WMPO Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

TO: WMPO Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Members
FROM: Suraiya Rashid, Associate Transportation Planner
DATE: January 8th, 2014
SUBJECT: January 15th, 2014 Meeting Agenda

A meeting of the WMPO Citizens Advisory Committee will be held on January 15th at 3pm. The meeting will be held at 305 Chestnut Street in the 4th Floor Traffic Conference Room.

The following is the agenda for the meeting:

1) Update on schedule
2) Approval of October 2nd, 2013 Meeting Minutes
3) Initial Public Outreach Survey Results Summary
4) Anticipated Funding Constraints & Alternative Funding Scenarios
5) Introduction to Draft Prioritization Methodology
6) Action Items & Next Meeting Date

Next Meeting: February 19th, 3PM
- Modal Prioritization Input
- Alternative Funding Discussion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAC Full Committee Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC Individual Member Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC Meeting to Review Subcommittees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection &amp; Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial GIS work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Data Finalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach Plan Finalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization Tool Created</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal Committees Evaluate project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal Committees Evaluate needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal Specific Chlorine @ 50% c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Analysis of Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate Project Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove redundant &amp; Undesirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC Approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Consultant Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal-Specific Chlorine Finalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Finalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption Process Initiates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tentative MTP- Action CAC Meeting Months**

- January, 2013
- February, 2013
- March, 2013
- April, 2013
- May, 2013
- August, 2013
- January, 2014
- February, 2014
- November 2014
- May, 2014
Members in attendance:
Howard Loving   Howard Capps   Stuart Smith
Steve Stanton   Scott Cromartie   Jim Smith
Al Freimark   Eric Coffey   John Ellen
Terry Obrock   David Hollis

Others in attendance:
Karen Fussell, NCDOT Division 3 Division Engineer; Suraiya Rashid, Associate Transportation Planner, Megan Matheny, WAVE Transit

Call to Order
Mr. Loving called the meeting to order.

Update on Schedule for MTP 2040 Plan
Mr. Loving asked Ms. Rashid to provide an update on the schedule. The public outreach track of the Gant chart was discussed. Ms. Rashid stated that the public outreach results would be discussed later on in the meeting. She also stated that the data collection and processing track was underway by the staff and the selected consultant.

Introduction of Karen Fussell – NCDOT Division 3, Division Engineer
Mr. Loving introduced Ms. Fussell, NCDOT Division 3 Division Engineer and asked her opinion on what the CAC needed to know about the Strategic Mobility Formula (SMF). Ms. Fussell stated that the SMF was still very new but that the overall effort and concept was to increase transparency and to spend the same amount of money in a wiser way. Mr. Stanton asked what MPOs needed to be doing in light of the SMF and what the MPOs can do to have a greater impact. Ms. Fussell stated that the MPOs needed to plan and put on paper what their desires were and to collaborate internally to keep priorities moving forward. Mr. Capps asked if the SMF put an increased emphasis on roadways. Ms. Fussell responded that this was not her interpretation of the SMF – that the minimums and maximums in the formula were based on historical spending patterns. Mr. Smith asked why bus shelters were not desired elements in the right-of-way by Division 3. Ms. Fussell stated that this was a misperception and that her office was working with WAVE transit to ensure that bus shelters could be installed. She stated that issues in the past that restricted bus shelter installations were due to insufficient submittals of specifications (which are necessary for safety & permitting). Ms. Matheny echoed this response and stated that a shelter design had now been approved for installation. Mr. Smith asked why bikes were not
cited when they rode in roadways even when an MUP was present. Ms. Fussell stated that legislation viewed bikes as vehicles so they had the legal right to use the roadways. Ms. Fussell stated that if the MPO desired to change this any changes would have to be done at the legislative level. Ms. Fussell then stated that she desired for the public to be educated that NCDOT does have intelligent reasons and thorough research for their decisions and also that a goal was to better inform the public on why decisions are made the way they are. She stated that she desires to improve the reputation of NCDOT and to increase the level of trust from the public.

Approval of August 14th, 2013 Meeting Minutes
Mr. Cromartie moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Outreach
Mr. Rashid gave a brief overview of the public outreach to date. She stated that they had received 4002 surveys at that time and that there were 66 attendees at the public open houses. She stated that the survey would be closed by their next meeting date and that staff would give an overview of the complete survey data in January. Mr. Freimark stated that their goal next time around should be better attendance at the open houses. Mr. Loving stated that the area has so many different competing community activities that getting open house attendance is difficult. Mr. Loving stated that 5,000 surveys should be the new goal.

