Committee of 21
Road Solutions for Now and the Future

Committee Of 21
Meeting #8
November 3, 2008
MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members				
NAME	**PRESENT**		**NAME**	**PRESENT**
Ned Curran, Chair	YES		Pat Mumford	YES
Johnsie Beck	YES		Peter Pappas	YES
Mark Casper	YES		Ken Randall	YES
Cindy Chandler	YES		Wendy Spanbauer	YES
John Crosland	YES		Allen Tate	YES
Frank Emory	YES		Betty Turner	YES
Ray Eschert	YES		Virginia Keogh	YES
Claire Fallon	YES		Ed McMahan	YES
Anthony Fox	YES		Randy Kincaid	NO
David Howard	NO		Charles Knox	YES
Steve Iannarino	NO			
Non- Committee Members				
Vi Lyles, Lee Institute	YES		Natalie English, Chamber	YES
Doug Bacon, Lee Institute	YES		Norm Steinman, City	YES
Deborah Goldberg, City	YES		Mary Thomsen, REBIC	YES
Jim Schumacher, City Manager's Office	YES		Valaida Fullwood, Lee Institute	YES
Dan Gallagher, CDOT	YES		Danny Pleasant, CDOT	YES

WELCOME AND REVIEW OF MEETING OBJECTIVES

Committee Chair Ned Curran called to order the 8th meeting of the Committee of 21 at 11:12 am. The meeting took place at the Government Center, Room 280. He reviewed the agenda, which focused on the guiding principles.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Vi Lyles led the committee in a process of reviewing the eight guiding principles from the October 20 meeting. Committee members refined the language for some of principles and also combined a pair. Each of the revised versions received a unanimous show of green consensus cards or a predominate show of green cards and no red cards. The following page lists the agreed upon principles, which were reduced to seven.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES, continued

1. Decisions about road network are appropriately consistent with adopted public policies for land use, environment, air quality and transit.

2. The process to identify road needs will have clarity, transparency, accountability and limited political influence.

3. The financing strategy will include a menu of revenue sources that would seek to:
   - support debt financing
   - use pay-as-you-go funding
   - have dedicated revenue sources
   - be sustainable, scalable and compatible with local and state funding
   - maintain Charlotte-Mecklenburg's competitive edge
   - apply user fees (local and drive thru)
   - be easily administered
   - obtain and incorporate public-private partnerships

4. Recommendations will be politically viable.

5. Recommendations will connect planning, funding and implementation to ensure efficiency and effectiveness and to build roads faster and less expensively.

6. Recommendations will coordinate with 21st Century Committee recommendations.

7. Recommendations will seek to leverage and optimize local, state and federal financing and public-private partnerships.

Danny Pleasant and Norm Steinman advocated being specific, particular on the issue of whether the term "implementation" includes the maintenance of roads. Wendy Spanbauer suggested being explicit in an introductory paragraph that would emphasize how recommendations address road construction <u>and</u> maintenance.

21ST CENTURY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE UPDATE

Natalie English provided an update on the planning and progress of the 21st Century Committee. She noted that the group is exploring "out of the box" ideas, including tolls and VMT taxing based on graded fees. Members posed questions, discussed the 21st Century Committee's work and agreed that they should reach out to elected officials from Mecklenburg County to advocate for the 21st Century Committee's recommendations.

Committee of 21
Road Solutions for Now and the Future

Committee Of 21
Meeting #8
November 3, 2008
MINUTES

DISCUSSION ON GOVERNANCE

Lyles reviewed the group's charge regarding governance and presented the following definition of governance:

> Authority, responsibility and accountability to make decisions for roadway system: (a) Plan, prioritize, design; (b) Financing; (c) Implementation; and (d) Maintenance.

Danny Pleasant briefly reviewed a map of state and local roads. Lyles led Committee members in addressing the following questions: What changes in Governance would you make for state roads? For local roads? Below are key topics that were highlighted as well as, in some instances, notes captured on sheets charted along a wall.

Planning, Design – Local Roads

- Commission for County
  - authority for planning/design
- Legislate home rule to generate revenue, to build roads locally and to put maintenance back on state
- Organize state DOT on urban regions
- Model "Pennies for Progress"

Planning, Design – State Roads

Priority Setting – Local Roads

Priority Setting – State Roads

- Efficient
- Local control of design

Implementation – Local Roads

Implementation – State Roads

Maintenance – Local Roads

Maintenance – State Roads

Financial Responsibility – Local Roads

- Matching funding

Financial Responsibility – State Roads

- Matching funding

A committee member advocated thinking locally and suggested one commission that would be responsible for state and local roads (construction and maintenance) in

Mecklenburg County. The State would give that commission the authority to raise money in Mecklenburg County. The intent of this suggestion would be to concentrate on Mecklenburg County and to work with MUMPO and the State to build roads faster, cheaper and better (e.g. "Pennies For Progress" in SC).

Some members expressed concern that the suggested approach would result in the State leaving Mecklenburg County to fund far too many roads. Steinman noted that there are more state-maintained roads in the six towns than in Charlotte. Another member proposed finding a simpler approach (less of a governance function) for generating local revenue. Another suggested a governance strategy that could focus on regional, urban needs.

Curran called the meeting to an end at 1:20 pm.