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
Board
Meeting Agenda

TO: Wilmington Urban Area MPO Board Members
FROM: Mike Kozlosky, Executive Director
DATE: June 22, 2022
SUBJECT: June 29th meeting

A meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area MPO Board will be held on Wednesday, June 29, 2022, at 3 pm.
The meeting will be held in the 6th Floor Conference Room at 320 Chestnut Street downtown Wilmington.
The public may attend the meeting in person. Due to COVID-19, pursuant to N.C.G.S. sec. 166A-19.24
the public and Board Members may also attend the meeting remotely as follows:

The meeting will be simultaneously streamed live online so that simultaneous live audio, and video, if any,
of the meeting is available to the public at the following URL:
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83969107282?pwd=QnlxYWhHxliMHlyek5JQXhHbDh1Zz09

The public may also dial in and listen to the simultaneous live audio of the remote meeting at the following
dial in number: 646 558 8656 or 301 715 8592. And when prompted, enter:
Meeting ID: 839 6910 7282
Passcode: 920663

Please join the meeting from your computer, tablet, or smartphone.

The following is the agenda for the meeting:

1) Call to Order
2) Conflict of Interest Statement
3) Approval of Board Member Excused Absences
4) Approval of the Agenda
5) Public Comment Period
   Persons wishing to submit a public comment to be shared during the MPO Board meeting may
do so by 5 pm on June 28, 2022, by calling (910) 341-3258 to leave a message or by e-mailing
comments to wmpo@wilmingtonnc.gov. The public voicemails will be played aloud and the
public comment e-mails will be read aloud by a staff member during the meeting. Per the
adopted Public Participation Plan, public comments shall be limited to 3 minutes.
6) Presentations
a. TET Coalition/NCDOT Mileage-Based User Fee Pilot for Elected Officials- Amna Cameron, NCDOT (p. 4-5)
b. Town of Kure Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan- Jason Reyes, Alta Planning + Design

7) Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from May 25, 2022 (p. 6-9)
   b. Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendments #22-3 and #22-4 (p. 10-13)
   c. Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modification #22-5 (p. 14-17)
   d. Resolution requesting Administrative Modifications to the 2020-2029 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Public Transportation Projects (p. 18)
   e. Resolution approving the Go Coast Committee’s model policy for Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules (p. 19-22)
   f. Resolution supporting the Mobility for Everyone, Everywhere in North Carolina (MEE NC) grant application to the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Rural Surface Transportation Grant Program (RURAL) (p. 23-24)
   g. Resolution approving the Scoring Criteria and Competitive Process for the FY 23 Surface Transportation Block Grant-Direct Attributable, Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Direct Attributable, and Carbon Reduction Programs (p. 25-44)
   h. Resolution adopting the Town of Kure Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (p. 45-103)

8) Regular Agenda
   a. Resolution requesting the North Carolina Department of Transportation Explore Extending Interstate 685 from Dunn to Wilmington in North Carolina (p. 104-111)

9) Discussion
   a. 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #22-6 (p. 112-114)
   b. Initial Draft 2024-2033 State Transportation Improvement Program (p. 115-169)

10) Updates
   a. Wilmington Urban Area MPO (p. 170-176)
   b. Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority (p. 177-178)
   c. NCDOT Division (p. 179-181)
   d. NCDOT Transportation Planning Division (p. 182-183)

11) Announcements
   a. Wilmington MPO Bike/Pedestrian Committee-August 9th

12) Next meeting – July 27, 2022

Attachments
- Eastern Transportation Coalition/NCDOT Mileage-Based User Fee Pilot for Elected Officials Summary
- MPO Board Meeting Minutes- May 25, 2022
- Proposed 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendments #22-3
- Proposed 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendments #22-4
- Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendments #22-3 and #22-4
- Proposed 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modification #22-5
- Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modification #22-5
- Resolution requesting Administrative Modifications to the 2020-2029 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Public Transportation Projects
- Draft Go Coast Committee’s model policy for Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules
- Resolution approving the Go Coast Committee’s model policy for Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules
- Resolution supporting the Mobility for Everyone, Everywhere in North Carolina (MEE NC) grant application to the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Rural Surface Transportation Grant Program (RURAL)
- Proposed FY 23 Surface Transportation Block Grant-Direct Attributable, Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Direct Attributable, and Carbon Reduction Program Scoring Criteria and Competitive Process
• Resolution approving the Scoring Criteria and Competitive Process for the FY 23 Surface Transportation Block Grant-Direct Attributable, Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Direct Attributable, and Carbon Reduction Programs
• Town of Kure Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
• Resolution adopting the Town of Kure Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
• NC Carolina Core Article
• Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) Page 168
• Maps of Proposed Extension of Interstate 685 from Dunn to Wilmington in North Carolina
• Resolution requesting the North Carolina Department of Transportation Explore Extending I-685 from Dunn to Wilmington
• Proposed 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #22-6
• 2024-2033 Initial Draft State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs (Wilmington MPO and Statewide)
• 2024-2033 Initial Draft State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs Projects Available to Swap
• 2024-2033 Initial Draft State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs Presentation-NCDOT
• 2024-2033 Initial Draft State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs Presentation-WMPO
• Wilmington Urban Area MPO Update (June)
• Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority Update (June)
• NCDOT Division Project Update (June)
• NCDOT Transportation Planning Division Project Update (June)
The Eastern Transportation Coalition is a partnership of 17 states and Washington D.C. dedicated to advancing the national conversation around Mileage-Based User Fees through real-world pilots, data analysis, education, and outreach. As vehicles go farther on less fuel and some stop using fuel at all, it will be harder to maintain our transportation system. To explore alternative solutions, the Coalition is partnering with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) to conduct a Mileage-Based User Fee Pilot Program (MBUF), where each driver pays for the miles they drive instead of the fuel they buy. The Pilot will help determine if a MBUF would be a more equitable and financially sustainable approach.

**PARTNER PACKET**

**2022 Pilot Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 6 Launch</td>
<td>July 31 Last day to sign up for Pilot</td>
<td>Oct. 31 Pilot concludes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How Can You Get Involved?**

- Share information about the Pilot with your networks and encourage others to enroll in the Pilot.
- Post our social media content to your channels. Packets will be provided by our team.

If you know people that are interested and want to learn more, call a team member at 984-254-7400 or visit our website at NorthCarolinaMBUFpilot.com.

---

**1. Enroll** - Fill out the enrollment form by clicking the link on the website.

**2. Insert** - Plug a small device into your vehicle to record mileage.

**3. Drive** - Then drive as you normally do.

**4. Return** - After a few months, mail back the device.

*These steps may vary depending on the mileage-reporting option selected.*
How does the Azuga Insight Connected Vehicle Platform work?

Azuga Insight designed and operates the Connected Vehicle Platform that supports the MBUF system. The platform’s process is simple:

• Enroll in the Pilot by providing your personal and vehicle information.
• Select your mileage reporting option (MRO). See below for more details about the MROs.
• Activate your MRO and user account.

Drive normally. Azuga Insight will collect and manage your daily mileage and fuel use for the Pilot.

The Pilot provides drivers all the services and benefits of the Azuga Connected Vehicle Platform at no cost when they participate in the Pilot.

How much does it cost to participate in The Eastern Transportation Coalition MBUF Pilot?

No cost. If you join the Pilot, both participation in the Pilot and access to premium features are free. Fuel tax credits are simulated for the Pilot, and no actual money is exchanged.

What is Azuga Insight?

Azuga Insight is a private company working in partnership with the Coalition to facilitate and manage the technology services for the Pilot. Azuga Insight has been selected by the Coalition to offer mileage-based user fee services for the Pilot. The Azuga Insight platform has been built and tested to provide safe and secure MBUF operations in compliance with security requirements of the Pilot while also providing premium features to participants.

What MROs are available if I sign up for the Pilot?

The following four options are available from Azuga Insight: Plug-in Device with GPS, Plug-in Device without GPS, Manual Odometer Entry, and In-Vehicle Telematics. The Plug-in Devices (with or without GPS) are inserted into the On-Board Diagnostics II port on your vehicle.

• Plug-in Device with GPS: The GPS-enhanced Plug-in Device differentiates miles driven by the state where the miles were accrued and calculates the fuel usage fees in each state. The simulated MBUF is charged only on miles driven in states that partner with the Coalition. This option also provides maps of your trip routes for your personal use. Route information is not provided to the Coalition, state departments of transportation, or any other third party.

• Plug-in Device without GPS: This Plug-in Device option has no GPS to identify which states the vehicle was driven. All miles recorded are assumed to have occurred in the participant’s state of residence using the non-location “per mile rate” for that state.

• Manual Odometer Entry: This is a basic “low-tech” option that the participant provides monthly odometer readings throughout the Pilot. Participants choosing this option provide their vehicle’s odometer readings by logging into an online account management portal hosted and maintained by Azuga Insight and manually entering the odometer value. The odometer reading can also be entered using a smartphone app by taking a picture of the odometer and uploading the image.

• In-Vehicle Telematics: The In-Vehicle Telematics option is available for most newer vehicles manufactured with telematics technology, which can be used to report vehicle mileage data automatically. If approved, the participant will be required to enable telematics service on the enrolled vehicle, authorize Azuga Insight to receive automatic vehicle odometer data, and keep the subscription active for the duration of the Pilot (which may involve additional cost). Detailed step-by-step instructions for authorizing In-Vehicle Telematics will be provided to the approved participants after enrollment.

Will the government be able to see my driving data and location?

No. All program-related data remains secure and confidential. All Pilot data is destroyed shortly after the completion of the Pilot. If a location-enabled MRO is chosen, precise location and routing information—other than the number of miles driven in each state—is not disclosed. Moreover, all data is anonymized for research purposes.
MPO Board Meeting Minutes  
6th Floor Training Conference Room, 320 Chestnut Street, Wilmington, N.C.  
Wednesday, May 25, 2022

**Members Present (in-person)**  
Neil Anderson, City of Wilmington  
Lynn Barbee, Town of Carolina Beach  
Jonathan Barfield, Jr., New Hanover County  
Brenda Bozeman, Town of Leland  
Mike Forte, Brunswick County  
Deb Hays, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority  
David Piepmeyer, Chair, Pender County  
Luke Waddell, City of Wilmington

**Members Present (remotely)**  
Mike Allen, Town of Belville  
John Ellen, Town of Kure Beach  
Hank Miller, Vice Chair, Town of Wrightsville Beach  
Eulis Willis, Town of Navassa

**Others Present (in-person)**  
Adrienne Cox, NCDOT  
Scott A. James, WMPO  
Nikki Cooper, WMPO General Counsel  
Chad Kimes, NCDOT  
Mike Kozlosky, WMPO  
Abby Lorenzo, WMPO  
Denis McGarry  
Matt Nichols, WMPO General Counsel  
Greer Shivers, WMPO  
Emma Stogner, WMPO

**Others Present (remotely)**  
Veronica Carter, Town of Leland  
Patrick Flanagan, COG, RPO  
Cheryl Hannah, HDR  
Lauren Haviland, NCDOT  
Jamar Johnson, WMPO  
Deb LeCompte, Town of Carolina Beach  
Rachel McIntyre, WMPO  
Marie Parker, Wave Transit  
Amy Passaretti, Port City Daily  
R Royster  
Nazia Sarder, NCDOT  
Tony Sumpter, NCDOT-IMD

**a. Call to Order**  
Chairman Piepmeyer called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

MPO Executive Director Mike Kozlosky acknowledged the presence of new Board member Luke Waddell, representing the City of Wilmington in place of Charlie Rivenbark, who resigned.

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

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

**b. 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.

**c. Approval of Board Members’ Excused Absences**  
Mr. Kozlosky said that none of the MPO Board members have requested to be excused from this meeting.

**d. Approval of the Agenda**  
Mr. Barfield made a motion to approve the agenda as presented.
Ms. Hays seconded the motion and it carried unanimously by roll call as follows:

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

e. **Public Comment Period**
Mr. Denis McGarry, resident of South Third Street, spoke to the MPO Board regarding the request for stoplights on South Third Street that he made to the MPO Board at its October meeting. He reminded the Board that 55 accidents have occurred along the six-block section of the road this year, and 52 accidents occurred the prior year. Since October, another accident occurred involving a 13-year-old boy from St. Mary’s who crossed the street during daylight hours with the pedestrian crossing lights flashing.

Mr. McGarry said that he has collected 670 signatures on a petition requesting stoplights. He noted that NCDOT conducted a study of traffic flow and recommends traffic lights at Orange Street and Ann Street for an estimated cost of $1.4 million. He commented that NCDOT has added this to its list of projects and the MPO will be asked to add it to its list of projects. He added that funding for the project and the required 20% local match have yet to be identified.

f. **Closed Session**
Chairman Piepmeyer made a motion to enter into a closed session for the purpose of discussing two separate matters.

i. The first matter is a closed session to discuss personnel matters pursuant to Section 143-318.11 (A) (6) of the General Statutes.

ii. The second matter is a closed session to discuss with the MPO’s attorney matters within the attorney-client privilege pursuant to Section 143-318.11 (A) (3) of the General Statutes.

Mr. Anderson seconded the motion and it carried unanimously by roll call as follows:

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

***

Mr. Barfield made a motion to return to open session, seconded by Mr. Anderson, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call as follows:

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

g. **Consent Agenda**

a. **Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from April 27, 2022**

b. **Opening of the 30-day public comment period for 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendment #22-4**

c. **Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modification #22-4**

d. **Resolution approving the 2022 Focus Areas and Action Steps for Implementation of the 2022-2026 Strategic Plan**

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

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

h. **Regular Agenda**
   a. **Resolution approving Amendment #1 to the FY 23 Unified Planning Work Program**
      MPO Deputy Director Abby Lorenzo explained that Amendment #1 to the FY23 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) includes the continuation of 5304 funds that were incorporated into the MPO’s FY22 UPWP. She noted that the funds are part of a contract between the Federal Transit Authority (FTA), Wave Transit, and NCDOT’s Integrated Mobility Division (IMD) to be used to develop a zero-emissions vehicles transition plan as well as engineering and design for infrastructure for charging stations. She added that the funds require a 20% local match, which is being provided by the Integrated Mobility Division. She pointed out that there is no additional cost to members and that the workplan for FY23 is being amended to show the pass-through funds.

      Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve Amendment #1 to the MPO’s FY23 UPWP. Ms. Hays seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously by roll call as follows:

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

i. **Discussion**
   a. **2020-2029 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #22-5**
      Mr. Kozlosky stated that this administrative modification is for informational purposes only and will be brought back at the Board’s next meeting for consideration.

   b. **Go Coast Committee’s Model Policy for Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules**
      Ms. Lorenzo said that this model policy was developed by the Go Coast Committee over the course of several months in response to a need for navigating a return to the workplace following the COVID-19 pandemic. Prior to the pandemic, 25% of MPO area residents reported being able to work from home at least one day a week. By July 2020, the percentage increased to 69%. She noted that many public and private employers lack formal policies for allowing alternative and telecommuting schedules. She explained that the intent of the model policy is to provide a guide for employers seeking to amend or implement a policy. Ms. Lorenzo requested comments from the Board. She noted that a final draft will be brought to the MPO Board for consideration at its next meeting.

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

Mr. Kozlosky acknowledged the presence of the MPO’s new GIS Analyst, Greer Shivers. Ms. Shivers expressed appreciation and gave a brief overview of her background.

Mr. Kozlosky displayed an award that was presented at NCDOT’s Mobi Award ceremony on May 4th to the MPO and the Town of Leland in the Small Urban category for the Old Fayetteville Road Multi-use Path and Resurfacing Project. He noted that the award will be displayed at the MPO offices as well as at the Town of Leland.
Mr. Kimes said that efforts regarding the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge Replacement are on track for a presentation to the MPO Board in late July. He noted that the RFI (Request For Information) that was sent out closes tomorrow at 4:00 p.m. He added that NCDOT staff will review submissions next week.

k. **Announcements**
   a. **525 North 4th Street Groundbreaking Ceremony- May 31st**
   b. **Wilmington MPO Bike/Pedestrian Committee-June 14th**

Mr. Kozlosky said that the groundbreaking ceremony for 525 North 4th Street will be postponed due to some contractual issues that may impact the potential start date. He noted that the City issued a notice to proceed on May 19th. He noted that at the pre-construction meeting with the contractor on Thursday, the contractor indicated an anticipated start date of August 15th, which conflicts with the City’s policy to mobilize within 10 days of the noticed to proceed. Currently, the MPO is working with the City’s legal staff and Purchasing Division staff to determine a new start date.

Mr. Kozlosky said that the next Bike/Pedestrian meeting will be June 14th and the MPO Board’s next meeting will be June 29th.

l. **Adjournment**

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

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

**Absent:** Landon Zimmer.

The meeting adjourned at 4:19 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.**
STATEWIDE PROJECT

STIP ADDITIONS

NCDOT, 5311 ADTAP CAPITAL FUNDING FOR RURAL TRANSIT.
ADD FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.

FY 2023 - (S)
$137,000
FY 2023 - (L)
$137,000
FY 2023 - (5311)
$1,097,000
$1,371,000

* TC-0003
STATEWIDE PROJECT
STATEWIDE PUBLIC TRANS PROJECT CATEGORY

STATEWIDE PROJECT

- NCDOT, FEDERAL AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN (ARP) FUNDS FOR CAPITAL
ADD FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.

FY 2023 - (ARP)
$500,000
$500,000

* TC-0026
STATEWIDE PROJECT
STATEWIDE PUBLIC TRANS PROJECT CATEGORY

STATEWIDE PROJECT

- NCDOT - INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION STATE ADMINISTRATION - FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE IMD WITH PROVIDING SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT AND PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS AND PLANS FOR SMALL URBAN AND RURAL AREAS. (5311 ADMIN/OPERATING/CAPITAL AND 5311 (F)).
ADD FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.

FY 2023 - (5311)
$3,950,000
$3,950,000

* TM-0002
STATEWIDE PROJECT
STATEWIDE PUBLIC TRANS PROJECT CATEGORY

STATEWIDE PROJECT

- NCDOT - INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION STATE ADMINISTRATION - FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE IMD WITH PROVIDING SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT AND PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS AND PLANS FOR SMALL URBAN AND RURAL AREAS. (5311 CAPITAL - ADTAP).
ADD FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.

FY 2023 - (5311)
$150,000
$150,000

* TM-0004
STATEWIDE PROJECT
STATEWIDE PUBLIC TRANS PROJECT CATEGORY

STATEWIDE PROJECT

- NCDOT, FEDERAL AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN (ARP) FUNDS FOR CAPITAL
ADD FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.

FY 2023 - (ARP)
$2,000,000
$2,000,000

* TC-0026
STATEWIDE PROJECT
STATEWIDE PUBLIC TRANS PROJECT CATEGORY

STATEWIDE PROJECT

- NCDOT, FEDERAL AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN (ARP) FUNDS FOR CAPITAL
ADD FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.

FY 2023 - (ARP)
$157,000
$157,000

* TC-0003
STATEWIDE PROJECT
STATEWIDE PUBLIC TRANS PROJECT CATEGORY

STIP ADDITIONS

STATEWIDE PROJECT

(March 2022)
STIP/MPO TIP Amendment #22-3
Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs
## STIP Additions

(March 2022)

STIP/MPG TIP Amendment #22-3

Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPG TIP Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STIP Additions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEWIDE PROJECT**

**STIP Additions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$522,000 (5310)</td>
<td>$522,000</td>
<td>$522,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STIP Additions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$370,000 (5303)</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STIP Additions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,501,000</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEWIDE**

**PUBLIC TRANS**

**STIP Additions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 (FEDT)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEWIDE**

**PUBLIC TRANS**

**STIP Additions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,000,000 (5310)</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEWIDE**

**PUBLIC TRANS**

**STIP Additions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEWIDE**

**PUBLIC TRANS**

**STIP Additions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000 (5320)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

ENGINEERING

FY 2023 -

(5G02CV)

$50,000

FY 2023 -

(L)

$7,000

RIGHT-OF-WAY

FY 2023 -

(5G02CV)

$46,000

FY 2023 -

(L)

$7,000

CONSTRUCTION

FY 2024 -

(5G02CV)

$132,000

FY 2024 -

(L)

$19,000

FY 2025 -

(5G02CV)

$132,000

FY 2025 -

(L)

$19,000

$412,000

* BL-0059

NEW HANOVER

DIVISION

PROJECT CATEGORY

FT-0021

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

- PLANNING

FY 2023 -

(L)

$20,000

FY 2023 -

(5303)

$80,000

$100,000

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

- STIP ADDITIONS

FORT FISHER BOULEVARD, K AVENUE, AND NORTH 3RD STREET, INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING ADA CROSSWALKS, PEDESTRIAN ACTUATED PUSH BUTTONS, AND SIDEWALK CONNECTIONS IN KURE BEACH.

ADD PROJECT AT THE REQUEST OF THE MPO.

ADD PROJECT AT THE REQUEST OF THE MPO.

PROJ.CATEGORY

PUBLIC TRANS

NEW HANOVER

DIVISION

TU-0012

PROJECT NAME

TU-0012

PROJECT NAME

TU-0012

STIP/MPO TIP Programs

CONSTRUCTION

FY 2023 -

$912,000

FY 2024 -

$1,092,000

FY 2025 -

$1,920,000

FY 2026 -

$1,920,000

FY 2027 -

(5G02CV)

$1,920,000

FY 2028 -

(5G02CV)

$72,000

FY 2029 -

(5G02CV)

$50,000

ENGINEERING

FY 2023 -

$500,000

FY 2024 -

$500,000

FY 2025 -

$500,000

FY 2026 -

$500,000

FY 2027 -

(5G02CV)

$500,000

FY 2028 -

(5G02CV)

$500,000

FY 2029 -

(5G02CV)

$500,000

CONSTRUCTION IN KURE BEACH.

CONSTRUCTION IN KURE BEACH.

CONSTRUCTION IN KURE BEACH.

CONSTRUCTION IN KURE BEACH.

CONSTRUCTION IN KURE BEACH.

CONSTRUCTION IN KURE BEACH.

CONSTRUCTION IN KURE BEACH.

CONSTRUCTION IN KURE BEACH.

CONSTRUCTION IN KURE BEACH.
WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Board has found that the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization is conducting transportation planning in a continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive manner; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Board of Transportation adopted the 2020-2029 State Transportation Improvement Program on September 5, 2019, and the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Board adopted the Statewide/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs on October 30, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization desires to amend the adopted 2020-2029 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Amendments #22-3 and #22-4; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization has conducted a 30-day public comment period to receive citizen input on these proposed amendments.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby approves amending the 2020-2029 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Amendments #22-3 and #22-4.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on June 29, 2022.

______________________________
David Piepmeyer, Chair

______________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
STATEWIDE PROJECT
STIP MODIFICATIONS
STATEWIDE, 5339(b) DISCRETIONARY GRANT FOR FACILITY CONSTRUCTION
MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 22 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC-0010</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2022 - (L)</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2022 - (5339)</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,650,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC-0008</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2023 - (L)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2023 - (5339)</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC-0007</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2023 - (L)</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2023 - (5339)</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC-0005</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2022 - (L)</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2022 - (5339)</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,650,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2022 (L)</th>
<th>FY 2022 (5339)</th>
<th>FY 2023 (S)</th>
<th>FY 2023 (L)</th>
<th>FY 2023 (5303)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC-0011</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT - STATEWIDE, 5339(b) DISCRETIONARY GRANT FOR FACILITY CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$790,000</td>
<td>$2,647,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$10,809,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-0012</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT - STATEWIDE, 5339(b) DISCRETIONARY GRANT FOR PURCHASE OF ELECTRIC BUSES AND CHARGING STATIONS</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$2,650,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$11,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU-0006</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT - STATEWIDE PROJECT - PROJ.CATEGORY- PUBLIC TRANS - ACQUISITION</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td>$2,647,000</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$10,032,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU-0012</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT - STATEWIDE PROJECT - PROJ.CATEGORY- PUBLIC TRANS - FACILITY CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$5,700,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$18,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STIP MODIFICATIONS**

Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs

(4/22/22)

STIP/MPO TIP Modification #22-5
WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

CONSTRUCTION

FY 2028 - (T)$500,000
FY 2028 - (O)$4,500,000

$5,000,000

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

STIP MODIFICATIONS

WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM), EXTEND RUNWAY 6-24 PHASE 1
AT THE REQUEST OF THE DIVISION OF AVIATION, WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM), EXTEND RUNWAY 6-24 PHASE 1
CONSTRUCTION

SR 1217 (17TH STREET) INSTALL NEAR SIDE SIGNAL HEADS ON A PEDESTAL ON BOTH SIDES OF SR 1217 AT DOCK STREET IN WILMINGTON.

TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL TIME FOR PLANNING AND DESIGN, DELAY CONSTRUCTION FROM FY 22 TO FY 23.

CONSTRUCTION

FY 2023 - (HSIP)$34,000

STIP/MPO TIP MODIFICATIONS

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

(4/17/2022)
STIP/MPO TIP Modification #22-5

Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs
WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BOARD

RESOLUTION APPROVING ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS #22-5 TO THE 2020-2029 STATE /MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Board has found that the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization is conducting transportation planning in a continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive manner; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Board of Transportation adopted the 2020-2029 State Transportation Improvement Program on September 5, 2019, and the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Board adopted the Statewide/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs on October 30, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization desires to modify the adopted 2020-2029 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Administrative Modifications #22-5.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby approves modifying the 2020-2029 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Administrative Modifications #22-5.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on June 29, 2022.

