

**MINUTES OF  
THE WILMINGTON URBAN AREA  
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
October 9, 2002**

**Members Present:**

Jackson Provost, Division 3, NCDOT  
Dexter Hayes, Director, New Hanover County Planning Department  
Jane Daughtridge, Planning Director, Town of Carolina Beach  
Bill Bennett, NC State Ports  
Penny Tysinger, CFCOG  
Roger Hawkins, Division Traffic Engineer, NCDOT  
Mark Tinkler, Senior Planner, City of Wilmington  
Don Bennett, City Traffic Engineer, City of Wilmington  
Darrell Hensdale, NCDOT, Statewide Planning Branch, representing Mike Bruff  
Cameron Moore, Town of Leland  
Albert Eby, WTA  
Loretta Barren, FHWA  
Marcus Wilner, FHWA  
Andrea Surratt, Town of Wrightsville Beach

**Members Absent:**

Renee B. Roach, Area Traffic, NCDOT  
Jim Flechtner, Traffic Engineer, City of Wilmington  
Helen Bunch, Brunswick County Planning  
Cheryl Evans, NCDOT  
Dave Weaver, Assistant County Manager  
Allen Pope, Division Engineer, NCDOT  
David Bender, NCDOT Rail Division  
Jeff Crouchley, PTD, NCDOT

**Staff Present:**

Lawless Bean, TDM Coordinator, City Of Wilmington  
Don Eggert, Cape Fear COG  
Julie Weiss, Admin. Support Specialist

Chairman Tinkler called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. He stated that Darrell Hensdale will be representing NCDOT Statewide Planning on the TCC.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Mr. Eby moved approval of the August 7, 2002 TCC meeting minutes. It was seconded by Mr. Hawkins and carried unanimously.

### **Old Business:**

### **Decisions of MOU and Bylaws**

Regarding the MOU and Bylaws, Mr. Tinkler stated that no further progress has been made because the representatives from New Hanover and Brunswick Counties were absent. These items were continued until the TAC meeting of October 24, 2002.

### **NCDOT Presentation on TIP and Funding Process**

At the last TCC meeting a presentation was made by NCDOT on the TIP funding process.

### **Citizens Advisory Committee**

Mr. Tinkler stated that Jim Medlin and Dick Scott made a presentation at the last TCC meeting, and to the TAC, offering the support of the Community Growth Planning Transportation Team to efforts to establish a Citizens Advisory Committee. The TAC established a subcommittee including Mr. Scott, Mr. Medlin, Mr. Doetsch from Carolina Beach, Jane Gilbert from Leland and Jason Thompson from the City, for a total of five members, to meet with Mr. Tinkler and develop a proposal to bring back on the 24<sup>th</sup>. The initial option was that the Transportation Team of the Community Growth Planning Program would function as a Citizens Advisory Committee and it would be open to anyone, however, this option was not well received by the TAC. Option two was to form a Citizens Advisory Committee where each TAC member would appoint one citizen member and the Growth Planning Team would appoint three people, but that wasn't well received by the Transportation Team. As a third option, he met with Mayor Peterson, TAC Chairman, and the Mayor would like to see a new grass roots group formed. The TAC wants someone to answer to them and the Community Growth Planning Team has a sense that they answer to the Chamber. Therefore, there is an impasse on how to establish this group. Mr. Tinkler asked for any comments or recommendations as to what should be recommended to the TAC.

Mr. Hayes stated that he understood the Community Growth Planning Team hasn't been acknowledged or endorsed by the elected officials. Mr. Tinkler stated that when he attended their meeting, they were to give him something describing their history and how they were formed. The team has their own special committees, but the team was a partner in the Community Growth Planning effort, as were the COG and others. They were disappointed that they were perceived as being the Chamber group and not an independent group. They felt they were making progress and didn't want to start over with a new group. Mr. Hayes stated that when the Chamber initiated a planning effort, they wanted to make their own decision. He felt it is important that an official recommendation of the City and County be funneled through the TAC because they are the recognized group for making transportation recommendations to DOT. He asked if the TAC took any official action and Mr. Tinkler stated that the only action thus far was forming the subcommittee to come back on the 24<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Eggert commented that one thing he sensed from the recent Community Growth Planning Transportation Team meeting was that group thought they were already doing what the TAC wanted another committee to do and why was another committee needed. Ms. Tysinger stated that when the Transportation Team was formed, a meeting was held and people could sign up for various committees they wanted to serve on. Citizens, elected officials and leaders of the community signed up and that is how the group got started.

