



305 Chestnut Street
PO Box 1810
Wilmington, NC 28402
Ph: (910) 341-3258
Fax: (910) 341-7801
www.wmpo.org

Create and execute continuing, cooperative and comprehensive regional long-range planning efforts that pro-actively drive transportation decisions to improve safety, connectivity, economic development and quality of life in the Wilmington region.

**Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting Agenda**

TO: Wilmington Urban Area MPO Citizen Advisory Committee
FROM: Abby Lorenzo, Senior Transportation Planner
DATE: January 30th, 2019
SUBJECT: February 6th, 2019 meeting

A meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area MPO Citizen Advisory Committee will be held on Wednesday, February 6th, 2019 at 2 pm. The meeting will be held in the 6th Floor Conference Room located at 320 Chestnut Street in downtown Wilmington.

The following is the agenda for the meeting:

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of the Agenda
- 3) Approval of Minutes- January 7th, 2019
- 4) Wilmington Urban Area MPO 2045 Travel Demand Model Presentation – Nazia Sarder, NCDOT
- 5) Cape Fear Moving Forward 2045 Bicycle and Pedestrian Modal Project List Discussion
Recommended Action: CAC approval of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Modal Project List
- 6) Cape Fear Moving Forward 2045 Draft Ferry and Water Transportation Ranked Projects and Policies
Recommended Action: CAC approval of the draft Ferry and Water Transportation ranked project list and policies
- 7) Alternative Funding Sources from the 2040 MTP

Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

Recommended Action: CAC review the 2040 MTP supported alternative funding sources prior to the March 6th CAC meeting

8) Next Meeting- March 6th, 2019

9) Adjourn

Attachments:

- Meeting Minutes- January 7th, 2019
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Modal Subcommittee Project Response Letter to CAC
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Modal Project List
- Draft Ferry and Water Transportation Ranked Project list and Policies
- Alternative Funding Sources from the 2040 MTP Presentation

Citizens Advisory Committee
6th Floor Conference Room, 320 Chestnut Street
Wednesday, January 7, 2019
Meeting Minutes

Members Present:

Laura Padgett, Chair, City of Wilmington
John Cawthorne, Vice Chair, Town of Kure Beach
Neal Andrew, North Carolina Board of Transportation
Web Bostic, New Hanover County
Patrick Boykin, Town of Carolina Beach
Harold King, Town of Wrightsville Beach
Vanessa Lacer, Cape Fear Public
Transportation Authority
Sallie Rochelle, Pender County
Stuart Smith, Town of Belville
Brayton Willis, Town of Leland
Jason Windham, City of Wilmington

Members Absent:

Valorie Hatten, Town of Navassa
David Hollis, Brunswick County

Staff Present:

Abigail Lorenzo, Senior
Transportation Planner, WMPO
Amy Kimes, Senior Project Engineer
Zachary Manfredi, Associate
Transportation Planner
Michael Madsen, GIS Analyst
Mike Kozlosky, Executive Director

1. Call to Order

Chairman Padgett called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Willis made a motion to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Mr. King, and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes – December 12, 2018

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the minutes of December 12, 2018, seconded by Mr. Boykin, and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Cape Fear Moving Forward 2045 Modal Project List Discussion

- a. **Aviation:** Ms. Lorenzo stated that the first two projects would carry over since they are committed and have been assigned a TIP (Transportation Improvements Project) number and funding.

In response to an inquiry by Chairman Padgett, Ms. Lorenzo stated that the aviation terminal improvements not appearing on the list have already been funded.

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the Aviation Project List, seconded by Mr. Willis, and the motion carried unanimously.

- b. **Bike/Ped:** In response to inquiries by Ms. Lacer and Vice-Chairman Cawthorne, Ms. Lorenzo stated that the project list included segments and intersection projects. She explained that the segments are linear such as a multi-use paths, and that intersection improvements include crosswalks and/or ped-heads.

Chairman Padgett requested a list that connects segments and intersections.

