

Meeting Notes
Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
Transportation Advisory Committee
Date: October 27, 2010

Members Present:

Jonathan Barfield, Chairman, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority
Jack Batson, Town of Belville
Walter Futch, Town of Leland
Mike Ballard, Town of Navassa
Kristi Tomey, City of Wilmington
Bill Sue, Brunswick County
Mike Alford, NC Board of Transportation
Bob Lewis, Town of Carolina Beach
David Williams, Pender County

Staff Present:

Mike Kozlosky, Executive Director
Joshuah Mello, Associate Transportation Planner

1. Call to Order

Mr. Barfield called the meeting to order at 4:02 PM. He asked everyone to take a moment to review the TAC mission statement.

2. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes for the meeting on August 18th were approved unanimously.

3. Public Comment Period

Mr. Ricky Meeks told members he is a frequent rider of WAVE Transit buses. He said the bus stop in front of the Arboretum needs to have a shelter and bench installed for riders. He also asked that the green light with the arrow for left turns on to Greenville Loop Road be returned to replace the currently blinking-yellow for the left turns. Traffic is backing up while waiting to make the turn with the new blinking-yellow light and it's become more dangerous for pedestrians trying to cross the intersection.

Mr. Andy Koeppel told members he sent an email last week regarding the prioritization processes in place for transportation projects for the area. He said in 2009 the group worked on a list of the Top 25 projects. Then late in the summer, Mr. Kozlosky introduced the Mobility Fund which the final report will be prepared by the end of next month for presentation to the state transportation board. Now he has received an email regarding Prioritization 2 announcing an upcoming meeting in Kinston. He said he is trying to understand that with the different priority, just how the whole thing is going to affect us in terms of how the needs of this division are going to be addressed. It seems we are making a lot of lists. How are they going to be unified into one procedure to give us a real guideline as to what the future may hold?

Mr. Barfield stated that Mr. Alford would speak to the item later in the meeting.

4. Old Business

None

5. Public Hearing – Resolution adopting *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan*

Mr. Barfield asked if there was anyone at the meeting who wished to speak during the public hearing on the *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan*. No one wished to speak.

Mr. Barfield told members that staff is waiting on a couple elements to be added to the plan before this board considers a resolution adopting the plan. He suggested tabling the resolution until the information can be provided.

Mr. Kozlosky asked if any TAC members had any comments or concerns with regard to the plan before it's finalized. Mr. Williams told him everything he has heard from his constituency has been very positive.

6. New Business

a. Resolution supporting the Diverging Diamond Interchange Design at US 17/US 74/ US76 and NC 133 in Brunswick County

Kristine O'Connor and BenJetta Johnson from NCDOT is Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch gave a presentation on the design alternative for the US 17- US 74-76 and NC 133 project in Brunswick County.

Ms. O'Connor told members that the original project scope was to add an auxiliary lane on the causeway in each direction (Alternative A). The current scope now includes an alternative that would widen the causeway and make improvements at the US 17- US 74-76 and NC 133 interchange to address heavy congestion (Alternative B). Due to the budget concerns regarding the right-of-way acquisition needed for Alternative B, they presented another alternative to the committee for consideration. Alternative C is a Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI).

Ms. BenJetta Johnson told members the DDI offers safety improvements with fewer conflict points and better sight distance at turns for drivers. It also has operation benefits with simple left and right turns from all directions and the DDI will increase left-turn capacity without adding lanes. The two-phase signal cycle in the design will offer reduced delays. Ms. Johnson said the cost/benefit for Alternative C will use the existing bridge in the retrofit. She stated that additional right-of-way is rarely needed and construction time is reduced. In a cost comparison of the three alternatives, the DDI is expected to come in just under \$20.4 million and offer improved traffic operations at the US 17- US 74-76/ NC 133 interchange. She told members NCDOT recommends Alternative C as the preferred alternative.

Mr. Barfield told members when traveling in Reno, Nevada he encountered the new DDI and found it to flow quiet well. Mr. Sue asked what changing to Alternative C would do to the project schedule. Mr. Pope said it should not affect the schedule. Mr. Jeffery Teague, with NCDOT's Roadway Design Unit, told members there may be a two or three month delay but no more if this is decision is made quickly.