__________________________________
David Piepmeyer, Chair

__________________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
RESOLUTION REQUESTING ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS TO THE 2020-2029 STATE/MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority, and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority has respectfully requested an administrative modification to the 2020-2029 State and Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Transportation Improvement Programs in FY 23; and

WHEREAS, the requested modifications are outlined below:

- TO-4751/Operating/Federal $1,796,522/State $600,000/Local $1,196,522/Total $3,593,044
- TG-5243/Preventative Maintenance/Federal $900,000/State $0/Local $225,000/Total $1,125,000
- TP-5110/Planning/Federal $152,000/State $0/Local $38,000/Total $190,000
- TG-5246/ADA Comp Para/Federal $316,500/State $0/Local $79,125/Total $395,625

WHEREAS, the requested public transportation administrative modifications are required to be submitted by the Metropolitan Planning Organization to the North Carolina Department of Transportation for consideration; and

WHEREAS, if approved, the administrative modifications will be submitted to the North Carolina Department of Transportation and will be considered for formal approval as an upcoming Administrative Modification to the 2020-2029 State and MPO Transportation Improvement Programs.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby requests Administrative Modifications to the 2020-2029 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for these public transportation projects.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on June 29, 2022.

__________________________________________
David Piepmeyer, Chair

__________________________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
Alternative Work Schedule and Telework Schedule Model Policy

Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
Go Coast Program

PURPOSE

This model policy was developed by the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (WMPO) Go Coast Committee. Go Coast, the region’s Transportation Demand Management Program, aims to reduce traffic congestion caused by the use of single occupancy vehicles by emphasizing the movement of people over motor vehicles. Go Coast attempts to mitigate traffic congestion by encouraging the use of alternative transportation such as bicycling, walking, carpooling, using public transit, and teleworking; so that while the population of the region grows, our time spent in a vehicle does not. This model policy is intended to be used as a resource for Wilmington area employers to guide regulations and expectations surrounding alternative work schedules and telework schedules.

COVID-19 has had a clear effect on working trends. Prior to the pandemic, a reported 25% of WMPO Area residents worked from home at least one day a week. That number increased to 69% by July 2020. 61% of these respondents also claimed they were just as, if not more, productive while working from home compared to in an office setting. The City of Wilmington 2021 Citizen Survey revealed that residents view increasing traffic congestion is the principal challenge facing the city today.

According to data provided by the United States Census Bureau, the population in the WMPO region is expected to increase by 40% by the year 2045; the population in Wilmington alone is expected to increase by 50%. Go Coast works to increase the utilization of alternative transportation to mitigate traffic congestion and reduce the number of multi-million-dollar roadway projects needed to accommodate more personal vehicles. These trip-reduction strategies can have a positive impact on roadway congestion, specifically during peak commuting hours, and can be an effective benefit to employees. By enabling WMPO area employees to utilize alternative work schedules and telework schedules, local employers may see improved employee satisfaction, increased retention, reduction in overall absenteeism, reduced office space costs, and a reduction in the need for parking infrastructure.

Alternative work schedules and telework schedules may be requested and provided for a number of reasons. Work-life balance, family commitments, commuting distance, and personal preference are examples of valid motives for adopting an alternative work or telework schedule. This model policy may be used as a guide for any WMPO area organization that wishes to implement or amend an alternative work schedule or telework schedule policy. As a model, the language in this policy may be revised to best suit the organizations’ needs.
POLICY

Employees may request to work a schedule other than the traditional work hours of 8:00am – 5:00pm Monday through Friday. Requests may be formally submitted by the employee to their direct line manager. Upon approval, the Department Lead will give notice to Human Resources if the employer elects for Human Resources to keep a record of individuals participating in an alternative work schedule or teleworking schedule. The total work hours required each week cannot be altered by a flexible work schedule, nor will flexible schedules result in overtime. Part-time, probationary, and temporary employees may also be assigned an alternative schedule at the discretion of the department.

1.0 Guidelines

1.1 An employee may request an alternate work schedule or teleworking schedule by submitting the request in writing to their immediate supervisor. The supervisor will provide a recommendation to the Department Lead. The Department Lead will provide final approval or denial of the request. A written notice of approval or denial will be proved by the Department Lead to the requestor.

1.2 Employees should consult with supervisors in composing schedules that allow the employee to complete their duties under adequate provisions for security, supervision, facilities and/or personnel access.

1.3 Service to customers and the employees’ personal safety must be considered in reviewing flexible schedule arrangements.

1.4 Accessibility during a majority of business hours is required for the adoption of an alternative work schedule or teleworking schedule.

1.5 The utilization of alternate work schedules or teleworking schedules will in no way alter pay periods, pay days, leave policy or procedures, or any other administrative processes. Failure of the individual or department to comply with time reporting requirements will result in disqualifying the work.

2.0 Alternate Work Schedule and Telework Options

2.1 Flex-Schedule – A standard workweek (40-hours for full-time employees) is completed but there is flexibility in establishing daily start and quit times. Days of the workweek may have varying start and quit times, but the pattern should recur or be consistent over each workweek. For example: a flex-schedule could include working on-site from 7 am to 4 pm, or 9 am to 6 pm, in contrast to the traditional 8 am to 5 pm schedule.

2.2 Compressed Workweek – Alternative work arrangement where a standard workweek is reduced to fewer than five days, and employees make up the full number of hours per-week by working longer hours. Examples of this option include working four, ten-hour days or 4, nine-hour days and a half day on a fifth day.

2.3 Teleworking – An alternative work option where at least one or more days per pay period are worked from a secondary work location. While teleworking, an employee may be assigned a flextime, compressed or conventional work schedule.
2.3.1 As a standard, the employee must provide, at their own cost, adequate high-speed internet access if their telework requires connectivity to the internet or access to the organization’s network. The employer shall provide installed software on the employee’s computer to allow secure network connections.

2.3.2 Supervisors shall set clear expectations for the employee(s) while teleworking and should evaluate this work option regularly.

2.3.3 Employees who telework outside the office setting are still responsible for complying with all of the organization’s policies and procedures.

- Department Leads set the expectations for operational needs and are, therefore, responsible for approving telework schedule requests based upon the operational needs of their department. Here are some things for Department Leads to consider when approving telework schedules for their employees:
  - Will the employee’s direct supervisor be able to effectively supervise the employee that has a telework schedule?
  - Are onsite meetings/interaction with supervisors and other employees necessary for the type of work the employee does?
  - Are documents the employee uses available electronically?
  - Should any training be completed before allowing the employee(s) to telework?
  - Is the employee(s) in possession of the appropriate equipment to effectively telework?
  - Does employee meet performance expectations to telework effectively?

- Supervisors are responsible for setting clear expectations for employee(s) while teleworking. Expectations for teleworking should be agreed to and documented prior to approving the request. These expectations should address all the following issues:
  - Agree upon the office hours or regularly scheduled times that the employee(s) will be available.
  - Determine timelines for responding to emails and phone calls.
  - Supervisors must determine and then communicate to the employee(s) the appropriate means for clocking in/out or reporting time.
  - If working with confidential material/information, supervisors must ensure the employee has a private office or location to work remotely so information is not shared with others.

- Supervisors and Department Leads are responsible for determining the effectiveness of the alternative work schedule or teleworking schedule once it has been approved. Here are some considerations for Supervisors and Department Leads when evaluating whether an alternate work schedule is working:
  - Regularly check to see if the employee’s work assignments are being completed accurately and in a timely manner.
  - Depending on the nature of the employee’s work, Supervisors may request employee(s) to keep a log of the various action items they are working on and to report project completion on a regular basis.

- If it is determined that an alternative work schedule or teleworking schedule is not effective for a particular employee, a Supervisor or Department Lead may revoke the arrangements previously agreed upon and return the employee back to their regular schedule. Supervisors may also amend these agreements at any time in order to suit changing department needs.
RESOLUTION APPROVING THE GO COAST COMMITTEE’S MODEL ALTERNATIVE WORK AND TELECOMMUTING SCHEDULES POLICY

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority, and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Go Coast Committee is tasked with providing recommendations on policies regarding transportation demand management strategies and initiatives in order to redistribute trips typically taken within a single-occupancy-vehicle through time and mode choice; and

WHEREAS, through this role the Go Coast Committee encourages area employers to consider the implementation of these strategies and initiatives; and

WHEREAS, the population and development within the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s planning area boundary is continuing to increase, thereby increasing the demand of the current transportation network; and

WHEREAS, the Covid-19 pandemic and subsequent office closures resulted in the ability for many area residents to complete their job duties from their residence; and

WHEREAS, the Go Coast Committee recognizes the importance and need to support area employers with resources necessary to implement transportation demand management strategies including alternative work and telecommuting schedule options; and

WHEREAS, the Go Coast Committee, in coordination with Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization staff, developed these standards and language as a model policy to be used as a resource for its affiliates and members; and

WHEREAS, the proposed policy is for recommendation purposes only and would require adoption by individual employers before the proposed standards would take effect; and

WHEREAS, the Go Coast Committee voted to approve the language in the model policy and to recommend that the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Board endorse the model ordinance at their meeting on February 17, 2022.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby approves the Go Coast Committee’s Model Alternative Work and Telecommuting Schedules Policy.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on June 29, 2022.

__________________________________________
David Piepmeyer, Chair

__________________________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BOARD

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE MOBILITY FOR EVERYONE, EVERYWHERE IN NORTH CAROLINA (MEE NC) GRANT APPLICATION TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION’S RURAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM (RURAL)

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority, and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Rural Surface Transportation Grant Program (RURAL) will support projects to improve and expand the surface transportation infrastructure in rural areas to increase connectivity, improve the safety and reliability of the movement of people and freight, and generate regional economic growth and improve quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation has developed the Mobility for Everyone, Everywhere (MEE NC) in North Carolina grant application for these RURAL funds; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation’s Integrated Mobility Division’s vision and strategy is to partner with the state’s rural transit systems to launch on-demand micro-transit throughout the state; and

WHEREAS, micro-transit is a technology-enabled transit system that uses shuttles or vans to provide pooled, on-demand transportation with dynamic routing; and

WHEREAS, this service provides several benefits to riders including more efficient and responsive service, reduced wait and travel times, and flexibility to address changing mobility needs; and

WHEREAS, rural transportation challenges in North Carolina are a formidable barrier to accessing critical services and opportunities, particularly for residents in lower incomes, disabilities, and without access to a vehicle; and

WHEREAS, by addressing public transportation, MEE NC will fund on-demand services tailored to each community’s needs and vision and will tangibly and meaningfully improve the lives and economies of North Carolinians by increasing rural populations’ access to employment opportunities, healthcare, and essential services.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby supports the North Carolina Department of Transportation’s Mobility for Everyone, Everywhere in North Carolina (MEE NC) grant application to the United States Department of Transportation’s rural Surface Transportation Grant Program.
ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on June 29, 2022.

__________________________________________
David Piepmeier, Chair

__________________________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
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Introduction

The Federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) infrastructure package was signed into law on November 15, 2021, revising and expanding the funds available for qualifying projects. Several elements of the new bill allow for greater flexibility in the application of federal funds to infrastructure projects. The Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WMPO) is the recipient of allocated funds for STBGP Direct Attributable, Transportation Alternatives Set Aside and Carbon Reduction Efforts in the following amounts for the fiscal year of October 1, 2022 thru September 30, 2023:

- Direct Attributable: $3,673,700
- Transportation Alternatives Set Aside: $462,484
- Carbon Reduction Efforts: $492,634

(Note: there is some flexibility with allocation of funds across the above categories.)

The funds will be awarded in a manner similar to past allocations made via the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) and amended the provisions contained in 23 U.S.C. 133. STBGP funds have broad latitude for use on metropolitan transportation planning and projects and in support of the Federal-aid system per 23 U.S. C. 133. Specific eligibility criteria and guidance can be found through the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA www.fhwa.dot.gov).

The IIJA funds are available for obligation until September 30, 2026, with any amounts not obligated on or before this date to be returned. Furthermore, the Federal share payable shall be up to 80% percent of qualifying costs. All projects, including public transportation projects, requesting STBGP-DA or TASA-DA or Carbon Reduction funds must submit a formal funding request. A competitive process will be used to determine which projects are funded.

Follows are brief summaries of the three main categories. Additional information is available on the FHWA website for STBGP administration: www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/)

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program – Direct Attributable

The Surface Transportation Block Grant program (STBG) provides flexible funding that may be used for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on any Federal-aid highway, bridge and tunnel projects on any public road; pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals.
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program – Transportation Alternatives Set Aside

The TA Set-Aside provides funding for a variety of projects such as pedestrian and bicycle facilities; construction of turnouts, overlooks and viewing areas; community improvements such as historic preservation and vegetation management; environmental mitigation related to storm water and habitat connectivity; recreational trails; safe routes to school projects; and vulnerable road user safety assessments.

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program – Carbon Reduction

The purpose of the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) is to reduce transportation emissions through the development of State carbon reduction strategies and by funding projects designed to reduce transportation emissions.
Eligibility Criteria

In order to be eligible for funding, a project must meet the minimum criteria outlined in this section. Also, a completed application must be submitted by the applicant(s). Co-applications may be submitted in a primary applicant and secondary applicant format. Incomplete applications will not be considered. These criteria meet federal and state funding requirements, as well as the goals of the WMPO for STBGP- DA/TA/CR dollars as adopted by the Board. Projects that do not meet these criteria will not be considered for funding.

1) Federal Aid Eligible Projects
   The federal eligibility requirements associated with Surface Transportation Block Grant Program can be found in 23 USC §133 (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/160307.cfm).

2) Locally Administered
   The applicants (if awarded) shall be responsible for all federal and state reporting requirements associated with STBGP- DA, STBGP – TA or STBGP – CR funding. The local government entities are also expected to make progress reports to the Board upon request. An inter-local agreement between the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and the designated recipients will outline a reimbursement schedule. Local sponsors will be required to front all project costs, invoice NCDOT, and then receive reimbursement for the project. The WMPO may assist in coordination between NCDOT and the local government entities, however, the ultimate responsibility for the NCDOT agreements remains with the local government entities.

3) Compliant with the adopted MTP/LRTP
   Projects must be identified in the WMPO’s current and adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). For this submittal period, the MTP is the Cape Fear Moving Forward 2045 Plan. A copy of the current plan can be found here: http://wmpo.org/plans/regionwide-plans.

4) Locally funded with funding commitment
   All funds programmed with IIJA dollars require a minimum 20% local match. The funds are payable up to 80% percent of qualifying costs. Local government entities are responsible for funding cost overruns on projects in excess of the final programmed cost estimate. This provision may be reviewed at the discretion of the WMPO Board and through additional Surface Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) amendments by the Board of Transportation, if needed.

5) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
   Projects not in compliance with an existing TIP category will require a TIP amendment. Applicants should note that the TIP amendment process could delay
the funding obligation timeline.

6) **Federal Highway Funds versus Federal Transit Authority Funds**
Projects from local transit authorities whose proposed improvements are typically not listed within FHWA categories may have funding ‘flexed’ to the Federal Transit Agency (FTA) to allow for disbursement of these funds. This is an additional step, undertaken after the funding award. Applicants should note that the processing time for authorization is longer due to the additional level of review.

7) **Project Design Intent**
Project design intent must meet or exceed Federal, State and local guidelines for design elements, including any minimum widths, safety elements or controls.

8) **Project Cost**
Total Cost of Project = 20% local match + 80% requested from WMPO

For example, if the total project cost is estimated at $250,000, the local match amount would be $50,000 and the amount requested would be $200,000.

**Program Administrative Details**

1) **Project Submittal Limits**
Please limit submittals to no more than thirty (30) pages, including appendices.

2) **No Unfunded Project Carry-Over**
Projects submitted that are not prioritized for funding are not automatically considered for funding in subsequent years. Any unfunded project may be resubmitted in subsequent years for funding.

3) **Construction Requirement within 10 years**
As a federal funding source, the use of funds must result in achieving Construction Authorization of the project within 10 years of the fiscal year when Preliminary Engineering was authorized. As a result, projects that have cost overruns must be accounted for through a commitment of local funds through the construction phase. This provision may be waived by the approval for additional funding from the WMPO Board and through additional STIP amendments by the Board of Transportation, on a case by case basis.
Application Materials

Applicants are required to submit the following materials with their application:

- Funding Request Submittal Form
- Map of project (See Exhibit A for an example)
- Signed resolution of financial support (minimum 20%) from local government
- Detailed Engineer’s Opinion of Probable Construction Costs
- Project Schedule highlighting key milestone dates (i.e. deadlines for plan submittals at applicable stages, dates for requesting funding authorizations, etc.)
- Additional supporting documents – exhibits, additional maps, prior resolutions adopting plans that specify a need for the project, etc.

Funding Request Submittal Form

The following descriptions are to help completion of this form:

**Project Name** – A descriptive name of your project.

**Project Location** – physical location and extents of the project, with the jurisdiction.

**TIP ID#** - For projects already in the STIP, include the TIP number here.

**Total Project Cost** – An estimate of the total cost of the project for *all phases* needing completion (Design/NEPA, Right-of-Way, and Construction).

Note: local jurisdictions are responsible for 100% of actual project costs exceeding the estimations programmed through this process into the STIP. Estimated project costs are to include inspection and contract administration costs during construction and must be prepared by a licensed Professional Engineer in the State of North Carolina. If design has not been started on the project, it is recommended to use a 25% contingency.

**Requested STBGP Funding** – This is no more than 80% of the “total project cost”

**Primary Applicant** – The name of the agency submitting the application.

**Secondary Applicant** – If the applicant is a joint application include the name of the second entity applying for the funds. For example, local governments may partner with NCDOT, the WMPO, or an adjacent jurisdiction based on funding and project location.

**Project Manager** – The primary point of contact throughout the life of the project. This staff position is typically a representative of the primary applicant.
Contact Person – The person WMPO staff should contact with questions.

Project Description – A specific description of your project, including beginning and end points of the project and facility type. This should include a broad overview of the required work, plus any relevant background or context to the proposal.

Problem Statement – This can be a “Preliminary Purpose and Need Statement” to justify expenditure of funds to address a problem in a WMPO member jurisdiction. The statement should present the transportation problem to be solved as well as reference any supporting information.

Eligibility Requirements – The Eligibility Matrix should be reviewed to determine if your project is eligible for this funding source. Projects not meeting the eligibility requirements will not be considered.

Allocation of Points (100 points total):

1. Safety (25 Points)
   a. Reported Crashes over past three (3) years (up to 5 points):
      i. One (1) to five (5) – 2 points
      ii. Six (6) to ten (10) – 4 points
      iii. More than ten (10+) – 5 points
   b. Crash pattern analysis (up to 7 points)
      i. Any preventable pedestrian crashes? – Yes 5 points
      ii. Percent vehicles only (100% - 3 points)
      iii. Percent vehicle/pedestrian-cyclist, if >0% add 2 points
      iv. Percent other, if >0% add 2 points
   c. Mode separation (proposed) – up to 5 points
      i. No physical barrier – 5 points to correct
      ii. No vertical barrier – 5 points to correct
      iii. Time of day restrictions – 3 points to correct
      iv. Turn/access restrictions – 3 points to correct
      v. Road closures (partial or full) – 3 points to correct
   d. Upgrading infrastructure – up to 5 points
      i. Narrow width sidewalks – 2 points to correct
      ii. Narrow width bicycle lanes – 2 points to correct
      iii. Installing transit shelters – 2 points to correct
      iv. Other – up to 1 point
   e. Designating and installing dedicated routes (up to 3 points)
      i. Part of existing safe routes to school – 3 points
      ii. Identified pedestrian crossings – 2 points
      iii. Bicycle crossings – 2 points
      iv. Closing gaps between facilities – 2 points
2. Congestion Management/Capacity Improvements (25 points)
   a. Adding thru capacity – up to 10 points
      i. Dedicated turn lane – 5 points per direction, 10 points maximum
   b. Adding turn lanes at intersections – up to 5 points
      i. Conversion of dedicated lane to Shared thru/turn lane – 3 points
      ii. Dedicated turn lane – 5 points
   c. Restricting access - up to 5 points
      i. Limiting left turn movements – 3 points
      ii. Limiting thru movements – 5 points
   d. Revising traffic controls to improve thru capacity – up to 5 points
      i. Upgrading traffic signal phasing – 3 points
      ii. Upgrading intersection geometry – 5 points

3. Multi modal elements (20 points)
   a. Adding non-automotive capacity to existing roadways – up to 4 points
      i. Installing sidewalk – 2 points
      ii. Installing bicycle lane(s) – 2 points
   b. Extending bicycle lanes – up to 4 points
      i. Extension < ½ mile – 2 points
      ii. Extension ≥ ½ mile – 4 points
   c. Adding recreational trails – up to 4 points
      i. New SUP 10 feet wide < ½ mile length – 2 points
      ii. New SUP 10 feet wide ≥ ½ mile length – 4 points
   d. Upgrading transit infrastructure – up to 4 points
      i. Installing new transit stops (sign posts) – 2 points
      ii. Installing shelters at new/existing transit stops – 4 points
   e. Reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) – up to 4 points

4. Accessibility (15 points)
   a. Closing sidewalk gaps – up to 6 points
      i. Gap is < ¼ mile in total length – 2 points
      ii. Gap is > ¼ mile in total length – 4 points
      iii. Gap connects transit, school and/or trail – 6 points
   b. New ADA infrastructure (ramps, pedestrian signals, markings) – up to 5 points
      i. Installing/replacing ADA ramps at intersection – 2 points
      ii. Installing ADA ramps and pavement markings (crosswalks) – 3 points
      iii. Installing pedestrian traffic signal equipment – 5 points
   c. Removing/addressing barriers – up to 4 points
      i. New accessible roadway crossing – 2 points
      ii. New accessible roadway crossing w/document (crashes) – 4 points
5. Project Status (10 points)
   a. Design/Planning – 5 points
   b. Right of way acquisition – 8 points
   c. Construction – 10 points

6. Administration (5 points)
   a. Prior project – up to 5 points

Project Cost estimates

Cost of NEPA/Design Phase – Provide an estimate of the total cost of the NEPA/Design Phase. This estimate should include the cost for environmental documentation, permitting, engineering, and bid document preparation (including specifications).

Cost of Right-of-Way Phase – Provide an estimate of the total cost of the Right-of-Way Phase. This estimate includes the cost for right-of-way acquisition and utility relocation. Note that the sum of the three phase specific cost estimates (NEPA/Design, Right-of-Way, and Construction) should equal the “Total Cost of Project”. Estimates must be prepared by a Licensed Professional Engineer in the State of North Carolina.

Cost of Construction Phase – Provide an estimate of the total cost of the Construction Phase. This estimate should include the cost for materials, construction and inspections of the project. Note that the sum of the three phase-specific cost estimates (NEPA/Design, Right-of-Way, and Construction) should equal the “Total Cost of Project”. Estimated project costs must be prepared by a Licensed Professional Engineer in the State of North Carolina.

Total Cost of Project – This is a sum of the cost of NEPA/Design, Right-of-Way and Construction. The estimate used to generate the associated costs should be provided as an attachment. See appendix for example.

Funding Year Request – Federal Amount requested per Phase and Fiscal year

The STBGP-DA program allows for a multi-year award program with a recurring call for projects every year. The first two years of the program are considered committed. If a project receives funding for design, then the construction and/or Right-of-Way of that project will also be considered committed. Years 3 thru 5 of the program will compete in the next call for projects but will receive points in the application for being previously programmed.
Key Documents for Submittals

Proposed Project Map(s) – See Appendix and Exhibit A for criteria and example map.

Signed Resolution of Support

Resolution must be on the Primary Applicant’s letterhead and signed to be considered to be complete. See Exhibit C for an example resolution.

Detailed Opinion of Probable Construction Costs

Detailed Anticipated Construction Costs prepared by a licensed professional engineer along with all costs associated with producing design documents (if required). All associated costs that may be incurred with the completion of the project including engineering, right-of-way, utility relocations, construction contingencies, NCDOT inspection / materials testing and construction administration (approximately 15% of project cost), and NCDOT project administration (currently set at 3% of project cost) should be presented in a line-item cost form.

Project Schedule

Project Schedule highlighting key milestone dates (i.e. deadlines for plan submittals at applicable stages, dates for requesting funding authorizations, etc.). An example schedule is provided in the appendix.

Additional Supporting Documents

Exhibits or site photos (with labels), additional maps, safety reports, crash records, resolutions adopting plans that specify a need for the project, etc. Resolutions in support of project must have been adopted prior to call for projects.

Tiebreaker elements

In the event the number of applications exceeds the funding amount available, and one or more selected projects receive the same number of points using the evaluation matrix, the following elements will be used as a tiebreaker:

1) Existing projects will have priority over newly proposed projects, and
2) The project closest to bid phase will have priority, and
3) If necessary, the project with the lower cost shall have priority.
Submittal Guide Appendix
Fiscal Year 2022-23

Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP)
Direct Attributable (DA)
Transportation Alternatives Set Aside (TA)
Carbon Reduction (CR)
**Proposed Project Map** – This map is **required** with all applications. Map should include project and map title along with a project description and/or project extent explanation (minimum one sentence). Include below the description the following statement to indicate the affected municipality/county “STBGP-DA or TASA or CR FUNDING APPLICATION (INSERT MUNICIPALITY/COUNTY), NC.” to identify the source of funds for your request (STBGP – DA, STBGP – TA, STBGP – CR). Please format the map for 8.5 x 11 or 11 x 17 sheet of paper.

Map must show the following:

1) Full extent of proposed project (multiple sheets are allowed)
2) Inset Extent map – use the WMPO boundary Highlighted in **DARK BLUE**
3) ½ mile buffer around proposed project drawn in **RED**
4) Existing roadways drawn in **DARK GREY**
5) Existing Water Features in **LIGHT GREY**
6) Proposed project drawn in **RED DOTTED LINE** (linear projects) or **RED CIRCLE** (intersection or point projects)
7) Existing sidewalk drawn in **BLUE**
8) Existing bike lanes drawn in **YELLOW**
9) Existing greenway/multi-use path drawn in **GREEN**
10) Existing bus stop drawn as **PURPLE CIRCLE**
11) Existing crosswalks (improved intersections) drawn as **ORANGE CIRCLE**
12) Major obstacle drawn in **BROWN**
13) Mapping Elements
   a) Title
   b) Legend
   c) North Arrow
   d) Scale
   e) Length of project (if applicable)
   f) Label at minimum **5 street names** for reference on the map in **BLACK**

Note: if you are suggesting the proposed project should receive points for providing a new connection over a major obstacle, be sure to illustrate this on this map.

