Create and execute continuing, cooperative and comprehensive regional long-range planning efforts that proactively 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, 2023
SUBJECT: June 28th meeting

A meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area MPO’s Board will be held on Wednesday, June 28, 2023, at 3 pm. The meeting will be held in the 6th Floor Conference Room at 320 Chestnut Street downtown Wilmington. Members of the public, MPO Board Members and MPO Staff can attend the meeting in person and virtually through the Zoom platform. MPO Board member attendance will be subject to the adopted Remote Participation Policy. The meeting will be streamed live online so that simultaneous live audio, and video, if any, of the meeting is available at the following URL: https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83969107282

The public may also dial in and listen to the simultaneous live audio of the remote meeting at the following dial in number: (309) 205-3325 or (312) 626-6799. And when prompted, enter:
Meeting ID: 839 6910 7282

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
6) Presentations
   a. North Carolina Department of Transportation Rail Division Update- Jason Orthner, NCDOT
   b. Wilmington International Airport Update, Jeff Bourk, ILM
   c. Cape Fear Memorial Bridge Shared Use Bridge Concept / Bridge Compatibility Study- Roger Rochelle, Hardesty Hanover
   d. Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Organizational Assessment- J. Scott Lane, J. Scott Lane & Company (p. 3-47)
7) Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from May 31, 2023 (p. 48-54)
   b. Resolution requesting Administrative Modifications to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Public Transportation Projects (p. 55-59)
   c. Resolution requesting Amendments to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Public Transportation Projects (p. 60)
   d. Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modifications #23-3 (p. 61-63)
   e. Opening of the 30-day Public Comment Period for 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendment #23-4 (p. 64-66)
   f. Opening of the 30-day public comment period for the 2024-2033 State/Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Improvement Programs (p. 67-74)

8) Discussion
   a. 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #23-4 (p. 75)
   b. 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Logo and Branding (p.76-82)
   c. Prioritization 7.0 Project Submittals (p. 83-100)
   d. Military Cutoff Road/Eastwood Road interchange
   e. PROTECT Grant (p. 101-102)

9) Updates
   a. Wilmington Urban Area MPO (p. 103-113)
   b. Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority (p. 114)
   c. NCDOT Division (p. 115-118)
   d. NCDOT Transportation Planning Division (p 119-120)

10) Next meeting – July 26, 2023

Attachments
   • Final Draft WMPO Organizational Assessment
   • MPO Board Meeting Minutes- May 31, 2023
   • Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority Request for Amendments and Administrative Modifications
   • Resolution requesting Administrative Modifications to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Public Transportation Projects
   • Resolution requesting Amendments to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Public Transportation Projects
   • Proposed 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modifications #23-3
   • Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modifications #23-3
   • Proposed 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendment #23-4
   • Proposed 2024-2033 State/Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Improvement Programs
   • Proposed 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #23-4
   • 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Logo and Branding Options
   • Prioritization 7.0 Draft Project Submittals
   • E-mail regarding Prioritization 7.0 Roadway Carryover Projects
   • PROTECT Grant Memorandum
   • 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)
An assessment of the WMPO purpose and structure; a review of policies; staff/member interviews, peer MPO reviews, and draft recommendations
# Executive Summary
A brief description of the findings of the WMPO Organizational Assessment

# About the MPO
A description of the purposes and structure of this assessment

# WMPO Structure
A description of the WMPO and its organizing structure, as well as a review of foundational documents

# Identifying Key Issues
The results from internal surveys of staff, WMPO members, and their partners; directions for the preliminary recommendations

# Directions and Recommendations
A review of peer MPOs and potential lessons; a preliminary description of the recommendations

# Moving Forward
A summary listing of preferred actions, tiers of priority, and resources for implementation

## Appendix
A. Expanded MPO Peer Summary

"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."
MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

Mike Kozlosky
Director, Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

Community Stakeholders.

These are exciting times in the Wilmington Urban Area. We are experiencing significant population and economic growth and with this growth is the need to plan for our future transportation infrastructure. As the federally designated transportation planning agency for the Wilmington Urban Area, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (WMPO) mission is to "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." Along with the growth and evolution outside, the WMPO is also growing and changing as an organization, and it is important to look inside to determine what we as an organization are doing well and to identify areas of improvement.

The FY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program included funds for the WMPO to hire an independent consultant to better understand how the organization is performing based on the needs of our members and perform an evaluation of the roles, responsibilities, staffing, program delivery, and structure of the organization. The recommendations from this assessment will be used to deliver our services more efficiently and effectively to our members.

The WMPO contracted with the J. S. Lane Company to perform this important analysis and in March the WMPO kicked off the evaluation. The process used included one-on-one stakeholder interviews and a survey to receive feedback as well as a peer reviews with other MPOs across the southeast. We strive to be one of the highest performing MPOs in the country and the recommendations from this assessment will help to advance the organization forward.

It is with great pleasure that I present to you the WMPO’s 2022-2023 Organizational Assessment.
In early 2023, the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization (WMPO) conducted an assessment of its organization. This study addresses both the impacts of external conditions of change on the WMPO and its processes, as well as conduct an assessment of how well the WMPO is performing in its role as facilitator of local transportation needs. Transportation infrastructure and services contribute to a regional program on which the success of the WMPO and its members is based.

The study entered a discovery phase of work in March, beginning with a summarization of the foundational documents of the WMPO as well as auditing meetings of the WMPO Board (the policy committee) and Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC). Interviews with all 12 WMPO staff were followed by interviews with nine members of the WMPO committees. This information fed into the development of a survey of MPO member agency representatives and partners (48 respondents) and the design of a questionnaire used to interview five peer metropolitan planning organizations in the Southeast.

A one-page summary of the project and its initial findings and directions for the preliminary recommendations was provided to staff for distribution to the WMPO membership to determine if there were any comments or concerns on the study findings or the proposed areas of recommendation. Preliminary recommendations were reviewed with WMPO leadership in June. The preferred set of recommendations was prepared for the staff, TCC, and WMPO Board to review and comment later that same month with presentations to the members in July.

Three categories of recommendations were developed: staff attraction/retention, project implementation, and communications with and between the WMPO committees. Additionally, a number of adjustments to the WMPO documentation and processes were suggested. These categories, and approximately 30 individual recommendations, were derived from the earlier discovery phase of study (document/meeting reviews, survey, interviews, and peer MPO studies). In a few cases, additional insights were offered by the technical consultant for the project, which included two long-time professionals in the area of MPO policy.

The opposite page provides a listing of the preferred actions presented to the MPO Board. Some actions are easy to implement; others, like developing additional funding capacity for new project construction, are longer-term propositions.
Based on your understanding of WMPO and the benefits to your community, are there areas where more personnel, consulting, or other resources should be deployed?

The best relationship averaged from all respondents was with NCDOT; the worst was with private sector partners.

RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Going Into the WMPO</td>
<td>Stand Up a New Non-Profit Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Departing the WMPO</td>
<td>Conduct an Annual Board Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Retention Actions</td>
<td>Conduct One Joint (TCC &amp; MPO Board) Worksession Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt &amp; Communicate Key Principles that Empower the WMPO</td>
<td>Update Member Survey and Compensation Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link the Site Review Process to Transportation Goals</td>
<td>Signature Communications (annual summary/or podcasts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Integrated Land &amp; Transportation Guidance</td>
<td>Distribute and Focus Communications Simultaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Hires (Multimodal. Communication, Funding)</td>
<td>Focus on Board Member Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Developing an Adjunct Funding Mechanism to Finance Large Projects</td>
<td>Modify the LPA Agreement to Benefit the WMPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner With the Other North Carolina TMAs to Develop Pooled Resources</td>
<td>Study Voting Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign or Hire/Contract Staff to Advance Viable Traffic Congestion Projects</td>
<td>UPWP Modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Adjunct Capacities to Expand WMPO Resources</td>
<td>Document Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking Ahead on the MTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPO Meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABOUT THE MPO

A DURABLE STRUCTURE UNDERGOING IMPORTANT CHANGES

FIFTY YEARS AND COUNTING. MPOs were conceived in the 1960s largely in response to complications created by rapid suburban residential growth after the second World War. The MPO premise, which has endured through periods when complex government bureaucracies were perceived more as problem than solution, was that better coordination between state and local officials—along with an overarching federally mandated set of goals—would produce longer-term considerations of more comprehensive solutions.

This premise has generally proved correct, and the MPO as a concept has survived and even grown in importance where other regional structures have disappeared or been sharply diminished. Factors in this success have waxed and waned over the decades, like concerns for the environment or counterbalancing the authority of state transportation departments.1

One important reason for their continued relevance, and one that explains a need for this assessment, has to do with the basic MPO structure. Essentially, an MPO is a group of local governments and other transportation-relevant organizations whose representatives discuss and decide how to spend transportation dollars in their combined planning area. While the mandate for MPOs is top-down (federal), the day-to-day operations are, for the most part, bottom-up (local), helping to ensure an adaptable and representative body. The most important MPO partner is almost always the state department of transportation (DOT), whose interests are represented by one or more members on the policy board, but there are usually more members from local governments and organizations. Therefore, one way of describing the efficacy of an MPO is how well it articulates the regional transportation objectives of its individual members.

The MPO structure will continue to work as long as (1) federal mandates of MPO involvement in transportation decision-making stay in place; and (2) the MPO has a functioning board of policy officials that can debate and determine transportation investments.

A second important reason for this assessment is that the underlying conditions under which MPOs operate are always changing. Advancements in technology-enhanced transportation services, inflation, ongoing concerns about equity to vulnerable populations, demographic shifts, and environmental and economic resiliency are among the biggest external considerations that have emerged in recent years. Internal conditions pertaining to staffing, the staff’s skill development, emphasis on performance-based planning, effective communications, and modifying workplace structures are also important internal contexts when considering how to meet these challenges.

OTHER IMPORTANT MPO ELEMENTS: Parts of the MPO structure besides the policy board, including technical advisory committees and staff, are also important. But the federal description of an MPO doesn’t require them, just a functioning policy board. General advisory committees, topical committees (e.g., for freight, bicycle-pedestrian modes, or transit services), and, of course, the staff required to serve those committees and implement their decisions, are all critical parts of the MPO machinery.
**PURPOSES AND STRUCTURE OF ASSESSMENT**

This assessment addresses both the impacts of external conditions of change on the MPO and its processes. However, the study is also purposed an assessment of how well the MPO is performing in its role as facilitator of local transportation needs that contribute to a set of regional policies and implementation program. These two purposes are intertwined: the short- and middle-term challenges may be much different than those in the past when key programs, services, or other investments were made. Objectives from ten years ago may have less relevance today or be superceded by emerging goals.

This assessment will examine conditions and strategies both internal and external to the WMPO, beginning with a review of its adopted policies and plan elements describing the organization’s current structure and goals. A series of one-on-one staff interviews were conducted to develop an impression of the internal operations of the WMPO, followed by interviews of a subset of WMPO Board and TCC members. An anonymous survey of all board members was performed to gather additional detail on specific issues raised from earlier rounds of research. This work was summarized, and a brief set of “directions” for the general course of the recommendations was prepared and reviewed by the WMPO.

Once the general directions and conclusions were validated, five peer MPOs were identified and interviewed to help understand their approach to the identified issues. The consultant had unique access to recent, prior research on a range of challenges and responses both in North Carolina and across the country in NCHRP 1002 (MPOs: Strategies for Future Success).

The final task was drafting a complete report and recommendations, presenting the major findings to the WMPO policy and advisory (TCC) boards. Based on comments collected from the boards and staff, the consultant prepared a final report and recommendations that took into account the comments received.

One feature of the approach taken for this assessment was that each element built on prior tasks to maximize the utility of the final product. This constructive relationship is suggested by Figure 1.
WMPO STRUCTURE

TAILORING A FEDERAL PROGRAM TO LOCAL NEEDS

ONE OF MANY UNIQUE ORGANIZATIONS. The Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization was first designated in 1978 and subsequently redesignated a Transportation Management Area (TMA) in 2012. MPOs and TMAs are primarily operationalized by their policy boards. The WMPO metropolitan planning area (MPA) is approximately 494 square miles. The WMPO Board consists of the following members.

- Pender County
- Brunswick County
- Town of Leland
- City of Wilmington (2)
- Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority (New Hanover County)
- New Hanover County
- Town of Kure Beach
- Town of Wrightsville Beach
- Town of Belville
- Town of Carolina Beach
- Town of Navassa
- NCDOT Board of Transportation

Ex-officio, or non-voting, members of the WMPO Board are the following.

- Federal Highway Administration (North Carolina Division Administrator or designee)
- Cape Fear Council of Governments
- North Carolina State Ports Authority
- New Hanover County Airport Authority
- North Carolina Turnpike Authority.

The WMPO structure and range of functions generally follow the pattern of most North Carolina MPOs, with some exceptions. The level of involvement and interaction between the WMPO and the Wave transit authority is more extensive than what is typically seen in the North Carolina MPO sphere. Second, the WMPO assists local governments with reviews of transportation impact studies, sometimes a function of regional councils of government but seldom done at metropolitan planning organizations. Lastly, the development of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Coordinator position in 2015 represents a dedicated resource to address an increasingly important mobility function not often found in MPOs.

Figure 2 on the opposite page illustrates the basic structure and staffing of the WMPO. Technical positions are supported by leadership (supervisory) positions, which in turn report to the policy board and various subcommittees. The following pages provide a review of key documents that guide this structure in practice.
Figure 2. WMPO Structure and Reporting. Derived from current organizational chart. Note that while the work of the WMPO can be collaborative between any position, several posts directly support the team as a whole or regularly work with various staff. Not shown: intern position(s) that may be employed on a shorter-term or part-time basis.
DOCUMENT REVIEWS. As part of the initial explorations of the WMPO and its processes, a review of relevant documentation was conducted. The 2022 WMPO Board and TCC agendas and summary minutes were also reviewed, as was the WMPO website. Some questions and clarifications with separate coordination with WMPO staff are incorporated into the reviews of the following documents. Additionally, two WMPO Board meetings were attended and reviewed.

- Federal Certification Report (“Program Review”)
- 2022 Compensation Analysis Wilmington MPO
- Cape Fear Moving Forward 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan
- Unified Planning Work Program: FY 2023
- Memorandum of Understanding
- Bylaws Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Section 104(f) Disbursement and Accounting Agreement
- Rules of Procedure: Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Prospectus for Continuing Transportation Planning for the Wilmington Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Audit of WMPO Board Meeting (January 2023)

The following are brief summaries, sometimes with initial observations that may be pertinent to the objectives of this organizational assessment. Potentially actionable observations are shown in boldface text and summarized at the end of this section.

FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REPORT (“PROGRAM REVIEW”)  
FEBRUARY 23, 2023

A federal audit of MPO practices is conducted for each TMA across the country at least every four years and is the key part of the recertification process undertaken jointly by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The on-site review was presented to the WMPO Board in March, 2022. The main result of federal MPO certification reviews are a set of findings that include recommended actions, corrective actions, and/or acknowledgements of good practice (commendations). There were no corrective actions, three commendations, and one recommendation in the report.

Commendations:
- The MPO is commended for using subject matter experts and a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to assist with its MTP update.
- The MPO is commended for providing a Degree of Impact Analysis map and scoring of its Environmental Justice (EJ) communities.

Recommendations:
- With the MPOs progress in the incorporation of EJ analysis into their MTP development, it is still recommended that the WMPO incorporate past projects into this EJ analysis, and the benefits and burdens specific to EJ communities.
- It is recommended that the MPO coordinate with NCDOT to update the Regional ITS Architecture/Strategic Deployment Plan and that the MTP include stronger language directly connecting the Regional ITS Architecture/Strategic Deployment Plan to the projects identified in the MTP.

The report notes (1) several areas have been suggested that would expand the MPA boundary (page 10); and (2) the WMPO was recertified until February 23, 2027.
The market-based compensation study was conducted by a private consultant and compared WMPO staff salaries to a mix of privately sourced and surveyed data points. WMPO staff salaries performed within an acceptable (or “competitive”) range on almost all salaries except for the positions of WMPO Executive Director and Traffic Counter (both lower than the mid-point of the comparative sources). It was noted that there is considerable variation in only a couple of positions; it might have been valuable to see the range of values and median values within each source. Also note that it can be difficult to compare position titles and responsibilities across organizations, and longer-tenured personnel have had the benefit of experiencing more raises even within the same market segment. Finally, it may be desirable to periodically reassess salaries with peers to ensure competitiveness in the future.

A strategic plan was prepared by an external consultant that focused on key areas of performance: Improve Safety, Multi-Modal Focus, Regionally Focused, Economic Development, Community Engagement, More Organized, Vocal and Cohesive Voice, and Organizational/Operational Effectiveness. The report does not include specific action steps attached to a timeline, but offers general directions for each of these focus areas. It’s also noted that the goals (page 20) of the Cape Fear Moving Forward 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan are not cross-walked to the MPO Strategic Plan performance areas. Ideally, these would be linked fairly tightly.

The WMPO work program documentation is straightforward. It does not contain a "prospectus" document (see review of Prospectus), although that document is referenced in two locations.

One opportunity for improvement is that the UPWP may be used to raise the awareness and importance of the UPWP, and its update can be seen as an opportunity to review past performance toward objectives and create a better understanding of upcoming tasks (e.g., perhaps using a UPWP subcommittee, which may also help educate new or refresh longer-term members about the WMPO’s functions and products).

Regardless, a one-page summary of the relevant actions being undertaken in the upcoming fiscal year would be a solid addition to the UPWP to help decisionmakers quickly parse its contents. The current "Introduction" could be readily modified to fulfill this purpose.

A minor note is that this document is termed a “UPWP,” not a “PWP,” according to current federal nomenclature (23 CFR § 450.308).
The MTP is the most recognizable document the WMPO produces, and its development is a core function of every metropolitan planning organization. It is reflective of not only specific projects, programs, and policies that the WMPO wishes to pursue but also describes the goals and vision of the MPO — what is really important for the WMPO and its partners to accomplish over at least the next 20 years.

The MTP utilizes well-designed, clear graphics to support key elements of the text (e.g., summary of public inputs on pages 22-25). The plan does a good job of locating detailed technical information in appendices, resulting in a main body length of 100 pages (plus summary and front matter). A common shortcoming in many MTPs is that the disposition of comments is not included; here Appendix D doesn’t just list comments but describes their resolution as well.

The EJ assessment is quantitative and considers seven different vulnerable populations. There isn’t an in-body, text summary of the degree to which funding supports vulnerable populations, although an appendix provides a lot of detail on the collection and use of data.

Six modal committees were used to strengthen the content of the plan, and it reflects positively in areas like system management and TDM strategies (starting on page 51), TDM having a dedicated staff position at the WMPO, also an important success factor in this complex subject.

Other observations include the following.

- Key information would be more accessible to stakeholders if the WMPO website had a direct link to an interactive project map that described the MTP projects to supplement the (not-keyed) map and table on pages 67-68 — this interactive map exists in the Arc StoryMap summary of the MTP, so it should be easy to produce as a separate document/link from the WMPO website;
- There is a lot of information in this plan and a lot of text to navigate, so having a tight executive summary, annotated table of contents, and “reader’s guide” to help direct people to specific parts of the plan would be useful to those that aren’t familiar with these documents;
- Understanding how local governments and other agencies use the data and contents of the MTP using a proactive listening session before the next update begins in earnest might indicate how to make relevant changes in the MTP; and
- It is possible that future iterations of the MTP might exist as a printable summary with the main body and appendices of the Plan accessible only online. Experience suggests that on-line resources are used almost exclusively to access technical documentation produced by MPOs; how many people come into the MPO offices requesting a print version compared to the number accessing the documentation online is a worthwhile consideration. Doing so would likely reduce reproduction costs, ease MTP amendment processes, and create better opportunities to allow users to zoom in or see projects and topics of interest. The print version forces splitting apart maps onto different pages that are removed from descriptive tables. On a minor note, starting to utilize interactive data platforms like Tableau can increase the cognitive absorption rate for those stakeholders that attempt to understand the data. Again, the current version of the MTP is close to achieving this state now with online, Arc StoryMap content.
The lengthy official title of the MOU includes the description "for Cooperative, Comprehensive, and Continuing Transportation Planning Among the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, County of New Hanover, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, County of Brunswick, County of Pender, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the North Carolina Department of Transportation in Cooperation with the United States Department of Transportation." The MOU is typically updated when new members of the WMPO are added or if the WMPO's responsibilities change, as was the case when TMA status was conferred. The important purposes of the MOU are to establish why the WMPO exists (promote cooperation in formulating attainable capital improvements and guide patterns of development and redevelopment) and various responsibilities (Congestion Management Process, planning, programming, and data collection, etc.).