Ms. Bean stated that they agreed to have a sign-up indicating who they represent and where they live so the TAC would know what areas they represented. Ms. Daughtridge commented that, with all due respect to a standing group, just sort of naming them as the citizen representatives seemed out of line. They should have the freedom to join in whatever group is formed, to provide their input from their collective viewpoint, but this is a different situation.

Mr. Tinkler asked Ms. Bean and Mr. Eggert if they had the impression at the Transportation Team meeting that they would proceed. He hoped to use the resources they offered in terms of public outreach, etc. Mr. Eggert stated his perception was that they would pull the team ahead. Mr. Tinkler asked what the members felt should be recommended to the TAC. Ms. Daughtridge recommended having a group that is broad based from all the member governments of the MPO, but include any standing group whose purpose is to deal with transportation issues. However, she felt naming them as the official group is wrong, but they should be included in the process. Mr. Tinkler asked for ideas on how the group should be formed. Mr. Hayes stated that elected officials from all jurisdictions could solicit membership from their jurisdictions. Ms. Daughtridge stated that there could be additional membership from any transportation or other special interest group. Mr. Tinkler stated that he will take these comments to the TAC subcommittee that has been charged with the recommendation and the members present agreed.

#### **Endorsement of Enhancement Application for the Town of Wrightsville Beach:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that at their last meeting, the TAC endorsed the enhancement application for the Town of Wrightsville Beach, however, there was a miscommunication and the application wasn't presented at the June 26<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting. DOT indicated they need the MPO's endorsement by the end of August, so the TAC unanimously approved it and it was forwarded to DOT. Mr. Cameron Moore asked the status of enhancement applications and Mr. Tinkler explained that the June 30<sup>th</sup> to August 30<sup>th</sup> time period was for DOT to review applications and allow time for corrections if necessary. The Enhancement Advisory Council was just formed. They will review the applications this fall, make recommendations to the Board of Transportation and the final decision will be made in January.

#### **Design Charrette:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that on September 20<sup>th</sup>, the American Institute of Architects held a design charrette. The goal was to obtain input for the landscaping of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street access to the MLK Parkway corridor. The results of the charrette are not yet available. Mr. Chris Boney agreed to take all the products from that meeting and put it into a book for City Council, the MPO committees and DOT. Some of the discussion focused on the one-block stretch where traffic will transition from the expressway mode into downtown. Ideas included trees, brick crosswalks, columns, etc. Mr. Don Bennett commented that they also talked about the section where the Parkway ends and the Campbell Street bridge. It is

outside DOT's project limits, but traffic comes off this beautifully landscaped, well-laid out MLK project to telephone poles down the middle of the road. They discussed moving the telephone poles to the edge of the road. Mr. Tinkler will distribute the report as soon as it is available.

Mr. Tinkler reported that the TAC requested bus tours of the transportation area. It was suggested that it be two or three half-days, perhaps over the next year. At the last TCC meeting, the members indicated they wanted to be involved in that as well. Mr. Bennett suggested a visit to the traffic control center because a great deal can be seen from there. Mr. Dexter Hayes suggested reviewing the project needs list. Mr. Bennett commented that the morning problems are primarily from about 7:35 to 8:15, but from 3:00 – 6:30 is a greater duration. Mr. Tinkler said he will review the priorities list and arrange the tour in the afternoon. He will prepare a map and send it to the members.

### **MPO Project Updates – Regional Travel Surveys:**

Mr. Tinkler explained that the TCC was made the defacto steering committee for the Regional Travel Surveys project. The pilot travel survey is underway and one staff plant has already provided feedback. The materials sent out are being reviewed. This project is going very well and the consultants are doing a good job. A meeting is scheduled for Nov. 13 at 10:00 a.m. in this building. There will be no TCC meeting in November and he asked that the TCC members attend this meeting for a debriefing on the pilot and to firm up anything that may need to be changed in the survey instrument procedures.