See Exhibit A for an example of a ‘Proposed Project’ Map
Exhibit A – Sample project map
Closing a Gap: If you are suggesting the proposed project should receive points for closing a gap, a separate map is required. Map should include project and map title along with a project description and project extent (minimum one sentence). Include below the description the following statement to indicate the affected municipality/county “STBGP-DA or TASA or CR FUNDING APPLICATION (INSERT MUNICIPALITY/COUNTY), NC.” to identify the source of funds for your request (STBGP – DA, STBGP – TA, STBGP – CR). Please format the map for 8.5 x 11 or 11 x 17 sheet of paper.

Map must show the following:

1) Full extent of proposed project
2) Inset vicinity map – use the WMPO boundary in **DARK BLUE**
3) ½ mile – 2 mile buffer around proposed project drawn in **RED**
4) Existing roadways drawn in **DARK GREY**
5) Existing Water Features in **LIGHT GREY**
6) Proposed project drawn in **RED DOTTED LINE** (linear projects) or **RED CIRCLE** (intersection or point projects)
7) Only include the existing facility that your project will be closing a gap:
   a) Existing sidewalk drawn in **BLUE**
   b) Existing bike lanes drawn in **YELLOW**
   c) Existing greenway/multi-use path drawn in **GREEN**
   d) Existing crosswalks (improved intersections) drawn as **ORANGE CIRCLE**
8) Mapping Elements
   a) Title
   b) Legend
   c) North Arrow
   d) Scale
   e) Length of project (if applicable)
   f) Label at minimum **5 street names** for reference on the map in **BLACK**

See Exhibit B for an example of a ‘Closing a Gap’ Map
Exhibit B – Sample Gap Closure project map
Exhibit C – Sample Municipal Resolution of support

(sample)

Resolution authorizing (a local government) to submit an application to the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization in the Amount of $____ for Surface Transportation Block Grant Program - Direct Attributable Funds or Transportation Alternative Set Aside – Direct Attributable for Name of Project

LEGISLATIVE INTENT/PURPOSE:

On (date) the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WMPO) issued a call for projects to agencies in its jurisdiction for Surface Transportation Block Grant Program- Direct Attributable Funding (STBGP-DA) or Transportation Alternative Set Aside – Direct Attributable (TASA-DA). A total of $____ is available to award. STBGP-DA and TASA-DA is comprised of a collection of discretionary programs including (short description of what you are applying for – for example: planning, design and construction of on- and off- road bicycle and pedestrian facilities). The funding requires a minimum 20% local cash match.

<Insert description of proposed project, including (if applicable): length, connections to other facilities, and connections to schools, shopping, etc. Include other adopted plans that recommend this project. Include estimated cost, amount of DA funds requesting, and proposed match (percentage and amount).

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That, the (appropriate person) is hereby authorized to submit a STBGP-DA or TASA-DA application in the amount of $_______ and will commit $_______ as a cash match for the (name of project)
Exhibit D – Sample Engineer’s Estimate of Probable Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CONST SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CLEAR AND GRUB</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GRADING</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$28,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CURB RAMPS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>INCIDENTAL STONE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>#57 STONE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AGGREGATE BASE CRSE</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$162,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ASPH CONC SURF CRSE, $9.5B</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$66,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SEEDING &amp; MULCHING</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>REMOVABLE BOLLARDS W/ MARKINGS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$19,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>THERMO PVT MKGLINES (4&quot;, 90 MILS)</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$2,805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>THERMO PVT MKGLINES (24&quot;, 120 MILS)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$7.60</td>
<td>$912.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Construction Subtotal $395,667.00
Contingency (10%) $39,566.70
Inspection/DOT Fees (18%) $78,342.07
Total Construction Cost $513,575.77

Note: Contingency percentage should be based on the stage of the project. If design has not been started the contingency should be higher and should be determined by the engineer performing the estimate. If the project is ready for bid the contingency should be a minimum of 10%. Also, if funding is not being requested in the first two years inflation should be taken into account as part of the contingency.
RESOLUTION APPROVING THE SCORING CRITERIA AND COMPETITIVE PROCESS FOR THE FY 23 SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM - DIRECT ATTRIBUTABLE, TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES SET ASIDE - DIRECT ATTRIBUTABLE, AND CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority, and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, on July 18, 2012, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization was designated as a Transportation Management Area (TMA); and

WHEREAS, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act was signed into law by President Biden on November 15, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board is authorized to directly program Surface Transportation Block Grant Program - Direct Attributable (STBGP-DA), Transportation Alternatives Set Aside - Direct Attributable (TASA-DA), and Carbon Reduction program funds on eligible projects submitted by eligible entities through a competitive process; and

WHEREAS, a revised methodology has been developed to reflect both recent applications and the Board’s direction provided to staff; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization has developed the FY 23 scoring criteria and competitive process for the distribution of these funds through collaboration with the Board; and

WHEREAS, the evaluation metrics will total 100 points and are structured in the following manner:

1. Safety – 25 points maximum
2. Congestion Reduction – 25 points maximum
3. Multi-modal elements – 20 points maximum
4. Accessibility improvements – 15 points maximum
5. Project Readiness – 10 points maximum
6. Administration – 5 points

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby approves the scoring criteria and competitive process for the FY 23 Surface Transportation Block Grant Program - Direct Attributable, Transportation Alternatives Set Aside - Direct Attributable, and Carbon Reduction Programs.
ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on June 29, 2022.

________________________
David Piepmeyer, Chair

________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
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PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PLANNING PROCESS

PROJECT BACKGROUND
The Town of Kure Beach has recognized residents’ desire for improved and expanded facilities for walking and biking in town. The Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WMPO) agreed to contribute funds towards the development of this Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, in consideration of the planned future bicycle and pedestrian facilities that will connect Kure Beach residents and visitors to all that the town has to offer.

PLANNING PROCESS
The planning process began with a field tour with Town staff, the WMPO, and the project consultants. The tour focused on key opportunities and constraints for walking and bicycling in town (see opposite page for detail on opportunities and constraints). The tour was followed by a meeting with Town staff and an initial public workshop, to gather further input on existing conditions and potential projects. Consultants then drafted recommendations based on that input, and presented them back to the public for further comment and feedback. Feedback received at the public workshop was extremely informative and largely supportive, particularly for projects that would improve the safety of pedestrians crossing Fort Fisher Boulevard, improve the sidewalk network, and expand separated facilities for walking and biking, such as the Island Greenway Extension.

The field tour, staff meetings, and public workshops were followed up by an implementation-focused meeting with the Town, the WMPO, and the subsequent development of this draft plan report. The Final Plan was presented to the Town in March 2022.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Kure Beach Overview
The Town of Kure Beach, NC is located south of Wilmington on a barrier island between the Cape Fear River and the Atlantic Ocean. Residents and tourists alike have long been drawn to the Town’s ocean views as well as its proximity to attractions such as the NC Aquarium and Fort Fisher State Historic Site and Museum. Kure Beach has a small commercial district with shops and restaurants, centered around Kure Beach Pier and Ocean Front Park. Fort Fisher Boulevard is the main thoroughfare through the Town, providing connectivity to Carolina Beach to the north and the state park to the south.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the population of Kure Beach is approximately 2124, consisting of about 950 households. The median household income in Kure Beach is $71,319 (compared to $54,602 in North Carolina) with a median age of 57.8 years (compared to 38.7 years statewide).

Key Opportunities and Constraints for Walking and Bicycling
According to the field tour, public input, and input from Town leadership, key factors include:

» Between N Ave & E Ave, Kure Beach’s street network is a grid pattern that is a little less than a mile long and five blocks wide at its widest. To the north and south of this area, the street network is less connected, pushing pedestrian and bicycle traffic onto Ft. Fisher Blvd/US 421. Ft. Fisher Blvd marks the eastern edge of the street network, though there is significant development between Ft. Fisher and the Atlantic Ocean. To the west, the Town is bordered by land owned by the U.S. Army’s Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU). This constrains potential infrastructure changes on Dow Rd and the existing Carolina Beach Island Greenway.

» There are several key destinations within Town that can be reached by walking and bicycling, including the Kure Beach Pier and Ocean Front Park and Pavilion, the Carolina Beach Island Greenway, and Joe Eakes Park.

» There is a narrow, relatively uneven sidewalk on the east side of Ft. Fisher Blvd from N Ave to E Ave, with narrow bike lanes on both sides to the north of N Ave and to the south of E Ave. Other sidewalks are located along K Ave, heading west to Town Hall and Joe Eakes Park, as well as in some of the private developments.

» Because of low traffic volumes and speeds, nearly every street in Town can already be used for walking and bicycling, but conditions could be improved further with wider sidewalks, more visible crosswalks, and pavement markings for bicycling.

» Extending the Carolina Beach Island Greenway through Kure Beach would offer a unique opportunity to create a facility for walking and biking that is safe for all ages and abilities, completely separate from traffic. However, the greenway extension project would involve approval from & significant cooperation with MOTSU.

» Much of Kure Beach’s street network is owned by the town, with the major exceptions of Ft. Fisher Blvd and K Ave. This means that NCDOT funding sources can apply to improvements to these roadways, but not to the rest of the Town’s street network.
**RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY (NORTH SIDE)**

**SHORT ISLAND GREENWAY CONNECTION**

- Add sidewalk Strip on how to ride safely along town streets and rules of the road.

**ISLAND GREENWAY EXTENSION TO FORT FISHER**

- Project will not be possible without approval from the Department of Defense at Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU). Alternate alignments west of here are highly unlikely to be approved by MOTSU. Town is seeking input from MOTSU.

**SIDEWALK CONNECTION TO TOWN HALL**

- Existing conditions along the firebreak corridor on north of Kure Beach feels over-engineered. North of Kure Beach being designed with fencing per MOTSU requirements.

**BOARDWALK WIDENING**

- Using durable surface to reduce maintenance costs.

**K AVE CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS**

- Conceptual image of recommended sidewalk to Town Hall.

- Existing Kure Beach Boardwalk.

- Legend:
  - Beach Access Points
  - Churches
  - Parcels
  - Kure Beach Town Limits
  - Parks
  - Existing Bike Facilities
  - Existing Pedestrian Facilities
  - Planned Bike/Ped Facilities
  - Bike/Ped Facilities
  - Existing conditions from seeking input from MOTSU. Town is west of here are highly unlikely to be approved by MOTSU. Town is seeking input from MOTSU.

**TO FORT FISHER**

- Existing conditions along the fire break corridor on north of Kure Beach feels over-engineered. North of Kure Beach being designed with fencing per MOTSU requirements.

**TO TOWN HALL**

- Existing conditions from seeking input from MOTSU. Town is west of here are highly unlikely to be approved by MOTSU. Town is seeking input from MOTSU.

**SHORT ISLAND GREENWAY CONNECTION**

- Add sidewalk Strip on how to ride safely along town streets and rules of the road.

**TO FORT FISHER**

- Existing conditions along the fire break corridor on north of Kure Beach feels over-engineered. North of Kure Beach being designed with fencing per MOTSU requirements.

**TO TOWN HALL**

- Existing conditions from seeking input from MOTSU. Town is west of here are highly unlikely to be approved by MOTSU. Town is seeking input from MOTSU.
RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY (SOUTH SIDE)

TOWN OF KURE BEACH NC

SIGN BIKE ROUTES (sharrows and wayfinding signage providing safer alternatives to Fort Fisher Blvd)

Conventional image of recommended shared lane marking and signage. Note that stop sign and crosswalk at stop sign are shown to clarify for better flow along the bicycle route.

BICYCLE LANE CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS (at all streets intersecting with bike lanes)

Example of high visibility bicycle lane intersection markings.

FORT FISHER BLVD SIDEWALK (K Ave to E Ave sidewalk on west side)

Existing conditions along Fort Fisher Blvd on the west side of the street (looking south).

FORT FISHER BLVD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS (at beach access points)

Example of crossing beacons at beach access points (in Carolina Beach).

SIGNED BIKE ROUTES (sharrows and wayfinding signage providing safer alternatives to Fort Fisher Blvd)

Conventional image of recommended shared lane marking and signage. Note that stop sign and crosswalk at stop sign are shown to clarify for better flow along the bicycle route.

Example of crossing beacons at beach access points (in Carolina Beach).

Kure Beach Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan

Project Recommendations Map

Legend
- Beach Access Points
- Beaches
- Beach Trail
- Beach Trail Observation Site
- Beach Access Signage
- Beach Access Signage Site
- Fort Fisher Pier
- Fort Fisher Pier Boat Launch
- Future Path to Fort Fisher State Park
- Future Path to Fort Fisher State Park, NC Aquarium, and Ferry Terminal

PROJECT CUT SHEET:
K AVENUE CROSSING
IMPROVEMENTS

FORT FISHER BLVD AND K AVENUE
In 2021, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WMPO) secured funding from the Coronavirus Response and Recovery Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA) for four transportation projects in the region. The Town of Kure Beach is one of the recipients of the funds and will receive approximately $360,000 for the cost to improve pedestrian access and safety at the intersection of Fort Fisher Blvd and K Avenue, including sidewalks. See opposite page for a conceptual rendering of the project; the actual intersection design is still to be determined through a design process independent of this plan.

Existing conditions at Fort Fisher Blvd and Avenue K

ADDITIONAL K AVENUE CROSSING
IMPROVEMENTS
In addition to the crossing at Fort Fisher Blvd, crossing improvements are also recommended at Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Avenues. Recommendations include high visibility crosswalks along and across K Avenue, including median refuges and bulb outs where possible. This may require removal of a single parking space in the K Ave median at Third Ave, immediately north of the existing landscaped median.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
» Pros: Comments were supportive of improving the intersection at K Avenue and Fort Fisher Blvd in order to make it safer for pedestrians. Suggested improvements included pedestrian signals and crosswalks, and potentially signage reminding drivers to yield to pedestrians.
» The following comment on the online map received 15 likes: “Need crosswalks and pedestrian refuge islands at the light at Fort Fisher Blvd and K Ave. Consider “yield to pedestrians in crosswalk” signs.”
» Cons: Concerns for slowing down automobile traffic flow.

HOW TO USE ESTIMATED COSTS RANGES IN THIS PLAN
When reviewing the estimated construction costs in this plan, please take into account the following important notes and caveats:
» The cost estimates represent a planning-level of analysis and therefore are listed in ranges.
» Costs will likely change as more information becomes available in the design phase.
» Costs are listed in the base year of 2022, and should be escalated at a rate of 5% each year thereafter.
» Cost estimates do not include land acquisition/ROW needs, utility relocations, alterations to drainage structures, engineering, or construction inspection.
» Design costs are not listed per cut-sheet, but they can range between 10-20% of construction costs, depending on the size and complexity of the project. Higher ranges will be encountered on projects utilizing federal funds that require a high level of regulatory compliance and on projects that impact FEMA-regulated floodways that require detailed flood modeling and permitting. Small projects will also see higher percentages for design cost.
Conceptual image of recommended crossing improvements, the actual intersection design is still to be determined through a design process independent of this plan.

**K Avenue Crossing Improvements**

- **Existing Bike Lane**
- **Existing Sidewalk**
- **Proposed Sidewalk**
- **Proposed Shared Lane Markings (Sharrows)**
- **Proposed High Visibility Crosswalk**
- **Proposed Crossbike (green bike intersection markings)**

**Short sidewalk proposed to connect K Avenue sidewalk to Town Hall**

- **Opportunities to create median refuge islands between center parking at Third and Fourth Avenues**

**K Ave & Fort Fisher Blvd intersection improvements to use $360K in CRRSAA funding.**

### PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk (5 ft wide)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$6,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Delineator</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Curb Extensions (8)</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$35,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossbike Treatment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,152</td>
<td>$3,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$78,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$101,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Range** $100-120K*

SEE CALL OUT BOX ON PAGE 8: “HOW TO USE ESTIMATED COST RANGES IN THIS PLAN”

**ADDITIONAL IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FORT FISHER BLVD AND K AVENUE INTERSECTION ARE NOT INCLUDED ABOVE, WHICH ARE STILL TO BE DETERMINED AND MAY INCLUDE SIGNIFICANT COSTS SUCH AS UTILITY RELOCATION (WHICH IS WHY THE CRRSAA FUNDS ARE HIGHER THAN THE RANGE LISTED IN THE TABLE).
PROJECT CUT SHEET:
SHORT ISLAND GREENWAY CONNECTION

This proposed greenway extension would run for approximately 1,200 feet from the terminus of the existing Island Greenway in Carolina Beach, connecting to Settlers Lane in Kure Beach. This will provide a direct walking and bicycling connection for Kure Beach residents to the Island Greenway and destinations north of Kure Beach, creating a safer alternative to walking and bicycling along the higher traffic volume and higher speed roadway conditions of Fort Fisher Blvd.

Note that the portion of this project west of Spot Lane is not on Town property and will not be possible without approval from the Department of Defense at Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU). MOTSU would lease the property to the Town and require a fence along the trail if approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

» Pros: Comments in favor of the extension emphasize the need for a safe, paved connection for bicyclists and pedestrians between the greenway and Settlers Lane, provided that motorized vehicles, including golf carts, would not be allowed.

» Cons: A concern was that the extension would put walkers and cyclists in conflict with traffic on Settlers Lane, especially during the summer.

» Despite these concerns, Settlers Lane is a public street, already open to walking and bicycling. The current routing for people on foot and on bike along Fort Fisher Blvd presents greater challenges than this lower-volume, lower-speed residential alternative. Such routing is a common best practice for facilitating safer alternatives for active transportation connectivity. See the Federal Highway Administration’s report, Achieving Multimodal Networks: Applying Design Flexibility & Reducing Conflicts, page 57, for more on this topic:


The following comment on the online map received 27 likes and 4 dislikes: “Pave a path to get me to the Island Greenway without popping a tire!”

Existing conditions looking north to Spot Lane

Existing conditions looking south to Settlers Lane
The existing Island Greenway in Carolina Beach ends at Alabama Ave; Carolina Beach has plans for a sidepath on the north side of Alabama Ave, connecting to Fort Fisher Blvd.

This connector, from Spot to Settlers Lane, is on a Town-owned parcel and already serves as an existing connection. Recommendation is to pave this connector as part of the Island Greenway Extension.

See the following cut-sheet for proposed trail connection to the south

This portion of the proposed Island Greenway Extension west of Spot Lane is not on Town property and will not be possible without approval from MOTSU. MOTSU would require a fence along the trail if approved.

Consider adding a sign or kiosk at this location with information on how to walk and bike safely on town streets, with the rules of the road for bicycling especially.

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Use Path (10 ft wide)</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$180,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$234,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$230-$250K</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”*
PROJECT CUT SHEET:
ISLAND GREENWAY EXTENSION TO TOWN HALL/K AVENUE

This proposed greenway extension would run for approximately 5,250 feet from Spot Lane to Kure Beach Town Hall at K Avenue. This project is not on Town property and will not be possible without approval from the Department of Defense at Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU). MOTSU would lease the property to the Town and require a fence along the trail if approved.

Alternate alignments west of this location were considered (closer to Dow Road), but are even less viable due to current MOTSU restrictions of use.

If this trail is to be built, it should:
» Aim to preserve the natural feel of the corridor; construction of the existing Island Greenway north of Kure Beach had a wider footprint in the construction process than may be necessary;
» Be designed to decrease rather than increase currently reported drainage issues;
» Be designed to add enough native landscaping and trees between the trail and homes to provide adequate privacy (some homes do not currently have privacy or landscape screening in place from the corridor);
» Be designed with mile-markers for both safety and wayfinding; and
» Have a well-defined and adequately funded maintenance and management plan in place.

Existing conditions along the fire break corridor on MOTSU property.

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Use Path (10 ft wide)</td>
<td>5250</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$787,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total $787,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total     $1,023,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Range $1-$1.2M*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”
PUBLIC COMMENTS

» Pros:
  » This was the #1 project selected in the Town of Kure Beach public survey for this plan.
  » Comments in support of the greenway extension highlight the need for a safe, designated route for walking and biking that builds from the existing Carolina Beach Island Greenway and connects pedestrians and bicyclists to destinations north and south along the island.
  » The extension of the greenway would allow for substantially greater opportunities for recreation and exercise for Kure Beach residents.
  » Many comments, such as this online map submission which received 54 likes (and 1 dislike), reflect the positive attitude of many Kure Beach residents to the possibility of extending the greenway: “Would be amazing if we could extend the CB bike trail down to Ft Fisher. Would keep bikes and pedestrians off busy roads and provide access to Mike Chapell Park, KB Park and Ft Fisher all from one trail.”

» Cons:
  » Many residents along Settlers Lane have passionately expressed concerns about safety and privacy issues if the greenway were to be extended.
  » Another concern is about preserving the wetlands on the land behind Settlers Lane, and whether the wet areas would be suitable for a greenway.
  » There is also recognition that implementation of the greenway is largely dependent on MOTSU.
  » Additional concerns were expressed about the potential cost of the greenway extension.
PROJECT CUT SHEET: ISLAND GREENWAY EXTENSION TO FORT FISHER BLVD

This proposed greenway extension would run for approximately 5,900 feet from Town Hall to Fort Fisher Blvd at President Davis Ave, and would closely align with the western edge of the Town of Kure Beach. From President Davis Ave, it would connect to the proposed Fort Fisher Blvd sidepath, which connects south to town limits near Fort Fisher State Park (see separate cutsheet).

This project is not on Town property and will not be possible without approval from the Department of Defense at Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU). MOTSU would lease the property to the Town and require a fence along the trail if approved.

If this trail is to be built, it should:

- Aim to preserve the natural feel of the corridor; construction of the existing Island Greenway north of Kure Beach had a wider footprint in the construction process than may be necessary;
- Be designed to decrease rather than increase any drainage issues;
- Be designed to add enough native landscaping and trees between the trail and homes/buildings to provide adequate privacy;
- Be designed with mile-markers for both safety and wayfinding;
- Have a well-defined and adequately funded maintenance and management plan in place; and,
- Be aligned to have minimal impact on the disc golf course, or routed on-street if necessary to avoid those impacts.

Example of the existing Island Greenway in Carolina Beach.

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Use Path (10 ft wide)</td>
<td>5,914</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$100-200</td>
<td>$887,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total $887,100

Total $1,153,230

Estimated Range $1.2-$1.5M

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”
PUBLIC COMMENTS

» Pros:
  » Many comments received were in favor of expanding on the original proposed greenway extension to K Ave/Joe Eakes Park and continuing the greenway south to Fort Fisher. A particular benefit would be for families with children to be able to ride their bicycles safely to the aquarium, the state historic site, and the ferry.
  » Comments in support of the greenway extension highlight the need for a safe, designated route for walking and biking that builds from the existing Carolina Beach Island Greenway and connects pedestrians and bicyclists to amenities at the southern end of the island without having to travel on Fort Fisher Boulevard.
  » The extension of the greenway would allow for substantially greater opportunities for recreation and exercise for Kure Beach residents.

» Cons:
  » Similarly to the extension to K Ave/Joe Eakes Park, main concerns include the cost of construction and ongoing maintenance, especially in a flood-prone area, as well as disruptions to wildlife in the area.
PROJECT CUT SHEET:
BICYCLE LANE CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS

Intersection crossing markings indicate the intended path of bicyclists. They guide bicyclists on a safe and direct path through intersections, including large driveways. They provide a clear boundary between the paths of through bicyclists and either through or crossing motor vehicles in the adjacent lane.

Bicycle lane crossing benefits:
» Raises awareness for both bicyclists and motorists to potential conflict areas.
» Reinforces that through bicyclists have priority over turning vehicles or vehicles entering the roadway (from driveways or cross streets).

Existing bicycle lanes on Fort Fisher Blvd with 4 inch white dash intersection markings.

For more on this topic, see:
» https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/intersection-treatments/intersection-crossing-markings/

PUBLIC COMMENTS
» Pros: Comments received were in favor of marking bike lane crossings at intersections to improve safety in a cost-effective way.
» Cons: None received specifically for this project.

Example of high visibility bicycle lane intersection markings.

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crossbike Treatment</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,152</td>
<td>$31,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”
Fort Fisher Blvd is the official on road route for the East Coast Greenway; for more info, see www.greenway.org/route-map.
PROJECT CUT SHEET:
WESTSIDE SIGNED BIKE ROUTE

A combination of wayfinding signage and shared lane markings or “sharrows,” are recommended on this route. Sharrows are road markings used to indicate a shared lane environment for bicycles and automobiles. Among other benefits, shared lane markings reinforce the legitimacy of bicycle traffic on the street, recommend proper bicyclist positioning, and may be configured to offer directional and wayfinding guidance. The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) outlines guidance for shared lane markings in section 9C.07.

The Town of Carolina Beach is already using a similar concept with wayfinding signage. The Town of Kure Beach could coordinate signage design for continuity.

Example of a shared lane marking

Designating a residential street as a route for walking and bicycling using sharrows and signs has several key benefits:

» Less costly to build than new, fully dedicated walking and bicycling facilities
» Limits impermeable surface area and minimizes stormwater runoff.
» Encourages slow travel speed when narrower than 20 ft.
» Supports on-street or shoulder parking for property access.
» Connects local residential areas to destinations without using busier streets.
» Maintains aesthetic of narrow roads and uncurbed road edges.
» Low maintenance needs over time.

Example wayfinding signage in Carolina Beach

Different examples of bicycle route wayfinding signs

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$24,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$31,850</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$30-40K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Pros:
» Comments in favor of the connector point to the need for a safe alternate bike route that allows cyclists to avoid biking on Fort Fisher Blvd.

» The following comment from the online map received 6 likes: “Biking on Ft. Fisher Blvd/Lake Park is so dangerous. Widen bike lanes and make them more visible, or put a lane along the back of the island.”

