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

**Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization**

**Board**

**Meeting Agenda**

**TO:** Wilmington Urban Area MPO Board Members

**FROM:** Mike Kozlosky, Executive Director

**DATE:** July 20, 2023

**SUBJECT:** July 26th meeting

A meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area MPO’s Board will be held on Wednesday, July 26, 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. Walk Wilmington Pedestrian Plan Update- Abby Lorenzo, WMPO
   b. Terry Benjey Foundation (TBF)- Eileen McConville, TBF
   c. Wilmington Urban Area MPO’s Direct Attributable Program Update- Scott A. James, WMPO
   d. 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan- Vanessa Lacer, WMPO
7) Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from June 28, 2023 (p. 4-11)
   b. Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendments #23-3 (p. 12-13)
d. Resolution supporting the award of Section 5310 Community Grant Project Funds (p. 16-18)
e. Resolution adopting the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s 2023 Organizational Assessment (p. 19-64)
f. Resolution adopting the 2023 Walk Wilmington Pedestrian Plan Update (p. 65)
g. Resolution supporting the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s efforts to secure a Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Program grant to complete a Resiliency Improvement Plan for the Wilmington Urban Area (p. 66-67)

8) Public Hearing
   a. 2024-2033 State/Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Improvement Programs (p. 68-72)

9) Regular Agenda
   a. Opening of a 14-day public comment period for the Prioritization 7.0 Project Submittals (p. 73-91)
   b. Resolution supporting the allocation of additional Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Direct Attributable Funds to the City of Wilmington for the Hooker Road Multi-use Path, Hinton Avenue Multi-use Path, and Wrightsville/Greenville intersection improvements (p. 92-95)

10) Updates
   a. Wilmington Urban Area MPO (p. 96-107)
   b. Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority (p. 108)
   c. NCDOT Division (p. 109-112)
   d. NCDOT Transportation Planning Division (p. 113-114)

11) Announcements
   a. 2050 WMPO MTP Technical Steering Committee Meeting- July 27, 2023
   b. Wilmington MPO Bike/Pedestrian Committee Meeting- August 8, 2023

12) Next meeting – August 30, 2023

Attachments
• MPO Board Meeting Minutes- June 28, 2023
• Proposed 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendments #23-3
• Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendments #23-3
• Proposed 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modifications #23-4
• Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modifications #23-4
• Section 5310 Community Grant Funding Memorandum
• Resolution supporting the award of Section 5310 Community Grant Project Funds
• Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s 2023 Organizational Assessment
• Resolution adopting the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s 2023 Organizational Assessment
• https://www.wmpo.org/walk-wilmington-plan/
• Resolution adopting the 2023 Walk Wilmington Pedestrian Plan Update
• Resolution supporting the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s efforts to secure a Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Program grant to complete a Resiliency Improvement Plan for the Wilmington Urban Area
• 2024-2033 State/Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Improvement Programs
• Prioritization 7.0 Modifications Memorandum
• Draft Prioritization 7.0 Project Submittals
• E-mail from NCDOT regarding Prioritization 7.0 and the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge
• City of Wilmington resolution requesting additional funds for the Hooker Road Multi-use Path, Hinton Avenue Multi-use Path, and Wrightsville/Greenville intersection improvements
• Resolution supporting the allocation of additional Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Direct Attributable Funds to the City of Wilmington for the Hooker Road Multi-use Path, Hinton Avenue Multi-use Path, and Wrightsville/Greenville intersection improvements
• Wilmington Urban Area MPO Update (July)
• Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority Update (July)
• NCDOT Division Project Update (July)
• NCDOT Transportation Planning Division Project Update (July)
1) **Call to Order**

Chairman Hank Miller called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM. MPO Executive Director Mike Kozlosky called the roll, and a quorum was present as follows:

2) **Conflict of Interest Statement**

3) **Approval of Board Member Excused Absences**
   
   Mr. Kozlosky said that there were no requests for excused absence.

4) **Approval of the Agenda**
   
   Vice Chairman Waddell made a motion to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Mr. Williams, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:

   **Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Lynn Barbee, Veronica Carter, John Ellen, Wendy Fletcher-Hardee, Hank Miller, Dane Scalise, Luke Waddell, Frank Williams, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Absent:** Johnathan Barfield. **Nays:** None.

6) **Public Comment Period**
   
   Bijan Salehi, 7209 Orchard Trace, Wilmington, expressed concerns regarding the lack of sidewalks and drainage issues in the Masonboro area, improvements of which would benefit pedestrians, especially those with disabilities who are prevented from driving. He expressed frustration with current standing water issues, especially during hurricane season. He noted that he has attempted to contact the responsible authorities without satisfactory results, which he attributed to some political obstacle.