Ms. Lorenzo stated that the consultant would assume crossing improvements for any segments traversing intersections. She noted that the proposed 170 projects have been streamlined from a list of nearly 1,000. She added that the subcommittee was tasked with identifying those with a regional perspective that would have particular relevance during the next 25 years. Connectivity and proximity to schools would be considered as part of the scoring criteria.

Ms. Lorenzo stated that the subcommittee is comprised of stakeholders and subject matter experts who are strong advocates of bike-ped facilities. She noted that subcommittee members were given a map of existing facilities and crash data as tools for project selection. Additionally, many of the projects were gleaned from community-adopted plans including the Leland Pedestrian Plan, the New Hanover County Greenway Pedestrian Plan, and the Carolina Beach Pedestrian Plan.

Chairman Padgett expressed concerns regarding the safety of bike lanes on significantly congested roads such as Oleander Drive, 5th Avenue to Greenfield Street, Sidbury Road, and Wilshire Boulevard. She requested that these projects be justified as critical to a particular connector.

Ms. Lorenzo assured Committee members that any project selected for funding would undergo additional engineering analysis to determine the best cross-section. She reiterated that many of the projects, for example Oleander Drive and 5th Avenue, have been pulled from existing plans.

Chairman Padgett requested that the concerns regarding bike lanes be remanded to the subcommittee.

Ms. Kimes addressed concerns of Committee members by pointing out that typically more experienced riders use bike lanes. She noted that these lanes are dedicated and not shared with vehicular traffic.

Following further discussion, Chairman Padgett requested that the safety concerns regarding some of the proposed bike lanes be brought back to the subcommittee for them to identify those segments appropriate for recreational users. She pointed out that some sections of 5th Avenue cannot be widened to accommodate bike riders.

Mr. Willis made a motion to return the list to the subcommittee.

Ms. Lorenzo inquired if any projects could be forwarded to the consultant for financial forecast in the interest of keeping the plan on schedule.

Mr. Willis revised his motion to approve the Bike-Ped Project List with the exception of bike lane projects, in order for the subcommittee to address concerns. Mr. Bostic seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. King, Chairman Padgett stated that driver education is within the purview of NCDOT.

Ms. Lorenzo stated that after completing criteria and metrics the subcommittees would work on policies, which will include education.

- c. **Ferry:** In response to an inquiry by Chairman Padgett, Ms. Lorenzo stated that the criteria would be applied to the five proposed projects in green typeface. She explained that the Southport-Fort Fisher Ferry route is split between the MPO and the RPO. Although the draft STIP has yet to be released, funding has been programmed for a third ferry. Therefore, a fourth ferry would be under consideration for the next 25 years.

Ms. Lorenzo stated that multi-modal considerations have been included in the relevant modal subcommittees.

Chairman Padgett commented that projects that don't make the cut for funding should be listed in the plan since they are opportunities for public-private partnerships.

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the Ferry Project List, seconded by Mr. Cawthorne, and the motion carried unanimously.

- d. **Freight/Rail:** A brief question/answer and discussion period was held regarding the potential impact of a rail realignment, and the Castle Hayne to Wallace connection.

Mr. Cawthorne made a motion to approve the Freight/Rail Project List, seconded by Mr. Boykin, and the motion carried unanimously.

- e. **Public Transportation:** After a brief question/answer and discussion period, Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the Public Transportation Project List, seconded by Mr. Andrew, and the motion carried unanimously.

- f. **Roadway:** Chairman Padgett expressed concerns regarding the absence of planted medians. Ms. Lorenzo responded that the cross-sections are a high-level cost view only and may change following engineering studies once funded. She noted that the preference for planted medians will be communicated to the subcommittee and that policy recommendations will be presented to the CAC for consideration.

Chairman Padgett pointed out that aesthetic value is an important consideration for economic development and attracting the tech sector industry to the region.

Mr. Smith expressed concerns regarding maintenance of planted medians. Ms. Lorenzo stated that only the capital cost would be forecast.

Mr. Andrew inquired about the Southern Crossing or Skyway Bridge. Ms. Lorenzo responded that automatic carry-over programs are not included on the Roadway and Bike-Ped lists for cost estimate.