Second, the MOU describes the constitution of the WMPO Board and TCC, as well as their duties (e.g., approving mission / goals, prospectus, bylaws, UPWP, MTP, Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), and the prioritized needs list).

Lastly, the MOU discusses quorum requirements and voting weighting or procedures (51% of members present to carry a vote; no weighted vote).

The MOU is signed by representatives from the organizations listed as members, so modifying the document is somewhat cumbersome in practice. The MOU often has overlap with MPO operations described in other documents, like a prospectus or bylaws that outline responsibilities, voting specifics, and membership. The MOU takes precedence over the bylaws in the event of conflicts.

Other observations pertaining to the MOU are as follows.

Some nomenclature used in the MOU is dated or not in alignment with the current terminology used in other documents, such as references to the FAST Act, self-certification, a prospectus (not available on the WMPO website), and a formal public involvement policy.

The MOU states that the WMPO is responsible for conducting “public involvement and technical analyses to determine preliminary alignments” for transportation projects. CRTPO (Charlotte Region Transportation Planning Organization) has similar language; other TMAs including CAMPO (Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, Greensboro MPO, Winston-Salem MPO, DCHC (Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO), and French Broad (Asheville Region MPO, although related but different language is present) do not have this responsibility stated in the MOU. The importance of this language may be to signify that the alignments in the MTP are, within the system plan’s ability to geographically define them, the corridors that should be preserved and shown in local plans to avoid development-related conflicts that would be obstacles to construction later.

The WMPO has more non-voting members on the technical committee than is typically the case for NC MPOs, including representation from Pender County Adult Services, NCDOT District staff, and county/city planners. If these entities are productive and generally exhibit good attendance, there may not be an issue, but their presence may open valid arguments about why similar organizations from different jurisdictions aren't part of the membership. Not a bad thing by itself, but there should be some formal guidance about what the WMPO is looking for in a voting member of its boards to rationalize and make consistent the boards’ compositions.
The bylaws defer to the MOU for purpose and membership, although there is overlap in operational descriptions, such as the bylaws stipulating that members may serve as officers of the WMPO for successive terms. The bylaws also specifically permit sub-committees and emergency meetings.

A potentially important component of the bylaws is the language concerning absenteeism by WMPO Board members. A written request for reaffirmation is sent to the agency whose representative has missed three consecutive meetings; however, there is no language discussing how continued absences might change quorum requirements (e.g., the missing member would not be counted in the quorum “head count”).

Some other observations associated with this review of the WMPO bylaws follow. Adding or removing an agenda item at the outset of a WMPO Board meeting requires a super-majority of those present, but there is not a definition of what constitutes a super-majority (a two-thirds vote is referenced later to denote a requirement to amend the bylaws, but it is not called a super-majority). There is potential for ambiguity for majority voting (Article VI, Section I) since the MOU is referred to but the bylaws also have (different) language for what constitutes a formal action. Generally, it appears that the bylaws are less likely to require updates in the event of boundary, responsibility, and membership changes, thanks in part due to the deference given in several places to the MOU.

The bylaws defer to the MOU for purpose and membership, although there is overlap in operational descriptions, such as the bylaws stipulating that members may serve as officers of the WMPO for successive terms. The bylaws also specifically permit sub-committees and emergency meetings.

A potentially important component of the bylaws is the language concerning absenteeism by WMPO Board members. A written request for reaffirmation is sent to the agency whose representative has missed three consecutive meetings; however, there is no language discussing how continued absences might change quorum requirements (e.g., the missing member would not be counted in the quorum “head count”).

Some other observations associated with this review of the WMPO bylaws follow. Adding or removing an agenda item at the outset of a WMPO Board meeting requires a super-majority of those present, but there is not a definition of what constitutes a super-majority (a two-thirds vote is referenced later to denote a requirement to amend the bylaws, but it is not called a super-majority). There is potential for ambiguity for majority voting (Article VI, Section I) since the MOU is referred to but the bylaws also have (different) language for what constitutes a formal action. Generally, it appears that the bylaws are less likely to require updates in the event of boundary, responsibility, and membership changes, thanks in part due to the deference given in several places to the MOU.

The document provides a review of the WMPO bylaws, focusing on the deference to the MOU and the language regarding absenteeism. It also highlights the need for regular review and updates to reflect advances in technology and discussions about reducing the number of or combining line-item tasks. The document further mentions the use of the prospectus, which is a complementary document to the UPWP and is largely devoted to describing the many work tasks line items in the UPWP. The prospectus begins with a description of the WMPO’s purpose and general board structures and ends with Appendix A, a history of transportation planning in North Carolina generally and the local area specifically, although that history’s latest entry is 1999.

The current prospectus has some out-of-date language (e.g., TAC, PWP, LRTP, TEA-21, seven planning factors, Statewide Planning Branch, etc.). Appendix B references a 2010 vision statement.

The language of the prospectus with respect to its most important sections — the descriptions of work tasks — should be regularly reviewed and updated to reflect advances in technology, for example. Discussions are happening now about updating the prospectus, including reducing the number of or combining line-item tasks. There isn’t a need to duplicate language in other documents, which only complicates update processes. Some MPOs have placed the prospectus in the rear of the UPWP, since the former explains the general task-level purposes of the latter.
This agreement between NCDOT and the City of Wilmington sets out the framework by which the city serves as the Lead Planning Agency (LPA) for the WMPO for the purposes of disbursing funding identified in Section 104 of Title 23 of the US Code of Federal Regulations. MPOs in North Carolina are generally believed and set up to not be legally “contract-able” under state law, thus requiring incorporation of some form or an attachment to another entity. To date, the LPA for every MPO in North Carolina has been a city, county, or council of government.

The most-recent population figure developed by the secretary of commerce (this figure is attributable to the Office of State Budget and Management) is used to apportion these funds each year and are still a foundational part of every MPO’s revenue stream even though Surface Transportation Block Grant — Direct Attributable (STBG-DA) funds are increasingly used to supplement the Section 104 funds for TMAs. Allocations are based half on equal distribution to all MPOs and half on population. In the event that an MPO does not use all of its funds, the NCDOT Board of Transportation may authorize a reallocation (rare, but it has happened). Funding for MPO operations is done on a quarterly reimbursement basis, which requires the contracting entity to “float” the funding necessary to conduct business for at least three months.

Notably, the LPA (Wilmington) assumes liability and costs for work not found to be in compliance with and approved by the FHWA. The agreement goes on to stipulate accounting requirements and procedures (applicable to consultants as well). The LPA is responsible for collecting revenues from participating agencies (e.g., other units of local government), and providing all of the matching funds necessary to cover Public Law 104(f) (PL) expenditures.

An attachment (B) also describes the responsibilities of the municipality to conduct its business in a non-discriminatory manner, including hiring and procurement. This same attachment also discusses compliance with respect to information and reports and contract language — this language is broad and potentially covers nearly every action and product of the WMPO and its contracted agents. Again, the responsibility for compliance falls to the LPA/City of Wilmington.

An update to this document is recommended in concert with updating the LPA Agreement.

This document contains procedural guidelines for the WMPO Board members and their meetings. These guidelines include descriptions of the voting procedures, member elections/absences, location (all in downtown Wilmington), and agenda content/preparation/distribution.

As this language mirrors that of the bylaws and MOU, any changes to those documents would require similar adjustments to the complementary language in the Rules of Procedure. Otherwise, this document does not present much new information not previously described. Note also the comments in the review of the WMPO Board meetings that pertain to modifying this document to clarify abstentions and recusals.
The agenda for this regular Board meeting was dated January 20, 2023, suggesting it was sent out electronically 3-5 calendar days prior to the Wednesday meeting. The meeting was available to attend remotely online (in Zoom web-based format) and requires admittance to the meeting or screen-sharing by permission of staff, helping to make it more secure. It might be an improvement to have a consistent link available from the WMPO webpage for the board meetings and agendas rather than having to open the agenda and locate the link embedded in the agenda document.

The meeting began with nomination and election of officers (chair and vice-chair). The overall atmosphere was generally collegial among several members of the board and with staff. The content of the meeting was primarily informational, with presentations being heard by NCDOT staff (Integrated Mobility Division (IMD), Statewide Transportation Planning Branch, Division).

In terms of the actionable items, there was a lot of discussion, and some confusion, about when members should recuse themselves from items that present a potential conflict of interest. There was a lot of willingness to provide back-and-forth discussion between members.

Observations and some suggestions follow.

Apart from having a more direct remote link from the WMPO website, it is not clear how public comments are encouraged or facilitated in the current format (note: there was one comment submitted in writing at this meeting to one of the members, who wasn’t sure if it was directed to the WMPO). It would be advisable to think about how and if to have a more proactive stance on getting people to comment at these meetings.

The meeting host should manage the ability of online participants to unmute themselves to improve meeting security (those people that aren’t members of the WMPO Board). It may also be good to produce guidelines for presenters, including font size, focusing on key elements first (for example, the total cost of the new WMPO headquarters building and schedule for completion were not included, or at least not focal points, in that presentation), adhering to high-level graphic principles for use of color in presentations (for example, color different MPO planning areas different colors), and the maximum desirable length of the presentation appropriate to elected officials.

It is further suggested to conduct an MPO Board “refresher” course for members. This refresher course might be used as an opportunity to support other recommendations, like how recusals are done at WMPO, planning area/UZA boundary considerations, UPWP development/purposes, public participation procedures, etc.; in other words, helping set the table for having a more-informed discussion at the actual meeting.

There were 31 attachments to the agenda, creating an agenda packet 128 pages long. It isn’t clear that the agenda packets are being received with sufficient time to be reviewed by the membership (or if more time would translate into more thorough study of the agenda contents).

There needs to be language added into the bylaws or the Rules of Procedure about abstention and recusal, which are two different terms (not voting as opposed to not participating at all or even leaving the room while the item is being discussed). It is advisable to have a brief review at a WMPO Board meeting about the best practice procedure.

Finally, relocating the camera used for the online attendees to a position higher above the conference table might be a less distracting angle from which to view the proceedings.
The WMPO and City of Wilmington were modifying the LPA Agreement as of this writing. A draft of the LPA Agreement was made available for this review.

The agreement, which previously had not been updated since 1993, stipulates in detail the responsibilities of the LPA (here, the City of Wilmington) and the WMPO. The new agreement will go into considerable detail on procurement, personnel, and benefits.

In-line comments on one draft of an updated agreement were provided directly to the WMPO executive director.

The information manual provides guidance to new staff, WMPO Board members, and other committee members. Contents include the roles and responsibilities of MPOs generally and major planning documents (MTP and CTP element). The manual also discusses the NC-based prioritization system (SPOT) and legislation that provided the foundation for it (Strategic Transportation Investments, or STI).

Many of the documents summarized here are also summarized in other documents, including the MOU, Rules of Procedure, UPWP, and MTP. The cross-document references require a good effort to track changes happening in all of these documents.

To get the maximum utility from it, the manual needs to be updated regularly, since it references specific versions of other documents (e.g., MTP) and procedures or characteristics that may change. For example, on page five one of the duties of the WMPO is to self-certify (as a TMA, the WMPO undergoes an external audit by USDOT), or page seven where the manual lists seven federal planning factors but there are now 10 factors stipulated in 23 CFR §450.306 (note: it may be worthwhile to understand the relative importance of the federal planning factors compared to the goals or performance objectives in other WMPO documents, like the MTP or call for STBG-DA project selections). Some statements about transitory actions, like the number of projects recently completed under a particular funding category, have a short shelf life. Therefore, it may be easier to maintain the Information Manual if its contents change less often and employ an easily updated companion presentation (slide deck), or even short video series (less easy to update but more accessible), that contains the basics in the manual as well as the current specifics.

Although not within the scope of this review, some of the specific language is unnecessarily formal (“shall”) or could be more accurate (e.g., it’s unlikely that anyone cares about the “initial” composition of the TCC — and the list shown on page 7 is current, not historical).

In addition to making the contents of the Information Manual more static — although boundary and membership changes will necessitate some updates regardless — the next major update could make it more accessible by having a condensed, more-readable version online in Arc StoryMap. Anything that can make this document more accessible, more user-friendly, and referenced more often by members increases the proficiency of the membership (and incoming staff).
The WMPO is engaging in noteworthy and innovative practices relative to their peers in North Carolina, particularly in the areas of public engagement, travel demand management, and site/TIA reviews.

Some documents are using outdated language, such as the MOU, information manual, and prospectus (being updated). Updating the MOU for boundary changes should also include updates to the descriptions and terms. Placing the prospectus with the UPWP as an appendix may make it more relevant and explain the purpose(s) of the UPWP line item categories.

There appeared to be a need for clarifying the conditions under which a super-majority vote is reached at the MPO Board in the bylaws. Re-wording and clarification would be advisable.

As the new MTP update cycle gets underway, consider a strong executive summary and, perhaps, even reconsider the utility of a large printed document versus a much shorter summary (perhaps 20 or fewer pages) that is more graphically accessible, easier to translate to other languages, and easier to update. The fuller version of the Plan would be available only online.

MTP updates are major undertakings, so one idea would be to migrate towards a "continuous update" process that reduces stress and levels out workloads across cycles. Work with local governments to report new developments, gather consistent public feedback at all meetings, update the travel demand model as network changes happen, and take other steps to continuously update the planning process inputs to make the actual adoption and documentation easier.

The Board meeting that was audited suggests several potential improvements, from modifying the accessibility to/at the meeting virtually to the need of a periodic Board Member refresher course. One suggestion is to consider additional processes to get more public participation/comments at the meetings if the Board wants to have more direct input from the public in this venue.
IDENTIFYING KEY ISSUES

ESTABLISHING DIRECTIONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

IF YOU’VE SEEN ONE MPO.... As noted at the outset, MPOs, while created and guided by federal legislation, have all evolved differently to accommodate state and local contexts — a characteristic that allows the MPO to strengthen its place in transportation planning processes. The purpose of 12 one-on-one staff interviews, interviews with nine MPO committee members, and a survey of 48 MPO members and process participants was to derive how the WMPO is operating and potential directions for broad areas of recommendation, potential specific action items, and even the types of peer MPOs that should be studied to generate more ideas for good practices.

The following pages first present a summary of the anonymous findings from staff interviews, followed by the actual survey that was utilized (note that not every question was asked of every staff person; the intent was to encourage flexible discussion within a 60-minute timeframe). This survey was enhanced by eight interviews conducted with WMPO Board and TCC members, which are also summarized.

STAFF INTERVIEWS. The WMPO staff were interviewed for approximately 60 minutes, with each of the 12 interviews loosely following the “script” shown on page 22. Additional questions were posed to staff with direct supervisory responsibility (page 23).

The staff were impressive in their commitment and care for the WMPO and its mission. Each person seemed to have a solid grasp of their responsibilities, although some positions exhibited much more variety in their work compared to others and some people were uncertain about the connection between their role and the WMPO mission.

While not prevalent, there was some sentiment that different positions, or even a divide across two main branches of the organization, created tensions or at least a poor understanding of the value added or workloads placed upon coworkers. Better organization around onboarding and exit/succession planning could be explored to help incoming personnel get more comfortable and acclimated to the processes and organization of the WMPO, thereby potentially improving employee retention.

New hires that explore refined “niches” or expertise are to be expected in organizations of this size, in this instance bicycle and pedestrian planning; transit and Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS) programming; and implementation/funding specializations to better leverage external and private sector opportunities. Not atypically, the LPA sometimes struggles to integrate the MPO into its processes.
SUMMARY #2 STAFF INTERVIEWS

HIGH-LEVEL CONCEPTS DERIVED FROM THE STAFF INTERVIEWS

INTERVIEWS WITH WMPO STAFF. Each staff member was interviewed individually for an approximately 60-minute window of time on March 6 or 7. The list of prompts (next two pages) were reviewed by the WMPO executive director prior to the interviews. The actual results and notes of the individual interviews are not available, as confidentiality was promised to each staff person interviewed.

STRENGTHS
- People at the WMPO sincerely care about the quality of their work in a variety of ways.
- Relationships with the WMPO Board, TCC, and NCDOT are sound.
- Job responsibilities are very clear to both leadership and technical staff.
- The WMPO has good autonomy for training and purchasing, which are utilized.

WEAKNESSES
- Not often good paths for advancement for some (especially mid-level) staff at the WMPO.
- Workloads aren’t always viewed as being spread equitably across all team members.
- Succession planning for incoming staff could be made better, more consistent.
- Communications, teamwork, and a collaborative vision should be priorities.

OPPORTUNITIES
- Need more opportunities, both formal and informal, for socialization.
- Opportunity to increase/formalize training, and conduct cross-training between staff.
- Potential exists for specialization in existing and future hires.
- Potential for improving onboarding procedures (especially after a senior position is added).

THREATS
- Not all members of staff feel equally valued or see their value in the mission of the WMPO.
- Communication between some members of staff may be strained, infrequent, or both.
- Some of the leadership personnel interviewed did not sound optimistic about positive change.
- WMPO is an unusual function for a city, and the LPA may be hindering some changes.

An expression of general ideas is presented below, categorized as a (S)trength, (W)eakness, (T)hreat, or (O)pportunity, although it is recognized that some topics may breach these subjective categories.

Specific actions that were suggested during these meetings will be incorporated into the overall recommendations.
Staff Survey - Questions for All Positions
Name (preferred personal pronouns), Title

[INTRODUCTION. WE'RE TALKING BECAUSE THE MPO LEADERSHIP WANTS TO MAKE SURE THAT WMPO IS NOW OPERATING, AND CONTINUES TO OPERATE, AT THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE LEVEL. YOUR RESPONSES ARE CANDID AND ANONYMOUS, WITH THE CURRENT STUDY SHARING THEMES IN AGGREGATE BUT NOT SPECIFIC COMMENTS OR TO WHOM THEY ARE ATTRIBUTED.]

1. In your words what is an MPO generally; what are they supposed to do?
2. Describe what you do "normally" in your job, as well as assignments that come around in cycles (e.g., MTP or UPWP updates). Any "wins" for you so far this year?
3. Thinking about what you just said, are there some things that you wish you had more time to work on, feel rushed to finish, or is there other work that isn't getting done now?
4. Could any of this work be done differently, less often, or could be conducted by external staff (consultants, junior staff, interns, temporary employees, etc.) to improve your workload, the work itself, or open up other opportunities?
5. Do you feel like you are advancing professionally at WMPO? Are there opportunities for career advancement within WMPO?
6. Is the equipment (e.g., computers, software, etc.) adequate to optimize your time and work? If not, describe the deficiencies.
7. Is the amount of cross-training adequate to meet your needs and the needs of the organization, in your opinion?
8. What was the on-boarding process like when you came to work here (the first 10 days and the first 90 days after your start)?
9. What kinds of professional development opportunities do you wish there were more of?
   a. External Training (virtual):
   b. External Training (in-person):
   c. Conferences:
      d. Internal (WMPO or City of Wilmington) Trainings:
   e. Education (degree or continuing education):
   f. Accreditation (AICP, PE, ITE, etc.):
10. Please rate the following on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale for your organization. As usual, you can comment or expand on your response.
    a. Internal communication is excellent and consistent.
    b. The way the MPO works is transparent, and I understand it.
    c. Feedback is highly valued & people are open to positive change.
    d. Workload is spread equitably across the team.
    e. I am challenged on a daily basis at work.
    f. My job responsibilities are very clear to me.
    g. The mission of the WMPO is very clear to me.
    h. I am compensated fairly for my work and experience level.
    i. Work-Life balance here is really good.
11. If you could fix or change one thing in your own position or WMPO's culture generally, what would it be?
12. Describe how you feel on Sunday nights – nervous, resignation, excitement, etc.?
STAFF SURVEY - ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR LEADERSHIP / SUPERVISORY POSITIONS ONLY

1. Describe the Wilmington pay structure for WMPO employees, and how compensation works and is adjusted over time, including the effects of the recent compensation study.
2. Describe how new hires are sought out, and any issues with the hiring process. This may include non-competitive salaries, wage stagnation, relocation allowances, health care insurance, leave time, retirement contributions, or other forms of compensation.
3. What is the onboarding process used for new employees?
4. Do shifting politics create challenges to the LPA relationship?
5. Are the LPA staffing requirements or policies limiting for things you want to do with your staff (e.g., training, conferences, pay increases, etc.)?
6. How often are the following conducted with staff:
   a. Performance Reviews
   b. Satisfaction Surveys
   c. Team-Building Exercise (group activities away from the office)
   d. Other Interactions:________________________________________________________

5. Are there functions within WMPO that feel resource-strained, or even absent, today? Some ideas might include: public engagement / communication specialization, member agency engagement, GIS, land use planning, engineering, architectural / design, graphic design, administrative support, financial planning / grant administration, mobility specialization (freight, transit, micromobility, active modes), website / internet deployment, and / or travel demand modeling / microsimulation studies.
6. For the next five years, will the staffing levels and areas of specialty be adequate, and other challenges that the WMPO is likely to face? If not, in which of the areas in the previous question (or other areas not discussed) will there need to be an investment in resources?
7. If there are going to be or are currently staffing shortfalls, at what level(s) are they most likely to occur?
   a. Senior level
   b. Middle level (5-15 years of experience)
   c. Junior level (1-5 years)
   d. Entry level
   e. Part-time, temporary, or intern?
6. What are the biggest threats to WMPO in the next 5 – 10 years, in your opinion?
   a. Meeting federal and state requirements
   b. Maintaining MPO relevancy with / utility to its members
   c. Attracting new staff
   d. Keeping existing staff
   e. Keeping up with technology or demographic changes (external threats)
   f. Something else:________________________________________________________________

7. Whom should we talk with at the City of Wilmington to get a sense of the LPA relationship from the city’s perspective? What other organizations should we speak with (e.g., NCDOT, FHWA, others considered partners)?
WMPO BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEMBER INTERVIEWS AND SURVEYS. Using, in part, the input from interviews with the staff and WMPO Board and TCC members, a survey was created to use as a tool to obtain consistent, objective information from WMPO decisionmakers and influencers.