Mr. Futch said in the 2035 plan there is a line that shows that the NC 133 corridor should be widened to eight lanes. If it goes to 8 lanes, will the DDI still work? Ms. Johnson said yes. Mr. Futch asked what will the DDI, plus the addition of an extra lane in both directions do to the capacity to the causeway. Mr. Pope said the capacity "rule of thumb" is somewhere around 6,000 cars per lane is an acceptable level of service. Above that, you will typically see more congestion issues. Mr. Futch asked if once you add a lane on the causeway, won't you still be at a level-F. If you're going to construct one lane, why not construct two and then you end up with enough to handle the traffic. Ms. O'Connor pointed out that adding another lane on the causeway in each direction will significantly increase the environmental impacts and there would be difficulty in getting it permitted. There would also be stability issues with the sub-grade that would need to be addressed. The cost of that would increase significantly. Right now, the lane addition is being done in the median. Mr. Pope said you could make the improvements in that short distance, but you still have the same problem on both ends. Mr.

Pope said at least by adding the 3rd lane from ramp to ramp, you would have a full lane and don't have to merge into traffic. Mr. Futch said he understood that, he just thinks two is better than one. Mr. Pope said he would not disagree. It probably needs to be an eight-lane causeway, but you are only helping it between those two interchanges; you are not helping the problem beyond those two interchanges.

Mr. Batson told members the Town of Belville is trying to figure out what to do and the developer is ready to move forward with their plans at the intersection. He asked Ms. O'Connor and Ms. Johnson if they would attend the meeting on November 4th with town officials and the developers for the projects to answer questions. She said they will be happy to come.

Mr. Lewis told members the DDI seemed to move traffic pretty well when he was traveling in France and the concept makes a lot of sense in this instance. He said the Town of Carolina Beach just did the "road-diet" that caused problems mainly because signage was not up quick enough. If this project goes forward, make sure signs are up before opening to traffic.

Mr. Lewis made the motion to move forward with Alternative C, which is the DDI, for the US 17-74-76/NC 133 project in Brunswick County. Ms. Tomey seconded the motion and said she agreed that the signage will be key in avoiding confusion by drivers using the DDI. The motion carried unanimously.

b. Resolution encouraging the consideration of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the proposed Cape Fear Skyway

Mr. Kozlosky told members the *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan* calls for increased safety and security for all modes of transportation. The plan creates a vision for safe, efficient, appropriate, responsible, integrated multi-modal transportation system for the next 25 years. The Cape Fear Skyway is in its early planning stages with several different alternatives being studied. This resolution is to request that the Turnpike Authority give consideration to the addition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities during their early planning stages as they evaluate the project.

Ms Tomey made the motion to request consideration of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the proposed Cape Fear Skyway. She told members she did think we should not be building any facility that does not have bicycle and pedestrian access on it. Mr. Ballard seconded the motion.

Mr. Batson asked if this is just a resolution to encourage consideration of the bicycle and pedestrian access. He said he hoped one thing to be taken into consideration will be the cost to build these facilities.

Mr. Futch asked if the Cape Fear Skyway is going to be part of the I-140 loop. Mr. Kozlosky said it is part of the loop system. Mr. Futch stated if it is part of the I-140 loop, then it's going to be up to interstate standards and he was under the impression that interstate standards did not allow bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Mr. Mello told members that the *Cape Fear Commutes 2035 Transportation Plan* is recommending a multi-use path that will be separate from the roadway. The Windrow Wilson Bridge in Virginia and Maryland has a multi-use path adjacent to it and that is designated as I-95.

Mr. Barfield called for a vote on the motion made by Ms. Tomey. The motion carried with eight members voting in favor of the resolution and Mr. Futch voting against it.

c. Resolution supporting the Town of Belville for the NCDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative

Mr. Batson told members the resolution supporting the Town of Belville's grant initiative is a good opportunity for the town to get a bicycle path that will coordinate with the plans in place for Leland and Navassa. A comprehensive plan that can connect the towns in Brunswick County will be outstanding.

Mr. Futch made the motion to support the resolution for the Town of Bellville for the NCDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative. Mr. Lewis seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

d. Resolution supporting Airlie Road to be considered as a North Carolina Scenic Byway

Mr. Futch made the motion to support Airlie Road to be considered as a North Carolina Scenic Byway. Mr. Ballard seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

7. Discussion

a. Draft Wilmington MPO Ethics Policy

Mr. Kozlosky told members he sent the draft MPO Ethics Policy to the Institute of Government for feedback as the board suggested at the last meeting. Staff received an email from Mr. Fleming Bell, with the Institute of Government stating to the extent that the policy involves local elected officials, and prohibits those officials from taking action that are not prohibited under the general statute, they think that this is un-enforceable under North Carolina law and therefore probably not worth adopting in its current form. He also went on to say that the only remedies available to the board of local elected officials, if it thinks that one of its members has behaved unethically, is adopting a non-binding resolution of censure. Mr. Kozlosky asked for direction from board members on how they would like to proceed with the draft ethics policy.