Following further discussion, Mr. Andrew made a motion to approve the Roadway Project List, seconded by Mr. Cawthorne, and the motion carried unanimously.

5. **Additional Items**

Chairman Padgett inquired about demographics, trends and past plan projects.

Ms. Lorenzo responded that at the request of the Committee, a site was established with the requested information.

Mr. Willis inquired about the population forecast and growth nodes. Mr. Madsen responded that these are broken up by Census tract and American Community Survey.

Chairman Padgett inquired about a decrease in population between 2000 and 2010.

Mr. Madsen explained that the tracts are divided into smaller areas as the population grows.

Chairman Padgett encouraged Committee members to review this data to become aware of areas of projected population growth.

Mr. King inquired about data showing where people live and where they shop. Mr. Madsen responded that a 2045 households and employment data is available.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Padgett, Ms. Lorenzo stated that an update of the origin and destination study is needed hopefully before the next model update.

Mr. Willis inquired about areas of investment that could be impacted by a change or rise in sea level. Ms. Lorenzo stated that this information is available and might be selected as a metric at the modal subcommittee level. She pointed out that resiliency is a federal planning goal that needs to be considered.

Chairman Padgett expressed concerns regarding the impact of fewer people driving cars in 2045 than today on project selection.

A question/answer and discussion period was held.

6. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Abby Lorenzo
Senior Transportation Planner
Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

PLEASE NOTE: THE NEXT MEETING OF THE CAC WILL BE HELD ON FEBRUARY 6TH.

**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.**



305 Chestnut Street
PO Box 1810
Wilmington, NC 28402
Ph: 910-341-3258
Fax: 910-341-7801
www.wmpo.org

January 16, 2019

Citizen Advisory Committee Members,

On January 8th, 2019, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Modal Subcommittee was informed by WMPO Staff of the Citizen Advisory Committee's directive to review its selected projects which included bicycle lanes. The purpose for this review was to reevaluate the projects for their safety considering vehicular traffic on the existing street facility. WMPO Staff provided the Bicycle and Pedestrian Modal Subcommittee with an exclusive list of these bicycle lane projects, as well as ADT volumes for the roadway facilities and if the project appeared in an existing, community adopted plan, for the subcommittee's reconsideration and review.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Modal Subcommittee reviewed and reconsidered the cross sections of the bicycle lane projects. The Subcommittee, which consists of all skill levels of bicyclists, municipal staff, disability advocates, and regional tourism representatives, felt that safety was an overwhelming factor and driver in the selection of these projects. The Subcommittee supports its initial project list citing the following reasons:

- Bicycle lanes provide a dedicated facility for a bicyclist, removing them from the vehicular travel lane. A bicycle lane is for the exclusive use of bicyclists and is typically designated utilizing striping, signage, and pavement markings. The minimum pavement width required for a bicycle lane is four feet, but five and six foot bicycle lanes are common on high volume and higher speed roadways. In addition to the safety benefits of providing a facility that physically removes cyclists from the vehicular travel lane, bicycle lanes also guide cyclists to ride in the correct direction and remind motorists to look out for bicyclists.
- The projects proposing bicycle lanes are consistent with projects included in community adopted plans, or are projects consistent with cross sections implemented or in design on similar roadways by NCDOT and the WMPO's member jurisdictions. It should be noted that projects included in other community adopted plans have already been vetted by the public, and are accepted as part of the overall vision for the future network.
- In order to accommodate all types of ridership skill and comfort levels, a variety of facilities should be envisioned as part of the overall bicycle network. Additionally certain network connections must be made utilizing on-road facilities like bicycle lanes.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Modal Subcommittee would like to respectfully request that the Citizen Advisory Committee reconsider its proposed projects that include bike lanes and approve.

Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Wilmington • Town of Carolina Beach • Town of Kure Beach • Town of Wrightsville Beach
County of New Hanover • Town of Beville • Town of Leland • Town of Navassa • County of Brunswick
County of Perdue • Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority • North Carolina Department of Transportation

The Subcommittee feels that these projects contribute to providing a safer and better connected bicycle network for the future of the WMPO Region.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Carol Stein". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Carol Stein, Chair
WMPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Modal Subcommittee

Bike Lane Projects

Project #	ADT / Notes	Project Name	Project Type	From	To	Segment Length (Ft)	Sidewalk (Width in Ft, if applicable)	Bike Lane (Width in Ft, if applicable)	Typ Section Detail # Reference
BP-1	5000 ADT / COW planned road diet with cross section that includes bicycle lanes / in community adopted plan	5th Ave Bike Lane	On Street Bike Lane	Cambell Street	Greenfield Lake Park	10,975		5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-48
BP - 42		Jenkins Road BikePed	Bike Lanes and Sidewalk	US 17	St. Johns Church Rd.	835	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	Reference: Pender County Collector Street Plan Figure 27
BP -43		St. Johns Church Rd. BikePed	Bike Lanes and Sidewalk	Jenkins Rd.	end	1760	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	Reference: Pender County Collector Street Plan Figure 27
BP-45	7500 / Bike lanes in community adopted plan	SR - 2313 (Wilshire Blvd) BikePed Improvem ents	Bike Lanes and Sidewalk	Wrightsvill e Ave	Kerr Ave	5400	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP-52	37,000 / Would be picked up as a roadway project (Access Management). Runs parallel with MUP on Park Ave, geared towards a different user group	US - 76 (Oleander Dr) BikePed Improvem ents	Bike Lanes and Sidewalk (from 39th St to 42nd St)	Hawthorne Rd	42nd St	5600	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP - 146	Neighborhood St	Halifax Rd. BikePed Improvem ents	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Lake Ave.	Fordham Rd.	2800	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP-178	2,700 / Cross Section in Pender Co Adopted plan / rural roadway	SR - 1336 (Sidbury Rd) BikePed Improvem ents	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	US 17	Dairy Farm Rd	35,000	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	Pender County Collector Street Plan Figure 24
BP-193	Neighborhood St	Lake Ave BikePed Improvem ents	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks (from Halifax to 41st St)	Hallifax Rd	College Rd	3,250	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP-206	6,500 / rural roadway / carried cross section from Pender Co Adopted plan	SR - 1002 (Island Creek Rd.) BikePed Improvem ents	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	US 17	Royal Oak Ct	18,200	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	Pender County Collector Street Plan Figure 24
BP-233	6,000	Floral Pkwy BikePed Improvem ents	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Indpenden ce Mall Entrance	Wrightsvill e Ave	2,660	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP - 275	4,700	SR - 1592 (Landsdow n Rd.) BikePed Improvem ents	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Navaho Trail	S. College	3,000	5' (Each side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP - 281	4,800	US - 76 Waynick Blvd. Bike Lanes	Bike Lanes/Shar rows	Causeway Bridge	S. Lumina Ave.	6,500		5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP-298	In Community Adopted Plan	SR - 1524 (Chappell Loop Rd. SE) Bikelanes	Shoulder Bicycle Lanes/Shar rows	Blackwell Rd	River Rd	12,600		5' (Each Side)	Leland Bike Plan 5-9 #2 (Chappell Loop Rd SE and neighborhood connections only-- Blackwell Rd and NC 133 addressed in other projects)

BP-344	In Community Adopted Plan	SR - 1318 (Blue Clay Rd Bicycle Lanes I)	Bicycle Lanes	Holly Shelter Rd	Sidbury Rd	11,400		5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-46
BP-345	3,500 / In Community Adopted Plan	SR - 1318 (Blue Clay Rd Bicycle Lanes II)	Bicycle Lanes		Proposed Rail Trail Corridor	11,650		5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-46
BP - 355	14,200 / In Community Adopted Plan	US - 117/NC 133 (Castle Hayne Rd.) Bicycle Lanes	Bicycle Lanes	Kerr Ave.	North of I-140	11,400		5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP-373	28,000 / Similar build out to Kerr Ave / Bike Lanes in Community Adopted Plan	SR - 2048 (Gordon Rd.) BikePed Improvements	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	College Rd	Military Cutoff Rd	14,600	5' (Each side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP-376	2,700 / Portion in Pender Co Adopted Plan	SR - 1002 (Holly Shelter Rd.) BikePed Improvements	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Blue Clay Rd	Royal Oak Ct	33,800	5' (Each side)	5' (Each Side)	Pender County Collector Street Plan Figure 24
BP-396	42,500 / Bike Lanes in Community Adopted Plan	SR - 1409 (Military Cutoff) BikePed Improvements	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Wrightsville Ave	Eastwood Rd	3,200	5' (Each side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP-397	23,500 / In Community Adopted Plan	SR - 1272 (New Centre Dr.) Bicycle Lanes I	Bicycle Lanes	College Rd	Terminus	2,100		5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP-398	21,300 / Bike Lanes in Community Adopted Plan	SR - 1272 (New Centre Dr.) BikePed Improvements	Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalks (Sigmon Rd to Market St)	College Rd	Columb Dr	5,550	5' (Each side, approximately 600')	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP - 409	In Community Adopted Plan	St. Joseph St. Bikeped Improvements	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Lewis Dr.	Lees Lane	4,700	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	CB Ped Plan: A.2.2 Complete Streets
BP - 437	18,000 / In Community Adopted Plan / rural roadway	NC 133 (Castle Hayne Rd.) Bicycle Lanes	Bicycle Lanes	Kerr Ave.	Brentwood Dr.	8,600		5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-7
BP-456	75,000 / Bike Lanes in Community Adopted Plan / consistent with cross section being explored by NCDOT & COW for College Rd Improvements	US - 117 /NC 132 (S. College Rd.) BikePed Improvement	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Market ST	Shipyard Blvd	17,000	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP - 457	26,800 / Consistency with ongoing BikePed improvements on Kerr from MLK to Randall / Bike Lanes in Community Adopted Plan	SR - 1175 (Kerr Ave.) BikePed Improvement	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Randall Pkwy	Wrightsville Ave	6,500	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP-458	9,800 / Bike Lanes in Community Adopted Plan	SR - 1411 (Wrightsville Avenue) BikePed Improvements	Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalks	Dawson St	Wood Dale Dr	15,500	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47

BP-464	38,000 / Bike Lanes in Community Adopted Plan / Access Management Roadway Project - leads to bike lanes	US - 421 (Carolina Beach Rd.) BikePed Improvements	Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalks	Burnett Blvd	St Andrews Dr	21,800	5' (Each Side)	5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47
BP - 861	45,700 / Consistency with proposed road diet bikeped improvements	US - 17 BUS (Market St.) Bicycle Lanes	Bicycle Lanes	Kerr Ave.	Covil Avenue	4,700		5' (Each Side)	NHC Greenway Plan 5-47



305 Chestnut Street
PO Box 1810
Wilmington, NC 28402
Ph: (910) 341-3258
Fax: (910) 341-7801
www.wmpo.org

MEMORANDUM

To: Citizen Advisory Committee Members
From: Katie Moore, Associate Transportation Planner
Subject: Ferry and Water Transportation Ranked Projects and Policies

Preliminary Ranking of Proposed Ferry and Water Transportation Projects

1.	Multi-use path Fort Fisher Landing to Aquarium	Accessibility/Mobility	BP-246
2.	Fort Fisher Parking Lot Enhancement	Facility Improvement	F-23
3.	Southport Additional Mooring Facility	Mooring Facility	F-2
4.	Fort Fisher Mooring Facility	Mooring Facility	F-22
5.	New River Class Vessel (3 rd Ferry)	Additional Vessel	F-3
6.	New River Class Vessel (4 th Ferry)	Additional Vessel	F-10
7.	Fort Fisher Pedestrian Improvements	Facility Improvement	F-24
8.	Downtown Wilmington Ferry/Taxi Stop	Facility Improvement	F-5
9.	Carolina Beach Ferry/Taxi Stop	Facility Improvement	F-1
10.	Central Marina/Independence Terminal	Terminal and Vessel	F-6
11.	Wrightsville Beach Ferry/Taxi Stop	Facility Improvement	F-4