During the interviews with the WMPO Board and TCC members (nine interviews in total), it was apparent that the external perception of the WMPO, its staff, and its performance was highly regarded. The WMPO meetings and agenda packets were also viewed favorably, with members saying that they had enough time to review agenda packets before the meetings, which were the right length and level of detail. There was some dissatisfaction with the speaking volume of some presenters.

As is the case in many MPOs in North Carolina and beyond, some people expressed frustrations with failing to implement large capital projects, such as an additional bridge across the Cape Fear River. The prospect of a boundary expansion of the WMPO planning area was noted by multiple interviewees as a potential problem, creating more barriers to achieving unified action. Most interviewees and survey participants, whose responses are summarized below, supported a claim that their agency is well-represented at the WMPO. The summaries of responses below note if there were differences between the WMPO Board Member responses and responses from other (non-policy) respondents.

Q1-2. Representation. The survey responses were gathered from 47 participants in the WMPO process from two weeks of online data gathering. Most of these respondents were local government staff on the TCC (7) or not on the TCC (14) but serving on other WMPO committees. Ten representatives of the WMPO Board also responded, as did two additional NCDOT staff. Discussions of the responses to several questions are presented below, including areas where MPO Board members differed from other respondents. Nearly half of the respondents had served on a WMPO committee for four years or less.

Q3. Services and products valued the most. The provision of site development proposals and traffic impact analysis reviews were highly regarded as existing WMPO services, followed by advocacy with NCDOT, working directly with the community on their programs, and providing explanations of complex issues to facilitate decision-making.

Q4. Most important policy goals. The WMPO Board generally ranked all policy goals lower than the average of all other respondents (an average of 2.6 out of 4 compared to 3.1 for all others), and tended to favor implementing projects more consistently. Implementing projects, including bicycle/pedestrian, transit, safety, and roadway projects, generally received top marks.

Q5 and 6. WMPO planning products or decisions alignment with local needs. These questions were asked back-to-back, and there was very little differentiation from any group of responder between decision-making or product alignment with local agencies affiliated with the WMPO. However, MPO Board members tended to give lower values for both questions, particularly with alignments between their local government and the
decisions made by the WMPO (average of 6.9 out of 10 for Board Members compared to 7.8 for all other respondents).

**Q7. Most important improvements to WMPO meetings.** More cross-communication and additional training of members on technical, policy, or regional planning issues were the most common responses. An affiliated response, clarifying/updating the WMPO vision and goals, also resonated with the WMPO Board Members.

**Q8. Based on your understanding of WMPO and the benefits to your community, are there areas where more personnel, consulting, or other resources should be deployed?** Pedestrian planning and safety got the most support (the most first-place rankings and the most combined first-, second-, and third-place rankings). Again, project development and funding received a lot of attention from WMPO Board Members and others, and earned the second-most top-tier votes. Engagement and equitable planning got the third-most votes, tied with micromobility service planning.

**Q9. Equity of representation at the WMPO.** When asked directly how much they agreed with the statement “The WMPO treats every member equitably,” the average response was 4.6 out of 5, although the response was slightly lower for TCC Members. Other similar questions elsewhere in the survey responses suggested some softness in this perception of member equitability, although not consistently.

**Q10-11. Defining WMPO impact and relevance.** Two questions asked respondents to agree/disagree with several statements or rate the importance of various WMPO functions. Respondents suggested that staff turnover is a concern, as is the unfair composition of WMPO boards (somewhat different than prior responses to similar questions concerning equity) and an insufficient amount of resources to do the WMPO’s work now and especially in five years. Again, expanding implementation resources for projects was the highest-ranking objective for the WMPO Board but also for other respondents. (This sentiment was repeated in one more question later in the survey regarding development of the Transportation Improvement Program, TIP.) The WMPO Board respondents also thought expanding the suite of services provided by the organization was important.

**Q12. Relationships.** The WMPO relationships with NCDOT were felt to be very strong, but relationships with (potential) private sector partners could be better.

**Q13. Big priorities.** The overwhelming response for WMPO Board Members (8 out of 10 respondents) was to focus on building the top-five priorities in the region; this issue was an important priority for the TCC and other, non-Board respondents as well.

**Q14. Overall, how satisfied are you with the performance of the WMPO?** The response to this survey question mirrored the responses provided in the interviewee discussions, with an average of 4.4 out of 5 and no negative responses.

The next two pages provide a combined summary of the surveys and interviews.
SUMMARY OF WMPO BOARD AND TCC MEMBER INTERVIEWS & SURVEY RESPONSES

INTERVIEWS WITH AND SURVEYS OF WMPO BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. Web conference interviews with four members of the WMPO Board and five TCC members were conducted one-on-one with the Consultant between April 6 and April 25. The interview topics were structured to represent issues suggested by WMPO documents, staff interviews, and audits of two WMPO Board meetings and recent agenda packets.

This page and the next reflect high-level takeaways from the nine interviews and the returned survey results, which were collected in digital format from late April through mid-May. The survey questions are shown immediately after this summary.

STRENGTHS
- Interviews, especially of Board Members, indicated near-universal accolades for staff.
- People are generally getting utility out of committee meetings (right length, etc.).
- Great relationships with NCDOT were cited in the survey and interviews.
- There is broad agreement on the importance of implementation options.

WEAKNESSES
- There isn’t consistent agreement on or funding for the largest priorities in the Region.
- Need to focus more on transit and repositioning as core transportation need (one interview).
- Some things that the WMPO does best, like communicate with members and development of the MTP, CTP and other documents, aren’t as highly valued as other services — developing tools to improve public understanding of development processes was offered as one suggestion.

OPPORTUNITIES
- Easy to improve audio quality of meetings and presentations with simple technology.
- Improving private sector relationships could also help project implementation options.
- The members surveyed overwhelmingly supported more dedication of resources towards bicycle/pedestrian safety and project implementation (especially from the WMPO Board).

THREATS
- The expansion of the WMPO planning boundary threatens cohesive decision-making.
- Resources, staff turnover, and member representation were not always favorably regarded.
- While discussions of better engagement, particularly with underserved communities, are frequently discussed in the broader MPO community, these things weren’t always high priorities for members.
The best relationship averaged from all respondents was with NCDOT; the worst was with private sector partners.

Please rank how important the following WMPO tasks are to your organization. (Note: Increasing options got 26 first-place votes while no other option received more than 9 first-place votes. A dominant response for focusing on funding occurred in a later question.)

**#1: Expanding options to build transportation projects**

**Least-Agreed-Upon Statements**

1. Resources Now (and Later) are Adequate for WMPO
2. Staff Turnover is not a Problem at WMPO
3. The WMPO Boards Fairly Represent My Community

Provided with 11 statements, these three were the least supported (not agreed with) by survey respondents.

“The MPO does a great job! I like that they are innovative and forward thinking!”

Survey respondent
MPO Member Interview

[Introduction. (Introduce self) We’re talking because the MPO leadership wants to make sure that WMPO is now operating, and continues to operate, at the highest possible level. Feel free to add commentary at any point during our discussion.]

1. Ask / validate role at WMPO and how long has the member served in this position for the WMPO.

2. If asked, could you give a clear and accurate description of the WMPO and its purposes?

3. Are you comfortable with the role(s) of the WMPO?

4. Describe any notable successes of the WMPO during your time with the organization.

5. Have there been any notable frustrations or failures, or even just where things could be better?

6. A few quick responses but feel free to add any comments to your answer. (Agree/Disagree)
   - I have enough time to review WMPO meeting agendas and attachments
   - Presentations made by the WMPO staff are clear, concise, and the right length
   - The WMPO staff responds to inquiries quickly
   - The WMPO meeting day, time, and locations work well for my schedule
   - The organization I represent is fairly and accurately represented at WMPO
   - The WMPO staff that I’ve dealt with are highly skilled in and knowledgeable of their roles
   - There is the right amount of staff at the WMPO to meet the organization’s needs now
   - There is the right amount of staff at the WMPO to meet the organization’s likely needs in five years (note: if “disagree” then ask in what areas there may be deficiencies)

7. What is the WMPO staff doing that is of particular value to you or your organization?

8. What else could the WMPO do or improve on to assist you or your organization?

9. Are there enough funds to accomplish what the WMPO wants to achieve? If not, what would be some actions that could be taken to make the existing funding stretch further or increase revenues?

10. Would you be willing to advocate for additional funding if the WMPO provided additional services that may be important to you or your organization?

11. If you could fix or change one thing about the WMPO or its culture generally, what would it be?
MPO Member Survey

Thank you for participating in this brief (about 12 minutes) WMPO Member Survey for our Organizational Study. Your answers are reported directly to our consultant that will summarize all responses but maintain your anonymity.

1. Although our survey is anonymous, we would like to know how you are affiliated with the Wilmington Urban Area MPO.
2. How long in total have you served as a member of a WMPO board or committee?
3. What service or product(s) do you value the most from WMPO?
4. The consultant's research has helped us understand some key areas that WMPO feels are important for the region's success. Please rate the most important policy goals for the WMPO to undertake in the next five years.
5. In your opinion, how often do the WMPO planning products align with the needs of your organization?
6. In your opinion, how often do the WMPO decisions align with the needs of the government or agency you represent?
7. What are the most important areas of improvement that could be made to WMPO meetings (MPO Board or Technical Coordinating Committee)?
8. Based on your understanding of WMPO and the benefits to your community, are there areas where more personnel, consulting, or other resources should be deployed?
9. Please rate your agreement with the following statement: “The WMPO treats every member equitably.”
10. Please rate how important the following WMPO tasks are to your organization: Expanding options to build transportation projects; Fast responses to inquiries from my organization; Meeting federal and state requirements; Expand current services for WMPO members; Develop new services for WMPO members.
11. MPOs work better when they have strong partnerships. For each of the following partners please describe if you think that the WMPO's relationship is good enough now, needs improvement, or you aren't sure.
12. What are three most-important areas that you would suggest more training be offered to, or more attention be asked of, the current WMPO staff?
13. Rate the value of each of the following to your organization or community
14. Not every change is incremental; some are game-changers. Choose up to two options below for big priorities to tackle in the coming years.
15. If you have other ideas or comments, please feel free to share them with us in the space provided below. (Comments included: (1) Working with local governments to update ordinances for tree preservation (increased air quality, stormwater filtration, carbon sequestration, better quality of life) and elevation restrictions/modifications for new development (important for increased storm/flooding and within a hurricane prone area) would be a game changer. Looking forward, beyond the next proposed sub-division, to improve the transportation grid with public trans, bikes and pedestrian paths will increase the livability of our region. (2) Safety factors should carry more weight in decision making. (3) Consider retaining the CFM Bridge as a pedestrian link to west side of the river. (4) Shared micromobility and the inclusion of this alternative form of transportation reaches across cultural and socioeconomic ranges and can be accessed to help ease congestion and increase tourism and tourist mobility in our area. Infrastructure to support the growth of this form of transportation exists and is being improved but more focus and funding would benefit all partners and the WMPO's constituents.(5) The BPAC is well run and responsive. (6) The MPO does a great job! I like that they are innovative and forward thinking! (7) Working to expand sustainable transportation options within cities and between communities can add tremendous value to alleviate congestion only associated with vehicles. Multi-use paths for transportation in a network that can be actively and reliably used in addition to a regional bus network that is consistent and reliable to jump on a bus to and from high trafficked areas.)
17. Overall, how satisfied are you with the performance of the WMPO?
DIRECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPROVEMENTS TO A VERY GOOD ORGANIZATION AND PROCESS

IF IT ISN'T BROKEN.... Individual interviews with staff and WMPO Board / TCC members paint a picture of broad satisfaction with the performance of the WMPO processes and staff. While there is always potential for improving on any complex system, there are also risks associated with the unintended consequences of imposing change. The WMPO is doing a lot right.

It was therefore important to provide the WMPO with an opportunity to understand the linkages between the research findings and potential directions that the recommendations might take. The opposing page very briefly summarizes the key findings from this assessment and presents the broad categories of potential recommendations. This information was sent to the WMPO Board and Technical Coordinating Committee members to review, providing them with an opportunity to pose questions, request clarifications, and state any concerns.

Three broad areas of investigation were determined to exist from the introspective assessment of the WMPO, its staff, and stakeholders.

Project Implementation includes concepts surrounding revenue and financing of projects, but also wraps around innovative practices for leveraging existing partnerships or developing new or expanded ones with private sector entities, for example.

Attracting and Retaining Staff is a paramount concern for every organization that has employees, not just MPOs generally or the WMPO specifically. Although this issue is a modest concern at present, the importance of retaining, training, and, if turnover does occur, attracting talented staff make this issue relevant.

Creating a Great Member Ecosystem where the WMPO Board and committees can excel is another important issue, partially realized through the potential to expand boundaries and the number of member jurisdictions but also to ensure that there is a balance of resources towards smaller jurisdictions that need more assistance and larger jurisdictions that tend to have more resources but also more transportation needs.

After the summary, the next two pages summarize the MPO peer studies, and the alignment of the findings to the issues identified in the discovery phase of this assessment. The final section of this chapter will present the broad categories of concerns and the preliminary recommendations to several issue categories.
UPDATE

In March, the WMPO kicked off an evaluation of its own operations. The motivation for this organizational assessment was to clarify how the organization is functioning and identify areas of improvement, recognizing an increasingly competitive job market, release of census data requiring a review of the MPO composition, and a desire to make sure that the WMPO continues to return the best value to its members in the future.

This one-page summary is being provided now to allow the WMPO stakeholders an opportunity to understand early findings from a high level, findings built on an independent review of formative documents, key processes, over 20 interviews with staff and member organization representatives, and nearly 50 survey responses (thank you!). As we prepare to embark on a set of preliminary recommendations, now is the time to make sure we are getting the most out of this assessment and provide great feedback to our consultant team.

SAMPLE OF KEY FINDINGS

- The majority of the external reviews of WMPO performance and staff were exemplary in both interview and survey findings, including attention to local participation and priorities.
- There are some areas like staff retention, capacity, and internal communications that could be explored for specific action to make improvements.
- The members recognized some issues with a lack of focus on the top transportation priorities for the region, although collaboration remains strong.
- Walking, bicycling, and transit modes need even more attention and resources.
- More refreshment of the WMPO goals with the membership would be welcome, as well as additional training opportunities on complex technical and policy matters.

DIRECTIONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations may be small adjustments respecting the high performance already in play at WMPO, and also longer-term concepts. Here are some broad categories of recommendation we would like for you to consider.

- **Funding and implementation options**, particularly for major transportation priorities at a regional scale
- Better integration with local and private sector partners, including implementing both policies and projects to create and preserve transportation capacity
- Focus on improving employee retention through relationship-building, compensation, and cross-training
- Consider capacity increases in staffing, training, or contracting to support active mode planning/safety and increasing funding options through private sector partnering, increasing grant activity, and other means
- Consider a separate initiative addressing planning area boundary, member fee structures, and voting processes
- Improve upon on-boarding and “refresher” courses for both members and staff to improve performance, confidence, and / or technical proficiency in existing or emerging areas
Peer MPO Characteristics

Chosen from more than 15 candidates, these peers are all growing, successful, Southeastern metropolitan planning organizations. Peers were chosen for similarities to the WMPO, but also because some of the issues uncovered in the discovery phase were thought to align with the practices employed by these agencies.

5. Nashville, TN (GNRC)
The GNRC MPO changed host agencies to the regional planning council, allowing them to share staff resources to manage transportation planning for one of the fastest-growing regions in the U.S.

2. Charlotte, NC (CRTPO)
Although the host agency did not change, CRTPO may have undergone some of the most significant changes of this peer group, adding and reorganizing staff to get to a much stronger position working with two states and four MPO neighbors.

1. Cary, NC (CAMPO)
CAMPO changed host agencies just this year to the Town of Cary, in part to allow greater flexibility in staffing decisions. Cary’s attractive suite of employee benefits has also been a plus, as has the office location in the upscale Fenton Center development.

4. Sarasota/Manatee, FL
While the host county of Manatee provides limited services, the Sarasota/Manatee MPO is nearly autonomous. Adjacent to the Tampa Bay Region to the north, the area has seen a nearly 25% increase in population since 2010.

3. Orlando, FL (MetroPlan Orlando)
This region has maintained high growth rates and developed a diverse economy that reaches far beyond Disney World. MetroPlan Orlando (not to be confused with Metro in Oregon) is a recognized leader among Florida’s 27 MPOs.

**Figure 5. Peer MPO Characteristics (FY 2024 or latest available)**

*Pass-through dollars are included, inflating the CAMPO figure particularly.*
Every MPO studied cited adequate levels of control over projects in their direct authority (e.g., STBG-DA funds), and every one had some level of concern with how the state DOT collaborated on changes happening within a STIP update cycle (i.e., amendments). This dissatisfaction included non-compliance with federal requirements (especially for TMAs) and one mention of “blindsiding.”

Collaboration works more thinly or not at all during times of duress when funding changes are forced on the DOT from an external cause.

Most MPOs, including these peers, have not led the development of major new revenue sources for MTIP projects. Some contributed to local bonding programs in varying degrees (e.g., data, communication), or managed changes to funding streams when they occurred. Extending MPO funds can happen in a number of ways. Florida MPOs do not pay local match on planning dollars, which are provided through tolling collections distributed by the state. Partnerships with civic organizations, business development organizations, and regional councils of government have worked to create additional resources for acquiring grants, communicating with segments of the public, or supporting state-led initiatives to increase the gas tax (Tennessee). Florida, in addition to covering local matches, also has a 50-50 match program that attracts private sector participation that is worth exploration. Generally speaking, there is only modest involvement by the MPO to innovatively secure new or increase existing revenue sources with private sector partnerships, grant funds, or any other mechanism.

The MPOs studied did not often have large, systematic onboarding processes, but there were notable practices. These included a tailored “30-Day Roadmap” that guided employees on (easy) initial deliverables, learning tasks, and general familiarity with the MPO structure and products. Several MPOs have their own employee guidebooks and even HR policies. Staff retreats, one-on-one meetings with leadership — sometimes weekly — and informal interactions were noted as important to staff communication and retention. Reclassification was the most-cited promotion tool; some MPOs use a bonus system to provide unexpected financial benefits. The host agency was occasionally cited as having important benefits, like the “Benefits My Way” and “Leave My Way” programs that offered additional personal leave and compensation for personal expenses from dog grooming to kids’ sports equipment (CAMPO/Cary). Several MPOs studied had or were adding staff; most cited staff with specific experience in multimodal planning, engagement, and financial expertise. Another MPO not interviewed (North Florida TPO) started now-standalone organizations to manage smart technology initiatives. Regardless, staff retention and attraction were universally recognized as important issues.