Mr. Williams stated that all elected officials are annually participating in ethics training and asked if that doesn't cover this issue. Mr. Barfield agreed that it did and our local governing boards, as well as the citizens in the respected towns and counties would also hold members accountable for what we say we are doing or not doing. Mr. Futch said he thought we could do without an ethics policy but we have seen lack of ethics on this board in a number of cases. While we may not want to have a policy, when there is a conflict of interest among us we should have the guts to stand up and say we have a conflict of interest and not abdicate for whatever it is that we own or whatever it is that is a conflict of interest for us. We should ask for this board to excuse us. He said he was amazed because he never knew that Mr. Thompson owned any land on the Cape Fear Skyway route. He never mentioned it in all his advocacy on the Skyway.

Mr. Barfield told members that Mr. Thompson did not realize that his property would be affected. Mr. Barfield said he didn't feel it would directly affect Mr. Thompson's property, but with him thinking it might he told Mr. Barfield he would pull himself out of the equation. To that end, Mr. Thompson was being more pro-active as opposed to being re-active in the process. Mr. Barfield stated for that he did commend him for making that step before anyone came and made any allegations that were unfounded or untrue. Mr. Barfield suggested that until Mr. Futch had a conversation with Mr. Thompson, he would ask that he refrain from making any unfounded comments on what you think he thought until he had actually had a conversation with Mr. Thompson. That way, there will be no kind of misunderstanding. It's important that we have good communication. Please don't come here with innuendos thinking that someone did something out-of-line when you haven't confirmed that, we're not going to have that in this meeting.

Mr. Williams suggested that the record needs to show that in this meeting so far there has been one person that has claimed that members of the board have acted unethically. He said he did not have that feeling. Mr. Futch said he did. Mr. Williams said he knew that and we all knew it from the first meeting Mr. Futch attended. Mr. Williams stated he doesn't feel that way and he feels that the board has acted openly for years. He said the record needs to reflect that there is one member at the table who thinks that, and if others feel that way, then he will certainly stand corrected. He pointed out that Mr. Thompson is not here to defend himself either.

Ms. Tomey told members that she read through this and her first thought was that it was repetitive. All members are elected officials and we all have to deal with issues and conflicts of interest constantly in our ever day jobs. It seems like we are doing this just because there has been some discord and in her opinion this ethics policy is not necessary.

Mr. Batson told members he agreed with Ms. Tomey, but perhaps a statement somewhere that says that we recognize that we made these commitments in other places and that we will abide by those commitments. Mr. Barfield told members he has the oath that he took hanging on his office wall and for him the oath says it all. He has sworn before a judge and a body of people and in his opinion we are fine. Mr. Barfield asked if there was a motion to move ahead with the ethics policy. With there being no motion made to proceed with formulating an ethics policy, the matter was concluded.

b. North Carolina Mobility Fund

Mr. Kozlosky told members in 2010, the General Assembly created the North Carolina Mobility Fund to help relieve congestion and enhance mobility across the state. The General Assembly directed the Department of Transportation to establish the project criteria and selection process for the mobility fund. They identified the Yadkin River Bridge as the first project; however, have requested that a preliminary report be submitted to the joint Legislative Transportation Oversight Committee by October 1st and the final report by December 15th. Mr. Kozlosky stated that he submitted initial comments to NCDOT prior October 1st. Staff received the draft proposal and the Department has requested feedback. There were two possible options for the fund, a cost/benefit analysis approach and a needs-based approach. The Department is accepting additional feedback until October 29th. Staff wanted to see if the TAC members had any additional comments. He told members Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority has submitted comments that will be incorporated into a letter being sent to the Department by the end of the week.

Mr. Barfield asked what the comments were. Mr. Kozlosky said the comments related to the congestion and intermodal fund and how this fund could assist in funding the multi-modal transportation center. They also encouraged funding to be broken down by all modes of transportation so that the Department identifies how each funding allocation is going to be provided to bicycle, pedestrian, rail and other business units within the department.