Subcommittee Recommendation for 2045 Ferry and Water Transportation Policies

- A. Prioritize safety for operators and passengers by maintaining regulatory compliance and utilizing industry best practices for ferry systems.
- B. Recognize existing and potential ferry routes as public transit opportunities to connect pedestrian, bicyclist, and bus networks.
- C. Increase tourist and commuter ridership of existing ferry routes by improving facilities and adapting to changes in demand.
- D. Promote the viability of additional water transportation routes through a private or public/private partnership with local boat operators.

Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

Scoring Methodology for Ranking Ferry and Water Transportation Projects

Scale	Goal	Criteria:	Attribute:	Score
25	Safety	Reduce conflicts with non-ferry automobile traffic and multimodal traffic at ferry terminals	Adds waiting/stacking capacity onsite	20
			Adds crosswalk and cyclist crossing for Fort Fisher Blvd and ferry entrance access	
			Adds lights and/or signs calling attention to walkers and cyclists	
		Improve the efficiency of evacuation operations	Connects evacuation routes	5
	Standardizes/expands facilities accessible to ferry			
10	Environmental Responsibility	Minimize environmental disturbance of ferry operations	Study or mitigation plan for shoaling	10
			Study or mitigation plan for environmental impacts	
			Limits impacts to extent of previously disturbed site	
25	Efficiency and Level of Service	Improve the overall transportation network in terms of congestion management and the efficient use of public infrastructure	Connects evacuation routes to detour CMA	10
			Standardizes/expands facilities accessible to ferry	
			Reduces number of cars traveling to CMA	
			Reduces vehicle miles travelled	
			Adds daily or long-term parking at terminal	
		Improve capacity of existing ferry routes to reduce wait times and vehicles left behind	Adds service capacity (per hour/per day)	15
			Adds capacity for commuter "rush hour" traffic	
			Adds capacity for seasonal tourist traffic	
25	Modal Integration	Improve access to and quality of intermodal ferry terminal and marina facilities	Adds pedestrian connection to facility	10
			Completes sidewalk connection route	
			Connects to sidewalk network	
		Increase infrastructure to promote cycling to and from the ferry terminals	Completes continuous bike route to facility	5
			Connects to bike network	
		Improve public transit connections to ferry terminals	Connects to or adds transit infrastructure at terminals	10
			Increases connectivity to existing bus routes	
			Increases connectivity to transit stops	
		15	Economic Development	Enhance and maintain ferry service to tourist destinations and local employment areas
Route connects to employment center				
Route connects to tourism center				
Incorporate passenger amenities such as shuttles, waiting areas, and	Completes sidewalk connection route			5
	Improves existing terminals for passengers			

		sidewalks into future service facility design		
		Expand ferry capacity at rush hour to encourage commuting by ferry	Reduces number of cars traveling to CMA	5
			Adds service capacity (per hour/per day)	
			Connects to park and ride lots	
			Adds daily parking at terminal	

To create a ranked list of the proposed Ferry and Water Transportation projects, the subcommittee developed criteria by assigning a value to objective attributes with identifiable and measurable metrics. To maintain transparency of the process, it was important that metrics were data driven. This process should allow for replication of point assignments using available quantitative and qualitative datasets.

Ferry projects were awarded the score value based on a “yes/no” or “presence/absence” judgement after reviewing the project scope and description developed by the subcommittee. Projects meeting the metric of any single attribute or combination of multiple attributes listed for a given criteria qualify for the points assigned.

Point totals were used to sort projects into a ranked list. Although 100 points were potentially available for all projects, the total score of each project relative to 100 points does not represent its value to the region. The ranked list will need to be further evaluated and revised based on funding eligibility and regional needs.

The subcommittee recognized the importance of future analysis through the NCDOT Prioritization process and potential for project refinement by WMPO jurisdictions, partners, and community stakeholders.



