMPO conservatively estimated the amount of available funding to be \$725,000. The actual amount available is \$1,534,767. This amount is the total of the annual allocation of \$897,575 plus \$637,192 in the form of unobligated balances from previous fiscal years.

**PROCESS**

This matter was first discussed at the July TCC meeting, followed by a discussion at the July 13 Transportation Staff meeting. At that meeting, staff discussed how some of the funding would be allocated to support MPO tasks and the time line for submitting local project requests. The call for local transportation planning projects was issued on July 15 and applications were due on July 26. Seven local project applications were submitted, with one being later withdrawn by the applicant. Additional discussions of the MPO tasks and local projects were held at Transportation Staff meetings on July 27, August 10 and August 17.

**CHANGES**

The amount of PL funds requested for the Brookshire Boulevard/W.T. Harris Boulevard classification and cross-section analysis has been reduced from \$200,000 to \$100,000. The funds are proposed to be assigned to GIS tasks and the creation of an interactive mapping application development for MUMPO's website.

**ATTACHMENT**

The attached spreadsheet lists the potential projects to be funded with the additional \$809,767. More information about the proposed local projects can be found at:  
<http://www.mumpo.org/plans-programs/unified-planning-work-program>.



M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N  
**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

600 East Fourth Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853  
704-336-2205  
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE  
CORNELIUS  
DAVIDSON  
HUNTERSVILLE  
INDIAN TRAIL  
MATTHEWS  
MECKLENBURG  
COUNTY  
MINT HILL  
MONROE  
NCDOT  
PINEVILLE  
STALLINGS  
UNION  
COUNTY  
WAXHAW  
WEDDINGTON  
WESLEY CHAPEL  
WINGATE

TO: Technical Coordinating Committee  
FROM: Nicholas Polimeni  
MUMPO Principal Planner  
DATE: August 25, 2011  
SUBJECT: **NCDOT Prioritization 2.0 Process  
CMAQ Projects**

### **BACKGROUND AND GUIDELINES**

The North Carolina Department of Transportation has released an application, instructions and a timeline for the Prioritization 2.0 (P2.0) CMAQ process. The new application, and application instructions, can be found on MUMPO's website, or by clicking [here](#). Process guidelines include the following:

1. All CMAQ projects must be submitted, using the new application, during the month of October 2011.
2. MPO/RPOs are asked to submit project proposals to address CMAQ needs for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.
3. CMAQ projects must be endorsed by the MPO.
4. MUMPO currently has an endorsed list of CMAQ projects that identifies projects approved for funding in FY 2013, 2014 and 2015, as well as unfunded projects.
  - All projects on the endorsed list have been ranked and approved by the MPO (See attached **MUMPO P2.0 CMAQ Projects** dated July 21, 2010).
5. Target allocations are not available at this time, so MPOs are encouraged to develop proposals based on need, and use past year allocations as an indicator of anticipated available funding.
  - MUMPO is anticipated to receive over \$9 million in CMAQ funding for each of the fiscal years, FY 2013, 2014 and 2015
  - MUMPO's endorsed list of CMAQ projects identifies over \$20 million of unfunded project needs
    - Divided across two fiscal years, that is approximately \$10 million for FY 2016 and \$10 million for FY 2017.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Due to the fact that MUMPO has an endorsed project list that identifies CMAQ needs that exceed reasonable future funding expectations, and that there is limited time to submit CMAQ projects, a call for projects is not recommended.

It is recommended that MUMPO submit all of its remaining unfunded CMAQ projects in October 2011, for funding in FY 2016 and FY 2017.\*

- This includes projects 18-29 on the second page of the attached project list.

## **NEXT STEPS**

1. A new application will need to be completed for all projects recommended to be submitted to NCDOT for CMAQ funding.
  - The applications will then be submitted to NCDOT via Partner Connect, by MUMPO staff.
2. All project sponsors will be requested to fill out the application for their respective project(s) and provide it to staff in a timely manner (more information will follow regarding the completion date for this task).
  - The requests for funding for the CMAQ project proposals will need to be distributed evenly between FY 2016 and FY 2017.
3. Total CMAQ funding available will be finalized in early 2012.