Mr. Kozlosky said the needs-based approach addresses a weighted factor based on congestion, safety, infrastructure health, economic vitality and attractiveness, the multi-modal ability, funding leveraged (funding outside the Department of Transportation's funding) and then how it is consistent with the inter-modal bill. The cost/benefits approach is based on the cost and benefit and how it interacts with the congestion and inter-modal bill.

Mr. Kozlosky again stated that he will be preparing a letter to the Department by the end of the week and anyone wishing to provide addition comments should get them to him as quickly as possible.

c. Wilmington Multi-modal Transportation Facility

Mr. Kozlosky told members the Department of Transportation is currently undertaking an environmental assessment on the Multi-Modal Transportation Center. They are requesting feedback on any permits or anything the TAC would see pertinent to provide as part of their environmental assessment.

The board offered no feedback or comments for submittal to the Department.

b. Consensus Building

Mr. Barfield told members he requested that a consensus building item be added to the agenda. His thought process behind this is that as we move forward in this region, New Hanover, and parts of Pender and Brunswick Counties, we should speak with one voice so that it's clear to those in Raleigh. He said last month he was part of a contingent that went up to have lunch with the Governor. His job was to speak on transportation initiatives for this region. There were about 20 community leaders that spoke on various issues. He said that the one comment that Governor Perdue made to him that really struck a nerve was that she was very disappointed with what's happening in Brunswick County in their obstinance to moving forward with transportation initiatives. This is coming from a lady who leads the state of North Carolina in her observations. He said he finds that those in the General Assembly are looking at this part of our state, in particular Brunswick County as if Brunswick County does not know what it's doing. They are just a bunch of folks that are just not with it. It's making what we're trying to accomplish hard and impossible. What I see happening in the future if we're not on the same page is Brunswick County to become pretty much a non-issue. In other words, you won't be seeing anything happening in your county because folks are looking at Brunswick County as the laughing-stock of our State. There is no other way to put it. When the Governor of our State makes a comment like that, I took it very seriously. I truly believes we all need to be on one page. If we come here saying things about one of our members, we need to make sure we have facts backing those things up. Just not coming here saying things just to say them because it's what we think. We need to find ways to build consensus. He stated that one of the things he talk about when asking to be allowed to be chairman of the TAC was building consensus among all in the region. Mr. Barfield asked Mr. Alford if he was saying anything "out-of-school" in terms of his comments.

Mr. Alford told members the more we can speak with one voice, the easier it is to get things done. We're here to promote sound infrastructure, mobility and safety. We are also here to look forward and anticipate the needs of this area. Some of the rhetoric and some of the accusations are disheartening and don't represent the area the way it deserves to be represented. If you've got something you want to address, address it to the individual face to face and then deal with it accordingly. He said he would encourage this MPO to get on the same page as much you possibly can to promote this area as well as we can. We need to have a plan we can all agree with and work the plan because dollars are tight and not easily accessible. Any opportunity for someone to point at fragmentation and not deploy capital to an area due to that fragmentation, someone else is going to get those proceeds. Fortunately, it's more of a data driven approach and it's much more of a formula equation. The Governor has done a phenomenal job of focusing on key issues that are data driven with public response and asking for more and more public response going forward. You still need to have a plan and you need to work that plan. If it looks like you're disjointed or not together, it's very easy for those dollars to be deployed elsewhere.

Mr. Barfield told members the reason he made his comments is because he knows that some of the members have been copied on some of the emails Mr. Futch has been sending out. He has been sending those emails to everyone in our General Assembly for the most part, which again allows those folks to look at this part of our state and say that those are just a bunch of

bumbling you-know-what's down there in the southeastern part of the state. Why should we send our resources there? Mr. Barfield stated that the comment he made to the Governor was that we've got one person on our board that's really causing a ruckus. That person reminds him of the preacher in Florida that wanted to burn the Quran. Just one person in a small church; but, he caused a ruckus for the whole country. He said he would hate for what's happening with the one individual to affect what Pender County is trying to do, what Brunswick County is trying to do, what Navassa, Carolina Beach, Kure Beach, Belville, New Hanover County and Wilmington is trying to do in terms of moving forward with transportation initiatives here.