All MPOs studied said that new board members undergo an onboarding process (meetings, guidance), while Florida MPOs take advantage of the MPO orientation course conducted by the University of South Florida’s Center for Urban Transportation Research. Balancing small member needs was not usually an issue because of caps on numbers of members, Florida MPOs employ subcommittees that send one representative to speak for a group at MPO meetings. CRTPO (Charlotte) noted that their staff spend more time with small jurisdictions since larger ones are already sufficiently resourced. State DOTs play an important role in helping smaller jurisdictions manage projects (as do consultants). Simplicity in communications and a proactive stance ensure full participation of members on policy boards.
Preliminary Recommendations

This page and the next provide an initial list of recommendations presented to the WMPO in three main areas (staffing, including staff attraction/retention, project implementation, and organization) as well as several secondary recommendations on disparate topics that don't fit into one of the three main topic areas.

The WMPO has many positive attributes but faces some challenges going forward in terms of facilitating the

**STAFFING.** The WMPO's talented staff is its primary strength, a view shared from within and without. Achieving the tenure necessary to develop expertise and employee potential should be a primary goal moving forward.

1. **Staff Going In...** Recommendations from peer studies include tailoring a 30-day onboarding process to new employees (e.g., GNRC 30-Day Roadmap), "pre-boarding" to fill out paperwork before day one, assigning a mentor for the first 60-90 days, asking for early and easy deliverables, a "welcome aboard" package on day one, requiring every staff person schedule a 30-minute talk with the new person in their first month; regular, informal check-ins by all leadership (supervisory) staff; and a group lunch in the first week. The contracting of Forté company to improve staff communications and efficiencies also addresses this issue.

2. **...and Staff Going Out.** Staff turnover is inevitable, but preparing for change is easier with succession planning. Use the final two-week notice period to have the outgoing employee (a) create a user manual of files, file locations, processes, and current status of projects; and (b) complete a partially standardized exit survey describing experiences, potential for improvement, and position-relevant questions.

3. **In-Between Coming and Going.** (a) Have leadership meetings every month or during times of change to discuss other succession planning and retention principles like morale-building actions and mentoring next-in-line staff; and (b) conduct social events and team-building exercises that are sufficiently regular that they become part of the assigned duties of administration personnel.

4. **Adopt — and Communicate — Key Principles that Empower the WMPO.** Adopt new principles for the WMPO that are clear, tangible, and measured and communicate them in many ways. An example is the principles on page 13 of the recently released report (link) by the United Nations, "Integrity Matters: Net Zero Commitments by Businesses, Financial Institutions, Cities and Regions." Post these principles on the inside covers of publications, in the entryway of the WMPO office, etc. Identify ways of incorporating these into all external messaging. No one should have to ask what the WMPO means to them.

5. **Link the Site Review Process to Transportation Goals.** Given the depth of the WMPO involvement in development and TIA reviews, there is a natural advantage in place for increasing the linkages between land development and transportation capacity preservation, safety through enhanced access management, and multimodal development (best practices for site and TIA reviews for land use development that considers transportation impacts; see below) — and connect the WMPO staff that are doing these things.

6. **Develop Integrated Land and Transportation Guidance.** This guide would be adopted by the WMPO (although there are excellent starting points from already-published guidelines) and used by the site development review team to promote linkages between the site/TIA review functions and the longer-term WMPO and MTP goals. Integrate all modes of travel, as well as technology and policy considerations.

7. **Key Hires (3).** The WMPO is large enough to warrant additional specialized positions: a full-time active mode planner (a key survey priority), public engagement/diversity communication specialist, and an expansion of the financial team to include a funding specialist whose job is to coordinate both the project implementation recommendations below as well as proactively pursue ways of leveraging private, discretionary, and traditional revenue streams to the WMPO's optimum advantage.
advancement of capital-intensive projects, maintaining a competitive staffing environment, and ensuring that the MPO Board, TCC, and external partners stay engaged and operating collaboratively. After review by the WMPO, a list of edited recommendations was created and presented in the final chapter with a summary of implementation priorities and resource requirements.

**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.** The WMPO, like its peers, controls only a percentage of funds directly, with most projects originating from or channelled through the state. Additional or reorganized revenue structuring may lead to faster project implementation.

8. **Consider Developing an Adjunct Funding Mechanism to Finance Large Projects.** Explore additional revenue options, perhaps through an expanded sales tax or separate management authority (for example, the Hampton Roads Transportation Commission created in 2014 manages funds prioritized by the MPO). Legislative authority would be required, and is therefore linked to the next recommendation.

9. **Partner with the Other North Carolina TMAs to Develop Pooled Resources.** This partnership might extend to development of shared resources for research, lobbying the state legislature (funded through local sources), or developing new revenue sources.

10. **Assign or Hire/Contract Staff to Advance Viable Traffic Congestion Projects.** The NC SPOT project priority system rewards smaller, high-value projects and tends to punish long, expensive projects. Assigning or acquiring expertise in project development for the WMPO members to break apart big projects to develop planning/preliminary design studies would help advance project objectives faster.

11. **Continue Developing Adjunct Capacities to Expand WMPO Resources.** The WMPO already works with UNCW on internship positions; continue to expand this program as opportunities arise with Councils of Government, state agencies, non-profit organizations, or other higher-learning institutions.

12. **Stand Up a New Non-Profit Partner.** A resource expansion exemplified by the arrangement the North Florida TPO has with the Smart North Florida (SNF) non-profit that the MPO started and funded for its first two years. SNF is now an incubator for technology-based solutions for counties around the region, creating jobs and attracting a talented new workforce.

---

**Innovation: Regional Data Platform**

At 19 million people, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the largest MPO. But most of its 191 members are small. SCAG has found its Regional Data Platform (RDP) greatly expands local planning and analysis capabilities, but the RDP does more than that. Built with the input of a subset of its members, the RDP lets local planners spin up surveys and project websites; creates a one-stop shop for training; and platforms novel ways for member engagement, better "edge" planning, best practices, gathering input on MPO products, and cross-pollinating ideas across its massive region.

ORGANIZATION. The WMPO is facing interesting opportunities to expand its planning area and geographic range of influence on traffic that enters from its periphery, but there is also a need to strengthen lines of communication to flexibly address technological, demographic, and cultural changes to maintain and grow the organization’s relevancy.

13. Conduct an Annual Board Retreat. Conduct an annual retreat with a regular Board meeting at a different location around the planning area to acknowledge different parts of the broad study area.

14. Conduct One Joint (TCC and WMPO Board) Worksession Annually. This joint meeting would address issues of concern to both boards.

15. Make the Member Survey an Annual Affair and Update the Compensation Study Periodically.
   (A) The member survey might mesh with a dashboard performance report, although maintaining a useful dashboard represents a significant effort to do well and update often (see Sarasota-Manatee MPO - link); and (B) Updating the Compensation Study every 3–5 years would ensure that salaries are competitive.

16. Signature Communications. The value of the WMPO is only apparent over time and is easily lost if not communicated directly and often. Modify the annual report to be a snapshot of progress, challenges, and accomplishments that focus on things people want to read (less focused on details). It should also be in the “ABOUT” drop-down menu on the web landing page. Optional: A different signature piece could take the form of a podcast where WMPO interviews professionals, external experts, and elected officials.

17. Distribute and Focus Communications Simultaneously. This recommendation has two parts: (a) every WMPO staff person should be comfortable communicating in written form and to small audiences (external training is available), but (b) the WMPO should hire a communications specialist to work with staff and develop promotional materials and communication strategies, as well as maintaining quality standards.

18. Focus on Board Member Training. This recommendation has four parts: (a) consider offering external training for new board members; (b) refresh training materials every six months in both the employee and new member handbooks; (c) invite external speakers to give 15-minute discussions at the end of some board meetings on topics chosen by the WMPO Board (e.g., about four per year); (d) develop and conduct annual, one-hour training refresher courses at the start of each new fiscal year (June/July) to review changes in the UPWP, upcoming projects, results of the member survey (see above), proposed initiatives to improve internal and external communication, and firmly establish goals for the upcoming year; and (e) offer to send 1-2 board members to the annual NC MPO Conference — or even a national MPO conference.

19. Modify the LPA Agreement to Benefit the WMPO. The WMPO has already taken steps to create an objective suite of services to all of its members equitably. However, employee compensation and benefits may need additional flexibility. Studies suggest that an ideal arrangement is to leverage the host for HR support, insurance, covering "float" between expenditures and reimbursement, and not much else). The WMPO Board should be aware of and help guide these arrangements that influence MPO performance.

20. Voting Procedures. Address the potential planning area boundary changes suggested by the 2020 US Census reporting, as well as the resulting changes to composition of the MPO Board. Some members interviewed were wary of adding new members in terms of the ability of the WMPO to take consensus action, but there are a number of options available for accommodating new members.
MINOR MODIFICATIONS. Most of the procedures in place now were favourably regarded or met with little interest in changing based on interviews and surveys. Some of the following might be easy “wins” to tackle that would make modest but collectively meaningful improvements in the planning process, relationships, or deliverables of the WMPO.

21. UPWP Modifications. (a) Study a two-year UPWP process to reduce the administrative burden of annual development and improve the capability of looking beyond the immediate fiscal year; (b) make the UPWP development more important to the WMPO Board and TCC by developing a UPWP working subcommittee of Board / TCC representatives to work with staff to set out priorities for the coming year (or two years); (c) place the updated prospectus in the rear of the UPWP to improve its visibility and serve as a reference for the general line item functions; and (d) add a summary of important upcoming actions and recent past achievements at the front of the UPWP.

22. Document Updates. Some documents like the MOU and prospectus would benefit from refreshment to ensure that terminology and references are current. The Rules of Procedure should clarify correct practices on abstentions and recusals. Consider adding some structure to non-voting membership candidates in advance of considering adding any more non-voting members (MOU). The MOU has overlap in its language with other documents, including an updated prospectus; this overlap ideally is reduced or at least thoroughly cross-checked during updates of related documentation. Define majority and supermajority voting language clearly and consistently in both the bylaws and MOU.

23. Thinking Ahead on the MTP. MPOs are generally in, preparing for, or just finishing the development of the MTP, the cornerstone document of a long-range planning organization. (a) Consider what other parts of the MTP might be better served by a more seamless, continuous update process like socioeconomic data / development updates; (b) second, adding a strong executive summary in both the print/online document and in the Arc StoryMap versions of the MTP would help articulate the main points: trends, need for the document, basic development process (including public involvement), and recommendation maps. (Refer to page 12 for the review of the current MTP for details and additional ideas for improvements.)

24. MPO Meetings. Based on interviews and audits of meetings and agendas, there are some easy things to do to make the Board and TCC meetings more effective. (a) Use audio enhancement for speakers to ensure clarity; (b) adjust the camera position up and away from the table at the Board Meetings to give a better view of the Board and those in attendance that speak; (c) advertise the meetings differently or just more to get more public speakers attending to create an opportunity for members to interact directly with their constituents; and (d) the TCC meeting does not have a lot of discussion on the items presented; assuming more discussion is desired, change the agenda and meeting process to directly encourage more participation.

Innovation: Performance Dashboard

The Sarasota-Manatee MPO — one of our peers — creates and maintains a dashboard of performance measures that they tie to their goals.


## MOVING FORWARD

### PREFERRED RECOMMENDATIONS, RESOURCES, AND PROGRAMMING PRIORITIES

A PLAN NOT IMPLEMENTED IS A VISION UNREALIZED. Preferred implementation strategies developed from the prior section are shown in the following table. A brief description of the strategy is followed by the issue(s) being addressed; relative amount of resources in both (staff) time and (contracted) money required to implement and maintain the action; and the tier or priority of the action given its level of impact relative to the level of cost to implement it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Issues being addressed</th>
<th>Resources time / money</th>
<th>Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. STAFF GOING IN (A) DEVELOP EMPLOYEE &quot;ROADMAPS;&quot; (B) CONDUCT ONE-ON-ONE INFORMAL STAFF GREETINGS</td>
<td>Staff Retention &amp; Attraction</td>
<td>1 2 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. STAFF GOING OUT (A) CREATE A USER MANUAL; (B) CONDUCT EXIT SURVEYS</td>
<td>Staff Retention &amp; Attraction</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IN-BETWEEN COMING AND GOING (A) LEADERSHIP MEETINGS EVERY MONTH OR DURING TIMES OF CHANGE; (B) CONDUCT SOCIAL EVENTS AND TEAM-BUILDING EXERCISES</td>
<td>Staff Retention &amp; Attraction</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ADOPT — AND COMMUNICATE — KEY PRINCIPLES THAT EMPOWER THE WMPO</td>
<td>(1) Staff Retention &amp; Attraction; (2) Member/Public Awareness of WMPO Functions</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LINK THE SITE REVIEW PROCESS TO TRANSPORTATION GOALS</td>
<td>Cross-Training</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DEVELOP INTEGRATED LAND AND TRANSPORTATION GUIDANCE</td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. KEY HIRES (A) ACTIVE MODE PLANNER; (B) FUNDING SPECIALIST (SEE ALSO #17)</td>
<td>Technical Capacity Expansion</td>
<td>3 2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CONSIDER DEVELOPING AN ADJUNCT FUNDING MECHANISM TO FINANCE LARGE PROJECTS</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3 2 C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PARTNER WITH THE OTHER NC TMAS TO DEVELOP POOLED RESOURCES</td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 2 C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ASSIGN OR HIRE/CONTRACT STAFF TO ADVANCE Viable TRAFFIC CONGESTION PROJECTS</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2 NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. DEVELOP ADJUNCT CAPACITIES TO EXPAND WMPO RESOURCES</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2 1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. STAND UP A NEW NON-PROFIT PARTNER</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3 2 C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CONDUCT AN ANNUAL WMPO BOARD RETREAT</td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 1 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. CONDUCT ONE JOINT (TCC AND MPO BOARD) WORKSESSION ANNUALLY</td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 1 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. MAKE THE MEMBER SURVEY AN ANNUAL AFFAIR AND UPDATE COMPENSATION STUDY (A) THE ANNUAL MEMBER SURVEY; (B) UPDATE SALARY COMPENSATION STUDY EVERY 3-5 YEARS</td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 1 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**“If you fail to plan, you are planning to fail”**
— Benjamin Franklin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Issues being addressed</th>
<th>Resources time / money</th>
<th>Tier A B C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. SIGNATURE COMMUNICATIONS (A) ENHANCE AND REPOSITION THE ANNUAL REPORT; (B) OPTIONAL: CONDUCT PODCAST QUARTERLY</td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Member/Public Awareness of WMPO Functions</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. DISTRIBUTE AND FOCUS COMMUNICATIONS SIMULTANEOUSLY (A) WMPO STAFF COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING; (B) HIRE A COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST</td>
<td>Technical Capacity Expansion</td>
<td>3 1 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. FOCUS ON BOARD MEMBER TRAINING (A) EXTERNAL TRAINING FOR NEW BOARD MEMBERS; (B) REFRESH EMPLOYEE AND NEW MEMBER TRAINING MATERIALS; (C) INVITE EXTERNAL SPEAKERS TO PRESENT AT BOARD MEETINGS; (D) DEVELOP ANNUAL TRAINING REFRESHER; (E) SEND BOARD MEMBERS TO NC AND NATIONAL CONFERENCES</td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. MODIFY THE LPA AGREEMENT TO BENEFIT THE WMPO</td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. STUDY VOTING PROCEDURES</td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>1 1 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. UPWP MODIFICATIONS. (A) STUDY A TWO-YEAR UPWP; (B) MAKE THE UPWP DEVELOPMENT MORE IMPORTANT TO THE MPO BOARD; (C) PLACE THE UPDATED PROSPECTUS IN THE REAR OF THE UPWP; (D) ADD A SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT UPCOMING ACTIONS AND RECENT PAST ACHIEVEMENTS</td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. DOCUMENT UPDATES (A) MOU; (B) PROSPECTUS; (C) OTHERS</td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. THINKING AHEAD ON THE MTP (A) CONTINUOUS UPDATE PROCESS; (B) CREATE AN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY IN THE PRINT, ONLINE, AND THE ARC STORYMAP VERSIONS OF THE PLAN</td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. MPO MEETINGS (A) AUDIO ENHANCEMENT FOR SPEAKERS TO ENSURE CLARITY; (B) VIDEO ENHANCEMENTS; (C) WORK TO GET MORE PUBLIC SPEAKERS AT MEETINGS; (D) ENCOURAGE MORE PARTICIPATION AT TCC MEETINGS</td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 1 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resources**
1 = 1/8 FTE and/or $20,000 or less annually
2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually
3 = Full-Time FTE and/or more than $50,000 annually

**Tier**
A = 1 to 2 Years
B = 2 to 5 Years
C = 5 to 10 Years
APPENDIX A. EXPANDED MPO PEER SUMMARY

A DETAILED SUMMARY OF THE MPO PEER STUDIES

Project Selection and Programming. All of the MPOs studied said that they had high levels of autonomy directing STBG-DA (Surface Transportation Block Grant, also formerly known as STP-DA or “Direct Attributable” funds, that are set-asides which TMAs program) funds and just as consistent was the involvement or understanding of programming in the STIP. In four of five MPOs, GNRC (Nashville) being the exception, the process for creating project lists is relatively formulaic, although one Florida MPO noted coordination challenges during the “gaming” (the actual moniker for the project selection exercise) period when projects are selected. The influence of the MPO wanes as the horizon year in the STIP gets closer to the present year; influence is stronger in later-term projects in the STIP where funding obligations are fewer or more readily modified.

At this writing, the NC SPOT prioritization system has been in effect for over a decade with relatively few substantive prioritization changes from one cycle to the next, although recent challenges experienced during the COVID-19 era forced rapid movements, or “swaps,” of projects and funds to later implementation years on a large scale. The underlying specifics for making these changes were relatively poorly understood by the MPOs, underscoring the fragility of the project selection system to external (or major internal) disruptions to traditional funding streams. Even without a major funding disruption, the MPOs studied commented that inter-cyclical changes when the STIP isn’t undergoing a major update are less well-communicated than the more structured STIP cycle updates. One MPO spoke of being “blindsided” by DOT changes in the STIP to projects in their planning jurisdiction.

Project or Planning Funding Innovations. The involvement that MPOs have with private sector funders is limited, although one MPO commented that the state DOT has received unsolicited offers to develop tolling programs in highly trafficked corridors. Sales taxes, whether successful (CAMPO/NC) or not (MetroPlan Orlando, FL) have led to accelerated transit services. MPOs may offer a range of support for local initiatives, like sales tax or bond proposals, that range from providing data to helping develop project lists or communication in advance of a public referendum. In other cases, such as the 2017 passage of the transit sales tax in Wake County, NC, the MPO was not much involved in the lead-up to the referendum. Generally speaking, there is only modest involvement of the MPO to innovatively secure new or increase existing revenue sources with private sector partnerships, grant funds, or any other mechanism.

Leveraging also refers to extending the use of locally-programmed funds (generally the STBG, Transportation Allocation, or similar discretionary funds) by requiring a local match and incorporating higher match levels to better project scoring. This phenomenon has led to some issues servicing smaller
governments that find it hard or impossible to find the match, although this situation varies greatly. At CRTPO (Charlotte), the staff works much more with smaller governments than the central city – their host agency – because of the resource disparity.

As would be suspected with MPOs, partnerships play a substantial role at MPOs, especially in terms of implementing planning activities. Universities, regional business development groups, Rotary (and similar civic organizations) Clubs, and other NGOs were valued as partners for disseminating public engagement notices or connecting with key segments of the public. CRTPO has increased its support for training staff on grant writing, but also supports the Council of Government’s long-standing grant writing resource.

The State and State DOT played central roles in some revenue changes, including increasing the gas tax (Tennessee) or providing matching funds (Florida matches PL104 and other, non-grant programs through tolling proceeds). This latter greatly increases the capacity of smaller jurisdictions to participate in project development, as does the state DOT taking control of the project development once funding has been made secure (although project development and engineering has sometimes been contracted out to private consultants by the small, local government grantee). FDOT has a partnership program that requires a 50% match that attracts some private sector participation for new-capacity arterial projects.

**Staff Attraction / Retention.** The experience of the MPO peers ran the gamut from no organized on-boarding to having several established practices. CAMPO’s recent hosting agency change prompted them to join the NC League of Municipalities for liability / worker’s compensation insurance, and in so doing created a resource for a variety of materials and training that they have found useful for on-boarding new employees. Several peer MPOs said that they have developed their own employee guides and even human resource policies, benefit programs, and similar employee development options as a result of being independent or nearly-independent organizations (e.g., not covered under the host government’s umbrella of resources). Universally, the peers that have developed their own internal staffing programs spoke favorably of that tailored program, although in some cases there was an acknowledgement that better, more systematic onboarding programs were an identified need.