Cons:
» Residents opposed to the connector worry about the safety of drivers, particularly the elderly, if Settlers Lane were to be designated as a bike route. Other concerns include whether Settlers Lane is wide enough to accommodate bicycles along with existing traffic, and whether bicyclists would follow traffic laws.

» See the related program recommendations in this plan for a townwide walking and bicycling map that could be paired with information about the rules of the road for both bicyclists and motorists. A bicycle education and safety initiative for both local residents and visitors alike will be important for addressing these concerns.

» Also, as noted on another cut sheet in this plan, Settlers Lane is a public street, already open to walking and bicycling. The current routing for people on foot and on bike along Fort Fisher Blvd presents greater challenges than this lower-volume, lower-speed residential alternative.
PROJECT CUT SHEET:
FORT FISHER BLVD SIDEPATH FEASIBILITY STUDY
(STUDY FEASIBILITY OF CREATING A SIDEPATH WITH STRIPING AND CURB STOPS, ON WEST SIDE FROM AVE K TO AVE E)

Existing conditions along Fort Fisher Blvd from Ave K to Ave E are poor for walking. The only existing sidewalk in this section is narrow, against the curb with no buffer, frequently blocked by parked cars, and it undulates with each driveway it passes, creating constantly changing grades. Several solutions should be studied in greater detail for feasibility:

1. Rebuild and expand the existing sidewalk on the east side (high cost);
2. Add new sidewalk and/or sidepath on the west side. The west side of the street (looking south) is shown below. The addition of sidewalk on this side would require either moving utilities (high cost) or moving the curb and removing up to 30 parking spaces in total (also high cost); or
3. Explore a potentially lower cost option (estimated below), that would use the existing on-street parking area on the west side by marking bicycle and pedestrian space with pavement markings, striping, and curb stops (or “armadillo buffers”). The study should outline cost-benefits of this option, particularly in terms of safety with frequent driveways.

Example conditions along Fort Fisher Blvd on the west side of the street (looking south).

Example of an “armadillo buffer” being used to buffer on-street space for bicycling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Striping</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Stops (assumes approx. 80% of the length would use curb stops)</td>
<td>2720</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total $100,600
Total $130,780
Estimated Range $130-160K*

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Pros:
» Comments are in favor of improving walking conditions along Fort Fisher Blvd. The current sidewalk is too narrow, uneven, and frequently blocked by parking, especially during the summer months. Residents also favor increased enforcement of speed limits on Fort Fisher Blvd.

Cons:
» General concerns about costs relative to benefits for residents.
» Any discussion of removing parking in a future study should be expected to generate concerns.

Existing conditions along Fort Fisher Blvd on the east side of the street (looking north).

Connection to proposed sidepath starting at E Avenue, south to Fort Fisher State Park.
PROJECT CUT SHEET: FORT FISHER BLVD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS

Improving multiple crossings of Fort Fisher Blvd, especially at beach access points, is one of the most straightforward and effective ways to improve conditions for active transportation and recreation in Kure Beach. The recommended approach for this corridor is to pair high visibility crosswalks with pedestrian activated flashing beacons at key locations. The device includes two rectangular shaped yellow indications, each with an LED-array-based light source, that flash with high frequency when activated.

An example of this approach can be found just north of Kure Beach, on Fort Fisher Blvd at Alabama Ave in Carolina Beach, shown below.

Example of the recommended flashing beacons for beach access points (in Carolina Beach)

There are many benefits to using flashing beacons (also called Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons, or RRFBs).

» The installation of RRFBs can reduce pedestrian crashes by 47%, see National Cooperative Research Program (NCHRP) Research Report 841: Development of Crash Modification Factors for uncontrolled Pedestrian Crossing Treatments.

» RRFBs make crosswalks and/or pedestrians more visible at marked crosswalks

» RRFBs are particularly effective at multilane crossings with speed limits less than 40 mph.

» Solar-power panels can be used to eliminate the need for a power source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRFB (pair)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$168,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$218,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$215-230K*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”
PUBLIC COMMENTS

» Pros: Residents are overwhelmingly in favor of increasing the amount of crosswalks at key locations along Fort Fisher Blvd, especially at public beach access points and in areas with lots of residential and commercial development. Proposed crosswalks will have flashing beacons to improve visibility.

» The following online comment received 14 likes: “Needs a pedestrian crossing at this road because the boardwalk ends here,” referring to the intersection of N Avenue and Fort Fisher Blvd. Another commenter agreed that they frequently use this crossing to access the pier.

» Cons: Resident safety concerns include greater risk of collisions between vehicles and pedestrians if crosswalks were to be placed at non-controlled intersections.

» Research shows that the installation of RRFBs can reduce pedestrian crashes by 47% (see previous page)
PROJECT CUT SHEET:
FORT FISHER BLVD SIDEPATH
(AVE E TO FORT FISHER STATE PARK)

This sidepath connection would provide access for people walking and bicycling towards Fort Fisher State Historic Site, Fort Fisher State Recreation Area, the NC Aquarium, the Fort Fisher Ferry Terminal, as well as the Fort Fisher Air Force Recreation Area and all it offers. Even though there are currently standard bicycle lanes in place, bicycle lanes work best for more experienced bicyclists. In order to accommodate bicyclists of all ages and abilities, plus people who prefer to walk, a sidepath would be better suited.

Existing conditions along Fort Fisher Blvd.

Conceptual example of a sidepath along Fort Fisher Blvd.

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Use Path</td>
<td>10050</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1,005,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total: $1,005,000

Total: $1,306,500

Estimated Range $1.3-$1.6M

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”

** Does not include the potential future path connection south of town limits to Fort Fisher State Historic Site & Museum, NC Aquarium, and Ferry Terminal, which would be implemented separately by other project partners if pursued.
PUBLIC COMMENTS

» Pros: Residents are largely in favor of improving walking and biking access to destinations in the southern part of the island. The proposed sidepath along the southern stretch of Fort Fisher will help to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe by providing greater separation from fast-moving traffic. The implementation of the sidepath project will improve connectivity to and from the aquarium, state park, and other amenities, as well as Brunswick County for those who wish to travel with their bicycles on the Southport Ferry.

» The following comment on the online map received 9 likes: “Improving bike access to the ferry will open up visitors from Southport who come over on bikes. Likewise for Pleasure Island bicyclists wanting to visit Southport or Bald Head!”

» Cons: Some residents question the necessity of suggested improvements given that the bicycle lane “run all the way to the ferry”.

» Note that standard bicycle lanes work well for more experienced cyclists. In order to accommodate bicyclists of all ages and abilities, plus people who prefer to walk, a sidepath would be better suited.
PROJECT CUT SHEET: BOARDWALK WIDENING

The existing boardwalk is one of Kure Beach’s most recognizable and iconic features, aside from the pier to which it connects. However, the current width does not allow for people to comfortably pass in opposite directions as pairs, much less comfortably accommodate other modes, such as bicycling. The adjacent Atlantic Avenue is one-way and not wide enough to accommodate contraflow bicycling. The town could consider not allowing through traffic from L Ave to N Ave to reduce overall traffic.

Furthermore, the structure is made of wood, requiring constant care and repair from limited town maintenance staff and resources. The upgrade should be a minimum of 10 feet wide to meet standards as a multi-use facility; 12 feet is recommended if the right-of-way allows. Consider a precast concrete boardwalk or a composite material to address the maintenance, safety and longevity issues presented by timber decking boardwalk structures. For more information on precast concrete systems, see https://www.permatrak.com

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boardwalk</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$1,728,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk (5 ft wide)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$6,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,734,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,254,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.2-$2.4M* **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”

**Low end of the range is more applicable for a wood structure; high end is more applicable to PermaTrak or similar.
PUBLIC COMMENTS

» Pros: Comments highlight the issue with cyclists entering Atlantic Avenue (and having to cross Fort Fisher to access it) and traveling the opposite direction from vehicles. Comments also address frequent crowding which occurs on Atlantic Avenue during the summer between bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles, sometimes pushing cyclists onto the boardwalk where there is little space for them currently.

» Cons: Comments suggested that widening and upgrading the boardwalk should be less of a priority than getting bikes off of Fort Fisher Blvd.
PROJECT CUT SHEET: NORTH CAROLINA STATE BIKE ROUTE 3

This project would sign and direct bicyclists away from the higher volume traffic and higher speeds of Fort Fisher Blvd to a parallel route on Third Avenue, per the Cape Fear Regional Bicycle Plan. In doing so, it would be recommended to also remove NC State Bike Route signs on Fort Fisher Blvd from N Avenue through E Avenue where bicycle lanes are missing. Another consideration could be to work with the East Coast Greenway Alliance to shift the East Coast Greenway designation to Third Ave as well.

The Town of Carolina Beach is already using a similar concept with wayfinding signage. The Town of Kure Beach could coordinate signage design for continuity.

Existing conditions along 3rd Avenue

Conceptual image of recommended markings and signage. Note that stop signs and stop bars are flipped in direction to allow for better flow along the bicycle route.

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$8,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$19,050</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$24,765</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25-30K*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See call out box on page 8: “How to Use Estimated Cost Ranges in this Plan”
**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Pros:

» Comments highlight the need for a safe alternate bike route that allows cyclists to avoid biking on Fort Fisher Blvd.

» There is a significant desire to improve bicycle access to key destinations and attractions across the island.

» 3rd Avenue has lower speeds and lower traffic volumes.

» Commenters were in favor of solutions such as this one that will keep costs low.

Cons:

» General concerns about cost.

Above: Existing conditions at the 3rd Avenue crossing of K Ave. The landscaped median could be modified to allow passage of bicyclists only, similar to the conceptual example shown below.

The improved crossing of K Ave at 3rd Ave should be designed to preserve most of the existing palm trees. Concept source: https://ruraldesignguide.com/mixed-traffic/bicycle-boulevard

State Bike Route NC 3 Ports of Call

- Connection to existing bicycle lanes north to Carolina Beach
- Third Ave is most direct and intuitive detour for bicyclists to leave (and then return to) Ft Fisher Blvd, skipping the section that is too constrained to add bicycle lanes.
- Connection to existing bicycle lanes and proposed sidepath starting at E Avenue, south to Fort Fisher State Park.

Ocean Front Park and Pavilion

Kure Beach Pier

Kure Beach Town Hall

Connection to existing bicycle lanes north to Carolina Beach

Third Ave is most direct and intuitive detour for bicyclists to leave (and then return to) Ft Fisher Blvd, skipping the section that is too constrained to add bicycle lanes.

Connection to existing bicycle lanes and proposed sidepath starting at E Avenue, south to Fort Fisher State Park.
**PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

Education, encouragement, enforcement, and promotional programs will help improve safety and accessibility for residents, as they learn how to safely travel along sidewalks, trails, and bikeways.

**MEDIA CAMPAIGN**

Watch for Me NC is an ongoing statewide grant program administered by the NCDOT, aimed at reducing the number of bicyclists and pedestrians hit and injured in crashes with vehicles. The Town may participate by downloading materials and information that may be used right away. The Town could also apply when the Call for Participants is issued, typically in February of each year. See the website for contact information and notice of the annual program opening: [https://www.watchformenc.org/](https://www.watchformenc.org/)

Kure Beach also has access to materials and outreach assistance through the WMPO for a regional program called Be a Looker. Materials may be requested through the Go Coast, which provides alternative and sustainable transportation options to those who live, work, and play in the Cape Fear Region: [https://www.gocoastnc.org/bealooker/](https://www.gocoastnc.org/bealooker/)

---

**SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION & TRAFFIC CALMING**

Lowering speed limits has enormous safety benefits for all users, by lowering both the rate and severity of crashes, especially for pedestrians, as shown below. Public feedback during this planning process showed support for reducing the posted speed limit on Ft. Fisher Blvd to 25 MPH, as it is in the rest of Town. Additionally, a significant portion of Kure Beach residents are elderly, with slower reaction times, putting them at greater risk.

![Speed Limit Reduction & Traffic Calming Chart](chart.png)
HIKE & BIKE MAP

One of the most effective ways of encouraging people to walk more often or to ride a bicycle is through the use of maps and guides to show where you can walk and bike, and to guide people to enjoyable routes and destinations. The Town of Kure Beach currently has a beach access map posted on the Town website, but a complete map of recommended walking and biking routes would be an excellent resource for tourists and longtime residents alike.

These maps can be designed so that a portion of the map is devoted to bicycle and pedestrian safety education, such as informational graphics that demonstrate bicycle hand signals and how to share the road and the trail safely. The map should be made available online and printed as needed to be actively distributed to residents and visitors.

Kure Beach should consider working directly with Carolina Beach to create a whole island system map, especially since most people walking and biking in the area will not distinguish between the two towns.

Small towns in North Carolina are promoting walking and bicycling with maps that show bicycle and pedestrian facilities, highlighting destinations, and providing tips for safer walking and bicycling. Examples on this page from Columbia, NC.
NORTH CAROLINA’S YEAR OF THE TRAIL: 2023

On August 18, 2021 the NC Legislature declared 2023 North Carolina Year of the Trail, highlighting an opportunity to showcase, promote, and celebrate our state’s extensive trail systems. The event organizer, the Great Trails State Coalition, envisions a future where each of NC’s 100 counties enjoys the proven benefits of trails, including the health and safety of our citizens, tourism and economic development, transportation, and the environment.

This statewide campaign will reach all communities and potential visitors with the message of how and where to experience the trails across the state.

The Town of Kure Beach should seek out opportunities to be involved in the Year of the Trail in 2023. Planning efforts are already underway as of early 2022. Kure Beach could host an event to build support for trails proposed in this plan, with a focus on the East Coast Greenway.

Visit the Great Trails State Coalition website to learn more about key aspects of the Year of the Trail, such as:

» Public Engagement
» Media Attention
» Educational Tracks
» Legislative Connections

https://greattrailsnc.org/year-of-the-trail/
IMPLEMENTATION ACTION STEPS

The action steps draw from the opportunities shown in this document. These should be guiding steps for the Town of Kure Beach to initiate plan implementation and to begin top projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt this plan.</td>
<td>Through adoption, the Plan becomes an official planning document of the Town of Kure Beach. Adoption does not commit Kure Beach to dedication of funding, but rather shows intention to support plan implementation over time. It also signals to outside funding groups that Kure Beach has undergone a successful, supported planning process, which is key to securing outside funding.</td>
<td>Short-term (2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek multiple funding sources and facility development options.</td>
<td>Project recommendations contain cost estimates and potential funding opportunities are listed at the end of this report. Key funding partners could include NCDOT, WMPO, and NC State Parks’ NC Trails program (the East Coast Greenway is an official state trail that is designated in Kure Beach). Non-profit partnership should also be established with the East Coast Greenway Alliance, as a resource for potential trail funding partnerships and grant opportunities. Coordination and approval for lease and use of property from the Department of Defense at Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU) is required for several trail recommendations in this plan, as outlined in project cut sheets.</td>
<td>Short-term/ Ongoing (2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete top priority projects.</td>
<td>10 key projects are recommended in this plan. Aim to complete 2-3 top projects in the next 2-5 years.</td>
<td>Ongoing (2022-2027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a long-term funding strategy</td>
<td>To allow continued development of the project recommendations, capital funds for bicycle and pedestrian facility construction should be set aside every year. Aim for a minimum of 20% of the base costs for the priority project(s) in order to at least have a match for outside resources. Funding for an ongoing maintenance program should also be included in operating budgets.</td>
<td>Short-term/ Ongoing (2022-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate road resurfacing schedule with projects that could be furthered with resurfacing projects.</td>
<td>Resurfacing is a very important part of implementing bike facilities and comes at very little cost. If possible, coordinate installation of new pavement markings with the resurfacing schedule to save on costs (such as crosswalk and crossbike recommendations).</td>
<td>Short-term/ Ongoing (2022-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch new programs.</td>
<td>New programs should be launched to complement infrastructure improvements, as described in this document.</td>
<td>Ongoing (2023-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek designation as a Bicycle-Friendly Community &amp; Walk-Friendly Community.</td>
<td>The development and implementation of this plan is an essential first step toward becoming a designated Bicycle-Friendly and Walk-Friendly Community. With progress on these recommendations, Kure Beach should be in a position to apply for and receive recognition by 2026. See the League of American Bicyclists website - <a href="https://www.bikeleague.org/community">https://www.bikeleague.org/community</a> and the Walk Friendly Community program website - <a href="http://walkfriendly.org/">http://walkfriendly.org/</a> for further information.</td>
<td>Mid- to Long-term (2026-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Update</td>
<td>This plan should be updated by 2030 (about eight years from adoption). If many of the recommendations have been completed by then, a new set of priorities should be established. If not, a new implementation strategy should be established.</td>
<td>Long-Term (2030)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESIGN GUIDELINE RESOURCES

OVERVIEW
This toolbox presents guidance for local agency staff, elected officials and community advocates to create a more walkable and bicycle-friendly community for people of all ages and abilities. Planners and project designers should refer to these guidelines in developing the infrastructure projects recommended by this plan, but they should not be used as the sole reference for any detailed engineering design.

As a starting point, the following list of resources are from the NCDOT website for “Bicycle & Pedestrian Project Development & Design Guidance”, located here (resources listed are linked through this page; Last retrieved in December 2021): [https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/BikePed/Pages/Guidance.aspx](https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/BikePed/Pages/Guidance.aspx)

NORTH CAROLINA GUIDELINES

**NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (NCDOT):**

» WalkBikeNC: Statewide Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan
» Glossary of North Carolina Terminology for Active Transportation
» NCDOT Complete Streets: This policy directs the department to consider and incorporate several modes of transportation when building new projects or making improvements to existing infrastructure. The link below is a landing page with resources such as the Complete Streets policy, the Implementation Guide, Evaluation Methodology, Flowchart, FAQs, and more. [https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/BikePed/Pages/Complete-Streets.aspx](https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/BikePed/Pages/Complete-Streets.aspx)
» Evaluating Temporary Accommodations for Pedestrians
» NC Local Programs Handbook
» Traditional Neighborhood Development Guidelines

**GREENWAY CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS:**

» Greenway Standards Summary Memo
» Design Issues Summary
» Greenway Design Guidelines Value Engineering Report
» Summary of Recommendations
» Minimum Pavement Design Recommendations for Greenways
» Steps to Construct a Greenway or Shared-Use Trail
NATIONAL GUIDELINES

RAILS-TO-TRAILS CONSERVANCY:
» General Design Guidance: https://www.railstotrails.org/build-trails/trail-building-toolbox/
» American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO):
  » Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities
  » Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA):
» Accessibility Guidance
» Design Guidance
» Facility Design
» Facility Operations

MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES (MUTCD):
» Part 4E: Pedestrian Control Features
» Part 7: Traffic Controls for School Areas
» Part 9: Traffic Controls for Bicycle Facilities

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CITY TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (NACTO):
» Urban Bikeway Design Guide
» Urban Street Design Guide

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SRTS) NON-INFRASTRUCTURE:
» National Center for Safe Routes to School
» National Partnership for Safe Routes to School

US ACCESS BOARD:
» ABA Accessibility Standards
» ADA Accessibility Guidelines
» ADA Accessibility Standards
» Public Rights-of-Way, Streets & Sidewalks, and Shared Use Paths

ADDITIONAL FHWA RESOURCES NOT CURRENTLY LINKED THROUGH THE MAIN NCDOT LINK ABOVE:
» Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks Design Guide (2017)
   » Main Guide: https://ruraldesign-guide.com/
PROJECT BENEFIT RESOURCES

THE VALUE OF WALKABLE AND BICYCLE-FRIENDLY COMMUNITIES
Increased rates of bicycling and walking will help to improve people’s health and fitness, improve livability of our communities, enhance environmental conditions, decrease traffic congestion, and contribute to a greater sense of community.

Scores of studies from the fields of public health, urban planning, urban ecology, real estate, tourism, and transportation have demonstrated the value of supporting bicycling and walking. Communities across the United States and throughout the world are investing in improvements for bicycling, walking, and trails. They do this because of their obligations to promote health, safety and welfare, and also because of the growing awareness of the many benefits outlined in the studies listed below.

TRAILS RESEARCH SEARCHABLE BENEFITS LIBRARY
Headwaters Economics compiled 120 studies on the impacts of trails in a single library, searchable by type of benefit, use, year, and region. Findings include:

» Trails can generate business impacts and create new jobs by attracting visitors, especially overnight visitors.

» Local trail users often use community trails multiple times per week, and trails are a valuable part of residents’ quality of life.

» Trails are often associated with higher property value, especially when a trail is designed to provide neighborhood access and maintain residents’ privacy.

» Trails are associated with increased physical activity and improved public health, especially in rural places without other safe places to exercise.

https://headwaterseconomics.org/economic-development/trails-pathways/trails-research/

BIKES IN BEDS: HOW TO MAXIMIZE BICYCLE TOURISM
A 2015 report in Haywood County, NC that details economic impact of bicycle tourists. While focusing on Haywood County, this study provides an overview of bicycle tourism opportunities for other NC communities as well.


WALKBIKENC
WalkBikeNC (North Carolina’s Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan) is a blueprint for improving walking and bicycling for North Carolina communities. Here you will find further information on the benefits of walking and bicycling and the five ‘pillars’ - health, safety, economy, mobility, and the environment.

https://www.ncdot.gov/bikeped/walkbikenc

PATHWAYS TO PROSPERITY
A older, but relevant report on the economic impacts of investments in bicycle facilities by the Institute for Transportation Research & Education (focused on NC’s coastal region).


WALKING THE WALK: HOW WALKABILITY RAISES HOME VALUES IN U.S. CITIES
This report, by CEO’s for Cities, which looked at 94,000 real estate transactions in 15 markets, found that in 13 of those markets, higher levels of “walkability” were directly linked to higher home values.

https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/walking_the_walk_cortright.pdf
EVALUATING THE ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTION OF SHARED USE PATHS IN NC

Shared use paths, also known as greenways, provide a shared space for bicycle and pedestrian travel outside of the roadway. This project’s objective was to design and test an approach for measuring the economic contributions of greenways in North Carolina. The study found that, on average, every $1.00 of trail construction in North Carolina supports $1.72 annually from local business revenue, sales tax revenue, and benefits related to health and transportation.

For more information: https://itre.ncsu.edu/focus/bike-ped/sup-economic-impacts/

The four greenways featured in this study, with estimated annual trips and study years:

- Brevard Greenway: 76K, 2015-2016 (Estimated annual trips)
- Little Sugar Creek Greenway: 393K, 2015-2016 (Estimated annual trips)
- American Tobacco Trail: 481K, 2016 (Annual trips)
- Duck Trail: 146K, 2016 (Annual trips)

COMBINED STUDY RESULTS

A one-time $26.7M capital investment in the four greenways supports:

- Estimated annual sales revenue at local businesses along the four greenways: $19.4M
- Estimated annual local and state sales tax revenue from businesses along the greenways: $684K
- Estimated annual savings due to more physical activity, less pollution and congestion, and fewer traffic injuries from use of the greenways: $25.7M
- Estimated business revenue from greenway construction: $48.7M
- Jobs supported annually through greenway construction: 790

RETURN ON INVESTMENT: Every $1.00 of trail construction supports $1.72 annually from local business revenue, sales tax revenue, and benefits related to health and transportation.

Excerpt from the Executive Summary for “Evaluating the Economic Contribution of Shared Use Paths in NC”.
THE INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT AND JOBS ACT (IIJA)
The following is a preliminary summary of how IIJA may affect funding sources related to bicycle, pedestrian, and trail infrastructure based on what is known at the time this plan was written (early 2022).

FORMULA FUNDS (STATE DOTs ADMINISTER TO LOCALS):

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) will increase from $850 million to $1.44 billion per year. This is the largest dedicated source of funds for walking and biking projects in the US and it just got 70% bigger. The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) administers this funding for rural areas of the state that do not have a metropolitan planning organization. The Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WMPO) administers Transportation Alternatives Program funding on a competitive basis to local jurisdictions in its region.

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CMAQ)
Will increase by 10% to $13.2B. This program funds interchange improvements, local transit operations, and bike and pedestrian infrastructure to help meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standard in non-attainment areas; the WMPO, however, is not eligible for CMAQ funds.

States where more than 15% of all fatalities involve cyclists or pedestrians (Vulnerable Road Users or VRU), will be required to spend 15% of their HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) funding on bicycle/pedestrian projects. This includes North Carolina, where about 15% of all fatalities involve VRUs. Projects are evaluated, prioritized, and selected at the NCDOT district level based on three years of crash data (targeted funds) or systemic approved projects as outlined in the HSIP guidance.

FUNDING RESOURCES

OVERVIEW
When considering possible funding sources for bicycle, pedestrian, and trail projects, it is important to remember that not all construction activities or programs will be accomplished with a single funding source. It will be necessary to use several sources of funding that together will support full project completion. Funding sources can be used for a variety of activities, including: programs, planning, design, implementation, and maintenance. This appendix outlines the most likely sources of funding from the federal, state, and local government levels as well as from the private and nonprofit sectors. Note that this reflects the funding available at the time of writing. Funding amounts, cycles, and the programs themselves may change over time.

FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES
Federal funding is typically directed through state agencies to local governments either in the form of formula funds or discretionary grants. Federal funding typically requires a local match of five percent to 50 percent, but there are sometimes exceptions. The following is a list of possible Federal funding sources that could be used to support the construction of trail facilities.
Every state and MPO will be required to use at least 2.5% of its apportioned funding to develop planning documents that can include but are not limited to, Complete Streets standards, a Complete Streets prioritization plan, multimodal corridor studies, or active transportation plans (among other uses).