Mr. Lewis told members the TAC board is ever-changing. The board is going to continue to change so it's a little difficult to always have consensus. He said he thought that when we work out a plan and everybody agrees on upon a plan, we're going to move forward with that plan. He said he thought that we should be one voice but you're not always going to have consensus on every issue.

Mr. Barfield said he understood there is not always have consensus on every issue, but with his board of county commissioners, we may agree to disagree, but we're all on the same page because we are a "Board". That's what we're talking about in building consensus; but, at the end of the day when we come to a conclusion, that is what we need to go forward.

Mr. Williams told members no matter if he is elected at the up-coming election or not, or if someone else follows him on the TAC, they were not here to vote on things we were voting on years ago or involved in a process where we set priorities, but Pender County was at the table. Once the vote is taken, our job is to move on and do the best we can with the plan that we have. Whoever follows him on this board has to understand that. We are representing our constituents as best we know and he hopes the person following him will understand. They might not agree with some of the ways he voted but that's the process.

Ms. Tomey said she purposely did not read the emails. She told members that they may call it consensus; she calls it professional respect in that we all have a job to do. We have to do that job to the best of our ability once the path has been laid out. You get to have your comments and then you move forward. This is the second time during the meeting that members have talked about stuff that has happened prior to this meeting. We need to move forward. Let's agree to have professional respect for each other and let's move forward together.

Mr. Batson told members his opinion about this is that a board where all the votes are unanimous, is a board you don't need. That's because you should have discussions and there is going to be disagreements. He said we should then hash the things out and come up with a common compromise that everybody is happy with.

Mr. Futch told members this is one small part of the North Carolina Department of Transportation and one small part of North Carolina. If this board thinks that they are so important that they are going to tell his city that we're going to do something that we don't want to do and that the state of North Carolina is going to have to put in \$49 million dollars a year for 40 years, and if you think I'm going to sit here and argue with you, you're crazy. I'm taking it to everybody in North Carolina. If that's your consensus problem, then he said he would suggest that you drop the Cape Fear Skyway from this entire thing and then we can be consensus all the way because the contention here is the Cape Fear Skyway.

He stated that it was drawn up, in his opinion, by people who have special interest and had conflict of interest and who said they had conflict of interest after they drew it up. They drew it up through his town and did not consult with his town. They never asked him about it and they

never showed his representative. If this board thinks that they are God, they're wrong. People in North Carolina are going to decide this issue. If it means that we don't get one penny for any project, then that's your decision. He told members that if you drop the Cape Fear Skyway, he will help in every way he can to complete the loop to help Mr. Ballard. He said he has tried numerous times to get the loop completed. We have lost funds for the loop all because the Cape Fear Skyway has taken up funds and put us in a position where we go to the Legislature and ask for money for a project that is not even our number one project. We go to the Governor and we ask for money for a project that's not our number one project. Now, when we are willing to do that, then we are making a mistake as a board. He stated that if you guys think I'm going to sit back here and not do something for my town that I can do, then you're mistaken. If everyone of you don't do that for your town or your county, then you're making a mistake for your people. He said he just wants to let the members know where he stands. He found that this board is going to shut him out and not let him talk. He had cases where they changed the agenda and cases where he had to use the public comment period. Had it not been for the Federal Highway Administrator, he would not have been able to speak at all. He told members he was asked to sit down in the middle of a presentation and voted by members to sit him down. He has never seen that kind of thing. You guys have made a decision on the Cape Fear Skyway and you know very little about it. You know very little about the money or the route and you have been sold a bill-of-goods. If you think I'm going to sit back and let the people of North Carolina suffer for that and the people of Leland suffer, you're sadly mistaken. He informed members a public hearing will be held on October 30th on a transportation corridor which somebody drew. That's the way the law reads so we're going to have a public comment and everyone is invited.

Mr. Barfield thanked Mr. Futch for his comments and stated that first of all as an elected official he does not own this county, he just lives here. It's the citizen's county and his job as an elected official for New Hanover County is to give people a fair and balanced view of what is happening in government. He told members he visited the Town of Leland website and there were two things on it concerning the TAC. One was the minutes from the April 24th meeting where he and Mr. Saffo had words and the other was the eight PowerPoint's on his view of the Cape Fear Skyway.