Prioritization Methodology Preview
Ms. Rashid stated that a draft prioritization methodology would be presented in January & February based on modal subcommittee meetings, survey results, and direction from the STI. Mr. Smith stated that the prioritization process utilized by Cape Fear Commutes 2035 was very good and should be the basis of the Cape Fear Transportation 2040 prioritization process. Mr. Loving stated that a synopsis of the completed survey and a framework for prioritization would be emailed out in advance of the January meeting.

Next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 15th at 3PM.
Getting to Work and School

- Just over 80% use private vehicle for over half of these trips
- Approximately 80-90% do NOT carpool/vanpool, use public transit, bicycle or walk for any of these trips
- Just over 10% bicycle and/or walk for about a quarter of these trips

Future Preference for Getting to Work and School

- Approximately 55% prefer to carpool/vanpool, as well as drive a vehicle the same amount
- 55% prefer to bicycle more often
- Approximately 45% prefer to use public transportation and/or walk more often
- Just over 35% prefer to drive a vehicle less often

Table 1: Percentage of trips to work/school by mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Future Preference</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private vehicle</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool/ Vanpool</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Running Errands

- Nearly 90% use private vehicle for over half of these trips
- Approximately 30% bike and/or walk for about a quarter of these trips
- Over 80% do NOT use carpool/vanpool nor public transportation for these trips
- Just over 60% do NOT bicycle or walk to run errands

Future Preference for Running Errands

- Just over 55% prefer to drive the same amount; nearly 35% prefer to drive less
- Just over 60% prefer to bicycle more often
- 55% prefer to walk more often
- Nearly 45% prefer to use public transportation more often
- 65% prefer to carpool/vanpool the same amount

Preference Study II

Table 2: Percentage of trips for running errands by mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Future Preference</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private vehicle</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool/Vanpool</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would bus more often if...

- More frequent bus service (40%)
- Nothing will result in more frequent use of this mode (Nearly 40%)
- Express bus routes, and/or better access to stops and/or Park and Rides (Approximately 30%)
I would carpool/vanpool more often if...

- Nothing would result in utilizing this mode, due to logistical liability (Nearly 50%)
- More information regarding other participants schedules (Just over 30%)
- Park and Ride lots (Nearly 30%)

I would bicycle more often if...

- More off-road and multi-use paths (Just over 60%)
- More on-road bike lanes (Nearly 50%)
- More information about bike routes (Nearly 30%)
- Nothing would result in me bicycling more often (Nearly 25%)

I would walk more often if (top 3 responses)...

- More sidewalks and multi-use paths (Just over 60%)
- Safe intersection crossings (Nearly 55%)
- Safe connections from homes to stores, office, etc (Nearly 50%)

Getting the Kids to School

- Just over 55% currently use private vehicle
- 20% take a school bus
- 8% walk and/or bicycle and/or carpool

If it were safe and convenient, parents would encourage kids to...

- Bicycle (Just over 65%)
- Walk (Just over 55%)
- Take the school bus  (Nearly 30%)
- Use private vehicle (Nearly 25%)

Parents would encourage school-age kids to bus if...

Respondents assigned nearly equal importance (just over 20%) to the following:

- Less time spent on the school bus
- An additional bus monitor
- Drop off and pick up were closer to home
- Nearly 20% state that nothing will result in children riding the bus

Top 3 travel priorities

- Safety (Just over 80%)
- Convenience (Nearly 70%)
- Travel time (Nearly 70%)
Preference Study III: Respondents would rather...

- Pay a toll (Just over 15%)
- Wait in traffic (Just over 10%)
- Depends on the travel situation (Just over 70%)

We should invest transportation dollars in...

- Improving existing road safety (Just over 55%)
- Bicycles/pedestrian safety (55%)
- Improving existing road quality (Just over 50%)

I support these revenue sources the most...