**DISCRETIONARY GRANTS (US DOT ADMINISTERS TO LOCALS):**

**REBUILDING AMERICAN INFRASTRUCTURE WITH SUSTAINABILITY AND EQUITY (RAISE).**
In the first RAISE grant cycle, nearly one in five funded grant applications involved trail development. In addition, the selection committee awarded another 21% of funding to projects focused on making roads safer for vulnerable road users like cyclists and pedestrians. Projects such as the Carolina Beach Greenwy extension will compete well for the RAISE program with its focus on connecting people to local and regional destinations.

Under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), the RAISE grant program will have $7.5 billion available over the next five years. Competitive applications to this program have the following in common:

1. The project can demonstrate broad community support and is a recognized local or regional priority.
2. The project explicitly considers how it will address climate change and racial equity.
3. The project documents direct and significantly favorable local or regional impact relative to the scoring criteria:
   - Safety
   - Environmental Sustainability
   - Quality of Life
   - Economic Competitiveness
   - State of Good Repair
   - Innovation
   - Partnership
4. The project has a high benefit to cost ratio.
5. The project demonstrates readiness by providing a detailed scope of work and budget, a realistic project delivery schedule, an understanding of the environmental risks, permit requirements, and mitigation measures, and is within the public right-of-way.
6. A United States Senator or Congress member actively champions the project.

For more information on RAISE program guidelines and upcoming Notice of Funding Opportunities, see: [www.transportation.gov/RAISEgrants](http://www.transportation.gov/RAISEgrants)

**HEALTHY STREETS PROGRAM** (new): $500 million federal grant program to fund projects that address urban heat island effect, to include porous pavement changes and improvements to the tree canopy, especially along pedestrian walkways and public transit stops.

**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PROGRAM** (new): Local, regional, state, and tribal governments can apply to the program to receive funding for active transportation projects and planning grants that build upon a local/regional/state network or network spine. The projects and planning efforts have to account for safety and facilitate more people walking and biking.

**SAFE STREETS AND ROADS FOR ALL** (new): $6 billion federal grant program to fund Vision Zero plans, infrastructure, and programs. US DOT is developing grant program guidelines and will publish Notices of Funding Opportunities (NOFO) as they become available for each of the programs above.
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) BIKE/PED SCOPING GUIDE

In January 2020, NCDOT released the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Bike/Ped Scoping Guide. This document provides detail and guidance on the Project Delivery Process and important elements to consider in bike/ped project development.


STBGP-DA & TASA-DA FUNDS

The Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Direct Attributable (STBGP-DA) and Transportation Alternative Set Aside Direct Attributable (TASA-DA) are federal funding sources distributed by the WMPO. Member jurisdictions of the WMPO are eligible to apply for these funds through a competitive funding process that prioritizes locally administered projects in the Region. These projects are funded using the federal funding sources directly attributed to the region with a minimum 20% local match.

For more information: https://www.wmpo.org/stp-datap-da/

OTHER FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SRTS) PROGRAM

SRTS enables and encourages children to walk and bike to school. The program helps make walking and bicycling to school a safe and more appealing method of transportation for children. SRTS facilitates the planning, development, and implementation of projects and activities that will improve safety and reduce traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution in the vicinity of schools. Most of the types of eligible SRTS projects include sidewalks or shared use paths. However, intersection improvements (i.e. signalization, marking/upgrading crosswalks, etc.), on-street bicycle facilities (bike lanes, wide paved shoulders, etc.) or off-street shared use paths are also eligible for SRTS funds.

The North Carolina Department of Transportation’s Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program was established in 2005 through SAFETEA-LU as a federally funded program to provide an opportunity for communities to improve conditions for bicycling and walking to school. It is currently supported with Transportation Alternatives federal funding through the Surface Transportation Block Grant program established under the FAST Act. The SRTS Program has set aside $1,500,000 per year of Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds for non-infrastructure programs and activities over a three-year period. Funding requests may range from a yearly amount of $50,000 to $100,000 per project. Projects can be one to three years in length. Funding may be requested to support activities for community-wide, regional or statewide programs. Check the link below for information on the current funding cycle.

For more information: https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/BikePed/Pages/Non-Infrastructure-Alternatives-Program.aspx

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ENHANCED MOBILITY OF SENIORS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

This program can be used for capital expenses that support transportation to meet the special needs of older adults and persons with disabilities, including providing access to an eligible public transportation facility when the transportation service provided is unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate to meeting these needs.

For more information: https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/enhanced-mobility-seniors-individuals-disabilities-section-5310

FEDERAL LANDS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (FLTP)

The FLTP funds projects that improve transportation infrastructure owned and maintained by the following Federal Lands Management Agencies: National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), USDA Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and independent Federal agencies with land and natural resource management responsibilities. FLTP funds are available for program administration, transportation planning, research, engineering, rehabilitation, construction, and restoration of Federal Lands
Transportation Facilities. Transportation projects that are on the public network that provide access to, adjacent to, or through Federal lands are also eligible for funding. Under the IIJA, $2.2 billion has been allocated to the program for FY 2022-2026.  

FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND
The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) has historically been a primary funding source of the U.S. Department of the Interior for outdoor recreation development and land acquisition by local governments and state agencies. In North Carolina, the program is administered by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

Since 1965, the LWCF program has built a park legacy for present and future generations. In North Carolina alone, the LWCF program has provided more than $75 million in matching grants to protect land and support more than 875 state and local park projects. More than 38,500 acres have been acquired with LWCF assistance to establish a park legacy in our state. As of August 2020, the LWCF is now permanently funded by the federal government for $900 million every year. This is hundreds of millions more per year than the fund typically receives.
For more information: https://www.ncparks.gov/more-about-us/grants/lwcf-grants

RIVERS, TRAILS, AND CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
The Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program (RTCA) is a National Parks Service (NPS) program that provides technical assistance via direct NPS staff involvement to establish and restore greenways, rivers, trails, watersheds and open space. The RTCA program only provides planning assistance; there are no implementation funds available. Projects are prioritized for assistance based on criteria, including conserving significant community resources, fostering cooperation between agencies, serving a large number of users, encouraging public involvement in planning and implementation, and focusing on lasting accomplishments. Project applicants may be state and local agencies, tribes, nonprofit organizations, or citizen groups. National parks and other federal agencies may apply in partnership with other local organizations. This program may benefit trail development in North Carolina indirectly through technical assistance, particularly for community organizations, but is not a capital funding source.
For more information: https://www.nps.gov/orgs/rtca/index.htm

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION CLEANUP FUNDING SOURCES
EPA’s Brownfields Program provides direct funding for brownfields assessment, cleanup, revolving loans, and environmental job training. EPA’s Brownfields Program collaborates with other EPA programs, other federal partners, and state agencies to identify and leverage more resources for brownfields activities. The EPA provides assessment grants to recipients to characterize, assess, and conduct community involvement related to brownfields sites. They also provide area-wide planning grants (AWP) which provides communities with funds to research, plan, and develop implementation strategies for areas affected by one or more brownfields.
For more information: https://www.epa.gov/brownfields/types-brownfields-grant-funding

NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION: FIVE STAR & URBAN WATERS RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM
The Five Star & Urban Waters Restoration Grant Program seeks to develop community capacity to sustain local natural resources for future generations by providing modest financial assistance to diverse local partnerships for wetland, riparian, forest and coastal habitat restoration, urban wildlife conservation, stormwater management as well as outreach, education and stewardship. Projects should focus on water quality, watersheds and the habitats they support. The program focuses on five priorities: on-the-ground restoration, community partnerships, environmental outreach, education and training, measurable results, and sustainability. Eligible applicants include nonprofit organizations, state government agencies, local governments,
municipal governments, tribes, and educational institutions. Projects are required to meet or exceed a 1:1 match to be competitive.

For more information: http://www.nfwf.org/fivestar/Pages/home.aspx

STATE AND STATE-ADMINISTERED FUNDING SOURCES

There are multiple sources for state funding of bicycle and pedestrian transportation projects. However, state transportation funds cannot be used to match federally funded transportation projects, according to a law passed by the North Carolina Legislature.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (NCDOT) STRATEGIC TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS (STI)

Passed in 2013, the Strategic Transportation Investments law (STI) allows NCDOT to use its funding more efficiently and effectively to enhance the state’s infrastructure, while supporting economic growth, job creation and a higher quality of life. This process encourages thinking from a statewide and regional perspective while also providing flexibility to address local needs. STI also establishes a way of allocating available revenues based on data-driven scoring and local input. It is used for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which identifies the transportation projects that will receive funding during a 10-year period. STIP is a state and federal requirement, which NCDOT updates it every two years.

STI’S QUANTITATIVE SCORING PROCESS

All independent bicycle and pedestrian projects are ranked based on a quantitative scoring process, with the following main steps:
» Initial Project Review (NCDOT Strategic Prioritization Office (SPOT))
» Review Projects and Data (NCDOT Integrated Mobility Division (IMD))
» Review Data (MPOs, RPOs, Divisions)
» Review Updates and Calculate Measures (NCDOT IMD)
» Score Projects (NCDOT SPOT)

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECT ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS
» Minimum total project cost = $100,000
» Eligible costs include right-of-way, preliminary engineering, and construction
» Bicycle and pedestrian and public transportation facilities that appear in a state, regional or locally adopted transportation plan will be included as part of the proposed roadway project. NCDOT will fully fund the cost of designing, acquiring right of way, and constructing the identified facilities.

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENT TYPES
» Grade-Separated Bicycle Facility (Bicycle)
» Off-Road/Separated Linear Bicycle Facility (Bicycle)
» On-Road; Designated Bicycle Facility (Bicycle)
» On-Road Bicycle Facility (Bicycle)
» Multi-Site Bicycle Facility (Bicycle)
» Grade-Separated Pedestrian Facility (Pedestrian)
» Protected Linear Pedestrian Facility (Pedestrian)
» Multi-Site Pedestrian Facility (Pedestrian)
» Improved Pedestrian Facility (Pedestrian)

BUNDLING PROJECTS
» Allowed across geographies and across varying project types
» Bundling will be limited by project management requirements rather than geographic limitations
» Any bundled project must be expected to be under one project manager/administrative unit (must be a TAP-eligible entity)
» Makes projects more attractive for LIPs and easier to manage/let

MORE INFO ON PRIORITIZATION 6.0:

NCDOT’s Prioritization Data page has training slides that explain the prioritization process: https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/planning/Prioritization%20Data/Forms/AllItems.aspx
See the “Prioritization Training” folder and the following session information within:

» Session 3: Detailed information on overall scoring components, including local input points.
» Session 4: Features relevant project funding information, and
» Session 7: Detailed slides explaining the bicycle and pedestrian project scoring

HIGH IMPACT/Low Cost Funds
Established by NCDOT in 2017 to provide funds to complete low-cost projects with high impacts to the transportation system including intersection improvement projects, minor widening projects, and operational improvement projects. Funds are allocated equally to each Division.

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA
Each Division is responsible for selecting their own scoring criteria for determining projects funded in this program. At a minimum, Divisions must consider all of the following in developing scoring formulas:

» The average daily traffic volume of a roadway and whether the proposed project will generate additional traffic.
» Any restrictions on a roadway.
» Any safety issues with a roadway.
» The condition of the lanes, shoulders, and pavement on a roadway.
» The site distance and radius of any intersection on a roadway.
» $1.5M max per project unless otherwise approved by the Secretary of Transportation
» Projects are expected to be under contract within 12 months of funding approval by BOT

NCDOT TECHNICAL REVIEW & APPROVAL
» Division Engineer completes project scoring and determines eligibility.
» Division Engineer determines projects to be funded and requests approval of funding from the Chief Engineer. Division Engineer shall supply all necessary project information including funding request forms, project designs and cost estimates.

» The Project Review Committee will make a recommendation for further investigation or to include on the Board Agenda for action by the Secretary, NCDOT.

INCIDENTAL PROJECTS
Bicycle and Pedestrian accommodations such as; bike lanes, wide paved shoulders, sidewalks, intersection improvements, bicycle and pedestrian safe bridge design, etc. are frequently included as “incidental” features of larger highway/roadway projects.

In addition, bicycle safe drainage grates and handicapped accessible sidewalk ramps are now a standard feature of all NCDOT highway construction. Most pedestrian safety accommodations built by NCDOT are included as part of scheduled highway improvement projects funded with a combination of federal and state roadway construction funds.

“Incidental Projects” are often constructed as part of a larger transportation project, when they are justified by local plans that show these improvements as part of a larger, multi-modal transportation system. Having a local bicycle or pedestrian plan is important, because it allows NCDOT to identify where bike and pedestrian improvements are needed, and can be included as part of highway or street improvement projects. It also helps local government identify what their priorities are and how they might be able to pay for these projects. Under the updated NCDOT Complete Streets Policy, NCDOT pays the full cost for incidental projects if the project is proposed in a locally adopted plan (see link to updated NCDOT Complete Streets Policy below).


NC HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
The purpose of the North Carolina Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is to provide a continuous and systematic process that identifies reviews and addresses specific traffic safety concerns throughout the state. The program is structured in several distinct phases:
A system of safety warrants is developed to identify locations that are possibly deficient. Locations that meet warrant criteria are categorized as potentially hazardous (PH) locations. Detailed crash analyses are performed on the PH locations with the more severe and correctable crash patterns. The Regional Traffic Engineering staff performs engineering field investigations. The Regional Traffic Engineering staff utilizes Benefit: Cost studies and other tools to develop safety recommendations. Depending on the cost and nature of the countermeasures, the investigations may result in requesting Division maintenance forces to make adjustments or repairs, developing Spot Safety projects, developing Hazard Elimination projects, making adjustments to current TIP project plans or utilizing other funding sources to initiate countermeasures. Selected projects are evaluated to determine the effectiveness of countermeasures.

The ultimate goal of the HSIP is to reduce the number of traffic crashes, injuries and fatalities by reducing the potential for and the severity of these incidents on public roadways. For more information: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/Pages/NC-Highway-Safety-program-and-Projects.aspx

**HIGHWAY HAZARD ELIMINATION PROGRAM**

The Hazard Elimination Program is used to develop larger improvement projects to address safety and potential safety issues. The program is funded with 90 percent federal funds and 10 percent state funds. The cost of Hazard Elimination Program projects typically ranges between $400,000 and $1 million. A Safety Oversight Committee (SOC) reviews and recommends Hazard Elimination projects to the Board of Transportation (BOT) for approval and funding. These projects are prioritized for funding according to a safety benefit to cost (B/C) ratio, with the safety benefit being based on crash reduction. Once approved and funded by the BOT, these projects become part of the department’s State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

**GOVERNOR’S HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM**

The Governor’s Highway Safety Program (GHSP) funds safety improvement projects on state highways throughout North Carolina. All funding is performance-based. Substantial progress in reducing crashes, injuries, and fatalities is required as a condition of continued funding. Permitted safety projects include checking station equipment, traffic safety equipment, and BikeSafe NC equipment. However, funding is not allowed for speed display signs. This funding source is considered to be “seed money” to get programs started. The grantee is expected to provide a portion of the project costs and is expected to continue the program after GHSP funding ends. Applications must include county level crash data. Local governments, including county governments and municipal governments, are eligible to apply. For more information: https://www.ncdot.gov/initiatives-policies/safety/ghsp/Pages/default.aspx

**THE NORTH CAROLINA DIVISION OF PARKS AND RECREATION - RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM GRANT**

Funding from the federal Recreational Trails Program (RTP), which is used for renovating or constructing trails and greenways, is allocated to states. The North Carolina Division of Parks and Recreation and the State Trails Program manages these funds with a goal of helping citizens, organizations and agencies plan, develop and manage all types of trails ranging from greenways and trails for hiking, biking, and horseback riding to river trails and off-highway vehicle trails. Grants are available to governmental agencies and nonprofit organizations. The maximum grant amount is $250,000 and requires a 25% match of RTP funds received. Permissible uses include:

- New trail or greenway construction
- Trail or greenway renovation
- Approved trail or greenway facilities
- Trail head/ trail markers
- Purchase of tools to construct and/or renovate trails/greenways
- Land acquisition for trail purposes
- Planning, legal, environmental, and permitting costs - up to 10% of grant amount
- Combination of the above

**BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN PLAN**

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is designed to provide safe and accessible streets for all users. The plan includes strategies to improve cycling and walking options, and supports the development of safe and enjoyable trails. For more information: https://bicycleandpedestrian.ncdot.gov/plans-and-strategies/

**NC PARKS AND RECREATION TRUST FUND (PARTF)**

The Parks and Recreation Trust Fund (PARTF) provides dollar-for-dollar matching grants to local governments for parks and recreational projects to serve the general public. Counties, incorporated municipalities, and public authorities, as defined by G.S. 159-7, are eligible applicants. A local government can request a maximum of $500,000 with each application. An applicant must match the grant dollar-for-dollar, 50 percent of the total cost of the project, and may contribute more than 50 percent. The appraised value of land to be donated to the applicant can be used as part of the match. The value of in-kind services, such as volunteer work, cannot be used as part of the match. Property acquired with PARTF funds must be dedicated for public recreational use.


**CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND**

The Clean Water Management Trust Fund (CWMTF) is available to any state agency, local government, or non-profit organization whose primary purpose is the conservation, preservation, and restoration of North Carolina’s environmental and natural resources. Grant assistance is provided to conservation projects that:

- enhance or restore degraded waters;
- protect unpolluted waters, and/or
- contribute toward a network of riparian buffers and greenways for environmental, educational, and recreational benefits;
- provide buffers around military bases to protect the military mission;
- acquire land that represents the ecological diversity of North Carolina; and
- acquire land that contributes to the development of a balanced State program of historic properties.

For more information: [http://www.cwmtf.net/#appmain.htm](http://www.cwmtf.net/#appmain.htm)

**URBAN AND COMMUNITY FORESTRY GRANT**

The North Carolina Division of Forest Resources Urban and Community Forestry grant can provide funding for a variety of projects that will help plan and establish street trees as well as trees for urban open space. The goal is to improve public understanding of the benefits of preserving existing tree cover in communities and assist local governments with projects which will lead to more effective and efficient management of urban and community forests.

For more information: [https://www.ncforestservice.gov/Urban/urban_grant_program.htm](https://www.ncforestservice.gov/Urban/urban_grant_program.htm)

**LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES**

Local governments often plan for the funding of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure or improvements through development of Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) or occasionally, through their annual Operating Budgets. CIPs should include all types of capital improvements (water, sewer, buildings, streets, etc.) versus programs for single purposes. This allows decision-makers to balance all capital needs. Typical capital funding mechanisms include the capital reserve fund, taxes, fees, and bonds. However, many will require specific local action as a means of establishing a program if it is not already in place.

**PRIVATE AND NONPROFIT FUNDING SOURCES**

Many communities have solicited funding assistance from private foundations and other conservation-minded benefactors. Below are examples of private funding opportunities.

**RAILS-TO-TRAILS CONSERVANCY**

Under the Doppelt Family Trail Development Fund, RTC will award approximately $85,000 per year, distributed among several qualifying projects, through a competitive process. Eligible applicants include nonprofit organizations and state, regional, and local government agencies. Two types of grants are available - community support grants and project transformation grants. Around three to four community support grants are awarded each year, ranging from $5,000-$10,000 each. Community Support Grants support nonprofit organizations or “Friends of the Trail” groups that need funding to get trail development or trail improvement efforts
off the ground. Each year, 1-2 Project Transformation Grants area awarded that range from $15,000-$50,000. The intention of these grants is to enable an organization to complete a significant trail development or improvement project. For both types of grants, applications for projects on rail-trails and rails-with-trails are given preference, but rail-trail designation is not a requirement. The trail must serve multiple user types, such as bicycling, walking, and hiking, and must be considered a trail, greenway, or shared use path. For more information: http://www.railstotrails.org/our-work/doppelt-family-trail-development-fund/

NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION (NFWF)
The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) is a private, nonprofit, tax-exempt organization chartered by Congress in 1984. The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation sustains, restores, and enhances the Nation’s fish, wildlife, plants, and habitats. Through leadership conservation investments with public and private partners, the Foundation is dedicated to achieving maximum conservation impact by developing and applying best practices and innovative methods for measurable outcomes.
The Foundation provides grants through more than 70 diverse conservation grant programs. One of the most relevant programs for bicycle and pedestrian projects is Acres for America. Funding priorities include conservation of bird, fish, plants and wildlife habitats, providing access for people to enjoy outdoors, and connecting existing protected lands. Federal, state, and local government agencies, educational institutions, Native American tribes, and non-profit organizations may apply twice annually for matching grants. Due to the competitive nature of grant funding for Acres for America, all awarded grants require a minimum 1:1 match. For more information: http://www.nfwf.org/what-wedo/grants/Pages/home.aspx

THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND
Land conservation is central to the mission of the Trust for Public Land (TPL). Founded in 1972, the TPL is the only national non-profit working exclusively to protect land for human enjoyment and well-being. TPL helps acquire land and transfer it to public agencies, land trusts, or other groups that intend to conserve land for recreation and spiritual nourishment and to improve the health and quality of life of American communities. For more information: http://www.tpl.org

LAND FOR TOMORROW CAMPAIGN
Land for Tomorrow is a diverse partnership of businesses, conservationists, farmers, environmental groups, health professionals, and community groups committed to securing support from the public and General Assembly for protecting land, water, and historic places. Land for Tomorrow works to enable North Carolina to reach a goal of ensuring that working farms and forests, sanctuaries for wildlife, land bordering streams, parks, and greenways, land that helps strengthen communities and promotes job growth, and historic downtowns and neighborhoods will be there to enhance the quality of life for generations to come. For more information: http://www.land4tomorrow.org/

THE CONSERVATION ALLIANCE
The Conservation Alliance is a nonprofit organization of outdoor businesses whose collective annual membership dues support grassroots citizen-action groups and their efforts to protect wild and natural areas. Grants are typically about $35,000 each. Funding criteria states that:
» The project should seek to secure lasting and quantifiable protection of a specific wild land or waterway. We prioritize landscape-scale projects that have a clear benefit for habitat.
» The campaign should engage grassroots citizen action in support of the conservation effort. We do not fund general education, restoration, stewardship, or scientific research projects.
» All projects must have a clear recreational benefit. For more information: http://www.conservation-alliance.com/grants/?yearly=2020

BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD (BCBS) OF NORTH CAROLINA FOUNDATION
BCBS does not have a traditional grant cycle and announces grant opportunities on a periodic basis. Grants can range from small-dollar equipment grants to large, multi-year partnerships.

**DUKE ENERGY FOUNDATION**
Funded by Duke Energy shareholders, this foundation makes charitable grants to nonprofit organizations and government agencies. Grant applicants must serve communities that are also served by Duke Energy. The grant program has several investment priorities that could potentially fund bicycle and pedestrian projects. The Duke Energy Foundation is committed to making strategic investments to build powerful communities where nature and wildlife thrive, students can excel and a talented workforce drives economic prosperity for all.
For more information: [https://www.duke-energy.com/community/duke-energy-foundation](https://www.duke-energy.com/community/duke-energy-foundation)

**Z. SMITH REYNOLDS FOUNDATION**
This Winston-Salem-based Foundation is committed to improving the quality of life for all North Carolinians. The Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation is a statewide, private, family foundation that has been a catalyst for positive change in North Carolina for more than 80 years. A variety of grant programs are available.
For more information: [http://www.zsr.org/grants-programs](http://www.zsr.org/grants-programs)

**BANK OF AMERICA CHARITABLE FOUNDATION**
The Bank of America Charitable Foundation supports a wide range of activities, including a focus on community greening efforts that create healthy neighborhoods and environmental sustainability through the preservation, creation or restoration of open space, parks and community gardens.

**LOCAL TRAIL SPONSORS**
A sponsorship program for trail amenities allows smaller donations to be received from both individuals and businesses. Cash donations could be placed into a trust fund to be accessed for certain construction or acquisition projects associated with the greenways and open space system. Some recognition of the donors is appropriate and can be accomplished through the placement of a plaque, the naming of a trail segment, and/or special recognition at an opening ceremony. Types of gifts other than cash could include donations of services, equipment, labor, or reduced costs for supplies.

**CORPORATE DONATIONS**
Corporate donations are often received in the form of liquid investments (i.e. cash, stock, bonds) and in the form of land. Local governments typically create funds to facilitate and simplify a transaction from a corporation’s donation to the given locality. Donations are mainly received when a widely supported capital improvement program is implemented.

**PRIVATE INDIVIDUAL DONATIONS**
Private individual donations can come in the form of liquid investments (i.e. cash, stock, bonds) or land. Local governments typically create funds to facilitate and simplify a transaction from an individual’s donation to the given locality. Donations are mainly received when a widely supported capital improvement program is implemented.

**FUNDRAISING/CAMPAIGN DRIVES**
Organizations and individuals can participate in a fundraiser or a campaign drive. It is essential to market the purpose of a fundraiser to rally support and financial backing. Often times fundraising satisfies the need for public awareness, public education, and financial support.

**VOLUNTEER WORK**
It is expected that many citizens will be excited about the development of a greenway corridor. Individual volunteers from the community can be brought together with groups of volunteers from church groups, civic groups, scout troops and environmental groups to work on greenway development on special community workdays. Volunteers can also be used for fundraising, maintenance, and programming needs.
Appendix: Public Engagement Overview
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT OVERVIEW

CHARRETTE

Two public open houses were held at the Kure Beach Community Center in late autumn 2021. The first open house on the evening of November 30 was attended by over 70 community members, who were invited to give feedback on existing conditions for walking and biking in Kure Beach. Large-format maps were set up on tables, and attendees were encouraged to use markers and post-its to mark up the maps. There was no formal presentation, but town staff and Alta team members were available to answer questions and clarify the comment process.

The comments received at the first open house event informed the next day’s work for the Alta team, who prepared a set of ten proposed projects designed to improve walking and biking in Kure Beach. Posters of each of these potential projects were presented for public feedback at the second public open house on the evening of December 2. This second event had a similar structure to the first, with no formal presentation but with ample opportunity for attendees to write, draw, and otherwise communicate their feedback on the potential projects to Town staff and to Alta. This second event was attended by over 50 people. The valuable feedback received at these events is summarized on pages 55-57.