Transportation 2040 Alternative Funding Sources

Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, February 14, 2018



Projected Recurring Federal, State, and Local Revenues

- Initial project lists for the Transportation 2040 identified the need for \$11 billion in transportation improvement projects
- The forecast funding for the life of the plan, based on prior funding trends, state and local expenditures, and likely future funding levels, estimated only \$3.7 billion in funding
- \$7.3 billion shortfall



Board Supported Alternative Funding Options

- Quarter-Cent Local Option Sales Tax
- Quarter-Cent Local Option Sales Tax for Transit
- Vehicle Registration Fees
- Motor Vehicle License Tax
- Vehicle Rental Tax
- Statewide Auto Parts Tax
- Transportation Bonds*
- Tolling*



Quarter-Cent Local Option Sales Taxes

For All Transportation Improvements

- Implemented at the County level by voter referendum, per NCGS 105-535
- Funds can be used for any county-maintained service
- Sales tax does not apply to groceries, Rx drugs, gas, automobile purchases, and utilities
- NHC approved quarter-cent tax in 2010, additional legislative changes and voter referendum to add additional
- Pender Co could generate additional \$800,000 if implemented

For Transit Improvements

- Implemented at the County level by voter referendum, per NCGS 105-506
- Only Counties that operate a mass transit system can consider
- Funds can be used to finance, construct, operate, and maintain transit system
- Can also be utilized for projects supporting the transit system, like bike/ped infrastructure and signal improvements
- NHC could generate between \$8 and \$10 million if implemented



Vehicle Related Taxes and Fees

Vehicle Registration Fee

- County administered tax, enabled by NCGS 105-570
- All generated fees utilized to finance, construct, operate, and maintain transit system
- Maximum \$7 per registered vehicle in county (NHC could generate \$1 million annually)
- Wave Transit requested implementation of tax in NHC in 2013, was denied

Motor Vehicle License Tax

- Municipality administered tax, enabled by NCGS 20-97
- Maximum \$5 tax (municipalities operating transit system eligible for additional tax up to \$5)
- Basic tax revenue utilized for any public purpose
- Tax revenue from additional transit tax eligible for financing, construction, operations, and maintenance of transit system
- City of Wilmington could collect \$360,000 annually



Vehicle Related Taxes and Fees, Cont'd

Vehicle Rental Tax

- County administered tax, enabled by NCGS 153A-156
- Levy tax on gross receipts of vehicle rentals (passenger and cargo vehicles, trailers and semitrailers) in county up to 1.5%
- Levy tax on gross receipts of heavy equipment (construction, earth moving, industrial equipment) rentals up to 1.2%

Statewide Auto Parts Tax

- Generates close to \$8 million annually statewide
- Estimated if switched to a local tax the region could obtain additional \$184,000 annually



Annual Alternative Funding Projections (from 2018 - 2040)

Funding Source	Annual Revenue Projection
Quarter-Cent LOST	\$9,800,000
Quarter-Cent LOST for Transit	\$9,000,000
Vehicle Registration Fee	\$1,000,000
Motor Vehicle License Tax	\$101,000
Vehicle Rental Tax	\$1,900,000
Statewide Auto Part Tax	\$184,000
Annual Total	\$21,985,000
2018 – 2040 Total	\$505,655,000



Project Specific Alternative Funding Methods

Transportation Bonds

- Municipal level, authorized by NCGS 159-43
- Require voter approval, allow jurisdiction to buy and sell bonds to investors, enabling funds for transportation projects sooner
- Wilmington has passed transportation bonds in the past, most recently in 2014 a \$44 million bond was passed.

Tolling

- The North Carolina Turnpike Authority was created under NCGS 136-89
- The Authority is authorized to study, plan, develop, construct, operate, and maintain up to nine projects
- All toll revenues must be used to increase capacity, rebuild, repair, or maintain the facility for which the toll was collected
- At time of plan adoption, Cape Fear Crossing was a Turnpike project



Questions?