Based on the proposals received and cost estimates, it was decided to separate the surveys and award a contract only for the household travel survey component and the roadside intercept external travel survey component would be rebid with additional funds. This was discussed with Statewide Planning and they were initially receptive to assist in that regard. Based on conversations with other MPO's, it appears about \$10,000 will be needed for every station for a total of \$70,000-\$80,000 for Wilmington, but there is only \$25,000 remaining in the budget set up in the work program. Although Statewide Planning was initially receptive to working with us, they also have to address the fact that we still have unallocated money not used in the work program. Perhaps we can get an additional \$55,000 with half of it being Statewide Planning money with no local match and the other half would have to be added to our work program with a local match of another \$25,000. It's not a huge amount, but the work program for this project has already been increased. That might need to be done to get Statewide Planning's financial support for additional funding. Mr. Hayes stated that a decision has to be made soon because the City and County have already budgeted for next year and this will be an additional cost. Mr. Tinkler stated that he will prepare a letter requesting that additional assistance. If that goes well, the RFP can be initiated again.

### **Regional Projects Update:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that in the future, he would like to see this group as a means of updating everyone on all of our projects and this list could be added to today.

### **City of Wilmington Transit Merger Feasibility Master Plan:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that he has been in weekly contact with the Kimley Horn, project managers on this project. At the last TCC meeting, the group discussed disappointment

with the progress on this project. They submitted a rough outline of the merger plan documents they will produce by Thanksgiving. He anticipates getting some of the details within a few days. That information will be given to the Steering Committee for that project and a meeting will be arranged to get that project back on track.

#### **Multi-Modal Transportation Center:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that he met with Mayor Peterson last week. The Mayor called the Rail Division of NCDOT and encouraged them to submit their final comments and issues with the RFP. He thought the funding arrangement was agreed to by other parties where it would be 50% DOT and the other half spread between the City and Cape Fear Community College. Hopefully, the RFP will be completed within the next 3-4 weeks.

#### **Dawson/Wooster Corridor Landscaping:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that Councilwoman Laura Padgett worked with Lanny Wilson, our Board member, to get \$100,000 for landscaping improvements at the Dawson/Wooster intersections. Mr. Tinkler said he has had several meetings with City Parks and NCDOT. They discussed initial concepts, visited the site and they will meet again within a week or so. They discussed curb extensions, but there were site issues and they may be limited in what can be done. They will look at various approaches.

#### **Bikeways & Greenways – Mayor’s Brownbag Lunch Series:**

Mr. Tinkler explained that the Mayor met with about 30 people to get their thoughts on developing bike paths and greenways. The result of that meeting was that the Mayor would like us to establish some kind of an agreement in planning and move ahead with something. The Mayor agreed to meet with them again in a month or two to finalize some of their ideas.

Mr. Eggert thanked Mr. Tinkler for forwarding the e-mail on the East Coast Greenway project. He responded to a gentleman offering RPO assistance and explained who we are, etc. Mr. Tinkler stated that they work with DOT in establishing a bikeway up and down the coast, but he has not contacted them. Mr. Eggert stated he didn’t have the details, but there was some confusion in Brunswick County about eligibility or signage questions. Mr. Provost explained that the Brunswick County Planning Department had an enhancement grant for signs from East Coast Greenway. A board member agreed to pay for the signs and not go through Statewide Enhancement, but then the question arose as to whether they were appropriate signs and whether they could be put on the DOT right-of-way. Basically, East Coast Greenway is a coalition of people trying to get a route from Maine to Florida. They are trying to coordinate with NCDOT bike and pedestrian staff in Raleigh with East Coast Greenway to develop a route through North Carolina. They didn’t want to start designating routes and signing them unless there was an entire designated route in North Carolina. They didn’t want to piecemeal it. There is an existing Ports of Call route on the system and they wanted to attach these signs to it.

Mr. Tinkler said that meeting went well. Chris O’Keefe with New Hanover County coordinates the Bicycle Advisory Committee and they will work on developing a more sophisticated bicycle network map to prioritize bike path connections and improvements. Ms. Bean commented that one thing that came out of the meeting was the need to determine if those two groups could work together. Mr. Provost stated that the City applied

for a couple enhancement grants with a 4' paved shoulder for bike lanes. River Road is scheduled to be widened sometime next spring with a 4' paved shoulder on both sides from the Port to Hwy. 421. Mr. Tinkler indicated he would advise everyone of their next meeting. Ms. Bean asked if a replacement for Michelle Schizzner has been made. Mr. Provost responded no, but he will check into it.

Mr. Tinkler explained that he drafted a page on the MPO for the City's web site and included a page on this group. As projects move forward they can be added to the web. The group discussed possible links to this web site.

