

Transportation Staff Meeting

October 31, 2012
2:00 PM
CMGC 266

AGENDA

1. MOU Subcommittee

Description: The MOU Subcommittee has met four times and has reached a point where direction on several key topics is beginning to emerge from its deliberations. The purpose of this discussion will be to:

- review the subcommittee's work; and
- provide feedback to the subcommittee.

Attached are three documents that will assist with reviewing and commenting on the subcommittee's work:

1. **Emerging Guidance on Key Topics** presents the topics, how they are addressed in the current MOU, and the guidance from the subcommittee that has developed thus far.
2. **NC MPO Voting Systems** provides a summary of how other NC MPOs address voting.
3. **National Peer MPO Voting Systems** summarizes the voting systems of MPOs identified by the subcommittee as peer organizations.

Access number: 704-432-5485

MUMPO MOU Subcommittee
Emerging Guidance on Key Topics
 October 2012

| MPO Voting Requirements | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------|
| Topic | Current MOU | Subcommittee Guidance | TCC Feedback |
| Population Minimum | >5,000 population required for cities/towns to vote on MPO. | Eliminate population minimum. <i>Straw vote taken by subcommittee.</i> | |
| Land Use Plan | Land use plan required for cities/towns to vote on MPO. | Retain land use plan requirement. <i>Straw vote taken by subcommittee.</i> | |
| Vote Distribution | A minimum of one vote is based on the population minimum and land use plan requirements (noted above). | Each jurisdiction should be allocated at least one vote. <i>Straw vote taken by subcommittee.</i> | |
| Weighted Voting/ Hybrid Voting System | Charlotte-16 votes ≥20,000-2 votes ≤20,000-1 vote | Indicated preference for weighted voting. <i>Straw vote taken by subcommittee.</i> Staff instructed to look into possible ways in which this could be accomplished, starting with the current weighted structure. Hybrid system received support from the subcommittee in which certain “critical” issues could be considered by a weighted vote, but all other items could use a one vote per member system. Raises two questions: 1) Who could invoke the weighted voting system? 2) How would the weighted vote be | |

MUMPO MOU Subcommittee
Emerging Guidance on Key Topics
 October 2012

| MPO Voting Requirements | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------------|
| Topic | Current MOU | Subcommittee Guidance | TCC Feedback |
| | | invoked? (e.g. would it have to be done in advance of the meeting so all members knew ahead of time?) | |
| BOT Voting Representation | Division 10 BOT member has 1 vote. | Subcommittee discussed options: a. 1 vote each for Division 10 & 12 b. 1 shared vote for Division 10 & 12 No preference indicated. | |
| Directed Vote | From current MOU: <i>Members will vote on matters pursuant to the authority granted by their respective governmental bodies.</i> | Subcommittee member suggested that if a jurisdiction's directed vote is not unanimous, the jurisdiction's MPO vote would be split in a manner proportional to the governing body's action. Subcommittee did not establish a position on this topic. | |
| Expansion of Non-Voting Representation | Current non-voting representation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Char-Meck Planning Commission • Union County Planning Board • U.S. Department of Transportation – FHWA, FTA | Context: MAP-21 requires that MPOs designated as TMAs must include transit officials on policy boards. This change does not appear to require that transit officials must be voting members. No definitive guidance provided by subcommittee. | |

MUMPO MOU Subcommittee
Emerging Guidance on Key Topics
 October 2012

| Population Calculation | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Topic | Current MOU | Subcommittee Guidance | TCC Feedback |
| Census data, or more frequent updates? | Population used to establish voting privileges based upon decennial Census. | No guidance provided. | |

| MPO Attendance | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------|
| Topic | Current MOU | Subcommittee Guidance | TCC Feedback |
| Should MPO implement minimum attendance requirement? | From MPO bylaws: <i>Each member shall be expected to attend each regular meeting. When voting members (or their authorized alternates) do not attend three (3) consecutive MPO meetings, the Secretary will send to the chief elected officer of the jurisdiction of the member in question, a letter indicating the number of absences and requesting reaffirmation or redesignation of the jurisdiction's representative.</i> | Context: issue raised out of concern that smallest jurisdictions may not be able to attend on a regular basis. No definitive guidance provided. | |
| Quorum | From MPO bylaws: <i>A quorum of the MPO shall be constituted by the presence of at least seven (7) of the eligible voting members at the beginning of the meeting, who together represent a minimum of 51% of the votes.</i> | Context: issue raised because currently the quorum is based on percentage of votes present, as opposed to number of voting members present, meaning Charlotte must usually be present in order for a quorum. No definitive guidance provided, but it was suggested that the definition for a quorum could be modified. | |