*\*It should be noted that this does not represent the total CMAQ needs of MUMPO, but does meet the guidelines set forth by NCDOT for submitting CMAQ projects as part of the P2.0 process.*

## MUMPO P2.0 CMAQ Projects

Ranked Projects - Endorsed for Funding (July 21, 2010)		Amount of Funding			
Rank	Project	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	Total
1	GRADE-Grants to Reduce Aging Diesel Engines	500,000			500,000
2	Hybrid-Electric Transit Bus Purchase	2,128,000	2,128,000	2,128,000	6,384,000
3	NC 51 Bus Service	1,356,500	292,500	292,500	1,941,500
4	Park & Ride Lot Construction	1,040,000	560,000	2,400,000	4,000,000
5	Harrisburg Road Express	97,500	97,500	97,500	292,500
6	Highland Creek Express	97,500	97,500	97,500	292,500
7	I-77 North HOT (High Occupancy/Toll) Lanes		1,530,273	3,469,727	5,000,000
8	Sidewalk-Tryon St	1,750,000			1,750,000
9	Barton Creek Greenway			917,600	917,600
10	Shopton Road /Beam Road Roundabout	1,125,000			1,125,000
11	Intersection Imp-Ballantyne Commons Pkwy/McKee Road & Providence Road (NC 16)	370,633	370,633	370,633	1,111,899
12	Sidewalk-Providence Road		750,000		750,000
13	Sidewalk-Nevin Gibbon	911,501	81,499		993,000
14	Sidewalk-Sunset Road		1,385,010		1,385,010
15	Sidewalk-Graham St		187,500		187,500
16	Intersection Improvement-NC 16 (Brookshire Blvd.) and Lawton Road		1,395,000		1,395,000
17	Tuckaseegee/Berryhill/Thrift Road Traffic Circle*		728,508		728,508

*\*Full request was \$2.1 million; \$728,508 awarded due to funding limitations*

## MUMPO P2.0 CMAQ Projects

Ranked Projects - Unfunded		Requested Amount of Funding			
Rank	Project	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	Total
18	UNCC-City Boulevard (Hwy 49) Multi-use path	1,125,000			1,125,000
19	Potts-Sloan Connector			810,000	810,000
20	McAlpine Creek Greenway	1,013,600			1,013,600
21	McDowell Creek Greenway		1,840,000		1,840,000
22	South Prong Rocky River Greenway		828,000		828,000
23	Intersection Improvement-Torrence Chapel Road & West Catawba Ave	288,680			288,680
24	Irvins Creek Greenway	2,028,000			2,028,000
25	9th St Pedestrian Bridge	800,000	800,000	800,000	2,400,000
26	Parking Pay Stations	46,422	46,422	46,422	139,266
27	Cash for Commuters	1,728,000	1,728,000	1,728,000	5,184,000
28	Drive Less Charlotte	997,000	997,000	997,000	2,991,000
29	US 21 & Catawba Ave-Intersection Relocation	2,095,000			2,095,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>10,121,702</b>	<b>6,239,422</b>	<b>4,381,422</b>	<b>20,742,546</b>



M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N  
**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

600 East Fourth Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853  
704-336-2205  
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE  
CORNELIUS  
DAVIDSON  
HUNTERSVILLE  
INDIAN TRAIL  
MATTHEWS  
MECKLENBURG  
COUNTY  
MINT HILL  
MONROE  
NCDOT  
PINEVILLE  
STALLINGS  
UNION  
COUNTY  
WAXHAW  
WEDDINGTON  
WESLEY CHAPEL  
WINGATE

TO: Technical Coordinating Committee  
FROM: Robert W. Cook, AICP  
MUMPO Secretary  
DATE: August 23, 2011  
SUBJECT: **Title VI Analysis**

**BACKGROUND**

MUMPO's 2007 Certification Review recommended that a process be developed to determine how minority and low-income populations are impacted by the long range transportation plan. Further recommended were:

- a. measures/analytical methods to determine overall transportation system equity in an effort to identify both burdens and benefits;
- b. the identification of any negative impacts on minority and-low income populations; and
- c. avoidance and/or mitigation measures as appropriate.