Photos pg. 48-50: Public workshop attendees talk to each other about existing conditions in Kure Beach and about proposed improvements. Also shown are marked-up maps used for feedback.
KURE BEACH BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN SURVEY

The 9-question survey was posted on the Kure Beach Town website and received 444 total responses between January 7 and January 25, 2022. The survey included a link to the initial recommendations maps (included in this plan on pages 6-7) for reference purposes.

The survey solicited opinions on general walking and biking conditions in Kure Beach, and also asked respondents to rank the ten potential projects in order of preference.

The survey also asked for some general demographic information in questions 7-9: 66% of respondents were between the ages of 51-70; 51% of respondents were female and 43% were male (about 6% preferred not to answer); and a little over 85% of respondents were white. This information is shown in the charts to the right. The rest of the results are explored in the following pages.

Q7: What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 or younger</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>13.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-70</td>
<td>60.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71+ or other</td>
<td>13.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8: What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9: What is your race/ethnicity? (Check all that apply).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Island</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/AA Hispanic</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Polynesian</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 1: How would you rate overall walking and biking conditions in Kure Beach? (8 respondents skipped)

[Bar chart showing responses to the question]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>13.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>54.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>30.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know or prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: How important to you is the goal of improving overall walking and biking conditions in Kure Beach? (Choose one) (5 respondents skipped)

[Bar chart showing responses to the question]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>74.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>16.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>8.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOWN OF KURE BEACH NC
Question 3: Please rank the following destinations that you would like to be able to reach safely by walking and biking (1=most important). (13 respondents skipped)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Island Greenway In Carolina Beach</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destinations near Kure Beach Pier / Ocean Front Park</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Fisher State Recreation Area, NC Aquarium, and Fort Fisher Ferry</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4: Please rank the following proposed projects (1=most important). See these two posters for more information on potential projects. (13 respondents skipped)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Island Greenway Extension to Town Hall at K Avenue</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue K Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Fisher Blvd Sidelpath (E Ave to Fort Fisher)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5 asked respondents to “please use this space to provide general comments about any of the proposed projects,” and received 260 responses. There are some key themes among responses, such as a general desire for improved safety for those who choose to bike or walk around town. Specific comments address the need for improved crosswalks along Ft. Fisher, more dedicated bike lanes, intersection improvements (especially at Avenue K and Ft. Fisher Blvd). The possibility of the Carolina Beach Greenway extension remained slightly contentious, with Settlers Lane homeowners expressing privacy concerns, and many other residents expressing their desire for a continuation of the safe and separate facility for walking and biking that exists in Carolina Beach.

Question 6: What is your relationship to Kure Beach? (Check all that apply) (4 respondents skipped)

Overall, responses to the survey were fairly consistent with the views expressed at the public workshops. Kure Beach residents (& property owners) as a whole are supportive of ensuring that their town is a safe and family-friendly place to explore on foot or on bicycles, for residents and tourists alike. There is also a general recognition of the safety issues that arise when pedestrian and bike traffic is mixed with car traffic, as it currently often is on Ft. Fisher Blvd. People are also enthusiastic about the possibility of being able to reach more key destinations, such as the Pier, Fort Fisher, and the existing Island Greenway on foot or via bicycle.
ONLINE INPUT MAP

Kure Beach residents were able to access an online input map (interface shown below) to give their input on existing conditions for walking and biking in Kure Beach. Participants could place green markers indicating key destinations, red markers indicating barriers to walking and biking, or could use either color to make general notes. They could also comment on markers placed by other participants, and were able to “like” & “dislike” other people’s contributions.

The input from the online map was incorporated into the initial project recommendations formulated by Alta and presented for public comment at the second public open house.

Many comments touched on the state of the sidewalk along Ft. Fisher Blvd, as well as the lack of crosswalks at many public beach access points. Another common theme was a desire to access points of interest such as Joe Eakes Park, the Pier, and Fort Fisher State Park in a safe, family-friendly way via walking and biking.

Tell us about walking and biking in the Town of Kure Beach

Use the buttons below to provide feedback on destinations you’d like to walk or bike to, routes that function well or need improvement, and barriers to walking or biking.

- Key destinations for walking and bicycling
- Barriers to walking or biking
- Notes on existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure

Check out the map to see what other visitors have already suggested, and click or tap any point or route to see more details. If someone has placed a point or route that you agree with, click its “Like” button to add your support.
## PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE COMMENTS SUMMARIZED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Summary of Public Feedback To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Lane Intersection Crossing Markers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> Comments received were in favor of marking bike lane crossings at intersections to improve safety in a cost-effective way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cons</strong> None received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenway Extension to Settlers Lane</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> Comments in favor of the extension emphasize the need for a safe, paved connection for bicyclists and pedestrians between the greenway and Settlers Lane, provided that motorized vehicles, including golf carts, would not be allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cons</strong> A major concern was that the extension would put walkers and cyclists in conflict with traffic on Settlers Lane, especially during the summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenway Extension to K Avenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> Comments in support of the greenway extension highlight the need for a safe, designated route for walking and biking that builds from the existing Carolina Beach Island Greenway and connects pedestrians and cyclists to destinations up and down the island. The extension of the greenway would allow for greater opportunities for recreation and exercise for Kure Beach residents. Many commenters are in favor of extending the greenway even further as a connection to Fort Fisher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cons</strong> Residents have expressed concerns about safety and privacy issues if the greenway were to be extended, as well as concerns about preserving the wetlands on the land behind Settlers Lane, and whether the swampy land would even be suitable for a greenway. There is also recognition that implementation of the greenway is largely dependent on MOTSU. Additional concerns were expressed about the potential cost of the greenway extension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page.
| **Avenue K Crossing Improvements** | **Pros** | Comments were supportive of improving the intersection at K Avenue and Fort Fisher Blvd in order to make it safer for pedestrians. Suggested improvements include pedestrian signals, crosswalks, and signage reminding drivers to yield to pedestrians. |
| **Cons** | None received. |

| **Westside Bike Connector** | **Pros** | Comments in favor of the connector point to the need for a safe alternate bike route that allows cyclists to avoid biking on Fort Fisher Blvd. |
| **Cons** | Residents opposed to the connector worry about the safety of drivers, particularly the elderly, if Settlers Lane were to be designated as a bike route. Other concerns include whether Settlers Lane is wide enough to accommodate bicycles along with existing traffic, and whether cyclists would follow traffic laws. |

| **Fort Fisher Blvd Crossing Improvements** | **Pros** | Residents are overwhelmingly in favor of increasing the amount of crosswalks at key locations along Fort Fisher Blvd, especially at public beach access points and in areas with lots of residential and commercial development. Proposed crosswalks will have flashing beacons to improve visibility. |
| **Cons** | Safety concerns include greater risk of collisions between vehicles and pedestrians if crosswalks were to be placed at non-controlled intersections. |

| **Fort Fisher Blvd Sidepath (E Ave to Fort Fisher)** | **Pros** | Residents are largely in favor of improving walking and biking access to destinations in the southern part of the island. The proposed sidepath along the southern stretch of Fort Fisher will help to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe by providing greater separation from fast-moving traffic. The implementation of the sidepath project will improve connectivity to and from the aquarium, state park, and other amenities, as well as Brunswick County for those who wish to travel with their bicycles on the Southport Ferry. |
| **Cons** | Some residents question the necessity of suggested improvements given that the bicycle lane currently does run all the way to the ferry. |
| **Fort Fisher Blvd Sidewalk (K to E Ave Retrofit)** | **Pros** | Comments are in favor of improving the sidewalk along Fort Fisher Blvd, which is currently too narrow, uneven, and frequently blocked by parking, especially during the summer months. This project would involve retrofitting the current sidewalk into a much wider sidepath, allowing for greater separation from traffic for pedestrians and cyclists. Residents also favor increased enforcement of speed limits on Fort Fisher Blvd. |
| **Cons** | General concerns about costs relative to benefits for residents. |
| **Boardwalk Upgrade & Widening** | **Pros** | Residents reacted positively to proposals to upgrade and widen the existing boardwalk parallel to Atlantic Ave. Comments highlight the issue with cyclists entering Atlantic Avenue (and having to cross Fort Fisher to access it) and traveling the opposite direction from vehicles. Comments also address frequent crowding which occurs on Atlantic Avenue during the summer between bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles, sometimes pushing cyclists onto the boardwalk where there is little space for them currently. |
| **Cons** | Comments suggested that widening and upgrading the boardwalk should be less of a priority than getting bikes off of Fort Fisher Blvd. |
| **NC State Bike Route 3 on 3rd Avenue** | **Pros** | Comments highlight the need for a safe alternate bike route that allows cyclists to avoid biking on Fort Fisher Blvd. There is a significant desire to improve bicycle access to key destinations and attractions across the island. Commenters are in favor of solutions such as this one that will keep costs low. |
| **Cons** | General concerns about cost. |
WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BOARD

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TOWN OF KURE BEACH BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Kure Beach seeks to improve safety, encourage alternative forms of transportation, stimulate economic development, create opportunities for active and healthy lifestyles, enhance the overall quality of life, and improve the Town’s chances to qualify for funding opportunities to design and construct bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and

WHEREAS, to assist in meeting these desired goals, the Town of Kure Beach requested the development of a comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian plan during the development of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s FY 2022 Unified Planning Work Program; and

WHEREAS, the planning effort began in September 2021 and included comprehensive stakeholder and public engagement, the culmination of this effort resulting in the final plan; and

WHEREAS, the plan is intended to assist the Town in guiding the policies and priorities for bicycle and pedestrian transportation investments and programs to include capital improvements, future Town Ordinance amendments, and general guidance for facility design; and

WHEREAS, the Kure Beach Town Council adopted the Town of Kure Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan on May 23, 2022.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby adopts the Town of Kure Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on June 29, 2022.

________________________________________________________
David Piepmeyer, Chair

________________________________________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill Clears the Way for Future I-685 Interstate Designation in the Carolina Core

The Carolina Core is one step closer to adding another interstate shield to the region, thanks to language included in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill signed by President Joe Biden on Monday. Business and civic leaders within the region are partnering with local, state and federal officials to designate part of Highway U.S. 421 as a future interstate in an effort to further spur economic growth and make the region even more competitive on a global stage.

“This is an important step in a lengthy process to secure a game-changing future interstate designation for Highway 421 in the Carolina Core, which will not only increase our economic competitiveness, but will further enhance safety and mobility throughout the region,” said Michael Fox, President of Piedmont Triad Partnership. “This has been a true collaborative effort with our partners from the local, state and federal levels all sharing in the vision for Future I-685 to better connect the region’s plentiful assets, including our megasites, labor markets and colleges and universities, among others. We look forward to continuing our work together to push this important initiative across the finish line.”

Instrumental to the inclusion of this language in the federal infrastructure legislation were U.S. Senators Richard Burr and Thom Tillis. This legislation marks important progress, listing U.S. 421 from the interchange with Interstate Route 85 in Greensboro to the interchange with Interstate Route 95 in Dunn as a “High Priority Corridor.” This measure will allow the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) to
request a future interstate designation through the Federal Highway Administration and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. If approved, NCDOT will then place signs notifying the public that I-685 is a future interstate corridor.

“One of the most important assets in Randolph County and the Carolina Core is our strong transportation network,” said Kevin Franklin, President of Randolph County Economic Development Corporation. “The future designation of U.S. Highway 421 as I-685 will further solidify the county and region as a destination for any business reliant on transportation and logistics. Randolph County is the proud home of the Greensboro-Randolph Megasite which is located on U.S. Highway 421. An upgrade to future I-685 status makes the site more marketable in the short term, and will better serve an end user for years into the future. Interstate access on the eastern side of Randolph County will result in additional development in the community which, in turn, will help the entire community to thrive.”

The future interstate designation is part of the Piedmont Triad Partnership’s long-term strategic vision for the Carolina Core. Over the last three years, local partners have been collectively rallying behind the future interstate designation for Highway 421, which will further enhance the region’s robust transportation network, while providing the vital connection of I-95 with I-40 and I-85. This designation will provide direct connections between large population centers and improve access to Fort Bragg, aiding in national defense and during natural disasters.

“Future I-685 here in central North Carolina is another reminder that we are ‘the good roads state,’” said C. Michael Smith, President of Chatham Economic Development Corporation. “We appreciate all of the support on this effort here in the Carolina Core. We look forward to continuing to build on this collaboration with our neighboring communities.”

Seven counties along the route have unanimously passed resolutions of support endorsing Future I-685. The region’s Metropolitan and Rural Planning Organizations have also given the green light in support of the future interstate designation.

“A critical component in Sanford and Lee County’s recent economic development success has been our highly strategic location at the epicenter of an abundant and skilled labor shed encompassing both the Carolina Core and RTP region,” said Jimmy Randolph, CEO of Sanford Area Growth Alliance. “With the designation of the U.S. Highway 421 corridor as a high priority corridor in the federal infrastructure bill, our long-standing goal of interstate connectivity with both I-85 and I-95 via I-685 is one step closer to reality, further strengthening our competitiveness for both talent and supply chain partners seeking convenient access to the megasites of the Carolina Core.”

105
SUCCESS IN THE CORE

The Carolina Core is a region on the rise with companies across industries finding success thanks to the area’s skilled talent, affordability and market access.
"(A) notice of the proposed waiver;
(B) an opportunity for comment on the proposed waiver; and
(C) the reasons for the proposed waiver.

(2) REPORT.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the waivers provided under this section.".

SEC. 11514. HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS ON THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.

(a) HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS.—Section 1105(c) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–240; 105 Stat. 2032; 133 Stat. 2018) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (84) and inserting the following:

"(84) The Central Texas Corridor, including the route—

(A) commencing in the vicinity of Texas Highway 338 in Odessa, Texas, running eastward generally following Interstate Route 20, connecting to Texas Highway 158 in the vicinity of Midland, Texas, then following Texas Highway 158 eastward to United States Route 87 and then following United States Route 87 southeastward, passing in the vicinity of San Angelo, Texas, and connecting to United States Route 190 in the vicinity of Brady, Texas;

(B) commencing at the intersection of Interstate Route 10 and United States Route 190 in Pecos County, Texas, and following United States Route 190 to Brady, Texas;

(C) following portions of United States Route 190 eastward, passing in the vicinity of Fort Hood, Killeen, Belton, Temple, Bryan, College Station, Huntsville, Livingston, Woodville, and Jasper, to the logical terminus of Texas Highway 63 at the Sabine River Bridge at Burrs Crossing and including a loop generally encircling Bryan/College Station, Texas;

(D) following United States Route 83 southward from the vicinity of Eden, Texas, to a logical connection to Interstate Route 10 at Junction, Texas;

(E) following United States Route 69 from Interstate Route 10 in Beaumont, Texas, north to United States Route 190 in the vicinity of Woodville, Texas;

(F) following United States Route 96 from Interstate Route 10 in Beaumont, Texas, north to United States Route 190 in the vicinity of Jasper, Texas; and

(G) following United States Route 190, State Highway 305, and United States Route 385 from Interstate Route 10 in Pecos County, Texas, to Interstate 20 at Odessa, Texas."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(92) United States Route 421 from the interchange with Interstate Route 85 in Greensboro, North Carolina, to the interchange with Interstate Route 95 in Dunn, North Carolina.

(93) The South Mississippi Corridor from the Louisiana and Mississippi border near Natchez, Mississippi, to Gulfport, Mississippi, shall generally follow—

(A) United States Route 84 from the Louisiana border at the Mississippi River passing in the vicinity of Natchez,
RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION EXPLORE EXTENDING INTERSTATE-685 FROM DUNN TO WILMINGTON IN NORTH CAROLINA

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority, and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, local, state, and federal officials are partnering to designate parts of Highway US 421 as a future interstate; and

WHEREAS, the federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) listed US 421 from the Interchange with Interstate Route 85 in Greensboro to the interchange with Interstate Route 95 in Dunn as a “High Priority Corridor;” and

WHEREAS, this measure will allow the North Carolina Department of Transportation to request a future interstate designation through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO); and

WHEREAS, if approved, the route between Greensboro and Dunn in North Carolina would be designated Interstate 685; and

WHEREAS, US Highway 421 extends from Dunn to Wilmington in North Carolina; and

WHEREAS, the extension of Interstate 685 to Wilmington, North Carolina would connect larger population centers, enhance economic development opportunities, provide an important connection to the Port of Wilmington, improve access between military installations, and provide for an improved evacuation route.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby requests the North Carolina Department of Transportation explore extending Interstate 685 from Dunn to Wilmington in North Carolina.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on June 29, 2022.

________________________________________
David Piepmeyer, Chair

________________________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
STIP MODIFICATIONS

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY,

**STIP MODIFICATIONS**

- Project provides operating support for Fixed Bus Route 205 Long Leaf Park which services Novant Hospital and the Medical Center. This route carries a high concentration of individuals with disabilities as identified through an extensive onboard survey effort conducted in FY17. A survey effort is slated for FY23.

- Modify funding in FY 23, 24 at the request of the MPO.

**OPERATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2025</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAPITAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TQ-6513**

NEW HANOVER PUBLIC TRANS

**PROJ.CATEGORY**

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION - CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY,

**STIP/MPO TIP MODIFICATION**

- Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs
WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

STIP MODIFICATIONS

CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, PROJECTS FULFILLS THE ALLOCATION FOR NON-TRADITIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AS DEFINED IN THE GRANT. THE PROJECT SUPPORTS THE COMMUNITY GRANT OFFERING TO NON-PROFITS AND GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS TO REMOVE TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS AND CONNECT ELDERS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES TO NEEDED RESOURCES.

MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 23, 24 AT THE REQUEST OF THE MPO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj. Category</th>
<th>Capital FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>(L) $18,000</td>
<td>(L) $73,000</td>
<td>(L) $20,000</td>
<td>(L) $79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ-9001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW HANOVER

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA - WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION - SR 2048 (GORDON ROAD) US 17 (MARKET STREET) TO BUILD NC ROW AFTER FY 2029

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj. Category</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
<th>FY 2028</th>
<th>FY 2029</th>
<th>After FY 2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILD NC ROW</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>$3,003,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST INCREASE EXCEEDING $2 MILLION AND 25% THRESHOLDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES: AND INDIIVUDUALS WITH DISABILITIES TO NEED TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS AND CONNECT ELDERS AND GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS TO REMOVE THE COMMUNITY GRANT OFFERING TO NON-PROFITS DEFINED IN THE GRANT. THE PROJECTS SUPPORTS AS CAPTAL PUBLIC TRANS METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION PROJECTS FULFILLS THE ALLOCATION FOR NON-TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2022</td>
<td>FY 2023</td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>FY 2025</td>
<td>FY 2026</td>
<td>FY 2027</td>
<td>FY 2028</td>
<td>FY 2029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$3,003,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

(MAY 2022)

STIP/MPO TIP MODIFICATION #22-6

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP PROGRAMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY(S) ROUTE/CITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>DIVISION(S)</th>
<th>MPOs/RPOs</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>FUNDS</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDS</th>
<th>PROJECTED NEEDS</th>
<th>SCHEDULE FOR CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>SCHEDULE FOR OTHER NECESSARY MOBILITY MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Bike/Ped 3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>$10,456,000</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
- **COSTS** ARE AS OF APRIL 2023 AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- **TOTAL FUNDS** ARE FOR CONSTRUCTION AND OTHER NECESSARY MOBILITY MEASURES.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY(S) ROUTE/CITY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>PROJECTED FUNDS</th>
<th>PROJECTED SCHEDULE</th>
<th>FUNDS FOR REQUESTED IN THE FUTURE AS NEEDED.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JACKSONVILLE DUPLIN, PENDER, PEN</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK, HANOVER STRAND AREA</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA MPO GRAND STUDY CAPE FEAR RPO, EASTERN CAROLINA</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSONVILLE URBN MPO MPO, GRAND STUDY CAPE FEAR RPO, EASTERN CAROLINA</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON RPO, WILMINGTON AREA MPO</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSONVILLE DUPLIN, PENDER, PEN</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK, HANOVER STRAND AREA</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA MPO GRAND STUDY CAPE FEAR RPO, EASTERN CAROLINA</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSONVILLE URBN MPO MPO, GRAND STUDY CAPE FEAR RPO, EASTERN CAROLINA</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON RPO, WILMINGTON AREA MPO</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>UFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO EB Loop</td>
<td>Signalized ‐ Market and Street BIKE/PED 3 Wilmington ‐ Hanover Boulevard</td>
<td>UTILITIES-BUILDING</td>
<td>$692,000</td>
<td>$692,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PROJECTED 2021</td>
<td>PROJECTED 2022</td>
<td>PROJECTED 2023</td>
<td>CURRENT CHARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHWAY 3 WILMINGTON</td>
<td>2021 $2,900,000</td>
<td>2022 $11,177,000</td>
<td>2035 $24,735,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER SR STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENDENHALL SR DRIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEACH ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extrapolated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extrapolated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON CDX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER US AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Remaining</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin</td>
<td>$624,000</td>
<td>$624,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside &amp; Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside &amp; Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside &amp; Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside &amp; Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td>$19,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>PROJECT</td>
<td>PHASE</td>
<td>SCHEDULED START</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>PROJECT A</td>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td>April 2023</td>
<td>$12,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>PROJECT B</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>July 2023</td>
<td>$11,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>PROJECT C</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>October 2023</td>
<td>$117,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>PROJECT D</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>December 2023</td>
<td>$156,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, visit the North Carolina Statewide Transportation Program website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>STI</th>
<th>DIV</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SELECTED</th>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th>PROJECTED FUNDS</th>
<th>FUNDS NEEDED</th>
<th>SCHEDULED TO</th>
<th>REMAINING FUNDS</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDS</th>
<th>TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATEWIDE VARIOUS HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9999WMSW</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>STATEWIDE FLOODPLAIN (HFP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5100</td>
<td>FLTP</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,163,000</td>
<td>$45,163,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5717</td>
<td></td>
<td>5717</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>SYSTEM DATA COLLECTION. HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATEWIDE VARIOUS ENGINEERING PRELIMINARY</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>$768,000</td>
<td>$768,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0554</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>T 2022</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>NCDOT MITIGATION SERVICES</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,000,000</td>
<td>$105,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0554SW</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>NCDOT MITIGATION SERVICES</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5702A</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>5702</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,513,000</td>
<td>$1,513,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5702</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>5702</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,024,000</td>
<td>$1,024,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5702E</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>5702</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>$768,000</td>
<td>$768,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source Funds</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Fund Project</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Projected Funds</td>
<td>Funds Approved</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>Engineer, Implement, and Evaluate Proposed Improvements to The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>35,200,000</td>
<td>35,200,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>Retiming Signal Operations to Improve Safety</td>
<td>8,400,000</td>
<td>8,400,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>State-Wide Various</td>
<td>1,648,000</td>
<td>1,648,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>Retiming Signal Operations to Improve Safety</td>
<td>4,320,000</td>
<td>4,320,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>State-Wide Various</td>
<td>5,670,000</td>
<td>5,670,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>State-Wide Various</td>
<td>5,670,000</td>
<td>5,670,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>State-Wide Various</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>State-Wide Various</td>
<td>7,200,000</td>
<td>7,200,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subject to change.
<p>| COUNTY(S) ROUTE/CITY DESCRIPTION | MODE | SUB‐REGION | FEASIBILITY STUDIES | ENGINEERING DESIGN, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING FOR | IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT | OPERATING FUNDS | CONSTRUCTION | UTILITIES | TOTAL FUNDS | PROJECTED FUNDS | FUNDED SOURCES | DESCRIPTION |
|----------------------------------|------|------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------|------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                  |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| STATEWIDE                        |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| ENGINEERING SERVICES, FEASIBILITY STUDIES |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| TRAFFIC 50                      |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| DRAINAGE 50                     |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| BRIDGES                         |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| OVERSIGHT                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| FORECASTING                     |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BRANCH  |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| TPMPU                           |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| TRANSPORTATION                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| INTERCITY BUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| ADMINISTRATIVE                  |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| TRANSIT                         |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| MISCELLANEOUS                   |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |
| PROJECTS.                       |      |            |                     | way                                             |                           |                 |                |          |            |             |                |                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY(S)</th>
<th>ROUTE/CITY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>DIVISION(S)</th>
<th>MPOs/RPOs</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>PLANNING FUNDS</th>
<th>SPECIAL FUNDS</th>
<th>FUNDS FOR OTHER ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE NEEDED</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>NECESSARY FUNDING SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>NCDOT 5311(F)</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,850,000</td>
<td>$2,850,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>5310</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,960,000</td>
<td>$1,960,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>5311</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$567,000</td>
<td>$567,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$154,320,000</td>
<td>$154,320,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>5311</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$154,320,000</td>
<td>$154,320,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>5339(b)</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,750,000</td>
<td>$6,750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>NARRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1    | UTILITIES - AIM GRANT | $168,000 | $168,000 | EXPAND SERVICE | DEVELOPED SBUS CAPTIAL PUBLIC AWARD. 
| 2    | PUBLIC DISCRETION | $500,000 | $500,000 | ADDED FOR STATEWIDE STATEWIDE FY21 | ADMINISTERED TO FTA. |
| 3    | DISCRETIONARY | $350,000 | $350,000 | ADDED AT THE OF IMD. | IN PROGRESS |
| 4    | RAIL IMPROVEMENTS | $6,400,000 | $6,400,000 | MODIFYING IN ENVIRONMENTAL PRELIMINARY | PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL |
| 5    | SAFETY SEPARATION | $3,280,000 | $3,780,000 | RAIL STATEWIDE STATEWIDE | RAIL STATEWIDE STATEWIDE |

**NOTES:**
- All funding is provided by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
- The funding is subject to change based on Federal requirements and appropriations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Condition</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Costs and dates are as of May 2022. Final costs and dates may differ. Projects listed are those recommended for funding in the 2024-2029 State Transportation Improvement Program.
| COUNTY(S) ROUTE/CITY DESCRIPTION | MODE DIVISION(S) | MPOs/RPOs | PROJECT ID | FUNDING CATEGORY | FUNDS NEEDED FOR TOTAL SOURCES | SCHEDULE FOR FUNDED | PRIORITIZATION PROJECTED | NEP | STI | STI FUNDS | TAB UTILITIES | ONLY | ONLY | OVER | FOR BOND FUNDING: OVER | FOR PAYBACK | FOR PAYBACK | FOR PAYBACK | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | OVER | O
2024-2033 STIP Development
Today’s Topics

- Discussion
- Next Steps / Schedule
- Project Prioritization Status
- STIP Format
- STIP Development
- Background
STIP Budget Changes

COVID - Revenues affected

- Board of Transportation approved changing from 1% compounded annually to 3%

Inflation adjustments

New budgets provided $3.8B in additional revenue

- Federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA)/Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL)

- State budget

Inflation adjustments

- Processes in place to ensure more accurate estimates moving forward

- Many increases due to outdated or low estimates

- Many increases since July 2020 ($8B+ in cost increases since July 2020)

- $2.5B impact ($8B+ in cost increases since July 2020)

Inflation adjustments

- Board of Transportation approved changing from 1% compounded annually to 3%

Inflation adjustments

- Processes in place to ensure more accurate estimates moving forward

- Many increases due to outdated or low estimates

- Many increases since July 2020 ($8B+ in cost increases since July 2020)

- $2.5B impact

Inflation adjustments

- Board of Transportation approved changing from 1% compounded annually to 3%

Inflation adjustments

- Processes in place to ensure more accurate estimates moving forward

- Many increases due to outdated or low estimates

- Many increases since July 2020 ($8B+ in cost increases since July 2020)

- $2.5B impact
As of January 25, 2022. Available Funding reflects accounting for 3% inflation. Programming Status Amounts are compared to 100% of budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Available Funding</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (D1 &amp; D4)</td>
<td>$647.5M</td>
<td>$383.2M</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (D2 &amp; D3)</td>
<td>$919.2M</td>
<td>$391.2M</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (D5 &amp; D6)</td>
<td>$1.78B</td>
<td>$297.1M</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (D7 &amp; D9)</td>
<td>$1.33B</td>
<td>$596.7M</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (D8 &amp; D10)</td>
<td>$1.67B</td>
<td>$756.5M</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (D11 &amp; D12)</td>
<td>$881.0M</td>
<td>$455.7M</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (D13 &amp; D14)</td>
<td>$676.1M</td>
<td>$982.2M</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes estimated funding from Infrastructure and Investment Jobs Act (IIJA)/Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL)

Total Overall Programmed: $8B

2024-2033 STIP Funding Availability for Committed Projects
Develop trustworthy and dependable STIP (fiscally constrained)

Ensure process is grounded in state/federal requirements

Produce 2024-2033 STIP using current STIP project list with transparent process

Have an opportunity to fund new projects in P7 scoring (all 22 STI funding categories)

Prioritization Workgroup Overall Goals

Develop trustworthy and dependable STIP (fiscally constrained)
Projects selected for funding using one of two approaches:

1. Delivery Projects – programmed first
   - Currently scheduled for CON in FY 2024, 2025, or 2026; ROW underway or has federal grant
   - Delivered Projects – programmed second

2. P3-P4-P5 Evaluation (Seniority Approach) – programmed second
   - Cost of project(s) swapped in must be within 10% of cost of project(s) being swapped
   - Swaps must be agreed to by NCDOT and MPO/RPO(s)

Opportunity to swap projects & project schedules following release of

DRAFT STIP (April 25th)

Only includes projects funded in 2020-2039 STIP Development (Framework)
Delivery Projects:

- Schedules for >80% of projects did NOT change!