Mr. Barfield said his goal is to make government as transparent as possible, which means he is not giving his view, but he is giving the entire view and trusting that the citizens of his community can make an informed and educated decision. He stated that when we give our limited view, we're robbing the citizens of their ability to participate in their government and that's wrong. The goal for media in New Hanover County is to make government more open, more accessible and more transparent. When you have limited information based on your personal views on your town's website, then you are blinding the eyes of the people who live in the Town of Leland. As a realtor selling property in the community of Leland, he hears from the folks living in Waterford and Brunswick Forest that they are fed up with transportation. Mr. Barfield told Mr. Futch that he did not believe he is speaking for all the folks there and as he said it is "my opinion". He would like to encourage him to survey the entire community of Leland and find out what citizens are looking for. He said he would like to see correct information on the Town of Leland website and give the people all the information, not just his limited view. Citizens in the community could give some great insight if you would open up the process.

Mr. Futch told members on October 14th when NCDOT came here and presented the northern corridor, they only presented one side. They have not presented both sides. They have not been open about the process. They have not answered questions. It took them 4 months to answer his questions. We have those questions on the website that anyone can read and see what the Turnpike Authority's ideas are on these questions. Mr. Futch said they have made

some huge mistakes on the questions and he thinks it's inherent upon the leader of a town to let everybody know the other side of the argument. He said he assumes NCDOT will be at the public hearing and if they wish to give their side of the story, they are more than welcome. If they think it is only going to be their side that's being told, they are sadly mistaken.

8. Updates

a. City of Wilmington/Wilmington MPO

Mr. Kozlosky updated members on projects within the City of Wilmington and the Wilmington MPO. He told members the consultant has been selected for the US 17/NC 210 Corridor Study. Martin/Alexiue/Bryson was chosen for the project and their contract will go before the Wilmington City Council, who serves the lead planning agency for the MPO, at their November 2nd meeting.

Mr. Williams distributed a summary of challenges and opportunities for the Hampstead Bypass from concerned citizens in his community.

Mr. Kozlosky told members that the Market Street Corridor Study draft plan has been presentation to the City of Wilmington Planning Commission and the New Hanover County Planning Board on October 26th. They have received feedback and staff will be taking it to each planning board. Once they receive a recommendation, staff will present the plan to the Wilmington City Council and the New Hanover County Commissioners for adoption. It will then come back to the TCC and TAC for final adoption.

b. Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority

Mr. Barfield told members last month the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority received concurrence from FTA on their environmental document for the station headquarters. They received a \$6 million grant awarded from FTA and will be making a formal announcement tomorrow at their board meeting.

c. NCDOT

Mr. Pope updated members on the Department's activities. Mr. Futch suggested that a sign be added to direct traffic on US Hwy 421 South at the Isabel Holmes Bridge and eliminate confusion for drivers in the south bound lanes. Mr. Pope said he will find out if the structure design can handle the additional wind-load.

Mr. Alford addressed Mr. Koeppel's questions from the public comment period. He said the 5-year work plan was submitted to the Transportation Board in August. The board will vote on that \$23 billion dollars of funding and that does not include the NC Mobility Fund. The NC Mobility Fund is a separate fund that the Legislature has established with a different prioritization process for that money. Public input is being requested for both the NC Mobility Fund, as well as the 5-Year Work Program. The goal of the 5-Year Work Program is to complete 95% of those projects within that 5-years plan.

Mr. Futch asked Mr. Alford if there are projects on the list that a certain municipality didn't want, who would they contact? Mr. Alford suggested starting with this MPO. He told members that the plan right now is a draft to be voted on by the Board of Transportation in June 2011. Between now and next June, anyone can submit comments.

Mr. Kozlosky said the prioritization and input won't be changed until this board inputs it into the next prioritization process which is Prioritization Process 2.0. NCDOT will be explaining that process at several work sessions. The next one is in Kinston on November 10th. During the next project prioritization, TAC members will go through and reprioritize all the projects. Based

on that prioritization, it is anticipated that we will have a quantitative and qualitative analysis again based on what has been done in version 1.0. The input from the MPO, NCDOT and infrastructure mobility and safety will all be input into a modal and it will develop a priority. Mr. Barfield encouraged all members to attend the upcoming meeting in Kinston.

9. Announcements

Mr. Kozlosky reviewed the upcoming meeting taking places for the next month. He introduced Ms. Tara Murphy to the board and informed members that Mr. Joshua Mello has accepted a new position in Atlanta, Georgia. He will be leaving on December 3rd.

10 Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 PM

Respectfully submitted

Mike Kozlosky
Executive Director
Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization