



MPO Board Meeting Minutes
6th Floor Training Conference Room, 320 Chestnut Street, Wilmington, N.C.
Wednesday, July 27, 2022

Members Present (in-person)

Lynn Barbee, Town of Carolina Beach
Brenda Bozeman, Town of Leland
John Ellen, Town of Kure Beach
Deb Hays, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority
David Piepmeyer, Chair, Pender County
Luke Waddell, City of Wilmington
Eulis Willis, Town of Navassa

Members Present (remotely)

Jonathan Barfield, Jr., New Hanover County
Mike Forte, Brunswick County
Hank Miller, Vice Chair, Town of Wrightsville Beach
Landon Zimmer, NC Board of Transportation

Others Present (in-person)

Pat Batleman
Zach Bugg, Kittelson & Associates
Gene Conti, Jr.
Adrienne Cox, NCDOT
Scott A. James, WMPO
Chad Kimes, NCDOT
Andy Koeppel
Mike Kozlosky, WMPO
Abby Lorenzo, WMPO
Caitlin Marks, NCDOT
Tyler Newman, BASE
Rebekah Roth, New Hanover County
David Roy, NC Turnpike Authority
Greer Shivers, WMPO
Emma Stogner, WMPO
Eric Terashima, Colonel USMCR (retired)

Others Present (remotely)

Bob Bates
Blake
T Canales
Veronica Carter, Town of Leland
Garrett Cox
Nick Craig

J Dayton
P Drye
Patrick Flanagan, Cape Fear RPO
Liam Ford
Travis Gilbert
R Greene, Jr.
Kayla Grubb, Volkert
Regina Hopkins, WMPO
Katie Hite, NCDOT
Tracy Hamm
Cheryl Hannah, HDR
Deb
Kim
Jamar Johnson, WMPO
J Rouse
Amy Kimes, Surf City
Bill Kincannon, HDR
D Kolosky
Rachel LaCoe, New Hanover County
Deb LeCompte, Town of Carolina Beach
K Lorbacher
Rachel McIntyre, WMPO
J Orona
Laura Padgett
Marie Parker, Wave Transit
Amy Passaretti, Port City Daily
Seth Poole
Ea Ruth, 2022 President of Cape Fear REALTORS®
Theresa
Nazia Sarder, NCDOT
Johanna Still
Tony Sumter, NCDOT IMD
Radha Krishna Swayampakala
Jen Thompson
Jacob Vlanich
Warren Walker
Nate Wiggins
Brayton Willis

1. **Call to Order**

Chairman Piepmeyer called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He asked if this would be the last remote meeting. MPO Executive Director Mike Kozlosky responded that if the Governor lifts his order, the next meeting will follow the MPO's Remote Participation Policy.

Chairman Piepmeyer pointed out that WMPO was one of the first MPOs to implement and use remote attendance for meetings, which has caught on and been applied throughout the state. He said that it would continue to be a convenient option, although the policy limits it to exceptions.

Mr. Kozlosky called the roll, and a quorum was found to be present as follows:

Present: Lynn Barbee, Jonathan Barfield, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Mike Forte, Hank Miller, David Piepmeyer, Luke Waddell, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Absent:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson and Deb Hays.

2. **Conflict of Interest Statement**

Chairman Piepmeyer read the conflict-of-interest statement. He asked if any member had a conflict of interest with any of the items on the meeting agenda. No members reported having a conflict.

3. **Approval of Board Members' Excused Absences**

Mr. Kozlosky said that Mike Allen has requested to be excused.

Mr. Miller made a motion to excuse Mr. Allen. Mr. Barbee seconded the motion and it carried unanimously by roll call as follows:

Ayes: Lynn Barbee, Jonathan Barfield, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Mike Forte, Hank Miller, David Piepmeyer, Luke Waddell, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Neil Anderson and Deb Hays. **Excused:** Mike Allen.

4. **Approval of the Agenda**

Mr. Ellen made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. Bozeman seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously by roll call as follows:

Ayes: Lynn Barbee, Jonathan Barfield, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Mike Forte, Hank Miller, David Piepmeyer, Luke Waddell, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Neil Anderson and Deb Hays. **Excused:** Mike Allen.

5. **Public Comment Period**

Mr. Andy Koeppel spoke to the MPO Board about "Bridges" and expressed appreciation to Mr. Kimes for the three-pronged approach. He expressed concerns that the prioritization process alone would probably not be able to provide the necessary funding, that any toll proposal for a bridge to downtown would be "dead on arrival," and that adding a southern bridge to the conversation is unpopular. He commented that the bridge being described as end of life is a false narrative. He noted that there are 70 or more vertical lift bridges around the country that are far older than the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge with no thought to dismantling them. Regarding the hesitancy to approach the General Assembly, the Ravenel Bridge in Charleston was built with contributions from every county in the state through its legislature as a source of funding.

Mr. Gene Conti, Jr., Raleigh, former Secretary of North Carolina DOT, spoke to the MPO Board about the "Bridge Proposal" on behalf of United Bridge Partners (UBP), which submitted an unsolicited proposal to NCDOT about 18 months ago. He pointed out that although tolls are unpopular, they are a solution where other funding can't be found. He noted for example, the Triangle Expressway in Raleigh, in which CAMPO

considered a road without tolls would be delivered in 25 years or with tolls in three (3) years. He added that the toll option was chosen and helping with traffic in the Triangle Area, and its extension will help with traffic from Greensboro and the northwest of the state to the beach, avoiding Research Triangle Park (RTP).

Mr. Conti said that no one wanted the Monroe Expressway as a toll road either, but it was needed as an option to get off US 74 in Charlotte. He pointed out that UBP is in a unique position because it has cash in hand in the form of a capital fund meaning it can start work as soon as authorized and finish the work promptly. He added that the bridge in Portsmouth, Va., is a successful electronic toll project that was built by UBP and offered to take a delegation there to see it. He requested that the Board consider the proposal seriously. He commented that it would be important to do something soon because the bridge is old and needs to be replaced.

Chairman Piepmeyer expressed appreciation to Mr. Conti, who traveled far to speak today.

6. Presentation

a. Congestion Management Process Data Support- Zachary Bugg P.E., Kittelson

Associate Engineer Zachary Bugg, Kittelson and Associates, gave a presentation on the Congestion Management Process (CMP). He said that the study focused on 30 critical study corridors within the MPO area for which an interactive dashboard has been developed. He noted that previous studies relied on manual labor to collect travel time data, and this study relies on Probe Data, the National Performance Management Research Data set, which the Federal Highway Administration encourages Transportation Management Area's such as the MPO to use.

Mr. Bugg displayed the travel time data for Market Street as an example. He explained the formula for corridor delay $[(\text{actual travel time} - \text{free flow travel time}) / \text{corridor length}]$. He noted that for the MPO area, greater than two minutes per mile (College Road), and greater than 1.5 minutes per mile (Market Street, College Road and Gordon Road) are the worst delays.

Mr. Bugg gave an overview of Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR), which is a ration of 80% travel time divided by mean travel time (50%). He said that a ratio greater than 1.3 is considered unreliable based on every metropolitan area in the U.S. although, MPOs can set individual goals. He reported that none of the WMPO study corridors had reliability ratios greater than 1.3 and several had ratios greater than 1.2, as follows:

<u>AM Peak</u>	<u>PM Peak</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gordon Road• US 17 (Porters Neck)• US 17/76/Memorial Bridge• Front Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• College Road• Gordon Road• Market Street (east of College Road)• Oleander Drive• Front Street

Mr. Bugg gave an overview of year-over-year trends, 2019 versus 2021. He said that several corridors had a travel time that decreased by more than 10% and a few had travel times that increased such as US Highway 17 near Hampstead. Generally, travel time has stayed the same since 2019 or improved. He attributed the differences to more people working from home and flexing commute patterns. He displayed the dashboard and gave a demonstration of sorting and comparing the data.

7. Consent Agenda

- a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from June 29, 2022
- b. Opening of the 30-day public comment period for 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendment #22-5
- c. Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modification #22-6

Ms. Bozeman made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda, Items 7a through 7c. Ms. Hays seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously by roll call as follows:

Ayes: Lynn Barbee, Jonathan Barfield, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Mike Forte, Deb Hays, Hank Miller, David Piepmeyer, Luke Waddell, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Neil Anderson. **Excused:** Mike Allen.

8. Discussion

- a. 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #22-7

Mr. Kozlosky stated that this item is for informational purposes only and will be brought back at the Board’s next meeting for consideration.

- b. Cape Fear Memorial Bridge Replacement- Project Delivery Options

Mr. Kozlosky said that at the Board’s February meeting, the Board adopted a resolution requesting NCDOT to explore all options for the replacement the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge including tolls and previous proposals.

NCDOT Division 3 Engineer Chad Kimes gave an update on the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge Replacement. He said that after the resolution was adopted, NCDOT formed a committee consisting of those from the Division, NC Turnpike Authority, the Chief’s office, and MPO (Mike Kozlosky). He noted that the three-pronged approach for delivery options consists of traditional, conventional toll, and alternative. Since the bridge replacement feasibility study was conducted several years ago, the first step was to obtain updated costs, consistent with NCDOT’s current practice of updating costs for STIP projects every two years. Updated replacement costs are as follows:

Options	Construction costs	Utility relocation costs	Right-of-way costs	Total Costs
Fixed span 65’ vertical clearance	\$227.4 M	\$2.2 M	\$11.6 M	\$241.2 M
Fixed span 135’ vertical clearance	\$346.0 M	\$3.7 M	\$41.8 M	\$391.5 M
Moveable span 65’ vertical clearance	\$687.8 M	\$2.2 M	\$11.6 M	\$701.6 M
Moveable span 65’ vertical clearance with railroad track component	\$885.8 M	\$2.2 M	\$11.6 M	\$899.6 M

Mr. Kimes pointed out that the cost increases for the options are \$50 million, \$145 million, \$200 million, and \$300 million, respectively. As for Traditional Delivery, he noted that the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge replacement is unfunded in the current STIP. In spring of 2023, new projects will be submitted for Prioritization 7.0 (P7.0). Even though Prioritization 6.0 was suspended, some important steps were taken such as ranking projects. The Cape Fear Memorial Bridge was submitted and scored around the 40th percentile. He reminded the Board that traditionally, only projects in the 20th percentile achieve funding in the Statewide category.

He said that for the Regional tier, funds totaling roughly \$900 million are shared with another Division. He pointed out that funding the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge would take an entire 10-year program, and nothing else can be built. He added that the same is true for the Division level of

funding. However, going into Prioritization 7.0, funding for the bridge replacement will be sought, perhaps in conjunction with other options.

Regarding Conventional Toll Delivery, David Roy, Chief Financial Officer, North Carolina Turnpike Authority, said that the Turnpike Authority's role in this process was to consider replacement of the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge as conventional toll project delivered through the Authority similar to the Triangle Expressway. He pointed out that no toll project in the State of North Carolina can move forward without the express consent and approval of a MPO or RPO. Additionally, in 2019, the NCDOT Board of Transportation adopted a toll project delivery policy for evaluating future toll projects. He added that there are four main inputs for a toll project: Traffic and Revenue Forecast, Capital Cost Estimate, Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Estimate, and Renewal and Replacement (R&R) Estimate.

Regarding Alternative Delivery, Mr. Roy said that in April, the Department issued a Request for Information (RFI) soliciting ideas from the industry for alternative delivery or funding options. He noted that the responses were due in May and that nine were received regarding buildability, alternative financing, operations and maintenance models, and project viability. He said that all but one included public-private partnerships (PPP). The outlier expressed interest in traditional design-build, design-bid-build delivery.

Mr. Kozlosky said that he sent out a summary of those responses yesterday, which have also been distributed to Board members at the table.

Mr. Roy said that the Department developed a summary of the responses and asked about the FHWA debrief primer. Mr. Kozlosky responded that he shared that with the Board last week. Mr. Roy said the primer was developed by USDOT several years ago and commented that it provides good information about the various alternatives that were discussed including Design-Build-Finance-Operate, Maintain (DBFOM) with or without a Pre-Development Agreement (PDA).

Mr. Roy said that from a funding perspective, there were two camps: toll revenue supported versus STI funds mostly in the form of availability payments or payments the Department would make over the life of the project to the developer or concessionaire. He noted that one or two of the responses included value capture mechanisms as a concept for funding the bridge, which is some form of tax increment financing, impact fees, development fees, etc., which are outside the Department's statutory authority.

Mr. Kimes said that regarding free highways, that no segment may be converted to a toll route without first being approved by the MPO Board. Regarding Bonus Allocation, Mr. Kimes noted that implementing a toll for the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge would allocate to the MPO an amount up to \$100 million in funding for projects within New Hanover and Brunswick counties.

Mr. Kimes said that grant opportunities exist that would impact benefit over cost to help a project score better or improve the cost of tolling. He noted that all grant opportunities would be pursued. However, he cautioned that there are no guarantees of an award, and the amount is not 100% (there always a non-federal match required of 20% to 50%). Also, there is no preliminary design or environmental document (NEPA), the project is not in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and no funds have been identified for a required match.

Chairman Piepmeyer asked about preliminary design. Mr. Kimes responded that for the \$400 million option, preliminary design might roughly cost 10% or \$40 million. He noted that it may be possible to consider funding a portion of the project in P 7.0 or through bridge funding.

Mr. Kimes said that potential grants identified are as follows:

Bridge Investment Program	\$50 million minimum	50% local match
Multimodal Project Discretionary Grants (MEGA and INFRA)	\$100-\$500 million	20%-40% local match
RAISE Grants	\$25 million maximum	20% local match

Chairman Piepmeyer inquired about the cost to administer the grant. Mr. Kimes responded that if NCDOT applies for the grant, it would cover the administration cost.

Mr. Kimes said that the unsolicited proposal that was presented is still viable. He noted that it still would need to go through the competitive bid process. However, the first step is MPO approval. He noted that during the steps of the NEPA document and preliminary design, grant funding can be sought. He added that the process can be stopped at any time prior to award during the 2.5- to three (3)-year window.

In summary, Mr. Kimes said that NCDOT will continue to submit for grants to offset the cost and will continue with Prioritization 7.0. He commented that conventional tolling may bring a significant portion, but not likely all the funds, and could be combined with traditional funding to reduce the cost of tolling. He pointed out that alternative delivery allows the delivery of the project much faster than a traditional project – and more than likely it would be a toll. Lastly, the unsolicited proposal is still on the table. He noted that NCDOT will continue to go through the steps for traditional funding. He reiterated that the unsolicited proposal, alternative delivery, and traditional tolling cannot move forward without the MPO Board’s approval.

Regarding public acceptance of tolling, Mr. Waddell asked about studies of the potential ramifications of changing commuter behaviors related to a toll bridge. Mr. Kimes responded that it would be necessary for the project to be in the programming phase for a more thorough traffic and revenue study with public hearings to collect public feedback.

Mr. Waddell pointed out that this information is critical part of the decision, which will have a tremendous impact on City of Wilmington infrastructure. Based on 2019 commuting data from the Census, Brunswick County had about 45,000 employed individuals, 26,500 of whom commute outside Brunswick County, and 50% of that number commute to New Hanover County. He commented that with inflation and the cost of fuel, 40% cannot afford tolls and might take an alternate route adding 5,000 trips a weekday or 1,005,000 trips a year that would impact City roads. He commented that he is a proponent of exploring all viable options and take pragmatic solutions to difficult solutions.

Mr. Waddell expressed concerns that the Cape Fear region has been designated as a beta test for tolling existing roadway projects. He pointed out that the citizens of Wilmington will have a difficult time understanding why they must foot the bill for aging infrastructure and the huge shift in commuter behavior that will likely be a result of a toll bridge. He speculated that majority of constituents might take the position that the Department should re-evaluate its scoring criteria to be more objective. He added that replacing an aging bridge with a multi-modal facility that will connect multiple towns and counties and supports a growing port should take a high priority with

the state over an additional interstate that would make it quicker for folks in Raleigh and Charlotte to get to the beach. Folks in the southeastern North Carolina as just as much North Carolinians as those in Raleigh and Charlotte and expect representation.

Mr. Roy agreed that some divergence can be expected with a toll. He pointed out that the sketch-level, six-week, \$25,000 traffic and revenue analysis does not get into that level of detail. A more detailed investment grade traffic and revenue analysis is a nine (9)- to 12-month process.

Mr. Barfield commented that the toll charge for his recent trip to Charlotte and back was \$8 and expressed concerns regarding the average citizen being able to afford such an expense daily. He commented that it would be great to have a pedestrian facility like South Carolina's. However, South Carolina funds projects at a local level, so cities and towns can enact taxes or fees for road projects in a specific area. He pointed out that North Carolina is one of seven states where DOT does the roads. He expressed concerns regarding the difficulty of getting projects funded here, for a bridge that is the main artery in and out of an urban and economic development center in eastern North Carolina, while projects in smaller towns throughout the state are happening. He expressed an interest in finding clout in Raleigh to influence projects in the region. He commented that he remains very much opposed to a toll project here.

