

**Wilmington Urban Area
Technical Coordinating Committee
Meeting Minutes for June 14, 2017**

Members Present:

Mike Kozlosky, City of Wilmington
Don Bennett, City of Wilmington
Adrienne Harrington, TDM
Abby Lorenzo, Town of Carolina Beach
Tim Owens, Town of Wrightsville Beach
Ken Vafier, New Hanover County
John Allen, Town of Belville

Ashli Barefoot, Town of Leland
Helen Bunch, Brunswick County
Megan Crowe, Pender County
Allen Serkin, Cape Fear COG
Alan Pytcher, NCDOT Division 3
Nazia Sarder, NCDOT Planning Branch
Megan Matheny, CFPTA

1. Call to Order

Mr. Kozlosky called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

With no changes to the agenda, Mr. Bennett made the motion to approve the agenda. Ms. Bunch seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

3. Consent Agenda

a. Approval of TCC Meeting Minutes – May 17, 2017

b. Resolution supporting the submittal of Ferry and Waterway Projects for Prioritization 5.0

c. Resolution requesting the North Carolina Department of Transportation Division of Motor Vehicles update the North Carolina Driver's Handbook for bicycle and pedestrian safety

Mr. Serkin made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda and to forward it to the Board for consideration. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

4. Regular Agenda

a. Resolution supporting the submittal of Bike/Pedestrian Projects for Prioritization 5.0

Ms. Motsinger reminded members that this Item was included on the agenda at the TCC's May 17, 2017 meeting. She also reminded members that a local match of 20 percent would be required for any of the bicycle and pedestrian projects included for funding in the STIP (Statewide Transportation Improvement Program). She commented that only limited success has been achieved with funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects through the prioritization process. She explained that the Strategic Transportation Investment Law evaluates all projects on the local tier at the same time, bicycle as well as roadway, in competition for limited funding.

Ms. Barefoot made a motion to approve the Resolution supporting the submittal of Bike/Pedestrian Projects for Prioritization 5.0 and to forward it to the Board for consideration. Mr. Vafier seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

b. Resolution supporting the submittal of Highway Projects for Prioritization 5.0

Ms. Motsinger reminded members that this Item was also included on the agenda for discussion at the TCC's May 17, 2017 meeting. She noted that the list has changed due to a meeting with the SPOT prioritization group and Division 3, which suggested that some of the projects be listed twice with slight modifications in order to increase the chances of funding. She added that the Division is anticipated to submit two (2) high priorities on the list – the Gordon Road Widening Project and the Greenville Loop and Oleander Drive Intersection Project. She reminded members that projects will include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations and may require a local match.

Mr. Bennett pointed out an error in Item #6 (Gordon Road Widening) and the Resolution, Ms. Motsinger responded that it would be corrected to extend from College Road US 117 to US 17.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Bunch, Ms. Motsinger confirmed that Projects #14 and #15 were one project that was split at the suggestion of SPOT. Ms. Bunch pointed out that it is a high priority project for Brunswick County.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Bennett, Ms. Motsinger clarified that Project #4 would be either a three (3)-lane or a four (4)-lane project (not both).

Ms. Crowe inquired about local transportation policies garnering public input at this phase of the process. She noted that her board has a public meeting scheduled for tomorrow night.

Ms. Bunch responded that input from stakeholders is gathered as needed to make sure everyone is on the same page; but without public input meetings.

Ms. Motsinger pointed out that public input is collected for this process and during the creation of the plans that encompass these projects.

Mr. Kozlosky stated that a public input period is held prior to adoption of the STIP. He noted that a 30-day comment period is required.

Mr. Bennett made a motion to approve the Resolution supporting the submittal of Highway Projects for Prioritization 5.0 as amended and to forward it to the Board for consideration. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

5. Discussion

a. Prioritization 5.0 Public Transportation Projects

Ms. Motsinger told members that this list is similar to what was submitted for Prioritization 4.0. She noted that it was developed in coordination with Ms. Matheny and Mr. Eby of Wave Transit. She added that the intention was to allow flexibility to further define where amenities are specifically needed along the routes. The projects are identified as amenity upgrades along routes. The list includes a project for the next phase of the Wilmington Multimodal Transportation Center and the purchase of a bus to allow additional service in New Hanover County.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Bennett, Ms. Matheny stated that Wave Transit's Short Range Transit Plan, which occurs every five (5) years, is currently in progress. She noted that the steering committee comprised of representatives from the County, the City, the MPO, staff, board members, and local jurisdictions served by Wave Transit will convene in June. She added that the plan will kick-off formally in July and conclude in the spring of 2018. She noted that it will identify locations warranting passenger amenities, mostly along major thoroughfares, using criteria such as ridership.

Ms. Motsinger noted that project submittal requires identifying geographies. A brief question/answer and discussion period was held.

Mr. Kozlosky reminded members that a final list would be presented for consideration at the Committee's July meeting.

b. Prioritization 5.0 Aviation Projects

Mr. Lopez told members that this list differs significantly from the Prioritization 4.0 submittal. He noted that many projects that were ineligible were not resubmitted. He added that Wilmington International Airport and its engineers were consulted in the development of the list.

Mr. Kozlosky reminded members that a final list would be presented for consideration at the Committee's July meeting.

c. Direct Attributable Submittal Form Proposal

Mr. Kozlosky told members that this is a takeaway from the organizational improvements and SWOT analysis. He noted that during that process the desire to create consistent criteria between the DA projects (STPBG and TASA) became evident. From the feedback, a consolidated form was created. He requested feedback from the group on the changes in an effort to bring back a revised form for consideration. He noted that the title has changed to the funding request form since it's for both programs/funds. He added that it lists contacts, description of the project and the problem statement.

Mr. Kozlosky stated that next pages include a table with a link to the maps that should be used as a tool for project managers and local jurisdictions to increase awareness of the types of funds, and where they may be used.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Serkin, Mr. Kozlosky stated that each row is for an applicable request as a standalone project. He noted that the purpose of the table and maps are to determine eligibility requirements. He then gave an overview of scoring as follows:

- Project preference points were added to give weight to communities continuing to submit projects that may or may not be funded;
- Local match percentage was a carryover from previous applications;
- Mandatory annual project manager training.

Mr. Serkin suggested that the one-on-one training be provided to new project managers. He also suggested that the disqualifying elements should be moved to the top of the list. Mr. Kozlosky stated that a caveat for one-on-one training would be added and the credentials of the project manager would be moved up.

- Project manager experience with a brief resume of projects was added to assure some experience with FHWA and DOT projects.

Ms. Crowe expressed concerns regarding a bias toward organizations with such personnel on staff. Ms. Motsinger responded that a consultant on retainer could qualify.

- Project horizon year was added to give precedence to projects in the LRTP (Long Range Transportation Plan) and disqualified those that are not;
- Project readiness was a carryover;

Mr. Kozlosky stated that a due diligence period or study has been identified for fiscal year 2019. He noted that it would be included in next year's version in order to prevent jurisdictions from submitting projects that cannot be built. He added that criteria would be included.

- Right-of-way easement dedication was a carryover; but will be more detailed in the due diligence period; same for utility and relocations;
- Congestion and mobility were an effort to coordinate usage of DA funds with studies for the Congestion Management Process;
- V/C (Volume to Capacity) Ratio was a carryover.

Mr. Kozlosky recommended removing the estimated capacity reduction ratio to bring it back with due diligence analysis.

A brief question/answer and discussion period was held.

In response to concerns expressed by members, Mr. Kozlosky explained that discussion on this would continue in July, and final approval would be sought in August. He noted that the application will be released in October.

- Travel Demand Model (TDM) was a carryover that ascertains if a project provides travel where there is demand;
- Closing a gap and major obstacles were carryovers;
- A section for Accessibility and ADA was added for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act;
- Proximity to schools and the bicycle/pedestrian generator were carryovers;
- Safety, the number of crashes, was modified for applicability to pedestrian facilities. Percentages were intended to verify if projects are in line with identified crash concerns. The crash reduction factor was a carryover from previous applications.
- Sustainability is a new category to address the question of long-term maintenance.

A question/answer and discussion period was held on lifecycle cost and credit for BMPs (Best Management Practices).

Mr. Kozlosky proposed to remove the lifecycle cost and incorporate it into the maintenance plan. He added that the project cost tables are a carryover.

A question/answer and discussion period was held regarding the cost effective/cost benefit analysis equation/formula to help rank projects across the board. Mr. Kozlosky stated that it is comprised of a linear regression analysis, to ensure a smooth execution of projects in the program.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Serkin, Mr. Kozlosky stated that the equation is for internal use only. He added that more work is required on the due diligence period.

Ms. Matheny requested that the ADA section be reconsidered since it's already a requirement for use of federal funds. A question/answer and discussion period was held. Mr. Serkin suggested that a new project might be worth more points than an upgrade to existing facilities.

It was the consensus of the Committee to keep the cost effective/benefit equation for internal use.

Mr. Kozlosky stated that this Item would be brought back for more discussion at the Committee's July meeting.

6. Updates

Updates are included in the agenda packet.

7. Announcements

- Next WMPO Bike/Ped Committee Meeting, August 20, 2017
- Next TCC Meeting, July 12, 2017

Mr. Vafier reported that the Middle Sound Greenway DA Project went out to bid on Monday, June 12, 2017

8. Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting was adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

**THE ABOVE MINUTES ARE NOT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS.
THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS ARE RECORDED ON A COMPACT DISC AS PART OF THIS RECORD.**