Staff retreats, one-on-one meetings with leadership – sometimes weekly – and informal interactions were noted as being important ingredients to maintaining staff cohesion and high levels of cooperation. Employee surveys and participation in state and national organizations for professional development are also cited as benefitting employee retention. One MPO (Nashville/GNRC) studied uses a “30-day roadmap” for new employee orientation, with each one being tailored to that employee so that they know what they are expected to learn, specific early deliverables (making them easy to accomplish), and other key talking points.

Studies, including organizational and staffing/salary studies, were cited by some peers as being important to creating the opportunity for hiring additional staff, modifying salary structures, or generating pay adjustments. Reclassification was cited as an important advancement tool, with some MPOs (Directors) having more authority than others to create job titles and responsibilities as part of a promotion. One peer MPO noted that they had to reclassify an engagement position to avoid the host agency aggregating that staff person into a “pool” of information officers under one (non-MPO) direction. Other MPOs are allowed to give bonuses at the discretion of supervisors, such as CAMPO (Austin, Texas, from a prior study) or at MetroPlan Orlando. These one-time bonuses are perceived as unexpected benefits and reward staff for going
above and beyond the normal scope of their work.

It's important to note that not every peer spoke unfavorably of the host agency's personnel structures. Some said that while they found the salary ranges restrictive for hiring, it wasn't perceived as severe or wasn't a problem for some positions (e.g., engineering candidates). For example, the City of Cary's "Leave My Way" program was cited as being very popular with their MPO staff, which offers 80 hours of leave on top of vacation and sick leave. The "Benefits My Way" program similarly has lifestyle spending accounts to reimburse staff for some personal expenses (e.g., dog grooming, sports equipment) less the cost of taxes.

**Staff Expertise and Capacity.** All of the peers had either been adding staff recently or were in the process of doing so. Some MPOs have dedicated staff for some functions like engagement, board administration, or modal expertise; this specialization tends to increase as the total number of MPO employees increases. The North Florida TPO, reviewed in a prior effort to this one, helped start non-profit agencies that were then positioned to "take over" certain aspects of desired activities, in this case the creation/coordination of smart transportation corridors and development of transportation technology infrastructure.

Again, the state context is important with respect to capacity. MPOs in Florida were purported to have seen in some cases a 40% increase in their operating budgets, which can provide for more staff or additional compensation to existing staff (through merit-based programs already in place).

**Interactions with MPO Boards and Committees.** All of the MPOs noted that new member orientations do occur, although only one (MetroPlan Orlando) noted that joint meetings with technical boards and educational opportunities played a major role in ongoing member education efforts. Most have a guide and/or presentation that they work through. The Florida MPOs studied employ a third-party research institute for new member orientation lasting several days in a workshop format.

Balancing the needs of small and large MPO members was an important topic, and many MPOs cited their discretionary funding and call for projects as opportunities for meaningfully engaging a range of government partners. As noted, CRTPO (Charlotte) said that their staff spends more time working with under-resourced, smaller member agencies than the center city/host agency because of resource differentials.

Once more, the state context is crucial for board member structuring and underlying communications. Florida state regulations cap MPO policy boards at 25 members. This cap (which used to be 19) has forced MPOs to have aggregated boards, like the Municipal Advisory Committee (MetroPlan Orlando) or Island Transportation Planning Organization (Sarasota-Manatee) that meet separately and send one voting member to represent the group on the MPO policy board.

Longevity of board members was viewed as crucial to sound communications, although board members are far more interested in discussing new projects and congestion relief than in typical MPO planning products like the MTP, safety plans, or congestion management process documentation. Simplicity was cited as a key ingredient in successful communication to ensure that the messages are understood and that members can effectively engage in dialogue on complex issues to reach a good decision.
ENDNOTES


General Resources.
1) **Call to Order**
Chairman Hank Miller called the meeting to order at 3:04 PM.

MPO Deputy Director Abby Lorenzo called the roll, and a quorum was present as follows:


2) **Conflict of Interest Statement**
Ms. Lorenzo read the conflict-of-interest statement and asked if any Board member had a conflict of interest. No Board member reported having a conflict of interest.

3) **Approval of Board Member Excused Absences**
MPO Executive Director Mike Kozlosky said that there were no requests for excused absence from today's meeting.
4) **Approval of the Agenda**

Mr. Barfield made a motion to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Mr. Waddell, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Johnathan Barfield, Deb LeCompte, Brenda Bozeman, Dane Scalise, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Mike Forte and Eulis Willis. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Neil Anderson, John Ellen, Wendy Fletcher-Hardee and Landon Zimmer.

Mr. Kozlosky noted that Mr. Anderson and Ms. Fletcher-Hardee will join the meeting later.

Mr. Dennis Panicali said that he is present in place of John Ellen.

6) **Public Comment Period**

Per the Public Participation Policy, Mr. Kozlosky read the only public comment that was received via email from Steve McNair as follows:

> I live in River’s Edge, a small community off Independence Blvd between Carolina Beach Rd and River Rd. We need Independence Blvd widened to 4 lanes, bike and walking paths installed. Independence Blvd is a major collector road, and is overcrowded with stopped and backed up cars. Bike and walking paths are broken up, incomplete, or never installed.

> Over 10,000 vehicles use this 1-mile stretch of road daily, according to a 2021 traffic study. In the morning, traffic backs up 2-3 lights to get across at Carolina Beach Rd, despite 5 outbound lanes on Independence next to the Harris Teeter, that much traffic flows through.

> In the afternoon over 30 cars wait on Independence to turn onto River Road at a single stop sign, keeping us from getting in and out of the neighborhoods onto Independence, We’re trapped!

> This one mile stretch of Independence Blvd from Carolina Beach Road to River Road, had 6 access points in 2017. With the addition of new housing and Harris Teeter, we now have 17 points of access to Independence Blvd, with more planned.

> In the Cape Fear Moving Forward 2045 report, the widening of Independence to 4 lanes with bike and walking paths is project # BP 285 scheduled for 2045. That’s a long time away.

> In 2017 the River Road Small Plan suggested a 250% increase in traffic, and Independence Blvd and River Road should become 4 lanes. What happened?

> There are just pieces of bike paths from River Lights thru South Wilmington to the Pointe along Independence. In certain points along the road, paths were never built. Other paths are torn up and not repaired.

> We ought to have a continuous bike path to connect to the paths at Carolina Beach and River Lights, linking up with paths going across town. How great it would be to bike up a path along the Blvd to the stores, shoppes and movie theaters. We need Safe Streets for All of Wilmington WMPO!

> We moved here in 2017, my wife commented that we’re sort of out in the country. Next trip the signs all said “Save Echo Farms”. We know how that ended, what could have been bike paths disappeared into new homes.

> We experience long waits on Independence trying to turn south onto River Road or just getting in or out our neighborhoods from more traffic from new neighborhoods plus the ever-expanding River Lights projects, which seem to get rubber stamped for approval. Why are these projects allowed without road and path improvements? The increase in traffic is a big concern for daily traffic hazards and future emergencies. The WMPO CMP dashboard doesn’t track traffic at the intersection of Independence and River Rd.
So we turn to you for help. I believe none of you live south of Shipyard Blvd, Still we are your constituents. Our petition for widening Independence Blvd has over 900 signatures and grows daily.

We truly hope you’ll seriously consider the traffic mess created on Independence and widen the road while adding a stop light at River Rd.

Ms. Lorenzo added that no one is present from the public to speak.

Mr. Kozlosky reminded Board members that during the COVID-19 pandemic, a provision was made for public voicemails to be played out loud and public comments to be emailed and read aloud by staff during meetings. He recommended that this carryover from the pandemic be omitted from the Public Participation Policy.

Following a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to require that all public comments be made in-person.

5) **Election of Vice Chair**

Mr. Anderson nominated and made a motion to elect Luke Waddell as vice chairman, seconded by Mr. Forte, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Johnathan Barfield, Deb LeCompte, Brenda Bozeman, Dennis Panicali, Dane Scalise, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Mike Forte and Eulis Willis. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Wendy Fletcher-Hardee and Landon Zimmer.

7) **Closed Session**

Vice Chairman Waddell made a motion to hold a closed session for the purposes of discussing two separate matters as follows:

1. The first matter is a closed session pursuant to N.C.G.S. sections 143-318.11(a)(5) and (a)(6) to consider the qualifications, competence, performance, character, fitness, or conditions of appointment of individual public officers or employees, and to establish or instruct staff or agents concerning the negotiations of the amount of compensation or other material terms of an employment contract.
2. The second matter is a closed session to consult with our attorney in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege pursuant N.C.G.S. section 143-318.11(a)(3).

Mr. Allen seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Johnathan Barfield, Deb LeCompte, Brenda Bozeman, Dennis Panicali, Dane Scalise, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Mike Forte and Eulis Willis. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Wendy Fletcher-Hardee and Landon Zimmer.

The meeting recessed for a closed session.

The meeting reconvened open session with all MPO Board members present as before. No action was taken.

Vice Chairman Waddell made a motion to approve the 10% increase for the MPO Executive Director position, seconded by Mr. Allen, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Johnathan Barfield, Deb LeCompte, Brenda Bozeman, Dennis Panicali, Dane Scalise, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Mike Forte and Eulis Willis. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Wendy Fletcher-Hardee and Landon Zimmer.
8) Presentations

a. North Carolina Department of Transportation Project Update- Chad Kimes, NCDOT

NCDOT Division Engineer Chad Kimes reported a cash balance of $2.4 billion, and open commitments across the state totaling $8.6 billion. He commented that the cash balance, storm resilience, and road maintenance programs are strong.

Mr. Kimes gave an update on projects including Gordon Road, Drysdale Drive Extension, College Road and Carolina Beach Road continuous flow intersection, Martin Luther King Jr. Parkway (MLK) and College Road controlled access to I-40 from Gordon Road to Market Street, interchanges at Eastwood Road and Military Cutoff Road (options to come), Eastwood Road and Market Street, MLK and College Road, MLK and Kerr Avenue, and US 421 and Isabel Holmes Bridge, five or six interchanges within the next five years. He said that although the College Road and Oleander Drive project is funded for PE only, NCDOT will analyze alternatives to improve the quadrant design. Also, he commented that the signal system upgrade is a much-needed project due to quickly aging technology.

Mr. Kimes commented that the Independence Boulevard Extension project with right-of-way (ROW) acquisition scheduled for Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 is a massive project. He noted that NCDOT is currently working on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). He added that the project extends from Randall Parkway to MLK for a full interchange and starts at grade with bridges over CSX rail line and over Darlington to maintain neighborhood interconnectivity, and a continuous bridge over Market Street and past Hurst Street for neighborhood interconnectivity at Hurst Street, Princess Place Drive and Market Street.

Mr. Barfield asked about a vacant lot on Montgomery Avenue on the other side of Princess Place Drive. Mr. Kimes advised caution and recommended that the property owners contact NCDOT regarding the schedule. He noted that according to the DEIS, the project could impact 120 businesses and homes.

Regarding the Hampstead Bypass, Mr. Kimes said that U-3300B project is under construction and U-3300A will be let in July of 2025, thanks to the MPO Board and NCDOT. He noted that the interchange near the high school is on schedule. He commented that this project will help tremendously when open. Mr. Kimes said that the Military Cutoff Extension will be celebrated around Labor Day. He added that the section of Market Street to Marsh Oaks should wrap up by the end of the year.

Mr. Kimes said two studies are under way and will be reported in July – traffic and revenue, and the planning document for the replacement of the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge. He noted that the bridge deck did not last ten years and needs to be replaced again, this time costing $15 million to $20 million. He added that traffic from the Ports is at an all-time high, and rehab projects will be needed more frequently.

Mr. Anderson inquired about repurposing the bridge. Mr. Kimes responded that the bridge could only be used for scrape by NCDOT unless a government entity formally requests it. He added that the Town of Sunset Beach kept a small portion of the Pontoon Bridge for educational purposes.

Although not in the jurisdiction but a top priority for NCDOT and related to the bridge, Mr. Kimes said that South Carolina is going to extend SC 31, bringing a six-lane facility into North Carolina and NCDOT is working on the merger document. He noted that South Carolina’s portion is fully funded.
but North Carolina’s portion is not. He commented that this gateway from the south is a huge challenge.

In response to an inquiry by Chairman Miller, Mr. Kimes said that this presentation will be forwarded to Board members.

b. WMPO/Go Coast Digital Communication Updates- Carolyn Caggia, WMPO

WMPO Associate Transportation Planner Carolyn Caggia gave an update on WMPO/Go Coast Digital communications including website changes to improve navigation and add content to www.wmpo.org and www.gocoastnc.org. Ms. Caggia said that new social media accounts include LinkedIn and Nextdoor, with a potential reach of 368 neighborhoods and more than 100,000 audience members. She noted that on average, each of the last three social media posts has reached 3,000 viewers.

Mr. Anderson expressed concerns about the public understanding what the MPO does. Ms. Caggia suggested that key words be added to meta data for search engine optimization.

9) Consent Agenda

a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from March 29, 2023
b. Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendment #23-2
c. Opening of the 30-day Public Comment Period for 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendment #23-3

Ms. Boseman made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, seconded by Mr. Allen, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:


10) Regular Agenda

a. Resolution approving the WMPO FY 24 Direct Attributable Project Submittal Guidelines and Scoring Criteria

Senior Transportation Engineer Scott A. James gave an overview of the FY24 Direct Attributable (DA) project submittal guidelines and scoring criteria and said that these would be the same as last year. He noted that the proposed schedule for this year includes a call for projects on July 7th, with a pre-submittal deadline of August 8th, a final deadline of September 15th, and awards to be announced in October. He added that safety and congestion management remain priorities in the scoring criteria.

Vice Chairman Waddell made a motion to approve the FY24 DA submittal guidelines and scoring criteria, seconded by Mr. Willis, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:


b. Resolution approving NCDOT Funding Swaps for Federal August Redistribution

Mr. Lorenzo said that the agenda packet includes a revenue neutral funding swap of $1,599,313 in the WMPO’s Carbon Reduction (CR) program and Transportation Alternatives Set Aside (TASA) funds in exchange for the same amount of the State’s Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Any Area funds. She noted that this is part of NCDOT’s efforts to prepare for the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) annual August redistribution of funds that will not be used by the close of
the federal fiscal year ending September 30th. She added that every July, NCDOT submits a request for additional funds to ensure that the largest amount of funds coming into State of North Carolina remains authorized.

Vice Chairman Waddell made a motion to approve NCDOT Funding Swaps for Federal August Redistribution, seconded by Ms. Boseman, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Deb LeCompte, Brenda Bozeman, Wendy Fletcher-Hardee, Dennis Panicali, Dane Scalise, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Mike Forte and Eulis Willis. **Nays:** None.

**Absent:** Johnathan Barfield and Landon Zimmer.

11) Discussion

a. **2020-2029 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #23-3**

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

b. **Final Draft 2024-2033 State Transportation Improvement Program and Project Changes**

Ms. Lorenzo said that two items are included in the agenda packet: changes to the draft STIP based on schedule changes and swaps, and the proposed draft of the 2024-2033 STIP, which is going before the Board of Transportation (BOT) for consideration next week. Once approved by BOT, she noted that this item will return for the MPO Board to consider the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) this summer.

c. **NCDOT Prioritization 7.0 Update**

Mr. Kozlosky said that with the approval of the draft 2024-2033 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the next cycle of prioritization, Prioritization 7.0 (P 7.0), will begin.

Ms. Lorenzo said that a schedule for P 7.0 has been included in the agenda packet. She noted that, the methodology for P 7.0, which remains largely the same as P 6.0, will also be considered next week at the Board of Transportation meeting. She added that in preparation for P 7.0, MPO staff has contacted the MPO’s modal planning partners to compile a list of projects for submission. She noted that submission window will open July 10th.

Ms. Lorenzo said that with the release of the 2020 Census, the WMPO will be eligible to submit up to 20 projects per mode of transportation. Also, she noted the MPO will also have an additional 100 local input points, an increase from 1,500 points in P 5.0 to 1,600 points in P 7.0.

d. **2020 Urbanized Area (UA) Census Data- Organizational Boundaries, Structure, and Governance**

Mr. Kozlosky reminded Board members that this item is a continuous discussion, which, based on state and federal laws, the MPO is required to evaluate with the release of Census data (last December and January). He noted that staff sent an email to the various jurisdictions related to the three expansion scenarios presented to the MPO Board and Ms. Lorenzo met with several jurisdictions in Brunswick County and gave presentations to Topsail Beach and Surf City. He added that the MPO Board-created steering committee met once. He reminded the Board that the MPO Planning Area Boundary is what is expected to be urbanized in the next 20 years. He recommended that next steps include gauging formal interest by email with a deadline for response by July 31st.
Mr. Waddell said that the subcommittee is still waiting for responses and expressed support for the July 31st deadline. Mr. Kozlosky said that staff will send out the email with the deadline for response.

12) Updates
   a. Wilmington Urban Area MPO
      Mr. Kozlosky acknowledged the presence of new Senior Transportation Planner Vanessa Lacer. Ms. Lacer expressed appreciation and gave a brief overview of her professional background.
   b. Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority
   c. NCDOT Division
   d. NCDOT Transportation Planning Division
      Mr. Kimes acknowledged the presence of NCDOT Division 3 Corridor Development Engineer, Michelle Howes. Ms. Howes expressed appreciation and gave a brief overview of her professional background.

13) Announcements
   a. WMPO Bike/Pedestrian Committee meeting- June 13th

14) Next meeting – June 28, 2023
    Chairman Miller expressed congratulations to Vice Chairman Waddell and welcomed Mr. Scalise.

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

    **Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Deb LeCompte, Brenda Bozeman, Dennis Panicali, Dane Scalise, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Mike Forte and Eulis Willis. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Johnathan Barfield, Wendy Fletcher-Hardee and Landon Zimmer.

    The meeting adjourned at 5:09 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.
June 6, 2023

Mr. Mike Kozlosky  
Executive Director  
Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization  
305 Chestnut Street  
Wilmington, NC 28401

Dear Mr. Kozlosky,

WAVE Transit requests the following amendments and modifications to the 2020 – 2029 and 2024 – 2033 versions of the North Carolina State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to align with planned uses for currently apportioned Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant program funds:

Federal 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Program
WAVE currently has four years of FTA apportionments under the 5339 program that are not reflected in the STIP. The following updates are requested to add these funds to the STIP:

1. **TG-0020 Bus Facilities Capital Program** – Amendment to add $238,839 in FY24, with 80% ($191,072) from FTA 5339 funds and 20% ($47,767) from locally contributed capital funds. This is a new STIP ID for capital investments to include:
   - Acquisition and installation of backup generators for Wave Transit’s Operations and Maintenance facility. These generators will ensure that Wave can fuel CNG buses and paratransit vans and power the communications and infrastructure for continual operation of public transportation in the event of extended power outages.
   - Replacement of failed bus lifts in the Operations and Maintenance facility
   - Replacement of failed bus wash infrastructure
   - Acquisition or replacement of other Bus Facilities infrastructure as applicable

2. **TM-0047 Support Vehicles and Equipment** – Amendment to add $311,090 in FY24, with 80% ($248,872) from FTA 5339 funds and 20% ($62,218) from locally contributed capital funds. This is a new STIP ID for capital investments to include:
   - Replacement of two trucks that are past their useful life – one light duty and one heavy duty – that are used for road-calls for disabled buses and to maintain facilities, including bus stations and bus stops.
   - Replacement of two vans that are past their useful life that are used to transport relief driver to in-route buses and return the relieved driver to the operations center.
- Replacement of failed radios onboard buses and in the operations center to maintain communication with buses while in service.
- Acquisition and deployment of a fleet management system that will schedule and track maintenance of buses and paratransit vans.
- Replacement of computer equipment that is used for training.

3. **TA-5222 Light Transportation Vehicles** – Modification to add $675,739 in FY24, with 80% ($540,591) from FTA 5339 funds and 20% ($135,148) from locally contributed capital funds. This is an existing STIP ID for replacement of paratransit vehicles that have exceeded their useful life.

4. **TC-0027 Passenger Facilities & Amenities Upgrades** – Modification to add $94,001 in FY24, with 80% ($75,200) from FTA 5339 funds and 20% ($18,801) from locally contributed capital funds. This is an existing STIP ID for capital investments to include installation of bus shelters, improving safety of the customer service area at Forden Station, and extending perimeter fencing at Padgett Station.