Mr. Zimmer commented that the amount of clout does not matter, because this is a STIP issue, which is objective, and a science. Unfortunately, the science shows that the area cannot sustain the funding, and outside funding needs to be sought.

Ms. Bozeman concurred with Mr. Waddell and Mr. Barfield. She expressed concerns with the way that this was done. She commented that the way that this was brought forth was underhanded, and the lack of transparency gives members a bad name. She questioned why grants have not been sought yet. She suggested that if this bridge is tolled, that the ones to the beaches need to be tolled as well, and even the Hampstead Bypass should be tolled.

Mr. Ellen expressed concerns that the Board voted not to support a toll asked how long it lasts before voting again. Mr. Kozlosky responded that Mr. Ellen was absent at the February meeting when the Board voted for NCDOT to explore all possible options for the replacement of the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge. He added that the language in the resolution was explicit to include tolls as an option as well as the previous proposal.

In response to an inquiry by Vice-Chairman Miller, Mr. Kozlosky said that the vote was nine (9) to three (3). Vice-Chair Miller said that nine (9) people are being accused of being underhanded. He noted the only deviation was to add "to include tolls." He pointed out that the county leaders and the city leaders, of Wilmington and Brunswick County need to figure out what they want. He commented that he followed the rules.

Mr. Zimmer said he is the only non-elected member on the Board. He asked what the problem is with getting more information. He reiterated that this process can be stopped at any point prior to award. He pointed out that this is free data provided by NCDOT.

Mr. Barfield expressed concerns regarding spending \$10 million on feasibility study for a fourth crossing, only to have it scrapped, and wasting taxpayer money on fruitless projects when it could be of better use elsewhere. He pointed out that the last time this was brought up, there was a lot of notice to the community, great community interest and people knew it was on the agenda. He commented that items of great importance not on an agenda are a disservice to the community.

Chairman Piepmeyer refocused the discussion and concurred with Mr. Zimmer's point that this is continued education relative to the process of replacing the bridge. He added that NCDOT, the expert, has indicated that the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge is near the end of its life. He commented that the timeline is vital, the inflationary period may be over by the fall of 2025, and things economically may be very different. He acknowledged the resistance to tolls and pointed out that residents of Charlotte may get a reduced toll rate.

Mr. Roy clarified that a reduced rate is available for those with a transponder. He added that no toll structure has been contemplated in detail for this facility.

Chairman Piepmeyer commented that the bridge will not be funded in this STIP or an upcoming STIP. So, it will be a substantial period before the bridge is built. He recognized with Mr. Waddell's comments that the criteria may need to be tweaked and added that he and Vice-Chairman Miller are willing to stop it today if that is the will of the Board. He agreed with Mr. Zimmer's comments that there is no harm in being better educated about the process, which can be stopped any time.

Mr. Willis said that his Board told him specifically that they do not want a toll. He noted that if the MPO Board is going to consider a toll, he would need to go back to his Board to see what they want, because he needs to answer to the Town of Navassa.

Mr. Waddell commented that without understanding the potential change in commuter behavior, he can't speak for the rest of City Council and the Mayor, although they would take issue to tolls. He expressed an interest in learning about the options, such as the cost.

Chairman Piepmeyer asked if the project could be better positioned for traditional funding. Vice Chairman Miller pointed out that the MPO Board is merely having a discussion and members have an opportunity to discuss this with their respective Boards.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Barfield, Mr. Kimes said that the bridge is perfectly safe today. However, depending on the type of funding to replace it, it is necessary to discuss replacing it today. He said that maintenance costs are increasing every day, and that the biggest concern is the moveable span.

Ms. Hays asked about starting the project. Mr. Kozlosky responded that the project would need to score in the STIP before NCDOT could begin any Preliminary Engineering (PE) or work on the project. Optionally, the Board could allocate some Direct Attributable funds. He advised that a funding mechanism needs to be determined. He pointed out that the challenge is that the project doesn't score high enough for traditional delivery and it won't produce enough revenue as a conventional toll.

Ms. Hays asked about the funds from the sales tax. Mr. Kimes said that the entire amount goes back into the STI.