Mr. Provost asked about the status of the City enhancement project for a bikeway along Eastwood Road. Mr. Tinkler responded that it is being designed and it will be located on the south side of Eastwood from Cardinal Drive to the east side of Military Cutoff Road.

#### **Future Land Use Plan Update:**

Mr. Tinkler said this project is being prepared by the City's Long-Range Planning section. Existing conditions on the first corridor, Oleander Drive, have been done. The update consists of three categories which include corridors, land use and aesthetics.

#### **New Hanover County Projects:**

##### **Monkey Junction:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that there will be a City/County/DOT meeting next week on how to spend the impact fees to make operational improvements at Monkey Junction and he will report back.

Mr. Hayes commented that the County Commissioners established a Planning Advisory group to look at the land use impacts of the 17 Bypass Corridor. The group hasn't met yet, but they have to report back to the Commissioners by March 2003 with preliminary recommendations.

##### **NCDOT:**

##### **Military Cutoff Widening:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that there will be a public meeting next Thursday at 6:30 at the Landfall Library. Our Board member, Lanny Wilson, brought up the issue that the roadway will be at capacity when it opens as a four-lane facility. Therefore, he proposed consideration of a six-lane alternative which would delay the project and have huge impacts. The NCDOT engineer who prepared the traffic engineering for that analysis will make a presentation on the SYNCHRO operational analysis at that meeting and there will be discussion and input. Mr. Provost stated that there was a lot of discussion a couple years ago about environmental issues.

##### **ROW for Future Extension:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that a positive note on Military Cutoff is that Mr. Lanny Wilson, Board of Transportation, is assisting with an effort to secure right-of-way for a potential extension of Military Cutoff Road north of Market Street to the Route 17 Bypass before

development encroaches further upon this link on the Thoroughfare Plan. A meeting with two developers will take place this week.

Mr. Provost stated that the bypass and MLK are on-going. He heard that there were positive comments about possibly tying the last section of the bypass into the Porters Neck area. There were discussions with property owners regarding easements DOT is trying to obtain for outfalls. That was the last link of the project that was being delayed.

### **WTA:**

#### **Administration/Maintenance/Site Feasibility Study:**

Mr. Tinkler stated he and Mr. Eby are working on establishing the parameters for a feasibility study for a new WTA administration/maintenance/transfer site to replace the Castle Street site and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street site. A site near Kerr and Emerson Streets will be given to the consultant as one of their top choices for consideration.

### **TCC Bylaws:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that he made changes to the TCC bylaws as agreed to at the last TCC meeting. Ms. Tysinger moved adoption of the Bylaws and it was seconded by Mrs. Surratt. Ms. Daughtridge suggested that a quorum be 50% of the total membership and not put a specific number on it because the membership can change. Then 50% of that quorum would be the prevailing vote. Ms. Tysinger agreed to include that change in her motion. Mr. Eby said there may be a situation where something has to go to the TAC and this committee couldn't move on it because there weren't enough members present. Mrs. Surratt suggested adding two members to the five making it seven and then 50% of the quorum. Ms. Tysinger agreed to include adding two members in her motion. Ms. Surratt accepted this change and the motion carried unanimously.

#### **MPO Project Priorities - Update – Mid-Cycle Between Long Range Transportation Plans:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that the priorities are listed in the Long Range Transportation Plan. We are a little over mid-way in the five year Long Range Plan. It appeared that the list was last updated in 1999 and it needs to be updated even though it is mid-cycle. He noted that it will go to the TAC in two weeks, prior to the NCDOT TIP Public Comment Meeting in Burgaw.

Mr. Tinkler said number 7. is a funded project now. Mr. Eggert stated that Southern Bridge has a feasibility study in the TIP. Mr. Tinkler indicated that should still be on the list. Mr. Hayes stated that the legislature approves toll projects. The southern bridge would be a good project and it needs to be at the top of the toll list. Mr. Eggert explained that legislation only allows three projects initially. Creation of the project in Gaston and Mecklenburg County are two of them. Mr. Hayes pointed out that neither of them are official and Mr. Eggert stated that they would have to be on the TIP. Ms. Daughtridge said Dare County is probably on that list. Mr. Tinkler stated that he may not have the correct list, but number 7., the Blue Clay Road interchange, should be removed because it is funded. Below the top 10 is Gordon Road Extension which has already been constructed. Military Cutoff Extension should be moved back up to the top 10 on the priorities list, but there is the question of other issues that come up. The TIP is 30% over budget and we have been told one of our