**Federal 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program**

Wave currently has two years of FTA apportionments under the 5307 program that are not reflected in the STIP. The following updates are requested to add these funds to the STIP:

5. **TO-4751 Operating Assistance** – Modification to add $4,050,044 in FY24, with 50% ($2,025,022) from FTA 5307 funds and 50% ($2,025,022) from local funds, and $4,060,232 in FY25, with 50% ($2,030,116) from FTA 5307 funds and 50% ($2,030,116) from local funds. This is an existing STIP ID for support of fixed route bus operations.

6. **TG-5245 Preventive Maintenance** – Modification to add $1,075,000 in FY24, with 80% ($860,000) from FTA 5307 funds and 20% ($215,000) from local funds, and $1,075,000 in FY25, with 80% ($860,000) from FTA 5307 funds and 20% ($215,000) from local funds. This is an existing STIP ID for support of preventive maintenance of vehicles and facilities.

7. **TG-5246 ADA Paratransit Services** – Modification to add $350,000 in FY24, with 80% ($280,000) from FTA 5307 funds and 20% ($70,000) from local funds, and $350,000 in FY25, with 80% ($280,000) from FTA 5307 funds and 20% ($70,000) from local funds. This is an existing STIP ID for support of paratransit operations.
Federal 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors & Individuals with Disabilities Program
Wave currently has two years of FTA apportionments under the 5310 program that are not reflected in the STIP. The following updates are requested to add these funds to the STIP:

8. **TQ-6513 Operating Assistance** – Modification to add $256,894 in FY25, with 50% ($128,447) from FTA 5310 funds and 50% ($128,447) from local funds, and $263,506 in FY26, with 50% ($131,753) from FTA 5310 funds and 50% ($131,753) from local funds. This is an existing STIP ID for support of fixed route 205 operations which serves hospitals, medical facilities, and communities with a high percentage of elderly residents.

9. **TQ-7005 Project Administration** – Modification to add $36,699 in FY25 and $37,643 FY26, with 100% from FTA 5310 funds. This is an existing STIP ID for oversight of Wave’s paratransit function.

10. **TQ-8019 Mobility Manager** – Modification to add $109,214 in FY25, with 80% ($87,371) from FTA 5310 funds and 20% ($21,843) from local funds, and $112,025 in FY26, with 80% ($89,620) from FTA 5310 funds and 20% ($22,405) from local funds. This is an existing STIP ID that funds Wave’s Mobility Manager position and related costs to increase awareness and ability to use the transit system in the community.

11. **TQ-9001 Capital Purchase Service** – Modification to add $143,093 in FY25, with 80% ($114,474) from FTA 5310 funds and 20% ($28,619) from local funds, and $146,778 in FY26, with 80% ($117,422) from FTA 5310 funds and 20% ($29,356) from local funds. This is an existing STIP ID to award community grants to organizations that provide transportation to the elderly and disability communities. Local funds for this section of the 5310 grant are provided by the recipients of the community grants.

Wave Transit would like to express our appreciation to the WMPO for your assistance and partnership in creating these amendments and modifications to the STIP. Please contact us if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Jonathan W. Dodson  
Interim Executive Director  
Wave Transit
RESOLUTION REQUESTING ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS TO THE 2020-2029 AND 2024-2033 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 administrative modifications to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State and Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Transportation Improvement Programs to include funding allocations to the Section 5339 projects programmed in for FY24; and

WHEREAS, the requested 5339 funding modifications are outlined below:

- TA-5222 – Light Transportation Vehicles / Replacement
  FY24 Federal Share 540,591 / FY24 Local Share 135,148
- TC-0027 - Passenger Facilities & Amenities Upgrades
  FY24 Federal Share 75,200 / FY24 Local Share 18,801

WHEREAS, the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority has respectfully requested administrative modifications to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State and Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Transportation Improvement Programs to include funding allocations to the Section 5307 projects programmed in for FY24 and FY25; and

WHEREAS, the requested 5307 funding modifications are outlined below:

- TG-5245 - Preventative Maintenance
  FY24 Federal Share 860,000 / FY24 Local Share 215,000
  FY25 Federal Share 860,000 / FY25 Local Share 215,000
- TG-5246 – ADA Paratransit Services
  FY24 Federal Share 280,000 / FY24 Local Share 70,000
  FY25 Federal Share 280,000 / FY25 Local Share 70,000
- TO-4751 - Operating Support
  FY24 Federal Share 2,025,022 / FY24 Local Share 2,025,022

WHEREAS, the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority has respectfully requested administrative modifications to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State and Metropolitan Planning Organization’s
Transportation Improvement Programs to include funding allocations to the Section 5310 projects programmed in for FY25 and FY26; and

**WHEREAS,** the requested 5310 funding modifications are outlined below:

- **TQ-6513 - Operating Assistance**  
  FY26 Federal Share 131,753 / FY26 Local Share 131,753

- **TQ-7005 - Project Administration**  
  FY25 Federal Share 36,699 / FY25 Local Share N/A  
  FY26 Federal Share 37,643 / FY26 Local Share N/A

- **TQ-8019 - Mobility Manager**  
  FY25 Federal Share 87,371 / FY25 Local Share 21,843  
  FY26 Federal Share 89,620 / FY26 Local Share 22,405

- **TQ-9001 - Capital Purchase Service**  
  FY25 Federal Share 114,474 / FY25 Local Share 28,619  
  FY26 Federal Share 117,422 / FY26 Local Share 29,356

**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 upcoming Administrative Modifications to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 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 and 2024-2033 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 28, 2023.

_________________________  
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

_________________________  
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
RESOLUTION REQUESTING AMENDMENTS TO THE 2020-2029 AND 2024-2033 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 amendments to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State and Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Transportation Improvement Programs to include funding allocations to the Section 5339 projects programmed in for FY24; and

WHEREAS, the requested 5339 funding amendments are outlined below:

- TG-0020 - Bus Facilities Capital Improvements
  FY24 Federal Share 191,072 / FY24 Local Share 47,767

- TM-0047 - Support Vehicles and Equipment
  FY24 Federal Share 248,872 / FY24 Local Share 62,218

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

WHEREAS, if approved, the amendments will be submitted to the North Carolina Department of Transportation and will be considered for formal approval as an upcoming Amendments to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State and MPO Transportation Improvement Programs.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby requests Amendments to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 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 28, 2023.

__________________________
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

__________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
### Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs

**STIP/MPO TIP Modification #23-3**  
*(May 2023)*

#### STATEWIDE PROJECT

### STIP MODIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA-6665</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
<th>STATEWIDE, 5311 CAPITAL PROJECTS FOR RURAL AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJ.CATEGORY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANS</td>
<td>MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 23, FY 24 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(5311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,850,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$23,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$42,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $92,050,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC-0021</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
<th>NCDOT, 5339 STATEWIDE RURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJ.CATEGORY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANS</td>
<td>MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 23, FY 24 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(5339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,925,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$13,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$8,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $38,025,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM-0027</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
<th>NCDOT, 5311 ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS FOR FTA GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJ.CATEGORY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANS</td>
<td>MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 24 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(5311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$988,000</td>
<td>$2,868,000</td>
<td>$15,428,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $51,684,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM-0028</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
<th>NCDOT, 5311 OPERATING FUNDS FOR FTA GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJ.CATEGORY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANS</td>
<td>MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 24 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(5311)</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$647,000</td>
<td>$647,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,600,000</td>
<td>$6,600,000</td>
<td>$6,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $15,494,000
## Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs

### STIP/MPO TIP Modification #23-3

(May 2023)

### STATEWIDE PROJECT

#### STIP MODIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Statewide Project</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TM-0031</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANS</td>
<td>NCDOT, RTAP STATEWIDE FUNDS FOR FTA GRANTS</td>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE</strong> FY 2023: $698,000 (RTAP) FY 2024: $650,000 (RTAP) Total: $1,348,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU-0011</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANS</td>
<td>NCDOT, NCDOT-IMD SECTION 5304 PROGRAM FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION URBAN TRANSIT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES.</td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong> FY 2024: $1,700,000 (5303) <strong>ADMINISTRATIVE</strong> FY 2023: $370,000 (5303) Total: $2,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU-0016</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANS</td>
<td>LINK TRANSIT, PLANNING FOR TRANSIT SYSTEM MANAGEMENT.</td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong> FY 2023: $600,000 (L) FY 2024: $2,400,000 (5307) FY 2025: $250,000 (L) FY 2024: $1,000,000 (5307) FY 2025: $45,000 (L) FY 2026: $185,000 (5307) FY 2026: $45,000 (L) FY 2026: $185,000 (5307) FY 2027: $45,000 (L) FY 2027: $185,000 (5307) FY 2028: $45,000 (L) FY 2028: $185,000 (5307) FY 2028: $5,170,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **L**: Local Match
- **5303**: NCDOT-IMD Section 5304 Program Funds
RESOLUTION APPROVING ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS #23-3 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 #23-3.

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 #23-3.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on June 28, 2023.

________________________________________
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

________________________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
**Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs**

**STIP/MPO TIP Amendment #23-4**  
(June 2023)

### STIP ADDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
<th>PROJ.CATEGORY</th>
<th>PMT.CATEGORY</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* HS-2015DIV</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>VARIOUS, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$2,490,000</td>
<td>FY 2023</td>
<td>$2,490,000</td>
<td>$4,590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,590,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* HS-2015REG</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>VARIOUS, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$2,490,000</td>
<td>FY 2023</td>
<td>$2,490,000</td>
<td>$4,590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,590,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* HS-2015SW</td>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>VARIOUS, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$3,320,000</td>
<td>FY 2023</td>
<td>$3,320,000</td>
<td>$6,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs

**STIP/MPO TIP Amendment #23-4**  
(June 2023)

#### WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT Category</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fund Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAND STRAND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VARIOUS, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. ADD PROJECT BREAK AT THE REQUEST OF THE TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY AND SAFETY DIVISION.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>FY 2023 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000 (VRU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VARIOUS, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. ADD PROJECT BREAK AT THE REQUEST OF THE TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY AND SAFETY DIVISION.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>FY 2023 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSONVILLE URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VARIOUS, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. ADD PROJECT BREAK AT THE REQUEST OF THE TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY AND SAFETY DIVISION.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>FY 2023 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-CAROLINA RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VARIOUS, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. ADD PROJECT BREAK AT THE REQUEST OF THE TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY AND SAFETY DIVISION.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>FY 2023 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN CAROLINA RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VARIOUS, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. ADD PROJECT BREAK AT THE REQUEST OF THE TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY AND SAFETY DIVISION.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>FY 2023 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE FEAR RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VARIOUS, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. ADD PROJECT BREAK AT THE REQUEST OF THE TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY AND SAFETY DIVISION.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>FY 2023 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs

**STIP/MPO TIP Amendment #23-4**  
(June 2023)

### WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ.CATEGORY</th>
<th>STATEWIDE</th>
<th>GRAND STRAND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>JACKSONVILLE URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>MID-CAROLINA RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>EASTERN CAROLINA RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CAPE FEAR RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### STIP ADDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ.CATEGORY</th>
<th>STATEWIDE</th>
<th>GRAND STRAND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>JACKSONVILLE URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>MID-CAROLINA RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>EASTERN CAROLINA RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CAPE FEAR RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**VARIABLE, VULNERABLE ROAD USER PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.**  
ADD PROJECT BREAK AT THE REQUEST OF THE TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY AND SAFETY DIVISION.

**CONSTRUCTION**  
FY 2023 - $400,000 (VRU)  
$400,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>REF/ID</th>
<th>AGENCY DESCRIPTION MODE</th>
<th>FUNDING PROGRAM</th>
<th>DIVISION(S)</th>
<th>PROJECT ID</th>
<th>STI CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROJECTED FUNDS (SEE FUNDING SCHEDULE FOR AGENCY)</th>
<th>PROJECTED FUNDS (SEE FUNDING SCHEDULE FOR AGENCY)</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>BIKE/PED</td>
<td>LOCALLY SELECTED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>BL-0040</td>
<td>BGDA, L</td>
<td>2023 $680,000</td>
<td>2024 $680,000</td>
<td>UNDER CONSTRUCTION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY(CS)</td>
<td>COUNTY(CYS)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>SHED</td>
<td>FUNDING PROGRAM</td>
<td>EXISTING(S)</td>
<td>MPF/EPF</td>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>UTILITY CATEGORY PENDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>BIKE/PED LOCALLY SELECTED 3 WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>BIKE/PED</td>
<td>NB150244</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>HBGP</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SOUTH 3RD STREET AND ORANGE STREET.</td>
<td>BIKE/PED</td>
<td>NB150245</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>HBGP</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS WITH PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEADS AT INTERSECTION OF SOUTH 3RD STREET AND ANN STREET IN WILMINGTON.</td>
<td>BIKE/PED</td>
<td>NB150246</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>HBGP</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS WITH PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEADS AT INTERSECTION OF SOUT 3RD STREET AND ANN STREET IN WILMINGTON.</td>
<td>BIKE/PED</td>
<td>NB150247</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>HBGP</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS WITH PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEADS AT INTERSECTION OF SOUTH 3RD STREET AND ANN STREET IN WILMINGTON.</td>
<td>BIKE/PED</td>
<td>NB150248</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>HBGP</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS WITH PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEADS AT INTERSECTION OF SOUT 3RD STREET AND ANN STREET IN WILMINGTON.</td>
<td>BIKE/PED</td>
<td>NB150249</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>HBGP</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY(S)</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>TOTAL FUNDING</td>
<td>TOTAL REMAINING</td>
<td>FUNDING SOURCE</td>
<td>PROJECTED UTILITIES</td>
<td>PROJECTED CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>COMMENT</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CITY OF WILMINGTON</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$26,800,000</td>
<td>$220,934,000</td>
<td>NCDOT</td>
<td>$3,632,000</td>
<td>UNDER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$26,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SCHOOL BOARDS</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$14,850,000</td>
<td>$79,475,000</td>
<td>NCDOT</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td>UNDER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$14,850,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SCHOOL BOARDS</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$4,290,000</td>
<td>$28,899,000</td>
<td>NCDOT</td>
<td>$5,380,000</td>
<td>UNDER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$4,290,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SCHOOL BOARDS</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>NCDOT</td>
<td>$7,580,000</td>
<td>UNDER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SCHOOL BOARDS</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$14,850,000</td>
<td>$79,475,000</td>
<td>NCDOT</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td>UNDER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$14,850,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SCHOOL BOARDS</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$4,290,000</td>
<td>$28,899,000</td>
<td>NCDOT</td>
<td>$5,380,000</td>
<td>UNDER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$4,290,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SCHOOL BOARDS</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>NCDOT</td>
<td>$7,580,000</td>
<td>UNDER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PROJECT #</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FUNDING PROGRAM</td>
<td>COST CENTER</td>
<td>STATE PROJECT NUMBER</td>
<td>FISCAL YEAR</td>
<td>SCHEDULED TO START</td>
<td>TOTAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 172683</td>
<td>$256,000</td>
<td>$314,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4235</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 191597</td>
<td>$6,450,000</td>
<td>$6,767,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4315</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 200850</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>$427,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4325</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 201062</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4335</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 201421</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4345</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 201692</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4355</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 201854</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4365</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 202000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4375</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 202186</td>
<td>$872,000</td>
<td>$872,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4385</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 202356</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4395</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 202530</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4405</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 202746</td>
<td>$1,648,000</td>
<td>$1,648,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4415</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 202912</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4425</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 203080</td>
<td>$424,000</td>
<td>$424,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4435</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 203248</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4445</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 203404</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4455</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 203560</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4465</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 203716</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4475</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 203882</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4485</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 204048</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4495</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 204204</td>
<td>$424,000</td>
<td>$424,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4505</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 204360</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4515</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 204516</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4525</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 204672</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4535</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 204828</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4545</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 205084</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4555</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 205240</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4565</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 205406</td>
<td>$424,000</td>
<td>$424,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4575</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 205562</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4585</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 205718</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 205874</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>4605</td>
<td>DIVISION 1</td>
<td>Project ID: 206030</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY(S)</td>
<td>ROUTE/CITY RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>MPO/REG</td>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>ORIGIN(S)</td>
<td>FUNDED ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td>TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS NEEDED FOR MORE INFO</td>
<td>TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS NEEDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT CAPITAL (NON-STI)</td>
<td>3 WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>TQ-8019</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td>5310</td>
<td>MORE INFO (TRANSIT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT CAPITAL (NON-STI)</td>
<td>3 WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>TQ-9001</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td>5310</td>
<td>MORE INFO (TRANSIT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HIGHWAY PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th>FUNDING DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FUNDING TYPE</th>
<th>(ESTIMATED COST ARE IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGANY</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (Any Area)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGDA</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (Direct Attributable)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGLT5</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (Less than 5K)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPDA</td>
<td>Carbon Reduction Program - Direct Attributable (All MPOs)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>Highway Fund</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHP</td>
<td>National Highway Performance Program</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPIM</td>
<td>National Highway Performance Program (Interstate Maintenance)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Highway Trust Funds</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>64703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>111387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NON-HIGHWAY PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th>FUNDING DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FUNDING TYPE</th>
<th>(ESTIMATED COST ARE IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310</td>
<td>Elderly and Persons with Disability (FEPD)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGANY</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (Any Area)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGDA</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (Direct Attributable)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGDACV</td>
<td>COVID Relief Funds</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Discretionary or Demonstration</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Local, Non Federal or State Funds</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>7104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Highway Trust Funds</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Transportation Alternatives Program (Uncategorized)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TADA</td>
<td>Transportation Alternatives Program (Direct Attributable)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>21463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## (INFLATED) STIP FUNDING SUMMARY 2024 - 2027 (June 2023)

### WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING TYPES: &quot;F&quot; - Federal  &quot;S&quot; - State  &quot;O&quot; - Other  &quot;C&quot; - City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING TYPES: "F" - Federal  "S" - State  "O" - Other  "C" - City

Tuesday, May 30, 2023
The North Carolina Department of Transportation has demonstrated fiscal constraint on the 2024-2033 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) adopted on June 6, 2023. The Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Transportation Improvement Program (MPO TIP) is a subset of the STIP and by extension therefore demonstrates fiscal constraint.
## Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs

### STIP/MPO TIP Modification #23-4

*(June 2023)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2023 -</th>
<th>FY 2023 -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC-0005</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE, 5339(b) DISCRETIONARY GRANT FOR FACILITY CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$750,000 (L)</td>
<td>$3,000,000 (5339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-0008</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE, 5339(b) DISCRETIONARY GRANT FOR FACILITY CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$1,500,000 (L)</td>
<td>$5,600,000 (5339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-0010</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE, 5339(b) DISCRETIONARY GRANT FOR FACILITY CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$1,000,000 (L)</td>
<td>$4,000,000 (5339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2050 MTP Logo and Branding

WMPO Board Meeting, 6/28/23
Title Options

Cape Fear Moving Forward 2050
Cape Fear Innovating Mobility 2050
Cape Fear Navigating Change 2050
Cape Fear Navigating Mobility 2050
Option A: Chevrons with blue/gold
Option B: Chevrons with cool tones/gold
Option C: Ship wheel design
Option D: Compass rose design
TCC Recommendations
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: June 7, 2023
Subject: *Draft* WMPO Prioritization 7.0 Aviation Submittals

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) released a schedule outlining the Prioritization 7.0 (P7.0) process. The P7.0 process includes a submittal window of July 2023 through September 2023 to allow MPOs, RPOs, and Division Engineers to submit projects for evaluation. The WMPO Board may submit up to 20 projects for each mode of transportation.

Below please find the recommendation for submittal to NCDOT for P7.0 Aviation projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ID</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A-21 Expand Air Carrier Auto Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AV-5799 Widen A-B Taxiway System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A-24 Airline and Customs Apron – Clean/Seal Joints, Pavement Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AV-5796 Increase Width of all Taxiways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A-36 2nd GA Hangar Aircraft Taxi Lane (North GA #2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A-33 Perimeter Road Improvements (Ph. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A-23 Perimeter Road Improvements (Ph. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A-25 Overlay Airport Blvd, Building Circulation and Surrounding Roadways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A-19 Apron Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A-37 Runway 35 Wind Cone/PAPI Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A-30 Upgrade Visual Approach Aids &amp; Runway Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A-7 GA Apron Development (Ph. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A-39 1st Paved Aircraft Taxi Lane (East Ramp Lane #1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A-38 Emergency Boat Ramp Access Launch Rwy 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A-26 Northside FBO #2 GA Apron and Hangar Development (Ph. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AV-5730 Extend Runway 6-24 (Ph. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A-29 Runway 17/35 Extension and Safety Area Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A-27 Map Utilities and Provide GIS Airport Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A-18 Land Acquisition for ASR Site Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14 Extend Runway 24 (Phase II of IV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: June 8, 2023
Subject: *Draft* WMPO Prioritization 7.0 Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Submittals

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) released a schedule outlining the Prioritization 7.0 (P7.0) process. The P7.0 process includes a submittal window of July 2023 through September 2023 to allow MPOs, RPOs, and Division Engineers to submit projects for evaluation. The WMPO Board may submit up to 20 projects for each mode of transportation.