- Impact fees on development (Just over 40%)
- No support for the listed revenue sources. Existing facilities accommodate present and future needs (Nearly 35%)
- Tolls and user fee (Approximately 30% for each of these sources)
## Potential MTP Alternative Funding Scenario Mechanisms (Cheat Sheet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Local Option Sales Tax</th>
<th>Transportation Utility Fees</th>
<th>Transportation Improvement Bonds</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How is it enacted?</td>
<td>Quarter-Cent (G.S. 105 Article 46)</td>
<td>Quarter-Cent for Transit (G.S. 105 Article 43)</td>
<td>Locality Approval</td>
<td>Voter Referendum and Municipal Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What geography does it cover?</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County/Region</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is funding generated?</td>
<td>Quarter-cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>Property Owner Fees</td>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>Annual $7 Vehicle Registration Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a sunset and if so, how long?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can the revenue be used for?</td>
<td>Any County-maintained Service</td>
<td>Financing, Construction, Operation, and Maintenance of Transit</td>
<td>Transportation Infrastructure Capital and Maintenance</td>
<td>Financing, Construction, Operation, and Maintenance of Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the estimate of annual revenue generation?</td>
<td>$8 to $10 million</td>
<td>$4 to $5 million</td>
<td>Varies by Bond</td>
<td>$0.5 to $0.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the generated revenue be used as a state or federal funding match?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where else in North Carolina is this funding source being implemented?</td>
<td>24 Other Counties</td>
<td>Mecklenburg, Durham and Orange Counties</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Several Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are some potential advantages to using this funding source?</td>
<td>Voter Control</td>
<td>Based on Usage</td>
<td>Accelerated Funding</td>
<td>Consistent Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are some potential disadvantages to using this funding source?</td>
<td>Additional Taxation</td>
<td>No Voter Control</td>
<td>Property Tax Rate Increase</td>
<td>No Revenues from Vehicles Registered Elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How easy is it to implement?</td>
<td>Somewhat Difficult</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are special educational programs needed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this funding source have the potential to disproportionately impact environmental justice areas or other population groups?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has this funding source been used in WMPO in the past?</td>
<td>New Hanover County</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WMPO Staff has reviewed the development of a prioritization process for Cape Fear Transportation 2040 in light of the following 3 factors:

1. Prioritization Process used in Cape Fear Commutes 2035
2. Prioritization Process used in Raleigh for the Strategic Mobility Formula
3. Modal Subcommittee's identified goals and objectives
4. Survey results from the Cape Fear Transportation 2040 survey

Overall Process to Define Prioritization
The overall process the WMPO proposes is below using an example for the development of 1 mode-specific list:

#1 Develop
Comprehensive
Mode-Specific
Project List

1. Project 1
2. Project 2
3. Project 3
4. Project 4
5. Project 5
6. Project 6
7. Project 7
8. Project 8

#2 Reduce List by
Applying Base
Scenario Projected
Funding

1. Project 1
2. Project 2
3. Project 3
4. Project 4
5. Project 5
6. Project 6
7. Project 7
8. Project 8

#3 Increase List by
Adding Alternative
Funding

1. Project 1
2. Project 2
3. Project 3
4. Project 4
5. Project 5
6. Project 6
7. Project 7
8. Project 8
Step #1 In order to develop the ranked mode specific project lists the staff will look at the Modal Subcommittee Goals to define overall categories. The CAC will be asked to weigh-in on the weight of the overall categories. Specific metrics used to define the project scores within each weighted category will be derived from:
   1. Prioritization Process metrics used in Cape Fear Commutes 2035
   2. Prioritization Process metrics used in Raleigh for the Strategic Mobility Formula
   3. Each Modal Subcommittee’s identified objectives
   4. Survey results from the Cape Fear Transportation 2040 survey

Step #2 An anticipated funding available amount will be created specific to each mode derived from the base funding scenario. These funding amounts will be applied to the apropos mode-specific ranked list to show which projects are likely to get funding and will be considered part of the fiscally constrained project list.

Step #3 Based on input from CAC after looking at public input results, funds available from alternative funding sources will be divided into mode-specific pots. These additional funds will be added to the base funding scenario fund available for each mode and an additional project list will be created per mode.

Proposed Mode Specific Prioritization Formulas (Step #1 Initial Draft)

Roadway
   1. Safe 10%
   2. Efficient 30%
   3. Appropriate 10%
   4. Responsible 10%
   5. Integrated 10%
   6. Multimodal 30%

Mass Transportation
   1. Economic Development 30%
   2. Physical Infrastructure 30%
   3. Broaden Ridership 20%
   4. Community Support 10%

Bicycle
   1. Safety 30%
   2. Transportation Choice 30%
   3. Built Environment 20%
   4. Health 10%
   5. Economic Development 10%

Pedestrian
   1. Safety 30%
   2. Transportation Choice 30%
   3. Built Environment 20%
   4. Health 10%
   5. Economic Development 10%
Aviation
1. Economic Development 30%
2. Regional Accessibility 30%
3. Physical Infrastructure 20%
4. Modal Integration 20%

Freight/Rail
1. Containerized Freight 30%
2. “Last Mile” Improvements 20%
3. Existing NC Port Markets 20%
4. Military 20%
5. Community Support 20%

Ferry
1. Safety 30%
2. Environmentally Responsible 30%
3. Fuel and Time Efficiency 15%
4. Modal Integration 15%
5. Economic development 10%