projects will be delayed further and it will probably be Kerr Avenue. Then the question is whether Independence or Kerr Avenue is more important. Mr. Bennett stated that with the Kerr Avenue Extension, they are trying to develop an alternate to College Road because it terminates at a very bad location. Mr. Hayes stated he thought the extension could be done without doing the interchange at College. Mr. Bennett responded that the area has been thoroughly studied. Right now, because of the proximity to College and Oleander, the only way Kerr Avenue could be extended would be a right in and right out to Oleander Drive and he was not sure how much relief that would give to College Road. A left turn could not be used and two signals can't be located that close together.

Mr. Tinkler said another issue is number 3., College and Oleander. The project is very expensive and it has a lot of community impacts. He asked if that should be fought for and postpone other projects for a long time or would it be better to take it off the list and get two or three other things funded. Mr. Bennett stated that he and John Ponder analyzed this and looked at every possible configuration in their operational analysis. College Road is the only continuous north/south route through New Hanover County. Because it is basically an extension of I-40, they looked at making Kerr and College a one-way pair in this section, but they couldn't get the cross-over to work with four lanes in each direction. From an operational standpoint, College Road can't be widened enough to handle the projected volume in twenty-five years. Grade separation was the only alternative that even came close. As the volume continues to grow on South College, people will seek alternate routes.

Mr. Hayes stated that we have Independence Extension as number 1. However, Kerr Avenue is listed as an extension and widening. What he was hearing was that the extension can only work if it is part of the College/Oleander improvements. Therefore, he felt it should be broken out and say Kerr Avenue widening project. Then there would be the Kerr Avenue extension project that would be part of the College Road/Oleander Drive improvements.

Ms. Bean pointed out that the Brunswick County bypass is not on the list. Mr. Eggert stated that the DOT Board met here in March and the MPO made a list of four or five priorities. The bypass extension was on that list. Mr. Tinkler stated that he may not have the correct list. Mr. Hayes asked that the Gordon Road Extension be put back on the list. Actually, when he referred to Gordon Road, there is an extension and a widening. Mr. Tinkler said the widening has been funded but it has been delayed. For clarification, Mr. Hayes stated his suggestion is to put the widening back on the list. Mr. Tinkler stated that he will update the wording of that. Ms. Surratt stated that if we don't have the grade separator interchange at College Road and Oleander, perhaps the College Road widening should be moved up to the top ten because it appears that is the only way to solve the problem. Mr. Bennett agreed that if the interchange is moved down, the widening should be moved up.

Mr. Provost stated that Village Drive needs to be removed from the list.

Mr. Bennett stated that once a project is funded, it should come off the list and those present agreed. Mr. Hensdale suggested separate lists. One list could be funded projects. However, because of DOT cutbacks, then we could determine which are to be cut and we would still have the priority list. Mr. Hayes stated that there could be a separate list of all the projects, a list of the funded projects and then a list of new projects. Mr. Moore asked if Village Road and Old Fayetteville Road will be done at the same time and Mr. Hawkins

responded that they will. Mr. Hayes said we are still pushing Randall Parkway Extension and Mr. Tinkler said the River Road upgrade will be done.

**Items from 2002 Conference – North Carolina MPO Association:**

Mr. Tinkler said he and Don Eggert attended this conference. A few key items he obtained an update on were as follows:

- a) MPO Participation in Project Regulatory Process – Regarding TIP projects, there are several major points in the environmental and regulatory review process. An agreement was reached where the MPOs will have a representative on that committee. On a project-by-project basis, the MPOs will have to vote for a representative to serve on that committee. It is a big responsibility, but it adds a lot of power to the MPO. He will provide additional details when they are available.
- b) TEA-3 – TEA-21 Reauthorization – This Bill is scheduled to expire a year from now, but indications are it will be funded for an additional year and extended another year after that. The planning funds have doubled for transportation planning over that allocated prior to 1991. In TEA-3 legislation there will be ear-marked projects that Congress approves and there is no question that those projects have to be done. State DOT would like to work with all the MPOs to make sure the list sent to the Feds is the right mix of projects between funding sources in the TIP vs. the earmarks. The right mix is established so that the net gain is a gain to the State and by funding category issues. Mr. Wilner said the Governor's office has organized all the project requests and the best way to insure a project will be funded is to get it ear-marked.
- c) Southern Corridor Bridge – Borders and Corridors – Campaign – Mr. Tinkler said he talked with Caitlin Hughes who represents the DOT in the State Governor's office in Washington. She indicated the Republicans are controlling the committee that controls what programs or what projects get on the borders and corridors program, and DOT has been trying to get the Southern Corridor Bridge Feasibility Study on the list, but it was not included at the time of the Conference. They are still working hard to get it back on the list. He talked to the TAC chairman and he suggested a meeting of political leaders to develop a strategy on how to campaign for this so we can get this feasibility study on the list.
- d) Three new TMAs – Three MPOs, Asheville, Greensboro and Winston-Salem, received TMA status. This is Technician Management Area where there are different requirements for an urbanized area that reaches a population of 200,000 people. He was sure Wilmington will reach that population in 2010.