P3-P4-P5 Evaluation (Seniority Approach):

- Schedules for 34% of projects did NOT change.

Other:

- Some non-committed projects were programmed to meet STIP minimum funding requirements.

- # and length of schedule changes varies by STI category.

- Schedules for <80% of projects did NOT change!
2024-2033 S TIP Format
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
<td>Data 11</td>
<td>Data 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 13</td>
<td>Data 14</td>
<td>Data 15</td>
<td>Data 16</td>
<td>Data 17</td>
<td>Data 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 19</td>
<td>Data 20</td>
<td>Data 21</td>
<td>Data 22</td>
<td>Data 23</td>
<td>Data 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Notes:**
- Column A describes the first type of data.
- Column B provides additional information related to Column A.
- Column C contains relevant data.
- Column D offers further details.
- Column E includes supplementary data.
- Column F summarizes the entire dataset.

**Graphical Representation:**
A graph showing trends or comparisons based on the data in the tables.
Project Prioritization Status
for the 2024-2033 STIP
Project Prioritization Status

Projects with first year of ROW or CON in FY 2029 or later are "Scheduled for Delivery.

Projects with first year of ROW or CON in FY 2028 or earlier are

BOT agreed to Workgroup Recommendation of a 5-year window

Reprioritized " in P7.0.
Next Steps / Schedule
Final 2024-2033 STIP to be adopted by BOT in Summer 2023

Public Involvement

Revised Draft STIP by December 2022

Project swaps due to STIP managers by September 30th

STIP coordination meetings with MPO/RPOs as needed

- Commissioners, Council members, Mayors, Managers, etc.
- Local Officials Education Webinar on May 17th

2024-2033 STIP Next Steps / Schedule
Next Steps and Schedule

P7 Workgroup will likely begin Fall 2022

P7 should generate the 2026-2035 STIP

Anticipated P7 submittal window: Summer 2023

Anticipated P7 quantitative scores and 2026-2035 Statewide Mobility

Programming: Spring 2024

Return to two-year Prioritization/STIP cycle

Prioritization Next Steps and Schedule

P7 Workgroup will likely begin Fall 2022

Anticipated P7 submittal window: Summer 2023

Anticipated P7 quantitative scores and 2026-2035 Statewide Mobility

Programming: Spring 2024

Prioritization Next Steps and Schedule

P7 Workgroup will likely begin Fall 2022

Anticipated P7 submittal window: Summer 2023

Anticipated P7 quantitative scores and 2026-2035 Statewide Mobility

Programming: Spring 2024

Prioritization Next Steps and Schedule

P7 Workgroup will likely begin Fall 2022

Anticipated P7 submittal window: Summer 2023

Anticipated P7 quantitative scores and 2026-2035 Statewide Mobility

Programming: Spring 2024

Prioritization Next Steps and Schedule

P7 Workgroup will likely begin Fall 2022

Anticipated P7 submittal window: Summer 2023

Anticipated P7 quantitative scores and 2026-2035 Statewide Mobility

Programming: Spring 2024
2024-2033 Draft STIP
Changes to WMPO Projects

June 2022
Presentation Overview

- Projects Unfunded (17)
- Projects Becoming PE Only (9)
- Projects Becoming Unfunded (11)
- Schedule Changes (7)
- Projects Unchanged (17)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current STIP</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects Becoming Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Priority Score at the time the project was committed or added to the work program |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Priority Score at the time the project was committed or added to the work program | | | | | | | |
| Priority Score at the time the project was committed or added to the work program | | | | | | | |
| Priority Score at the time the project was committed or added to the work program | | | | | | | |
| Priority Score at the time the project was committed or added to the work program | | | | | | | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-5705</td>
<td>US 421 (South Front St)</td>
<td>Widen to Multi-Lanes from Cape Fear Memorial Bridge to Burnett Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5128</td>
<td>NC 132 (College Rd)</td>
<td>Greenville Loop Rd and Greenville Avenue, Upgrade Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5702B</td>
<td>NC 132 (College Rd)</td>
<td>Greenville Loop Rd and Greenville Avenue, Upgrade Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5734</td>
<td>US 421 (South Front St)</td>
<td>Widen to Multi-Lanes from Cape Fear Memorial Bridge to Burnett Blvd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects Becoming Unfunded (Map)

For additional details, see previous slide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Round Score*</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Funding Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV-5795</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>79.90</td>
<td>Wydean North South Taxiway System</td>
<td>$6.3 million</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FY 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5797</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>81.55</td>
<td>Widen North-South Taxiway System</td>
<td>$6.5 million</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FY 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5798</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80.16</td>
<td>Increase the General Aviation Apron</td>
<td>$7.5 million</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FY 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5799</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>81.55</td>
<td>Widen North-South Taxiway System</td>
<td>$6.5 million</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FY 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>Widen North South Taxiway System</td>
<td>$6.8 million</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FY 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5801</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>Widen North South Taxiway System</td>
<td>$6.8 million</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FY 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5802</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>Widen North South Taxiway System</td>
<td>$6.8 million</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FY 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5803</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>Widen North South Taxiway System</td>
<td>$6.8 million</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FY 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects Becoming Unfunded

*Prioritization score at the time the project was committed or added to the work program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STT #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-5954</td>
<td>NC 133 (Castle Hayne Rd)</td>
<td>Construct a roundabout at N 23rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5863</td>
<td>NC 133 (Castle Hayne Rd)</td>
<td>Widen to Multi-Lanes From I-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5795</td>
<td>ILM</td>
<td>Increase the General Aviation Apron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5799</td>
<td>ILM</td>
<td>Expand the General Aviation Apron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5885</td>
<td>ILM</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Runway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5796</td>
<td>ILM</td>
<td>Widen North-South Taxiway System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5886</td>
<td>ILM</td>
<td>Taxiway Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5954</td>
<td>ILM</td>
<td>SR 130 (Division Drive) to 140/US 78 (Wilmington Bypass) to I-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5954</td>
<td>ILM</td>
<td>NC 133 (Castle Hayne Rd) to NC 133 (Castle Hayne Rd)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects Becoming Unfunded (Map)

For additional details, see previous slide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-5798</td>
<td>US 17 Business</td>
<td>North of US 117/NC 132 to Station Road Access Improvements</td>
<td>$112 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5701</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Improve Access to US 70 from NC 132</td>
<td>$37.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5702</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$56.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5703</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$102.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5704</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$130 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5705</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$336 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5706</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$5.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5707</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$54.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5708</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$111.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5709</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$339 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5710</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$5.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5711</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$54.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5712</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$111.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5713</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$339 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5714</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$5.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5715</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$54.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5716</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$111.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5717</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$339 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5718</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$5.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5719</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$54.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5720</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$111.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5721</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$339 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5722</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$5.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5723</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$54.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5724</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$111.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5725</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$339 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5726</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$5.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5727</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$54.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5728</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$111.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5729</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$339 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5730</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$5.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5731</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$54.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5732</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$111.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5733</td>
<td>US 70 (McGee Rd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from NC 132 to US 117</td>
<td>$339 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projects Becoming PE Only* Prioritization score at the time the project was committed.
### Projects Shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-5731</td>
<td>US 421/Isabel Holmes Bridge</td>
<td>Construct Fly-Over Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5729</td>
<td>US 421 (College Rd) to Sunnyside Road</td>
<td>Widen and Construct Flyovers at US 421 (College Rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5730</td>
<td>US 421 (Carolina Beach Rd) to US 117 (Shipyard Blvd)</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway和 Interstate Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5724</td>
<td>NC 132 (College Rd) to Sanders Rd</td>
<td>Widen and Construct Flyovers at US 421 (Carolina Beach Rd) and NC 132 (College Rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5733</td>
<td>NC 132 (College Rd) to Sanders Rd</td>
<td>Widen and Construct Flyovers at US 421 (Carolina Beach Rd) and NC 132 (College Rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5790</td>
<td>NC 132 (College Rd) to Sanders Rd</td>
<td>Widen and Construct Flyovers at US 421 (Carolina Beach Rd) and NC 132 (College Rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5796</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from Gordon Rd to New Centre Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5398</td>
<td>Upgrade Roadway from Gordon Rd to New Centre Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Details:
For additional details, see previous slide.
**Kerr Ave Interchange at MLK**

**U-3338C**

**Schedule Changes**

- **STIP #** U-3338C
- **Project Name** SR 1175 (Kerr Ave)
- **Description** Interchange at MLK and Kerr
- **Cost** $26.8 million
- **Funding Tier** Regional Impact
- **Prioritization Round** P3.0
- **Score** 57.71
- **Current STIP** In Progress Construction FY 2027
- **Draft STIP** In Progress ROW/Utilities FY 2029
- **R/U Change (years)** 0
- **Const. Change (years)** -2

*Prioritization score at the time the project was committed*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Tier</th>
<th>Division Need</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Prioritization Round</th>
<th>R/U Change (Years)</th>
<th>Constr. Change (Years)</th>
<th>FY 2028 Construction</th>
<th>FY 2028 ROW/Utilities</th>
<th>FY 2030 Construction</th>
<th>FY 2030 ROW/Utilities</th>
<th>Current STIP</th>
<th>Draft STIP</th>
<th>Final STIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-6201</td>
<td>SR 1175 (Kerr Ave)</td>
<td>Construct Roadway on New Location</td>
<td>$9.1 million</td>
<td>Division Need</td>
<td>$9.1 million</td>
<td>84.12</td>
<td>P5.0</td>
<td>Prioritization Round</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FY 2028</td>
<td>FY 2028 ROW/Utilities</td>
<td>FY 2030</td>
<td>FY 2030 ROW/Utilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Schedule Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>U-4902B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>US 17 Business Access Management Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Access Management Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$23.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Tier</td>
<td>Regional Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/U Change (Years)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constr. Change (Years)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization Round</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>57.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Utilities</td>
<td>FY 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Utilities</td>
<td>FY 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Utilities</td>
<td>FY 2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current STIP</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft STIP</td>
<td>FY 2029 Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Utilities</td>
<td>FY 2027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prioritization score at the time the project was committed.
### Schedule Changes

#### STIP # U-4434

**Project Name**: SR 1209 (Independence Blvd Ext.)

**Description**: Construct roadway on new location

**Cost**: $193.1 million

**Funding Tier**: Division Need

**Prioritization Round**: P4.0

**Score**: 85.00

#### Current STIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW/Utilities</th>
<th>FY 2024 Construction</th>
<th>FY 2027 Construction</th>
<th>FY 2028 Construction</th>
<th>FY 2029 Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>FY 2027</td>
<td>FY 2028</td>
<td>FY 2029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R/U Change (years)**: 3

**Constr. Change (years)**: 1

**Prioritization Round**: P4.0

**Division Need**: $193.1 million

**Cost**: $193.1 million

**Description**: Construct roadway on new location

**Project Name**: SR 1209 (Independence Blvd Ext.)

**STIP #**: U-4434

---

*Prioritization score at the time the project was committed*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>U-5710</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>US 74 (Eastwood Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Convert at-grade intersection to interchange at Military Cutoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$66.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Tier</td>
<td>Statewide Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization Round</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score*</td>
<td>58.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current STIP ROW/Utilities</td>
<td>FY 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>FY 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/U Change (years)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constr. Change (years)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current STIP ROW/Utilities</td>
<td>FY 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>FY 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/U Change (years)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constr. Change (years)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prioritization score at the time the project was committed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>AV-5730</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Wilmington International Airport (ILM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Extend Runway 6-24 Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$5.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Tier</td>
<td>Statewide Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization Round</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score*</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft STIP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current STIP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Utilities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction FY</td>
<td>FY 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constr. Change (years)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/U Change (years)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prioritization score at the time the project was committed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current STIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-6202</td>
<td>Gordon Rd Widening</td>
<td>$2.4 million</td>
<td>80.74</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
<td>$4.1 million</td>
<td>Division Need</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-7571A</td>
<td>Millitary Cutoff Extension</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Division Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5203A</td>
<td>Old River Rd</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Division Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-6743</td>
<td>US 17/76/76</td>
<td>$4.4 million</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
<td>$4.4 million</td>
<td>Division Need</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects Unchanged

*Prioritization score at the time the project was committed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>Name Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-5914</td>
<td>NC 133 (from US 17/74/76 to Old River Rd) Modernize Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-4751A</td>
<td>Lendire Rd Realign Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5710A</td>
<td>Drysdale Dr Extension between 23rd and 26th Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5926</td>
<td>23rd to 26th St Construct New Route on New Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5914</td>
<td>23rd to 26th St Construct New Route on New Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5714A</td>
<td>Realign Rd Construct New Route on New Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5914</td>
<td>U.S. 17/74/76 to Old River Rd Modernize Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-6202</td>
<td>U.S. 17/74/76 to Old River Rd Modernize Roadway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional details, see previous slide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Priority Tier</th>
<th>Prioritization Score</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Use Case</th>
<th>Uplift-Use Path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-4902D</td>
<td>US 17 Business Improvements (Middle Sound Loop Rd to Marsh Oaks Dr)</td>
<td>Access Management Improvements</td>
<td>$28.9 million</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
<td>60.43</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Upgrade Airfield Lighting Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5792</td>
<td>MLK at College Interchange Convert At-grade Intersection to Interchange</td>
<td>Walk at College Interchange (Marsh Oak Dr)</td>
<td>$47.8 million</td>
<td>P5.0</td>
<td>56.53</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>FY 25 FY 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5801</td>
<td>ILM Expansion of Air Carrier Apron</td>
<td>Construct Multi-use Path</td>
<td>$3.9 million</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
<td>64.76</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Convert Air-Gated Interchange to Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5713</td>
<td>ILM Pipe Ditches in FBO #2 Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60.42</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Pipe Ditches in FBO #2 Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5702</td>
<td>ILM Rehabilitate GA Apron North</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>56.53</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Rehabilitate GA Apron North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5704</td>
<td>ILM Upgrade Airfield Lighting Vault</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>56.53</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Upgrade Airfield Lighting Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-5600</td>
<td>South 17th Street (Harbour Dr)</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>$0.9 million</td>
<td>P3.0</td>
<td>44.97</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projects Unchanged*

*Prioritization score at the time the project was committed*
**PROJECTS SHOWN:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>Name Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-4902D</td>
<td>US 17 Business Improvements (Middle Sound Loop to Marsh Oaks Dr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5792</td>
<td>MLK at College Interchange, Convert At-grade Intersection to Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5801</td>
<td>ILM Expansion of Air Carrier Apron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-5600</td>
<td>South 17th Street (Harbour Dr to Shipyard Blvd), Construct Multi-use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5702</td>
<td>ILM Pipe Ditches in FBO #2 Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5704</td>
<td>ILM Rehabilitate GA Apron North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5704</td>
<td>ILM Upgrade Airfield Lighting Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5713</td>
<td>ILM Pipe Ditches in FBO #2 Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5732</td>
<td>ILM Expansion of Air Carrier Apron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-5600</td>
<td>South 17th Street (Harbour Dr to Shipyard Blvd), Construct Multi-use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-5740</td>
<td>ILM Pipe Ditches in FBO #2 Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional details, see previous slide.

Projects Unchanged (Map)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>STIP #</th>
<th>Name Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3300A</td>
<td>Hampstead Bypass New Route on New Location (US 17 to US 220 North of Hampstead to NC 210)</td>
<td>$146.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3300B</td>
<td>Hampstead Bypass New Route on New Location (US 17 to US 220 South of Hampstead to NC 210)</td>
<td>$231.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U-5732</td>
<td>US 210 Convert to Superstreet From Hampstead Rd to Vista Ln SR 1382 (Washington Acresрамплед)</td>
<td>$35.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-5707</td>
<td>Southport- Fort Fisher Construct Mooring Facilities</td>
<td>$5.0 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prioritization score at the time the project was committed

Projects Unchanged

Current STIP
### Projects Shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-3300B</td>
<td>Hampstead</td>
<td>Bypass South of Hampstead to NC 210 (US 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3300A</td>
<td>Hampstead</td>
<td>Bypass South of Hampstead to NC 210 (US 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-5707</td>
<td>Southport</td>
<td>Construct Mooring Facilities (Ft Fisher) to Vista Ln from SR 1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-5732</td>
<td>US 17 North of</td>
<td>Convert to Superstreet from SR 1582 to US 17 (Washington Acres Rd) to Vista Ln</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional details, see previous slide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2023</td>
<td>MPOs approve TIPs, FHWA approves 2024-2033 STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td>NCDOT finalizes and releases 2024-2033 STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2023 – Spring 2023</td>
<td>Revised draft STIP public comment period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2022</td>
<td>Revised draft STIP released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 2022</td>
<td>Project swap deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2022 – Fall 2022</td>
<td>Consideration for project swaps, MPO/RPO coordination meetings, STIP outreach sessions, draft STIP public comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

- STIP outreach sessions, draft STIP public comment
- MPO/RPO coordination meetings, consideration for project swaps
- Project swap deadline
- Revised draft STIP released
- NCDOT finalizes and releases 2024-2033 STIP
- MPOs approve TIPs, FHWA approves 2024-2033 STIP

**2024 – 2033 Development Schedule**
Questions?
WILMINGTON URBAN AREA  
MPO  
June 2022

KURE BEACH BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN  
Project Description/Scope: The Town of Kure Beach, Alta, and the WMPO kicked off development of a bicycle and pedestrian plan for the Town of Kure Beach in September 2021. The plan is intended to aid the Town in the development and prioritization of its bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure needs. A kick-off meeting to discuss the Town’s existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and develop a timeline and strategy for public engagement was held in mid-October. A 3-day charrette activity was held November 30th through December 2nd. The charrette included two public meetings and stakeholder interviews. Approximately 150 members of the public attended the two public meetings, with an additional 436 responses providing input through the online interactive map tool. Alta completed an initial draft of the final plan and released to the Steering Committee for initial review in late February 2022. A 30-day public comment period was held during the month of March and included a formal presentation by Alta to Kure Town Council. Kure Beach Town Council adopted the plan on May 23, 2022.

Project Status and Next Steps:  
• Presentation and consideration for adoption of final plan to WMPO Board in June 2022

WALK WILMINGTON COMPREHENSIVE PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE  
Project Description/Scope: The City of Wilmington, in recognizing the desire of its citizens for a more walkable, livable community, applied for and received an NCDOT Planning Grant in 2021 to update the 2009 Walk Wilmington Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan. A Steering Committee, comprised of local stakeholders, citizens, and city staff, has been assembled to work with the consultant, Alta, to guide the development of the plan’s update. The Steering Committee held its first meeting on Monday, March 28th. During the meeting, Steering Committee members discussed their visions for the future of walking in the City; reviewed the successes of the current plan and opportunities to build upon; and began identification of where improvements will be most critical in the future. Alta completed a draft existing conditions analysis and an infrastructure safety analysis. The infrastructure safety analysis was presented to and discussed by the Steering Committee during its May 26th meeting, as well as a strategy for public engagement. A comprehensive public engagement period that includes both a survey and input map application is currently ongoing.

Project Status and Next Steps:  
• Development of project and policy recommendations and review by Steering Committee planned for summer late 2022.  
• Draft plan anticipated for release in fall 2022.  
• Final plan presentation to City Council in December 2022.

NAVASSA COLLECTOR STREET PLAN  
Project Description/Scope: In October, the Town of Navassa, the WMPO, and AECOM kicked off the development of the Navassa Collector Street Plan. Development of the plan, which will serve as an update to the 2004 Town of Navassa Collector Street Plan, is scheduled to last approximately eight months. The plan is funded as a special study in the WMPO’s adopted FY 22 UPWP. The updated collector street plan will serve as a tool for the Town to guide both public and private investments in shaping the transportation network as the Town continues to grow. The plan will provide a comprehensive network of streets to safely and efficiently access major roads and thoroughfares, outline collector street design recommendations, and identify opportunities for multimodal connectivity, preparing the Town to serve future developments while preserving its existing

170
neighborhoods. The proposed collector street network will complement the Town’s future park and trail network as well as the Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan currently in development. Plan development is being guided by a Steering Committee and will incorporate public input received via a public survey and both in-person and virtual public meetings.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- Draft plan (including implementation plan) from AECOM was provided on April 29th
- Final Steering Committee Meeting to be held in mid-late June to review the draft plan
- Presentation to Navassa Town Council in July 2022
- Presentation to WMPO Board in August 2022

**SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW**

**Project Descriptions/Scope:** The Wilmington Urban Area MPO assists with site development and Transportation Impact Analysis review for the MPO’s member jurisdictions. During the last month, staff has reviewed the following development proposals:

- New Hanover County Formal Plan Reviews: 11 reviews
- New Hanover County Informal Plan Reviews: 6 reviews
- New Hanover Concept Reviews: 0 review
- Town of Leland Development Plan Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Leland Formal Reviews: 10 reviews
- Town of Leland Informal Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Navassa Formal Plan Reviews: 0 review
- Town of Navassa Informal Reviews: 0 review
- Town of Navassa Concept Reviews: 0 review
- Town of Belville Formal Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Carolina Beach Formal Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Carolina Beach Informal Reviews: 0 reviews
- Brunswick County Formal Plan Reviews: 0 reviews
- Brunswick County Informal Plan Reviews: 0 reviews
- Pender County Development Plan Formal Reviews: 4 reviews
- Pender County Informal Plan Reviews: 2 reviews
- Pender County Concept Reviews: 0 reviews
- TIA Reviews: 40 total active (34 under review; 3 approved; 3 new): New Hanover County 12 (1 new, 11 under review), City of Wilmington 9, (1 new, 8 under review), Carolina Beach 0, Town of Belville 0, Town of Leland 7, (0 new, 6 under review, 1 approved), Town of Navassa 1, (1 under review), Pender County 9 (1 new, 6 under review, 2 approved) and Brunswick County 2, (0 new, 2 under review)
- City of Wilmington Formal Reviews: 41 reviews (7 new, 34 on-going)
- City of Wilmington Informal Reviews: 16 reviews (4 new, 12 on-going)
- City of Wilmington Concept Reviews: 0 reviews
- City of Wilmington Full Releases: 6

**STBGP-DA/TASA-DA FY 2013 to Present**

**U-5534C - WRIGHTSVILLE AVENUE/GRENVILLE AVENUE TO HINTON AVENUE**

**Project Descriptions/Scope:** The project is for construction of intersection re-alignment
improvements at the intersection of Wrightsville Avenue/Greenville Avenue and bike lanes and sidewalks along Greenville Avenue from Wrightsville Avenue to Hinton Avenue.