In response, staff, with consultant assistance, has been working to develop:

- a. a quantitative analysis tool that can be used to assess how minority and low-income populations are impacted by both the LRTP and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and
- b. strategies to improve outreach to minority and low-income populations.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

No action is requested at this time; however, a recommendation that the MPO endorse the analysis tool will be sought at either the October or November TCC meetings.

**ATTACHMENT**

Attached is a description of the analysis tool that will be used to assess the LRTP and TIP.

## **MUMPO Minority & Low-Income Population Impact Assessment Methodology**

MUMPO's 2007 Certification Review recommended the development of a methodology by which the long range transportation plan's impact on minority and low-income populations could be assessed. Because there is no guidance provided by the Federal Highway Administration on how to conduct such an assessment, staff researched existing methods used by MPOs throughout the nation. Several were found to be sound, effective, and easily applied to the MUMPO planning area. Staff decided that, instead of using its limited resources to create a new methodology, it would use an existing, proven technique.

The methodology decided upon was developed by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC), which serves as the MPO for the Philadelphia area. The DVRPC approach was selected because:

- a. it requires little additional data collection;
- b. is easily understood; and
- c. effectively illustrates potential effects of proposed transportation improvements to staff, elected officials and the public.

### **How Will the Methodology Be Used?**

#### ***Long Range Transportation Plan***

The development of past LRTPs has included an environmental justice component within the project ranking process; however, it has been much more qualitative than quantitative. This methodology will allow for a more systematic approach to analyzing potential environmental justice community impacts, while still allowing for local knowledge to inform the decision-making process.

#### ***Transportation Improvement Program***

MUMPO has not conducted environmental justice community impact assessments of its TIP in the past. One exercise being performed in the development of this methodology has been to evaluate TIP expenditures dating to 1990. This exercise will permit us to compare past expenditures with how future funding is proposed to be distributed.

#### ***Other Processes***

The methodology can be used to assess the distribution of CMAQ, STP-DA and other funds throughout the planning area.

*It is important to remember that no formula exists that can accurately assess the impacts of individual projects, positive or negative. Each project must be evaluated on its own merits in order to assess its effects on the community.*

### **Population Groups to be Assessed**

The following population groups will be assessed:

1. Black
2. Hispanic
3. Asian American and American Indian and Alaskan Native
4. Households in poverty

5. Carless households
6. Limited English proficiency

### **Projects to be Included in the Assessment**

1. projects that add capacity on I, US and NC routes
2. projects that use federal funds to add capacity on roads not identified as I, US or NC routes
3. projects that add capacity on regionally significant roads using non-federal funds
4. rapid transit projects (e.g., LYNX Blue Line)
5. the CATS bus route network

### **Methodology**

1. Groups are located at the appropriate geography (tract or block group)
2. Planning area data gathered, combining populations from both counties
  - a. NOTE: to simplify data collection and the assessment process, all of Union County will be analyzed
3. Total number of persons in each group is divided by the total number of people or households in both counties
  - a. Example
    - assume total Hispanic population of 100 and the two-county population of 500
    - 100 divided by 500 = .2, or in other words, the Hispanic population of the two-county area is 20%
4. The above provides a regional average, or threshold, for the population group in question
5. Any census tract or block group exceeding the threshold is considered an EJ-sensitive tract/block group for that group  
Example  
Population group: Hispanic
  - regional total: 100 people
  - regional threshold: 20%
  - any tract/block group with a Hispanic population of 20% or greater is considered EJ-sensitive relative to the Hispanic group
6. The number of EJ-sensitive groups in each census tract/block group is referred to as its Degree of Impact (DOI)
  - a tract/block group with 0 groups exceeding regional averages is Not Impacted
  - a tract/block group with 1-2 groups exceeding regional averages is Slightly Impacted
  - a tract/block group with 3-4 groups exceeding regional averages is Moderately Impacted
  - a tract/block group with 5-6 groups exceeding regional averages is Highly Impacted

The above illustrates existing accessibility conditions; the LRTP and TIP are then evaluated to determine how to fill the accessibility gaps. The analysis locates the people most in need and determines how the regional transportation system and MUMPO's plans, programs and policies have and can in the future, impact these groups.