**MPO Orientation – New Members:**

Mr. Tinkler stated that there are new members on the TAC. The material he put together for the new City Manager, plus a little more information, will be included in a notebook for new members. He will continue work on this project and on the MPO web page.

**10. Meetings and Other Announcements:**

- a. 10/14/02 – RPO TCC Meeting - NCDOT ITS Presentation - Mr. Tinkler announced that on Monday morning, the RPO and Mr. Eggert have organized a presentation for NCDOT and ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems). Mr. Eggert explained that it is an informational meeting to raise the awareness of ITS. We are in the Wilmington Deployment Area of the Statewide ITS plan which includes Jacksonville, Onslow County, Pender County, the eastern half of Brunswick County and Wilmington/New Hanover County. From his perspective, ITS is on the cutting edge and he felt there is a real future for it here. This meeting will be the starting point. Mr. Eggert stated that he was in a meeting in Raleigh last spring and one can call 511 for information on road congestion and conditions, weather conditions, accidents, local visitor sites, etc. He thought there is a possibility for this in Wilmington.

Mr. Tinkler asked for an update on the new VMS signs being installed by DOT. Mr. Provost explained that there are four along the I-40 Corridor, four are going around the Wilmington area, four on I-95 and four on I-77, four as part of the outer loop/17 project and the MLK project. Some will be located in Brunswick County, near Monkey Junction and on US 421. Mr. Tinkler stated that the idea that people can be warned about some traffic event allows people to make an alternate decision. Mr. Provost stated it will all be controlled from lap tops at a remote location. Mr. Eby said another part of this is the Amber Alert Program. He believed legislation was passed to put several hundred thousand dollars in that program for the ITS devices, but he didn't know when or if that will be available.

- b. 10/16 Jacksonville – Regional Forums – NC Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan - Mr. Tinkler said the DOT Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan is on their second round of regional forums to develop strategies for our future transportation investments at the State level. Also, the TIP hearing will be on the 30<sup>th</sup> in Burgaw. Mr. Hensdale commented that a priorities list can be submitted to the Program Development Branch.

**11. New Business:**

Ms. Tysinger asked that staff try to give the members a little more time to review the agenda package, particularly when lengthy documents are included.

Ms. Daughtridge commented that outlining the process to be used for setting priorities would be helpful. She asked if they will be reviewed every year, would there be an opportunity to reject some projects, etc.

Ms. Daughtridge asked how this will play into the Thoroughfare Plan which was last done in 1992 for Carolina Beach. She represents Carolina Beach which is new to the MPO

and they are trying to determine the structure. Mr. Hensdale explained that they are in the process of an update that will include the entire area. Mr. Tinkler commented that Thoroughfare Plans are no longer being adopted. Mr. Hensdale explained that they will become an element of the Long Range Transportation Plan. The State law has changed so that the previous Thoroughfare Plan will be adopted by the MPO instead of the municipality. A municipality's input and approval is wanted too, but, legally, it would be between DOT and the MPO. Mr. Tinkler said it will be included in the Long Range Plan document that will be updated and asked if that section will carry the same weight or status as the Thoroughfare Plan did previously. Mr. Hensdale responded yes and said they are working on multi-modal plans now and the highway element of that plan. Historically, this is a rural state and highway planning has been a major part, but we're getting away from that and growing. Mr. Tinkler felt it is good to merge it all into one process and one document. Mr. Hensdale indicated we anticipate completion and adoption by the middle of 2004.

**Adjournment:**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Tinkler  
TCC Chairman

/jw