Project Status and Next Steps:
- 90% design review completed in November 2021
- Requested Right-of-Way Authorization in January 2022
- City currently requesting approval from NCDOT for final design elements and right-of-way authorization
- Begin Right-of-Way Acquisition – May 2022
- Advertise for Bid – December 2022
- Begin Construction – May 2023
- Construction Complete- January 2024

U-5534F – CITY OF WILMINGTON – PARK AVENUE MUP – PHASE II
Project Descriptions/Scope: This project is for the design and construction of an off-road multi-use path between Audubon Boulevard and Kerr Avenue.

Project Status and Next Steps:
- Began Construction – July 2021
- Project was substantially completed in January 2022.
- Official ribbon cutting occurred on 01/25. Project closeout is underway.
- Complete Project Closeout – Spring 2022

U-5534G – CITY OF WILMINGTON- HOOKER ROAD MULTI-USE PATH
Project Descriptions/Scope: The project consist of the construction of a 8' wide multi-use path along Hooker Road from Wrightsville Avenue to Mallard Drive/Rose Ave intersection

Project Status and Next Steps:
- 90% design review completed in November 2021
- Requested Right-of-Way Authorization in January 2022
- City currently requesting approval from NCDOT for final design elements and right-of-way authorization
- Begin Right-of-Way Acquisition – May 2022
- Advertise for Bid – December 2022
- Begin Construction – May 2023
- Construction Complete- January 2024
- City is currently requesting approval from NCDOT for final design elements and right of way authorization

U-5534H – CITY OF WILMINGTON- HINTON AVE MULTI-USE PATH
Project Descriptions/Scope: This project consists of the construction of an 8' wide multi-use path along Hinton Avenue from Park Avenue to Greenville Avenue.

Project Status and Next Steps:
- 90% design review completed in November 2021
- Requested Right-of-Way Authorization in January 2022
- City currently requesting approval from NCDOT for final design elements and right-of-way authorization
- Begin Right-of-Way Acquisition – May 2022
- Advertise for Bid – December 2022
- Begin Construction – May 2023
- Construction Complete – January 2024
- City is currently requesting approval from NCDOT for final design elements and right of way authorization

**U-5534I – TOWN OF LELAND- VILLAGE ROAD MULTI-USE PATH EXTENSION**

**Project Descriptions/Scope:** The construction of a 8 foot wide concrete path from the connection at the Brunswick Center in Leland across the front of the library property, down Village Road, ending on the western edge of the First Baptist Church property before the Sturgeon Creek Bridge.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- Construction commenced February 8, 2021
- Project on hold pending resolution of contracting issues with the consultant
- Contractor is expected to return last two-weeks in May 2022 to finish
- Project completion extended to June 30, 2022
- On hold pending negotiation of pay items and scheduling with the Contractor
- Final completion date to be determined

**U-5534J – TOWN OF LELAND- OLD FAYETTEVILLE LOOP ROAD PEDESTRIAN LOOP**

**Project Descriptions/Scope:** The construction of sidewalks in three locations: 1) The construction of an 8 foot concrete sidewalk along Village Road from Town Hall Drive to the apartment complex and widening the existing 5 foot sidewalk in front of the apartment complex to 8 feet. 2) The construction of a 6 foot sidewalk along Town Hall Drive from Village Road NE to the sidewalk that exists by the new Town Hall. 3) The construction of a 5 foot sidewalk along Old Fayetteville Road from the existing sidewalk in front of the apartment complex to Village Road NE.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- Construction commenced February 8, 2021
- Project on hold pending resolution of contracting issues with the consultant
- Contractor is expected to return last two-weeks in May 2022 to finish
- Project completion extended to June 30, 2022
- On hold pending negotiation of pay items and scheduling with the Contractor
- Final completion date to be determined

**U-5534K – TOWN OF LELAND- LELAND MIDDLE SCHOOL SIDEWALK**

**Project Descriptions/Scope:** The construction of 5-foot-wide concrete sidewalk adjacent to Old Fayetteville Road from Ricefield Branch Road to the US Hwy 74/76 overpass after Glendale Drive with connections to Leland Middle School and the surrounding neighborhoods.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- Construction commenced February 8, 2021
- Project on hold pending resolution of contracting issues with the consultant
- Contractor is expected to return last two-weeks in May 2022 to finish
- Project completion extended to June 30, 2022
- On hold pending negotiation of pay items and scheduling with the Contractor
- Final completion date to be determined

**U-5534Q – CITY OF WILMINGTON- S. COLLEGE/HOLLY TREE CROSSWALKS**
**Project Description/Scope:** The project will install sidewalk, ADA ramps, curb and gutter, markings and traffic signal revisions required to install actuated pedestrian crossings of S. College Road and crossings on Holly Tree Road.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- Final Approval on PS&E from NCDOT February 28, 2022
- Bid advertised on March 3, 2022 with May 3, 2022 opening date, pre-bid meeting held on March 5, 2022
- One bid submitted on May 3, 2022.
- Re-Bid opening on May 10, 2022 only received one bid. Staff did not recommend award due to budget constraints
- Submitted a Resolution to Council to Reject Bids and re-advertise on June 21st

**U-5534U – TOWN OF NAVASSA- NAVASSA PARK MULTI-USE PATH**

**Project Description/Scope:** This project will construct bike lanes on both sides of Brooklyn Street, a multi-use path connecting Brooklyn Street to the Navassa Park, and a multi-use path through the Navassa Park forming a loop within the park.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- Right Angle provided the 90% plans
- 90% plans and contract documents have been submitted to NCDOT
- CE Document has been approved
- Right-of-way authorization approved
- The consultant is proceeding with the right-of-way acquisition.
- Proposed property valuations have been submitted and have been approved by NCDOT.
- Letters to property owners have been mailed to initiate the acquisition process.
- Construction fund authorization request will occur next federal fiscal year

**EB-6025- TOWN OF BELVILLE- RICE HOPE MULTI-USE PATH**

**Project Description:** The project consists of the construction of a multi-use path of eight feet (8’) wide located at the western side of NC 133 between Morecamble Blvd and Rice Hope Run.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- The Town entered into a contract with Withers & Ravenel
- 100% plans approved by NCDOT
- Contract proposal (with cost estimate) approved April 11, 2022
- Project remains on track for a September 2022 LET

**U-6234 MULTI-MODAL PHASE 1 B**

**Project Description/Scope:** Rehabilitation of the historic structure located at 525 N 4th Street for MPO offices.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- Paragon Building Corp awarded bid and signed the contract
- Project design team working thru submittals and proposed construction schedule

**U-6235 – City of Wilmington/New Hanover County – Signal Pre-emption Phase 2**

**Project Description/Scope:** The project will install traffic pre-emption equipment at 50 locations throughout the City of Wilmington and New Hanover County and GPS equipment on emergency response vehicles.
Project Status and Next Steps:
• Design contract approved May 5, 2021 by City Council: execution complete.
• Design kick-off meeting held July 23, 2021 with Wilmington Fire Department, Traffic Engineering and Davenport Staff.
• Design started in October 2021 is expected to last through February 2023.

U-6039 – CAROLINA BEACH – ST. JOSEPH BIKE LANE
Project Description/Scope: Construct Bike Lanes along St. Joseph Avenue and Lewis Drive from Lake Park Boulevard to Access Drive in Carolina Beach

Project Status and Next Steps:
• NCDOT funding availability reopened January 25, 2021
• Town Council elected to move forward with the project
• Agreement executed with NCDOT on August 18, 2021
• Design discussions held with KHA on August 31, 2021
• Public meeting held on March 24, 2022, to present three (3) design alternatives for bike path on St. Joseph
• KHA presented to Town’s Bike & Pedestrian Committee summary of comments on April 18, 2022
• KHA scheduled to present at Town Council regularly scheduled meeting on May 10, 2022
• Town Council approved Option 3 on May 10, 2022, as presented by KHA
• On May 25, 2022 project managers submit RFLOI to NCDOT requalified engineering firms with a response deadline of June 8, 2022

TASA-DA

EB-6026- TOWN OF BELVILLE- BELVILLE ELEMENTARY- MULTI-USE PATH
Project Description: The project consists of the construction of a multi-use path of eight feet (8’) wide located along NC 133 connecting north and south entrances of Hawks Water Development to Belville Elementary School.

Project Status and Next Steps:
• The Town entered into a contract with Withers & Ravenel
• 100% plans approved by NCDOT
• Contract proposal (with cost estimate) approved April 11, 2022
• Project remains on track for a September 2022 LET

EB-6027 – NEW HANOVER COUNTY- MIDDLE SOUND GREENWAY
Project Description: Design only of the Middle Sound Greenway connection from Red Cedar to Ogden Park

Project Status and Next Steps:
• ROW acquisition continuing
• NCDOT issued notice of Construction Authorization on April 12, 2022.

EB-6028 — CITY OF WILMINGTON- 21ST STREET/MARKET HAWK SIGNAL
Project Description: Design and construction of a HAWK signal at the pedestrian crossing at Market Street and 21st Street

Project Status and Next Steps:
• NCDOT has approved the project plans
• Preparation of bid documents is underway

EB-6029 – TOWN OF CAROLINA BEACH – CLARENDON AVENUE MULTI-USE PATH
Project Description: Construction of the Clarendon Avenue multi-use path from 4th Street to Dow Road

Project Status and Next Steps:
• The Town is evaluating the scope for the project.
• Design modifications requested to include five-foot sidewalk and on street pavement markings in lieu of multi-use path

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
Project Description/Scope: The TDM “Go Coast” program works to increase the use of alternative transportation by WMPO residents and decrease Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). The WMPO Board approved Cape Fear Change in Motion 2020, the short-range TDM Plan which will guide Go Coast initiatives from 2021 to 2025. This plan identifies seven short-range strategies to increase mobility options and reduce traffic in the WMPO region. These strategies are: Alternative Work Schedules, Bike Share Program, Carpool and Vanpool, Consulting for Telecommuting Opportunities, Fostering a Bicycle and Pedestrian Friendly Culture, Improved TDM-Focused Collaboration, and Personalized Commuter Plans.

Go Coast current initiatives and project status:

1. Bike Share
The WMPO Board approved the release of a new Request for Proposal (RFP) to bring a bike share program to the Wilmington area. The RFP closed on April 11, 2022, and a bike share selection committee was assembled to review and score proposals. The committee voted to reject all proposals and re-advertise the RFP to solicit more options. After internal discussion, WMPO staff elected to pause the process while staff holds discussions with member jurisdictions to determine the best route forward.

2. River to Sea Bike Ride
The 32nd Annual River to Sea Bike Ride took place on May 7, 2022 and hosted a total of 333 participants.

3. TDM Coordinator
WMPO staff is currently advertising for the TDM coordinator position and has been interviewing potential candidates.

4. Go Coast Meeting
The Go Coast meeting on May 19, 2022, was cancelled. Staff will reach out to committee members in July to determine the next meeting date.
Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority
June 2022 Project Updates

SYSTEM NETWORK ENHANCEMENTS
Wave Transit Board of Directors passed the Authority’s final plan for the new System Network Redesign on May 26, 2022. The plan increases service hours by 30%, expanding the existing network, as well as heavily investing in more frequent service. The plan preserves the current urban core network, while implementing peripheral improvements. The changes include:

- Replace routes 207-North and 301-Pleasure Island with a responsive, on-demand microtransit service delivery model, serving an increased number of residents in a much larger geographic area. Fares are consistent with fixed route service at $2.00 per trip. Hours of service will be consistent with fixed route, which will provide continuous weekend service for both zones.
- Routes 108-Market Street, 201-Carolina Beach Road, and 205-Long Leaf Park will have increased frequencies. Current service will adjust from 60-minute frequencies to 30-minute frequencies during designated peak hours (from 6:00am-6:00pm Monday-Friday).
- Revise route 104-Northeast to include the Market St corridor from Gordon Rd. to N. College Rd. Current 104-Northeast segments on Gordon Rd., N. Kerr Ave., and N. College Rd will be serviced by microtransit. Route 104-Northeast is going to be renamed to 104-East.
- Route 107-College Road will now provide 60-minute continuous frequencies during all service hours (removing scheduled deviations to Pleasure Island).
- Provide seamless transfers at Monkey Junction for bidirectional routing between the 107-College Road and 201-Carolina Beach Road.
- Implement a seasonal trolley schedule that includes increased hours on Saturdays, adding both early morning service and later evening service. The off-season (December – February) will operate Monday-Saturday 8:00am-5:00pm. The trolley will no longer operate on Sundays.
- Update weekend hours to provide service based on demand. Saturday schedule will change from 9:00am-6:00pm to 8:00am-6:00pm. Sunday service will change from 9:00am-6:00pm to 9:00am-5:00pm.

All changes will be implemented on July 3, 2022.

RIDEMICRO MICROTRANSIT PILOT
Wilmington’s Regional microtransit pilot, branded RideMICRO, launched on October 11, 2021. Four zones have been implemented, including Zone 1-Northern Brunswick/Downtown Wilmington, Zone 2-Pender/Northeastern New Hanover County, Zone 3- South New Hanover County/Pleasure Island, and Zone 4-North New Hanover County. There are 3,400 virtual stops across the entire network. The regional pilot is funded at 100% by NCDOT for the first year, with a second year’s application currently under review (Zones 3 and 4 are permanent additions to the Wave Transit design and will not sunset after the conclusion of the pilot project).

Ridership:
Q1 – 276
Q2 – 413
Q3 – 587 (to date)
Total trips completed are currently averaging 260 per month. Zones 1 and 2, Brunswick and Pender County NHC connectors, account for almost 80% of all rides taken.

HEALTHY OPPORTUNITIES PILOTS
Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority was selected as a transportation service provider for the Healthy Opportunities Pilots program (HOPs). The service went live on June 2, 2022. The pilot includes three regions in North Carolina, including the Cape Fear Region, which is comprised of six counties. HOPs was created to test and evaluate the impact of providing non-medical interventions to high-needs Medicaid enrollees and is based on Social Determinants of Health. Currently, 90 percent of health care spending in the United States is on medical care, but research shows that up to 80 percent of a person’s overall health is driven by these factors.

The goal of the HOPS program is to intervene and invest more efficiently and strategically in a person’s health proactively. Increased options for public transit can mean better access to care. In New Hanover County alone, there are seven census tracts with 20% of the population or greater, with zero car households.

CFPTA will provide transportation trips to eligible Medicaid enrollees. Currently there are an estimated nine to ten thousand participants who are eligible. The program funds are allocated to administrative support, operational provisions, and capital purchases, but most of the funding will be used for cost-based reimbursement for trips provided. Services will initially be provided through paratransit operations, later expanding to other modes if needed. Qualifying reimbursable trips include visits to the grocery store, work, parks, gyms, childcare, places of worship, etc. This pilot program will serve the community, as well as increase ridership and revenue.

The federal government has authorized the use of Medicaid funding over the next five years for these pilots. If the program is shown to be effective after evaluation of the data, the NCDHHS will consider integrating the services statewide through Medicaid managed care.

CAPITAL PROJECTS
Installation of the Automatic Passenger Counters (APCs) has been completed. This data shows bus stop level information, including boardings and alightings by location. A passenger amenities improvement plan is currently under development to prioritize passenger amenity improvements and additions at our highest use stops. There are currently two projects underway to improve passenger amenities. Installations will include 16 shelters and 9 benches over the next 12 months.

TRANSIT SALES TAX
On May 2, 2022, the New Hanover Board of Commissioners approved, a resolution to place a referendum for a quarter cent sales tax on the November 8th ballot. If passed, the sales tax would be used to provide revenue for three public transportation initiatives, including Wave Transit. Revenues dedicated to Wave Transit would be used to provide more service hours, more frequencies, purchase new technology and vehicles, facilitate improvements to passenger amenities, and to develop programs to support the region.

OTHER PROJECTS
CFPTA submitted an application as part of a combined grant submission for the Mobility for Everyone, Everywhere in NC project. The grant request was for $25m and included eleven systems across North Carolina. If awarded, the funds would be used to further expand microtransit in the Wilmington metropolitan area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>Wilmington Rail Rehabilitation, Curve Realignment and Upgrade Rail Bridges</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2022</td>
<td>Installation of Railroad Grade Crossing Signals and Gates at Various At-Grade Crossings</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2022</td>
<td>Widen NC 133 from US 17/74/76 to Old River Road</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/2022</td>
<td>Installation of Railroad Grade Crossing Signals and Gates at Various At-Grade Crossings</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2022</td>
<td>Sidewalk between Randall Pkwy and N of University Drive</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2022</td>
<td>3rd Street and Dock Street Intersection</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2022</td>
<td>Offset lefts at NC 132 (South College Road) and Braggs Drive</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2022</td>
<td>Install Rumble Strips on US 17 Between New Hanover/Pender County Line and Mile Post 19.30 in On Pender &amp; Onslow</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/2022</td>
<td>Monkey Junction Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2023</td>
<td>Upgrade Pedestrian &amp; Traffic Signals and Revise Median Islands at US 74 (Eastwood Road) at US 17</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2023</td>
<td>Improvements to Hwy Grade Xings, Close &amp; Improve Various Existing At-Grade Crossings</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2023</td>
<td>1-40 Pavement rehab from Milemarker 420 to NC 210</td>
<td>New Hanover &amp; Pender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/00/2024</td>
<td>New Route from 23rd St to 26th St</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/2024</td>
<td>Widen Gordon Road to 4 lanes from US 17 Market St to I-40</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2023</td>
<td>US 140 - US 17 to North of US 74 pavement rehab</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2025</td>
<td>Replace Bridge 208 over Sturgeon Creek on SR 1472 (Village Road) in Brunswick County</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2027</td>
<td>Replace Bridge 7 on US 17 at US 76 in Brunswick County</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2025</td>
<td>US 74 (Eastwood Road) at US 17 (Military Cutoff Rd)</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/2026</td>
<td>MLK at College</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2026</td>
<td>US 17 from Military Cutoff Road to NC 210</td>
<td>New Hanover &amp; Pender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16/2028</td>
<td>US 74 at US 421 Flyover</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2028</td>
<td>US 174 from NC 210 to NC 10</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2028</td>
<td>US 174 from NC 210 to NC 10</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2029</td>
<td>US 17 from NC 210 to NC 10</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15/2030</td>
<td>College Road Access Management Improvement from Carolina Beach Road to Figure Rd</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WMPO Projects Under Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Number</th>
<th>Resident TIP/WBS/W</th>
<th>Work Order County Description</th>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC00316</td>
<td>Alex Stewart</td>
<td>New Hanover 48 on 1-40 E/4-10 W NE Substructure Repairs</td>
<td>3/1/2023</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00249</td>
<td>Alex Stewart</td>
<td>New Hanover (US 17 Business) and Dock St</td>
<td>10/2/2023</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00309</td>
<td>Daniel Waugh</td>
<td>New Hanover 49 on I-40 E/10 W</td>
<td>12/1/2023</td>
<td>89.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00300</td>
<td>Daniel Waugh</td>
<td>Brunswick 40 on I-40 E/10 W</td>
<td>9/13/2023</td>
<td>72.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204301</td>
<td>Alex Stewart</td>
<td>New Hanover 15BPR.19 New Hanover Banks Channel (#21, US 76) girder repair, clean and paint bearings</td>
<td>8/17/2022</td>
<td>14.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204309</td>
<td>Alex Stewart</td>
<td>New Hanover 15BPR.26 New Hanover Cape Fear (494.1-495.1) shear strengthening</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204553</td>
<td>Alex Stewart</td>
<td>Brunswick 15BPR.27 New Hanover (US 17 Business) and Dock St</td>
<td>3/14/2023</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204623</td>
<td>Alex Stewart</td>
<td>Brunswick 15BPR.28 New Hanover ILM Landscape Improvement - Available August 1</td>
<td>7/1/2022</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Completed Projects Summary:*

- **Brunswick:** 7 projects in various stages of completion.
- **New Hanover:** 6 projects in various stages of completion.
- **Wilmington:** 5 projects in various stages of completion.
- **Lumberton:** 4 projects in various stages of completion.
- **Pender:** 3 projects in various stages of completion.
- **Cape Fear:** 2 projects in various stages of completion.
- **Craven:** 1 project in various stages of completion.

*Estimated Completion Dates:*

- Brunswick: TBD
- New Hanover: TBD
- Wilmington: TBD
- Lumberton: TBD
- Pender: TBD
- Cape Fear: TBD
- Craven: TBD

*Percent Complete:*

- Brunswick: 0% - 100%
- New Hanover: 0% - 100%
- Wilmington: 0% - 100%
- Lumberton: 0% - 100%
- Pender: 0% - 100%
- Cape Fear: 0% - 100%
- Craven: 0% - 100%

*Description:*

- Replacement bridge 57 over Juniper Creek
- Replacement bridge 65 on NC 87 over Roan Creek
- Replacement bridge 57 over Roan Creek
- Replacement bridge 57 over Roan Creek (500 foot bridge)
- Replacement bridge 57 over Roan Creek (500 foot bridge)
- Replacement bridge 57 over Roan Creek (500 foot bridge)
- Replacement bridge 57 over Roan Creek (500 foot bridge)
- Replacement bridge 57 over Roan Creek (500 foot bridge)
- Replacement bridge 57 over Roan Creek (500 foot bridge)
- Replacement bridge 57 over Roan Creek (500 foot bridge)

*County:*

- Brunswick
- New Hanover
- Wilmington
- Lumberton
- Pender
- Cape Fear
- Craven

*Contract Number:*

- DC00316
- DC00249
- DC00309
- DC00300
- C204301
- C204309
- C204553
- C204623
- C204629
- C204553

*Resident TIP/WBS/W:*

- TBD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Number</th>
<th>County Routes</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC00311</td>
<td>2022 New Hanover Market Street, 3rd Street, Independence Blvd, and patching on 16th &amp; 17th Streets</td>
<td>9/29/2023</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00318</td>
<td>2021 Pender County Resurfacing</td>
<td>3/13/2023</td>
<td>88.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204409</td>
<td>2021 Brunswick 1 Section of US-17, US-74/76, And NC-130; and 11 Sections of Secondary Roads</td>
<td>10/1/2022</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00304</td>
<td>2021 New Hanover US 17, NC 904 &amp; Various Secondary Roads</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>48.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00302</td>
<td>2021 New Hanover New Hanover County Resurfacing</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>88.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00325</td>
<td>2022 Brunswick Resurfacing B (3/16/2022 Availability Date)</td>
<td>4/14/2023</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00327</td>
<td>2022 New Hanover New Hanover County Resurfacing (1/06/2022 Availability Date)</td>
<td>4/28/2023</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00330</td>
<td>2022 Sampson County Resurfacing and Preservation (7/06/2022 Availability Date)</td>
<td>6/9/2023</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00322</td>
<td>2022 Brunswick Resurfacing</td>
<td>4/1/2023</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00320</td>
<td>2021 Pender County Resurfacing</td>
<td>4/1/2023</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00318</td>
<td>2021 New Hanover New Hanover County Resurfacing</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>48.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00330</td>
<td>2022 Sampson County Resurfacing and Preservation (7/06/2022 Availability Date)</td>
<td>6/9/2023</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00322</td>
<td>New Hanover County Resurfacing</td>
<td>4/1/2023</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00320</td>
<td>Pender County Resurfacing</td>
<td>4/1/2023</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00318</td>
<td>New Hanover Market Street, 3rd Street, Independence Blvd, and patching on 16th &amp; 17th Streets</td>
<td>6/9/2023</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 2022

Nazia Sarder
Transportation Engineer
NCDOT Transportation Planning Division
1 South Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601

JUNE TPD UPDATES WILMINGTON MPO
JUNE 2022

Brunswick County Model: The Brunswick County Model was completed in February of last year.

Brunswick County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP): The Brunswick County CTP went through Peer Review, Management Review and Steering Committee Review. The county has experienced many changes to their land use and transportation network recently. This has led the county to re-evaluate the area and scope of the CTP. While the updated scope is being worked out, TPD will wait and pause the CTP. Once the county is ready to start the efforts back up again, TPD will reach out to the CTP Steering Committee and continue with the next steps.

Wilmington Model: The 2050 Travel Demand Model work started on 3/1/2022. The TDM is being developed for the next Wilmington MTP. Currently the TPD engineer and modeler are in the data collection phase. TPD has asked the MPO for employment data verification which is due end of August. The next MTP is due end of 2025, and that is also when the TDM will also be adopted by the MPO Board.

Helpful Links:
Click on links below to learn more:
- NCDOT home page—ncdot.gov
- Real-Time Traffic—DriveNC.gov | North Carolina Traffic & Travel Information
- Report a pothole—NCDOT Contact Us Form
- NCDOT: State Transportation Improvement Program—ncdot.gov/sti
- Links to all traffic count data information—Traffic Survey Group (ncdot.gov)
- NCDOT Interactive Traffic Volume Map—Interactive Traffic Volume map (ncdot.gov)
NCDOT Statewide Plans:
To learn more, click on the following links:
- NC Moves 2050 Plan (or go to ncdot.gov/ncmoves)
- NCDOT Strategic Transportation Corridors (or go to ncdot.gov and search: Strategic Transportation Corridors)
- NCDOT Comprehensive State Rail Plan (25-Year Vision) (or go to ncdot.gov and search: rail plan)
- NC Statewide Multimodal Freight Plan (2015-2040) (or go to ncdot.gov and search: public transportation plan)
- Great Trails State Plan (or go to ncdot.gov and search: Great Trails)
- Connecting North Carolinians to Opportunities (Public Transportation strategic Plan—2018) (or go to ncdot.gov and search: public transportation plan)
- NCDOT Resilience Strategy Report (2021) (or go to ncdot.gov and search: resilience strategy report)
- Statewide Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan (2013) (or go to ncdot.gov/bikeped/walkbikenc)