Below please find the recommendation for submittal to NCDOT for P7.0 Bicycle and Pedestrian projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ID</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BP-546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BP-212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BP-619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BP-561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BP-584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BP-298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MUP recommended with U-5702B in 2045 MTP

**MUP recommended with RW-51 in 2045 MTP
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: June 7, 2023
Subject: *Draft* WMPO Prioritization 7.0 Ferry and Water Transportation Project Submittals

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) released a schedule outlining the Prioritization 7.0 (P7.0) process. The P7.0 process includes a submittal window of July 2023 through September 2023 to allow MPOs, RPOs, and Division Engineers to submit projects for evaluation. The WMPO Board may submit up to 20 projects for each mode of transportation.

Below please find the recommendation for submittal to NCDOT for P7.0 Ferry and Water Transportation projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ID</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F-3  New River Class Vessel (3rd Ferry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F-22 Fort Fisher Mooring Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F-22 Fort Fisher Pedestrian Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: June 8, 2023
Subject: *Draft* WMPO Prioritization 7.0 Public Transportation Project Submittals

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) released a schedule outlining the Prioritization 7.0 (P7.0) process. The P7.0 process includes a submittal window of July 2023 through September 2023 to allow MPOs, RPOs, and Division Engineers to submit projects for evaluation. The WMPO Board may submit up to 20 projects for each mode of transportation.

Below please find the recommendation for submittal to NCDOT for P7.0 public transportation projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Amenities Route 101 (10 Stop Improvements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Amenities Route 105 (8 Stop Improvements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Amenities Route 108 (11 Stop Improvements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Amenities Route 205 (8 Stop Improvements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Demand Response Vehicle Expansion* Paratransit Vehicles (2 total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Staff confirming eligibility with NCDOT IMD
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: June 7, 2023
Subject: *Draft* WMPO Prioritization 7.0 Rail Project Submittals

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) released a schedule outlining the Prioritization 7.0 (P7.0) process. The P7.0 process includes a submittal window of July 2023 through September 2023 to allow MPOs, RPOs, and Division Engineers to submit projects for evaluation. The WMPO Board may submit up to 20 projects for each mode of transportation.

Below please find the recommendation for submittal to NCDOT for P7.0 rail projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ID</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FR-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FR-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FR-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FR-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FR-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FR-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: June 8, 2023
Subject: *Draft* WMPO Prioritization 7.0 Roadway Project Submittals

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) released a schedule outlining the Prioritization 7.0 (P7.0) process. The P7.0 process includes a submittal window of July 2023 through September 2023 to allow MPOs, RPOs, and Division Engineers to submit projects for evaluation. The WMPO Board may submit up to 20 projects for each mode of transportation.

Below please find the recommendation for submittal to NCDOT for P7.0 Roadway projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ID</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>U-6080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U-4738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>U-4738A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>U-4738B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RW-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RW-220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RW-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RW-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RW-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RW-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>RW-222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RW-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>RW-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>RW-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RW-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RW-226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RW-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>RW-221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>RW-181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RW-99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sarah,

Please accept the connection between US 17 and NC 133 in Brunswick County (H192190) and replacement of the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge (H191501) as the Wilmington Urban Area MPO’s carryover projects for Prioritization 7.0. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

Mike Kozlosky
Executive Director
Wilmington Urban Area MPO
(910) 342-2781
Prioritization Partners,

As mentioned in Part 1 of this P7 email update a few minutes ago, this message contains guidance
and a request for action. Please be sure to read this email in its entirety.

Based on P7 Workgroup recommendation, all organizations may designate 2 projects as Carryovers for P7 that were originally submitted in P6. The results of this decision are outlined in this email.

The SPOT Office has developed a copy of the P6 scoring spreadsheet that details the process for developing the initial list of designated projects as well as the overall list of eligible projects to choose from. See attached for this file, and it is also available on the Prioritization Data page in the “Prioritization 7.0” folder.

- “Process” tab – contains the process for developing the overall list of new P6 projects and identifying the highest scoring projects
- “P6 New Submittals” tab – contains the overall list of eligible projects to choose from
  - Column S (“P6 Submitter”) can be used to filter by submitter
  - Columns N-Q can be used to filter by project location, regardless of submitter

By default, the 2 highest scoring Highway projects per P6 submitter have been initially designated as the Carryover projects. These are highlighted in yellow in the “P6 New Submittals” tab.

- Note that the Highway mode was selected for initial use, since that is the mode for which the most project submittal slots are typically used.
- The highest scoring projects were selected since those would have the best chances of being funded in P7. These are based on column V (“Max Score”) that uses the max of Statewide Mobility Quantitative Score, Normalized Regional Score, and Normalized Division Score.

However, a few unexpected results were found through this process, as follows:
  - No new projects were submitted by Division 2
  - Only one new Highway project was submitted by Peanut Belt RPO

For these reasons, each submitting organization is free to designate 2 alternative projects from within their area as the Carryovers for their organization (regardless of the submitter), as long as the projects are in the “P6 New Submittals” tab. This means that organizations may designate a variety of projects as their 2 Carryovers, including:

- The initially designated projects (highlighted in yellow)
- A lower scoring Highway project that they submitted
- A Non-Highway project that they submitted
- A project of any mode that is in their area but submitted in P6 by a different organization

SPOT is requesting that all organizations respond to the SPOT Office by March 31st with the 2 designated projects for your organization. If not provided by March 31st, the initially designated 2 highest scoring Highway projects will be used.

- If you would like to designate a project that was initially submitted in P6 by an organization other than yours, please coordinate with that organization and include documentation of that coordination in your response to the SPOT office along with your designated projects. This is to ensure that the same project is not identified by multiple submitters.
- As these will be Carryover projects for P7 (not new submittals), the SPOT office is not requiring that MPO and RPO Boards approve the project designations, nor do we believe this
requires public involvement. However, we acknowledge that many Planning Organizations may have processes in place that will require your board to act and/or seek public input. If that is the case, for our planning purposes, please contact the SPOT Office prior to March 31st with an estimation of when your organization will be able to provide your designated projects.

As always, do not hesitate to reach out to us at spot@ncdot.gov with questions or concerns.

Thank you,
NCDOT SPOT Office

Sarah E. Lee
Senior Transportation Engineer
Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT)
NC Department of Transportation
919 707 4742 office
selee@ncdot.gov

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Vanessa Lacer, Senior Transportation Planner
Greer Shivers, GIS Analyst
Date: June 22, 2023
Subject: Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Grant Opportunity

The Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WMPO) is eligible to apply for planning grant funding at 100% federal share through the DOT Federal Highway Administration’s Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Discretionary Grant Program. The goal of the PROTECT Grant Program is “to ensure surface transportation resilience to natural hazards including climate change, sea level rise, flooding, extreme weather events, and other natural disasters through support of planning activities, resilience improvements, community resilience and evacuation routes, and at-risk coastal infrastructure.”

The PROTECT grant program offers two types of awards: planning grants and resilience improvement grants. Planning grants can be used create a Resilience Improvement Plan which could include “resilience planning, predesign, design, or the development of data tools to simulate transportation disruption scenarios, including vulnerability assessments; technical capacity building to facilitate the ability of the eligible entity to assess the vulnerabilities of its surface transportation assets and community response strategies under current conditions and a range of potential future conditions; or evacuation planning and preparation.” Further, all projects identified in a Resilience Improvement Plan would be eligible for subsequent implementation funding (a resilience improvement grant) through the PROTECT program with up to a 7% reduction in non-federal local match.

A regional Resilience Improvement Plan provides an opportunity to shape resiliency planning for the WMPO region, which is greatly in need of comprehensive disaster preparedness planning due rising population growth (and increased evacuation needs), the location of the Port of Wilmington and Wilmington International Airport, both operations having regional, statewide, and national impacts, and its coastal nature and high likelihood of future severe weather events such as hurricanes. Additionally, the area’s proximity to both the Atlantic Ocean and the Cape Fear
River, creates the likelihood of experiencing compound flooding during severe weather events. In 2018 Hurricane Florence effectively cut off New Hanover County from the rest of NC due to heavy rainfall, and coastal and riverine flooding which caused damage to the transportation network. Residents were trapped in the area for a prolonged amount of time and rescue operations were hindered due to roadway damage.

As the regional transportation planning organization, the WMPO is well poised to serve as the lead agency for this project. Additionally, the WMPO currently boasts a resource for the proposed Resilience Improvement Plan in staff member Greer Shivers who, if funding was awarded, would be a leader on the project team. Ms. Shivers holds an M.S. in Geoscience, concentrating in Geospatial Technologies, and has worked on a NOAA Sea Grant project to identify green infrastructure solutions in the transportation networks of New Hanover County and New Bern, NC. She has also published work on the creation of a rapid wetland vulnerability assessment through the journal Hydrology with, Dr. Narcisa Pricope of UNCW.

WMPO staff seek consensus from the WMPO Board to move forward with applying for a planning grant to develop a Resilience Improvement Plan for the WMPO planning area. The FY 22 and FY 23 PROTECT Grant Notice of Funding Opportunity was posted in April with applications for this funding cycle due on August 18, 2023. The minimum planning grant award is $100,000 at 100% federal share meaning that no local matching funds are required.
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 28, 2022. 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 included both a survey and input map application began June 15th and continued through mid-August. Ongoing during the outreach process were several in-person survey opportunities targeted to gather input from traditionally underserved communities. Just over 1,000 survey responses were received and used by Alta as a framework to guide the development of project and policy recommendations. The Walk Wilmington Steering Committee reviewed the draft priority areas identified through this framework during its September 27th meeting. Alta incorporated the Committee’s initial comments and released a draft plan in November for the Steering Committee’s further review. The committee’s comments, as well as comments from key city staff, were sent to Alta on December 16, 2022. A final Steering Committee meeting, presenting the plan for receiving public comment on the draft plan and requesting assistance in promoting its availability was held on January 17th. The Draft plan was released for public review and comment on January 20th and was available for comment until February 20th. Two Public Workshops were held to allow for in person review and comment on the plan’s recommendations. The first was held January 31st from 5pm – 7pm at Halyburton Park, and the second on February 1st from 5pm to 7pm at the MLK Community Center.

Project Status and Next Steps:
- All comments, including those from NCDOT IMD, have been received, reviewed, and addressed in the final draft version of Walk Wilmington
- Final plan presentation to City Council in June 2023

PENDER COUNTY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN

Project Description/Scope: Pender County, in collaboration with the WMPO and consultant WSP, seeks to develop a comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to direct multi-modal development within the southern portion of the County. The final plan will be used to prioritize bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure implementation that will improve mobility, increase safety, and strengthen the connectivity for multi-modal transportation options in southern Pender County. The notice to proceed was issued in late September 2022

Project Status and Next Steps:
- On June 5th, the steering committee met a third time to review draft recommendations.
- On June 7th, the plan will open for public comment. WSP, WMPO, and Pender County staff will host two pop-up events to collect public feedback.
- The online survey remains open for the plan through the end of the public comment period.
The public comment period will close on June 20th.

**NCDOT IMD FEASIBILITY STUDY GRANTS**

**Project Description/Scope:** In July 2022, the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) was allocated $2 million in one-time funding from the North Carolina General Assembly to establish a Paved Trails Feasibility Study Program. The Integrated Mobility Division (IMD) was also awarded $500,000 in State Planning and Research (SP&R) funds to support sidewalk and shared-use path feasibility studies. The purpose of the Paved Trails and Sidewalk Feasibility Studies Grant Program is to improve the pipeline of bicycle and pedestrian projects accessing state and federal funding, resulting in successful implementation of projects led by communities prioritizing multimodal infrastructure.

**Wilmington Downtown Trail Phases 2 & 3:**
The Downtown Trail will eventually connect the River to Sea Bikeway to the future Multimodal Transportation Center, Cape Fear Community College, and the Riverwalk. In between these locations, the trail will provide a recreational facility for several communities in proximity to the downtown. The project currently consists of three phases. The first phase, from 3rd Street to Archie Blue Park, is in the preliminary engineering phase. The purpose of this study would be to assess the feasibility of constructing Phases 2 and 3. A scoping meeting with NCDOT IMD and the selected consultant, Kittelson, was held on May 2, 2023.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- Kittelson has provided a draft scoping document currently being reviewed by WMPO and City staff.
- Work anticipated to begin in June 2023.
- Final study report anticipated in late spring/early summer 2024.

**Gullah Geechee Heritage Trail:**
The purpose of this study would be to assess the feasibility of constructing a 10’-12’ multi-use path facility in the Gullah Geechee Heritage Corridor from Phoenix Park in Navassa to Brunswick Nature Park in unincorporated Brunswick County. The Gullah Geechee Heritage Corridor is designated as a Cultural Heritage Area by U.S. Congress, presenting an opportunity to educate the public about the history of the Gullah Geechee people and highlight historical sites within Brunswick County. A scoping meeting with NCDOT IMD and the selected consultant, Kittelson, was held on May 2, 2023.

**Project Status and Next Steps:**
- Kittelson has provided a draft scoping document currently being reviewed by WMPO and member jurisdiction partner staff.
- Work anticipated to begin in mid-June 2023.
- Final study report anticipated in late spring/early summer 2024.

**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: 5 reviews
- New Hanover County Informal Plan Reviews: 3 reviews
- New Hanover Concept Reviews: 1 reviews
- Town of Leland Concept Plan Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Leland Formal Reviews: 4 reviews
- Town of Leland Informal Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Navassa Formal Plan Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Navassa Informal Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Navassa Concept Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Belville Formal Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Carolina Beach Formal Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Carolina Beach Informal Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Carolina Beach Concept Reviews: 0 review
- Brunswick County Formal Plan Reviews: 0 reviews
- Brunswick County Informal Plan Reviews: 0 review
- Pender County Formal Reviews: 3 reviews
- Pender County Informal Reviews: 2 reviews
- Pender County Concept Reviews: 0 reviews
- City of Wilmington Formal Reviews: 49 reviews (9 new, 40 on-going)
- City of Wilmington Informal Reviews: 18 reviews (3 new, 15 on-going)
- City of Wilmington Concept Reviews: 2 review(s) (2 new, 0 on-going)
- City of Wilmington Full Releases: 7

TIA Reviews: 42 total active (9 new; 32 under review; 1 approved)
- New Hanover County 14 (2 new, 12 under review, 0 approved),
- City of Wilmington 8 (2 new, 6 under review, 0 approved),
- Carolina Beach 0,
- Town of Belville 0,
- Town of Leland 3, (0 new, 3 under review, 0 approved),
- Town of Navassa 2, (1 new, 0 approved, 1 under review),
- Pender County 10 (2 new, 7 under review, 1 approved) and
- Brunswick County 5 (2 new, 3 under review, 0 approved)

**STBGP-DA/TASA-DA/CRRSA FY2013 to Present**

**U - 5527C NEW HANOVER COUNTY - Middle Sound Loop Extension/Connector Construction & Porters Neck Walmart Connector Construction**

Project Description/Scope: construction of bicycle/pedestrian trails along Middle Sound Loop Road from Red Cedar Road to Publix commercial lot. Also construct trails along US 17 Business (Market Street) from Mendenhall Drive to Porter’s Neck Wal-Mart commercial lot.

Project Status and Next Steps:
- Right of way acquisition is complete and was sent to NCDOT for ROW certification
- Anticipated construction let date Summer 2023

**U-5534C - WRIGHTSVILLE AVENUE/GREENVILLE 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:
- NCDOT approval of final design elements and right-of-way authorization obtained June 10,
U-5534G – CITY OF WILMINGTON- HOOKER ROAD MULTI-USE PATH
Project Descriptions/Scope: The project consists 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:
- NCDOT approval of final design elements and right-of-way authorization obtained June 10, 2022
- Advertise for Bid – August 2023
- Begin Construction – January 2024
- Construction Complete- September 2024

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:
- NCDOT approval of final design elements and right-of-way authorization obtained June 10, 2022
- Advertise for Bid – August 2023
- Begin Construction – January 2024
- Construction Complete- September 2024

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
- Town of Leland is working with the Contractor’s Surety
- Contractor’s certified payrolls/Engineer’s daily inspection reports are under review by NCDOT
- Final Project Closeout date to be determined
- Project completion requested to be extended to June 30, 2024 and NCDOT Raleigh offices are reviewing this request.
- The Town is standing by for guidance from NCDOT and DOJ on next steps.

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
- Town of Leland is working with the Contractor’s Surety
- Contractor’s certified payrolls/Engineer’s daily inspection reports are under review by NCDOT
- Final Project Closeout date to be determined
- Project completion requested to be extended to June 30, 2024 and NCDOT Raleigh offices are reviewing this request.
- The Town is standing by for guidance from NCDOT and DOJ on next steps.

U-5534K – TOWN OF LELAND- LELAND MIDDLE SCHOOL SIDEWALK
Project Description/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
- Town of Leland is working with the Contractor’s Surety
- Contractor’s certified payrolls/Engineer’s daily inspection reports are under review by NCDOT
- Final Project Closeout date to be determined
- Project completion requested to be extended to June 30, 2024 and NCDOT Raleigh offices are reviewing this request.
- The Town is standing by for guidance from NCDOT and DOJ on next steps.

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:
- Received Construction Authorization from NCDOT and Notice to Proceed (NTP) from NCDOT (U-5534Q & EB-6028) on February 8, 2023
- Advertise U-5534Q and EB-6028 on March 8, 2023
- Pre-Bid Meeting on March 21, 2023
- Bid Opening (LET) on April 13, 2023
- One (1) bid submitted and rejected (May 16, 2023 Council Meeting) due to Over/Under difference with Engineer’s Cost Estimate.
- Re-advertise w/ EB-6028 on May 18th
- Bid Opening (LET) on June 8, 2023
- One (1) bid submitted and rejected due to excessive cost(s)
- Revised bid schedule tentatively set for June/July

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

U-6233 CAROLINA BEACH HAMLET AVENUE/ US 421 TRAFFIC SIGNAL
Project Description/Scope: installation of traffic signal with pedestrian infrastructure at the intersection of Hamlet Avenue and US 421 in the Town of Carolina Beach

- The signal plans have been finalized.
- The construction WBS was amended in October 2022 by the Board of Transportation
- Tentative construction starts in mid-year 2023

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
- Contractor submitted a revised construction schedule and has mobilized on site
- September 12, 2022, building permit issued
- Right of Way permit has been approved
- Ongoing demolition of site and cleaning of the exterior walls
- Ongoing investigation for the stabilization of the brick
- Installed water service
- Prepared the masonry of the south parapet wall for reinstallation
- Prepared the subgrade for the concrete slab foundation installation
- Began installation of slab foundation (part 1 of 3)
- Poured second portion of the slab foundation (part 2 of 3)
- Began masonry repair on the south wall
- Installed structural steel columns.
- Continued masonry repairs for the south wall
- Completed masonry repairs to south wall
- Completed installation of structural steel
- Successful demolition & removal of existing second floor joists
- Continued installing masonry anchor bolts for the walls
- Continued repairing window openings
- Completed roof support system
- Installed majority of second floor flooring system
- Installed structural steel cross bracing
- Began installing HVAC duct work for 2nd floor ceiling
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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 and execution is 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 Summer 2023.

U-6039 – CAROLINA BEACH – ST. JOSEPH BIKE LANES
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 Kimley-Horn & Associates (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 presented 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 prequalified engineering firms with a response deadline of June 8, 2022
• Responses to RFLOI reviewed by WMPO/Town of Carolina Beach
• On July 12, 2022, the Town of Carolina Beach selected KHA as the design firm
• On September 22, 2022, the Town received a Letter of Agreement from KHA for Scope of Services and Project Engineer Design Estimate.
• The Town has uploaded documentation via EBS portal for review and approval.
• The Town has obtained NCDOT approval in January 2023
• Project meeting with consultant held March 2023
• Surveying of the project area is in progress.
• Community updates are being provided.