Mr. Forte said the bridge discussion has been ongoing since he joined the Board six years ago. He pointed out that this is the fastest growing region in the state, and the towns that would benefit the most from a bridge replacement are against it. However, he commented that he doesn't see the project happening without a toll.

Ms. Bozeman commented that its wrong not to find a way where it won't hurt everyday people.

Mr. Kozlosky said that the challenge is to find a way for the project to score high enough to be programmed in the STIP or look at some other funding option.

Ms. Bozeman pointed out that the STIP is broken. In response to an inquiry by Ms. Hays, Mr. Kimes said that modifications to the STIP need to go through the legislature.

Chairman Piepmeyer said that the ask to change the criteria needs to be specific, with an understanding of the potential ramifications to all projects. He noted that he did this with the Hampstead Bypass to understand the inputs and drivers to make it score better.

Mr. Ellen pointed out that the MPO Board voted not to support tolls and to explore all the options.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Zimmer, Mr. Roy said that tolls would need to go to the construction of the bridge but may allow for some flexibility with the toll structure. He noted that he cannot advocate for tolls, only educate. According to existing statutes, the debt to pay for a project comes from tolls, and toll revenues generated from a project must stay with the project for a continuous toll facility and cannot be used for other projects around a region or the state.

Mr. Barbee pointed out that for constituents, tolls are not good. However, opponents to tolling are prematurely stopping the process of finding alternative sources beyond tolling.

Chairman Piepmeyer commented that tourism will help pay for the bridge, that pay-for-use is the best form of paying for anything, and public-private enterprises are the most successful in staying on budget and on time.

Mr. Waddell concurred that pay-for-use is best for user fees for sports complexes and parking. However, roads and bridges seem different when they've been paid for with state revenue previously. He asked about other instances of tolling an existing roadway. Mr. Roy said that tolling an existing facility cannot be done without MPO approval. He noted that a small portion of the Triangle Expressway was existing.

Chairman Piepmeyer expressed appreciation for the discussion and to Mr. Kimes and Mr. Roy.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Hays, Mr. Kozlosky said that NCDOT will proceed with traditional delivery. If the Board wants to look at tolling, the unsolicited proposal or alternative funding, NCDOT will need an action from the Board. He noted that he has taken some notes regarding the question, comments and concerns from the Board, and staff will prepare a summary and forward it to NCDOT. If there is a desire for action, staff will put an item on the agenda.

Mr. Waddell requested a summary of the options as well. Mr. Kozlosky says there are three options: traditional delivery, conventional tolling, and alternative delivery.

Ms. Hays requested a bullet list of steps to get the bridge on the STIP. Chairman Piepmeyer responded that the score is 40 out of 80 and will stay that way unless the criteria changes.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Bozeman, Chairman Piepmeyer clarified that he did not change the STIP, only studied it to understand the formula better. Mr. Kozlosky added that the Hampstead Bypass was originally one project that was broken into phases. Chairman Piepmeyer said that the original project was \$330 million, and the phases scored better.

Ms. Hays expressed a desire to move the project forward. Discussion continued about breaking the bridge into phases (PE, NEPA). Mr. Kozlosky said that the MPO Board could put some of the Direct Attributable funds towards PE. Mr. Kimes noted that bridge funds are another potential funding source, although it cannot pay for the bridge.

9. Updates

- a. Wilmington Urban Area MPO
- b. Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority
- c. NCDOT Division
- d. NCDOT Transportation Planning Division

Mr. Kozlosky said the updates are included in the agenda packet and expressed appreciation to the Board.

10. Announcements

- a. Wilmington MPO Bike/Pedestrian Committee-August 9th
- b. Next MPO Board Meeting – August 31st

Mr. Kozlosky noted that if the Governor lifts his order on August 15th, the Board will operate under the Remote Meeting Policy, which allows members to participate remotely two times per year. However, the intention is for Board members to meet in person.

Chairman Piepmeyer said that he will not be present for the next Board meeting.

11. Adjournment

Mr. Ellen made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Bozeman, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call as follows:

Ayes: Lynn Barbee, Jonathan Barfield, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Mike Forte, Deb Hays, David Piepmeyer, Luke Waddell, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Neil Anderson and Hank Miller. **Excused:** Mike Allen.

The meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Kozlosky
Executive Director
Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

THE ABOVE MINUTES ARE NOT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS.
THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS ARE RECORDED DIGITALLY AS PART OF THIS RECORD.