**North Carolina MPO
Governing Body Voting Systems**
10-17-12

| MPO | Population Minimum Required? | Weighted System? | Vote Description | Vote Calculation | Notes |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---|---|---|
| Capital Area MOU:2005 | No | Partial | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One jurisdiction, one vote system used in most cases • Weighted voting system can be invoked by any member on any vote | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each member government is apportioned weighted voting based on the most recent certified NC Population Estimates for Municipalities and Counties • One vote for each 10,000 of population, or portion thereof. | According to staff, the weighted vote system is rarely invoked |
| Durham MOU: 1993 | No | Partial | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One jurisdiction, one vote system used in most cases • Weighted voting system can be invoked by any member on any vote | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No population-based method listed in the MOU or bylaws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Durham 6* ○ Chapel Hill 2 ○ Durham County 2 ○ Carrboro 1 ○ Hillsborough 1 ○ Orange County 1 ○ Chatham County 1 ○ NCBOT 1 ○ 15 total <p>* 3 votes per representative</p> | According to staff, the weighted vote system is rarely invoked |
| Greensboro MOU: 2010 | Yes 3,500 | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Weighted voting shall be roughly based on each municipality’s most current population estimates, either from the US Census or the NC State Demographers Office.” | Current Greensboro MPO voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greensboro-4 voting members • Guilford County-2 voting members • NC BOT-1 voting member • Shared Vote Oak Ridge, Pleasant Garden, Summerfield, and Stokesdale share a vote. The towns are responsible for selecting their representative by caucus. | Representation designed “to generally reflect the distribution of MPO population between the City, the unincorporated portions of the County, and the Towns.” |

| MPO | Population Minimum Required? | Weighted System? | Vote Description | Vote Calculation | Notes |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---|---|--|
| Winston-Salem MOU: 2008 | No | Partial | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One jurisdiction, one vote system used in most cases Weighted voting system can be invoked by any member on any vote | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 total votes to be apportioned based on the population of each jurisdiction as of the most recent decennial census with a minimum of one vote per voting member. | According to staff, the weighted vote system is rarely invoked |
| Asheville MOU: 2008 | No | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-tier weighted system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-TIP action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asheville-2 votes All others-1 vote TIP action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not mandatory, but can be invoked by any member Population-based weighted system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asheville-2 votes All others-1 vote | Weighted system for TIP related action is very complex |
| Wilmington | No | Yes | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilmington-2 votes All others-1 vote | |
| High Point | No | No | | | |
| Greenville MOU: 2012 | No | Partial | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One jurisdiction, one vote system used in most cases Weighted voting system can be invoked by any member on any vote | Votes assigned as follows? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenville 9 votes Pitt County 4 votes Ayden 2 votes Winterville 2 votes Simpson 1 vote BOT Member 1 vote | |

National Peer MPO Governing Body Voting Systems

10-17-12

| MPO | Population Minimum Required? | Weighted System? | Vote Description | Notes |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| Atlanta MOA: 2009 | No | No | 1 vote per member All signatory agencies to the MOA have voting membership | The Transportation & Air Quality Committee (TAQC) makes decisions on transportation-related policy matters TAQC submits its recommendations directly to the Commission |
| Austin MOU: 2010 | Yes (50,000) | No | 1 vote per member Some jurisdictions have more than one representative | Board also includes affiliate non-voting membership Once a CAMPO member city reaches a population of 50,000 or more (based on U.S. Census annual population estimate), a member from that city shall be added to the Board |
| Denver MOU: 2011 | No | No | Each member may appoint 1 elected official – Denver may appoint 2 members | 7 counties & 50 municipalities Each municipality and county is eligible to be a member of DRCOG |
| Nashville MOU: 2010 | No? | Partial | 1 vote per member – Nashville/Davidson have 2 members on the Board 2 non-voting members include FHWA & FTA | MPO Executive Board member may call a “critical issue,” then the vote on that item shall be weighted “Critical issues” must be approved by a 2/3 majority vote using population proportional weighting method |
| Orlando MOU: 2012 | No? | No | 1 voter per member Some jurisdictions have more than one representative | Board also includes non-voting advisors |
| Tampa-St. Petersburg MOU: 2004 | No? | No | 1 vote per member 1 seat is shared by 3 small communities, and that seat is rotated every 2 years | 20% to 33% of the representation is occupied by the county commission, which is the only representation that smaller towns receive on the MPO board |