TASA-DA/CRRSAA/STIP

BL-0045 – DOWNTOWN GREENWAY PH. 1 DESIGN
Project Description/Scope: design and engineering for an approximately 2.2 mile long, 10’ to 12’ in width portion of the trail beginning at 3rd street in the Downtown within the NCDOT owned rail corridor to McRae St (defined in the Wilmington Rail Trail Master Plan); abutting the Dorothy B. Johnson Elementary School western parcel line; traversing east along CSX right-of-way to Archie Blue Park; and continuing north through Archie Blue Park, parallel to the creek and terminating at the Love Grove Bridge multi-use path facility.
Project Status and Next Steps:
- Agreement executed by NCDOT on April 20, 2022
- City selected an on-call engineering consultant (WSP) to perform design and engineering. A scope and fee were agreed upon and approved by NCDOT.
- Award of contract by City Council on September 6, 2022.
- Notice to proceed issued on October 2, 2022.
- NCDOT Rail Division is moving forward with the design to accommodate both future passenger rail service and the Downtown Trail facility. The trail design schedule will align with NCDOT Rail’s design schedule, once the department secures funding. The final alignment of the trail will be determined through coordination.
- WSP submitted a supplemental scope of services for project management activities, NCDOT and CSX rail coordination, and additional survey tasks. The supplement has been approved by NCDOT.
- Public meeting to be determined after NCDOT Rail has identified funding.

BL – 0059 TOWN OF KURE BEACH - FORT FISHER BOULEVARD/K AVENUE AND NORTH 3RD STREET PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

Project Description/Scope: This project entails intersection improvements at Ft. Fisher Boulevard and K Avenue to include high visibility crosswalks, ADA ramps, and pedestrian signals; and filling gaps in the sidewalk network on Ft. Fisher Boulevard and N. 3rd Street that will create a pedestrian network connected to the Ft. Fisher Boulevard and K Avenue intersection.

Project Status and Next Steps:
- Agreement finalized and adopted September 2022
- Request for PE Authorization in October 2022
- Request for Letters of Interest to be sent in December 2022
- Four (4) proposals reviewed in January 2023
- PE firm selection February 2023
- Project kick-off meeting in March 2023
- Contract will be approved by Kure Beach Town Council in June 2023

EB-5600 – S. 17TH STREET MULTI-USE PATH

Project Description/Scope: This project consists of the construction of a 10’ multiuse path along South 17th Street from Harbour Drive to Shipyard Boulevard and the installation of crosswalks and pedestrian signal heads at the intersection of South 17th Street and Shipyard Boulevard.

Project Status and Next Steps:
- Agreement executed with NCDOT on May 24, 2022
- Scope and Fee submitted to NCDOT on September 16, 2022
- Change Request for PE Authorization submitted to NCDOT on September 21, 2022
- Request to use RS&H (COW On-Call) approved by NCDOT on October 10, 2022
- NCDOT approved the scope and fee on November 2, 2022
- Change Request for PE Authorization approved on January 20, 2023
- Contract between City and RS&H executed on January 24, 2023 and notice to proceed issued.
- Design kick-off meeting between City and RS&H staff held on January 31, 2023
- Design criteria and typical section submitted on March 17, 2023.
- Survey work completed on April 27, 2023.
- Natural Resources Technical Report (NRTR)/Environmental Document is in progress.
- Field visit conducted on May 4, 2023.
• 25% Preliminary Plans in progress

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:
• 100% plans approved by NCDOT
• Contract proposal (with cost estimate) approved April 11, 2022
• CEI contract award in October 2022
• Construction authorization February 2023
• CE Consultation pending approval from NCDOT
• Withers Ravenel delivered bid documents to the Town mid-May. NCDOT is currently reviewing.
• Tentative bid solicitation in July 2023
• Anticipated bid award/start of construction October 2023

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:
• 100% plans approved by NCDOT
• Contract proposal (with cost estimate) approved April 11, 2022
• CEI contract award in October 2022
• Construction authorization February 2023
• CE Consultation pending approval from NCDOT (revised b/c Tricolored Bat is on the potentially endangered species list. CE Consultation signed by both Withers Ravenel and NCDOT).
• Withers Ravenel delivered bid documents to the Town mid-May. NCDOT is currently reviewing.
• Tentative bid solicitation in July 2023
• Anticipated bid award/start of construction October 2023

EB-6027 – NEW HANOVER COUNTY- MIDDLE SOUND GREENWAY
Project Description: Design only of the Middle Sound Greenway connection to Publix

Project Status and Next Steps:
• Comments received from CFPUA indicate conflicts with utilities that require design adjustments
• NCDOT issued notice of Construction Authorization on April 12, 2022.
• Level A SUE completed, and results have been reviewed.
• CFPUA is reviewing final plans (were modified based on their comments)
• Right of way acquisition is complete and was sent to NCDOT for ROW certification
• Anticipated construction let date Summer 2023
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 100% project plans
- Received Construction Authorization from NCDOT and NTP from NCDOT (U-5534Q & EB-6028) on February 8, 2023
- Advertise U-5534Q and EB-6028 on March 8, 2023
- Pre-Bid Meeting on March 21, 2023
- Bid Opening (LET) on April 13, 2023
- One (1) bid submitted and rejected (May 16, 2023 Council Meeting) due to Over/Under difference with Engineer’s Cost Estimate.
- Bid opening held April 13, 2023
- One (1) bid submitted and rejected due to excessive cost(s)
- Revised bid schedule tentatively set for June/July

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:
- Town Council has requested to cancel this project.
- The MPO Board supported removal of the project at their November 30th meeting.
- STIP amendment to delete the project will be considered by the MPO Board at their March meeting.

HL – 0040 NC PORTS WILMINGTON – NEW NORTH GATE FEASIBILITY STUDY

Project Description/Scope: This project is a feasibility study, early design and NEPA work to determine the high-level alternatives and costs associated with a new North Gate on NC Port of Wilmington property to allow for efficient freight access to and from the General Terminal.

Project Status and Next Steps:
- Advertisement for on-call consultants, August 14, 2020
- Selection and signed contract with HDR on October 29, 2020
- Kickoff meeting on site with NCSPA on March 10, 2022
- NCSPA/WTRY call on April 5, 2022
- Draft scoping letter to Port on April 5, 2022
- Traffic counts completed April 12, 2022
- Scoping Letter to Agencies on April 18, 2022
- Draft design assumptions & Typical Sections submitted on June 3, 2022
- Draft Limited Environmental Records Review (LERR) submitted on July 5, 2022
- Revised typical sections submitted on July 7, 2022
- Natural Resources Technical Report (NRTR) on August 8, 2022
- Revised Limited Environmental Records Review (LERR) submitted August 15, 2022
- Draft 15% roadway submittal on September 15, 2022
- Preliminary Hydraulics submittal on October 11, 2022
- Revised Roadway plans submitted on November 16, 2022
- Draft traffic analysis submitted December 16, 2022
- Revised Roadway exhibits submitted January 23, 2023
- Revised Roadway exhibits and costs submitted January 31, 2023
• Waiting on SHPO concurrence of no effects
• Traffic noise documentation from NCDOT that Traffic Noise Report not needed.
• Working on impacts for the draft CE document

TC – 0021 WAVE PASSENGER AMENITIES AND UPGRADES
Project Description/Scope: Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority (WAVE transit) currently has a total of 440 bus stops, 24 benches and 27 shelters. Shelters only represent 6% of our passenger amenities, while other NC agencies average 14%. To meet the peer average for statewide systems, CFPTA needs to install an additional twenty-six (26) benches and twenty (20) shelters. This project will support the installation of a total of nine (9) bus stop benches and ten (10) bus stop shelters along eight (8) transit routes located within the City of Wilmington. The project includes engineering and design, construction of concrete pads, ADA ramps, ADA access, and purchase and installation of durable bench and/or shelter, waste receptacle, and solar lighting, where applicable.

Project Status and Next Steps:
• The project was awarded funds in November 2021
• NC Board of Transportation approved the flex request in January 2023
• Flex request confirmed end of April 2023
• Letters from NCDOT transmitted May 23, 2023

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. Go Coast Committee Meeting - The next Go Coast committee meeting will occur on August 17, 2023, at 3 PM.
2. Bicycle Helmet Initiative – The WMPO has been selected to receive 100 bicycle helmets to be distributed to low-income children through NCDOT’s Bicycle Helmet Initiative. Helmets will be distributed this summer during the Be a Looker campaign.
3. Be a Looker – WMPO and Go Coast will promote the Be a Looker campaign from April 2023 through October 2023, which encourages safety among all road users including motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians, through attending events, presentations, distributing informational brochures, advertising, and social media.
4. May is Bike Month – National Bike Month was observed in May. Go Coast facilitated the region’s Bike Month celebration with a page at gocoastnc.org/bike-month, with links to forms for tracking rides during May, an event/ride calendar, and helpful links. Participants biked nearly 2000 miles, as reported on the tracking form. Staff hosted a Bike on Bus workshop on May 9 at Padgett Station.
5. Printed map updates – staff is working to update and reprint maps for the Gary Shell Cross City Trail and River to Sea Bikeway.
**Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority**  
**June 2023 Project Updates**

**RIDERSHIP UPDATES**
Through May 2023, Wave Transit is showing 4% growth in ridership compared to the previous fiscal year. Average monthly ridership for the current fiscal year is 57,956.

Five out of the seven routes that are experiencing growth over the prior fiscal year are showing double digit growth. The strongest improvements for the year are among these three routes: 201 Carolina Beach Road route is up 22%, 108 Market Street route is up 29%, and the 107 College Road route is up 58% in ridership over the prior fiscal year.

RideMICRO’s (Microtransit) FY23 ridership average is 1,449 trips per month.

**SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN**
Wave Transit is utilizing Nelson/Nygaard to provide recommendations for service improvements for FY2024-FY2028 that are comprehensive, fiscally constrained, and implementable according to a timeframe. The primary objective of the analysis is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Authority’s fixed-route system to better serve the public transportation needs of the Cape Fear Region, without increasing the operating budget for the Authority and to also investigate models for service reduction. The efforts entail outreach and education and include analyses of paratransit, University shuttles, RideMICRO, and the development of a Transit Asset Management plan.

**CAPITAL PROJECTS**
Wave Transit has installed 19 new pole stops, finishing those efforts in late May 2023. In addition, funding was received for 20 shelters and 19 benches to be installed throughout the system.

Staff conducted an equity-focused analysis when determining locations for amenities and new stops. Income and car ownership data by census tract were used to determine locations for the new stops. More stops were added in census tracts with higher percentages of low-income and one-car or no car households. Wave Transit works to provide equitable access to transit and fair distribution of passenger amenities throughout its system.

**OTHER PROJECTS**
In December 2022, the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) awarded NCDOT $10.4 Million in Rural Surface Transportation Grant program funding to deploy on-demand microtransit services in eleven rural North Carolina communities, including the Wilmington area. Funding will accelerate the deployment of high-quality, on-demand transit services to rural, low-income communities throughout North Carolina, leading to more equitable mobility and improved access to opportunities, services, and resources for transportation disadvantaged populations.

Wave Transit requested additional vehicles, software, and service area expansion for the existing RideMICRO system. Castle Hayne was selected for expansion and was allocated $6.7 million for capital and operation costs over three calendar years starting in 2024.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>TIP</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>SAP LET Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Harding</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-6202</td>
<td>SR 2048 (GORDON ROAD) FROM US 17 (MARKET STREET) TO I-40. WIDEN ROADWAY.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2024.07.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Pielech</td>
<td>DPOC</td>
<td>BP3-R004</td>
<td>REPLACE BRUNSWICK BRIDGE 181 OVER STURGEON CREEK ON SR 1437 (OLD</td>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>2025.06.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAYETTEVILLE ROAD) (Previously 17BP.3.R.84).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Pielech</td>
<td>DPOC</td>
<td>BP3-R012</td>
<td>BRIDGE 208 OVER STURGEON CREEK ON SR 1472 (VILLAGE ROAD).</td>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>2025.07.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17BP.3.R.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Howell</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>R-3300A</td>
<td>US 17 HAMPSTEAD BYPASS FROM US 17 BYPASS SOUTH OF HAMPSTEAD TO NC 210</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER, PENDER</td>
<td>2025.07.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Howell</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-5710</td>
<td>US 74 (EASTWOOD ROAD) SR 1409 (MILITARY CUTOFF ROAD) INTERSECTION - CONVERT</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2026.09.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AT-GRADE INTERSECTION TO AN INTERCHANGE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Howell</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>R-5734</td>
<td>US 421 (SOUTH FRONT ST.) FROM US 17 BUSINESS/US 76/US 421 (CAPE FEAR MEMORIAL</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2027.06.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BRIDGE) TO US 421 (BURNETT BOULEVARD) WIDEN TO MULTI-LANES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Howell</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-5792</td>
<td>US 74 (MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. PARKWAY) AT US 117/NC 132 (COLLEGE ROAD).</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2027.06.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONVERT AT-GRADE INTERSECTION TO INTERCHANGE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Harding</td>
<td>DPOC</td>
<td>U-5954</td>
<td>NC 133 (CASTLE HAYNE ROAD) AT NORTH 23RD STREET. CONSTRUCT A ROUNDBOUT.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2027.06.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Pielech</td>
<td>DPOC</td>
<td>BR-0008</td>
<td>REPLACE BRIDGE 7 ON US 17 OVER US 76.</td>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>2027.09.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Pielech</td>
<td>DPOC</td>
<td>B-5653</td>
<td>PENDER BRIDGE 14 ON NC 133 OVER TURKEY CREEK.</td>
<td>PENDER</td>
<td>2028.01.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Kimmel</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-3338C</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AVENUE) INTERCHANGE AT US 74 (MARTIN LUTHER KING JR PARKWAY).</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2028.06.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Harding</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-5729</td>
<td>US 421 (CAROLINA BEACH RD) FROM US 421 (BURNETT AVENUE) TO US 117 (SHIPIYARD</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2028.07.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOULEVARD) IN WILMINGTON UPGRADE ROADWAY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Harding</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-5731</td>
<td>US 74 AT US 17/US 421, CONSTRUCT A FLY-OVER AND FREE FLOW RAMP AT</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2029.06.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERCHANGE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Harding</td>
<td>DPOC</td>
<td>U-6128</td>
<td>US 76 (OLEANDER DRIVE) NEW HANOVER COUNTY AT GREENVILLE LOOP ROAD AND</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2029.06.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GREENVILLE AVENUE. UPGRADE INTERSECTION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Kimmel</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-4902C</td>
<td>US 17 BUSINESS (MARKET STREET) FROM NORTH OF US 117/NC 132 (COLLEGE ROAD)</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2029.08.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TO STATION ROAD &amp; INTERCHANGE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Kimmel</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-4434</td>
<td>WILMINGTON, INDEPENDENCE BLVD EXT FROM RANDALL PARKWAY TO MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PARKWAY.</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>2031.06.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Kimmel</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-4902B</td>
<td>US 17 BUSINESS [MARKET STREET] FROM THE CSX RAILROAD TO CINEMA DRIVE AND FROM JACKSONVILLE STREET TO NORTH OF US 117/NC132 (COLLEGE ROAD).</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Howell</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-5702A</td>
<td>NC 132 [COLLEGE ROAD] FROM SR 1272 [NEW CENTRE DRIVE] TO US 117 [SHIYARD BOULEVARD].</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Howell</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-5704</td>
<td>NC 132 [COLLEGE ROAD] AT US 76 [OLEANDER DRIVE].</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Howell</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-5732</td>
<td>US 17 FROM SR 1582 [WASHINGTON ACRES ROAD] TO VISTA LANE. CONVERT TO SUPERSTREET.</td>
<td>Pender</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Harding</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-5863</td>
<td>NC 133 [CASTLE HAYNE ROAD] FROM I-140 / US 17, WILMINGTON BYPASS TO SR 1310 [DIVISION DRIVE] WIDEN TO MULTI LANES.</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Howell</td>
<td>DDRL</td>
<td>U-5881</td>
<td>NC 132 [COLLEGE ROAD] FROM SR 2048 [GORDON ROAD] TO SR 1272 [NEW CENTRE DRIVE]. UPGRADE ROADWAY.</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Kimmel</td>
<td>DPOC</td>
<td>U-6201</td>
<td>SR 1175 [KERR AVENUE] FROM SR 1411 [WRIGHTSVILLE AVENUE] TOUS 76 [OLEANDER DRIVE]. CONSTRUCT ROADWAY ON NEW LOCATION.</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Update provided: 6/05/23
PO: WMPO
Contact: Adrienne Cox, amcox1@ncdot.gov, 910.341.2001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Number</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>TIP/WBS/Work Order</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C203980</td>
<td>Joshua Pratt</td>
<td>U-4751</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>Military Cutoff Road Extension from Market St to the Wilmington Bypass with an interchange at the Bypass</td>
<td>2024.01.30</td>
<td>89.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204301</td>
<td>Joshua Pratt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>New Hanover #48 and #49 on I-40E &amp; I-40 W/NE Substructure Repairs</td>
<td>2023.05.31</td>
<td>84.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00249</td>
<td>Joshua Pratt</td>
<td>B-4590</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>Bridge #29 over Smith Creek</td>
<td>2023.10.11</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204319</td>
<td>Joshua Pratt</td>
<td>U-4902D</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>Superstreet median on Market St (US 17 BUS) from Marsh Oaks Dr to Lendire Dr</td>
<td>2023.09.19</td>
<td>59.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204629</td>
<td>Joshua Pratt</td>
<td>B-5624</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>Replace Bridge 57 on NC 211 Over Juniper Creek</td>
<td>2023.12.12</td>
<td>49.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204331</td>
<td>Joshua Pratt</td>
<td>15BPR.19</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>Banks Channel (#21, US 76) girder repair, clean and paint bearings, epoxy caps</td>
<td>2023.09.29</td>
<td>37.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204553</td>
<td>Daniel Waugh</td>
<td>R-3300B</td>
<td>Pender</td>
<td>NC 417 (Hampstead Bypass) from South of NC 210 to North of SR 1563 (Sloop Point Road)</td>
<td>2027.06.14</td>
<td>21.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C204747</td>
<td>Joshua Pratt</td>
<td>U-5710A</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>Drysdale Drive Extension from Military Cutoff Road at Drydale to US 74</td>
<td>2025.02.27</td>
<td>23.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00420</td>
<td>David Sawyer</td>
<td>W-5703R</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>NC 132 (College Road) &amp; Bragg Drive in the City of Wilmington. Offset Lefts.</td>
<td>2024.02.23</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WMPO JUNE RESURFACING PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Number</th>
<th>Contract Year</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC00344</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Brunswick, New Hanover</td>
<td>Brunswick and New Hanover county resurfacing, various secondary routes</td>
<td>2023.06.16</td>
<td>77.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00311</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>Market Street, 3rd Street, Independence Blvd, and patching on 16th &amp; 17th Streets</td>
<td>2023.09.29</td>
<td>52.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00406</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>Resurfacing, pavement preservation &amp; NC State Port Patching</td>
<td>2023.11.17</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00426</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>Resurfacing and pavement preservation</td>
<td>2024.05.24</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Go!NC Portal** for public information: [HMIP](https://ncdot.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=ceae1d0cf870473fb7d935294ac6b71c) GIS maps

https://ncdot.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=ceae1d0cf870473fb7d935294ac6b71c
June 2023

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

JUNE TPD UPDATES WILMINGTON MPO

JUNE 2023

Brunswick County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP): There were three in-person public involvement sessions throughout Brunswick County for the Brunswick County CTP and a virtual session from May 1st – May 15th. The engineer has been working on compiling all feedback and plans on reviewing major recommendations with steering committee mid to late June.

Wilmington Model: The 2050 Travel Demand Model (TDM) work started on 3/1/2022. The TDM is being developed for the next Wilmington MTP. Currently the engineer and modeler are working on checking and updating network attributes, creating base year SE Data and preparing base year network. TPD is also continuing to work with the MPO to collect and verify data.


Helpful Links:
Click on links below to learn more:
- NCDOT home page—[ncdot.gov](http://ncdot.gov)
- Real-Time Traffic—[DriveNC.gov | North Carolina Traffic & Travel Information](http://www.driveNC.gov/)
- Report a pothole—[NCDOT Contact Us Form](http://www.ncdot.gov/)
- NCDOT: State Transportation Improvement Program—[ncdot.gov/sti](http://www.ncdot.gov/)
- Links to all traffic count data information—[Traffic Survey Group (ncdot.gov)](http://www.ncdot.gov/)
- NCDOT Interactive Traffic Volume Map—[Interactive Traffic Volume map (ncdot.gov)](http://www.ncdot.gov/)
- Traffic Safety Data & Engineering—[NCDOT: Traffic Safety Data & Engineering](http://www.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)