   Mr. Salehi said that he has been in contact with Adrienne Cox of NCDOT, who is aware of his personal challenges. He pointed out that individuals such as himself are capable of and proficient at advocating for themselves, such as his passion regarding insufficient public transportation during a meeting at Forden Station. He expressed appreciation for Wave Transit’s micro transit system, which he uses daily to reach essential destinations.

   Mr. Anderson suggested that Mr. Salehi contact the New Hanover County Commissioners and NCDOT regarding his concerns. Although, Mr. Barfield noted that counties do not build sidewalks.

   Ms. Rose Terry, 1789 Cedar Hill Road, Navassa, said she is a retired educator who at resides on NC-1430 on a severe curve, and shares the road with the River Bend Mine. She noted that many trucks travel the road daily, however, the road’s width is insufficient for maneuvering. Consequently, as trucks enter the narrow passage, she has witnessed several near accidents over the years. She explained that the trucks come across the road, to the center line, carrying dirt, rocks, and soil, and since they can’t navigate the turn successfully, they go into the ditch area. Currently, there are virtually no borders on the road, which poses a significant problem.

   Since there was no signage regarding trucks entering the road, Ms. Terry said she contacted the DOT, which resulted in compliance and helped tremendously. She offered to provide copies of her correspondence with NCDOT in Raleigh, and Mr. Kimes obtained her phone number.

7) **Presentations**
   
   a. **North Carolina Department of Transportation Rail Division Update- Jason Orthner, NCDOT**
   
   NCDOT Rail Division Director Jason Orthner gave an update on the Rail Division’s projects impacting the region and future access to the region including:

   - **Piedmont Atlantic Intermodal Rail System** (funded by a 2017 grant): improvements to transform movement of rail containers from the Port of Wilmington to Charlotte and the CSX intermodal network with **Wilmington Beltline Project** (P-5740) to begin this year.
   - **Southeastern North Carolina Passenger Rail Service Feasibility Study:** Two routes under evaluation. Draft study anticipated by this summer. Twelve corridors have been submitted to the Federal Railroad Administration’s Corridor ID Program.
- **Freight Rail and Rail Crossing Safety Program**

  Mr. Anderson asked about the number of intersections without crossing arms and expressed concerns regarding horn sounding complaints. Mr. Orthner responded that he would research the number. However, he noted that the horn rule of specific sounding patterns for different crossings is federally required for safety reasons.

  Mr. Barbee asked for a copy of the schedule of Wilmington Beltline improvements, as follows:

  - (Market Street and Wrightsville Avenue, complete)
  - June 28 & 29: 17th Street will be closed the first day at 5 a.m. and will reopen the day after at 5 a.m. (detour route and traffic control are in place).
  - June 29 & 30: 16th Street will be closed and reopen the day after at 5 a.m.
  - July 21: Princess Street crossing work tentatively scheduled
  - Mid-Sept.: Oleander Drive crossing work tentatively scheduled
  - Nov. '23: Railroad crosstie and rail replacement work tentatively scheduled
  - March '24: Grade crossing warning device replacements; Roadway improvements withing the railroad corridor tentatively scheduled
  - May '24: Navassa and Hilton Bridge modernization; Burnt Mill Creek Bridge replacement; New track construction west of King Street Crossing tentatively scheduled

  Mr. Williams expressed concerns regarding intersection closings without prior notice.

  In response to an inquiry by Mr. Ellen regarding high-speed trains, Mr. Orthner said that an equipment vendor has been identified and the trains are capable of speeds of greater than 100 mph, although speeds of 80 mph are being considered.

b. **Wilmington International Airport Update, Jeff Bourk, ILM**

  Deputy Airport Directors Granseur Dick and Bob Campbell gave an update on Wilmington International Airport (ILM).

  Mr. Dick said that the Airport Authority completed its first five-year vision plan in January and will implement annual updates, which will coincide with updates to the MPO Board. He reminded Board members that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) recommends commercial service airports operate self-sufficiently. He noted that leases are one revenue stream and gave an overview of active business park projects in due diligence or design, which include expansions of the CIO cold storage and 84 Lumber facilities, development of an on-airport hotel, an auto warehouse, corporate aviation hangars, a flight school, a general aviation manufacturing training and maintenance center, and a hanger complex for private aircraft.

  Mr. Dick reported that the airport terminal itself has new tenants including Port City Java and Flying Machine Brewery, expected to be operational by Thanksgiving. Other new tenants will include Dunkin’ Donuts, Jimmy Johns, and a retail convenience center.

  Mr. Dick gave an overview of Capital Projects aimed at supporting the airport's growth. He noted that projects include improvements to parking, realignment of Airport Boulevard, the potential addition of a parking deck, further airline terminal expansion, noise studies, and general airfield projects. He emphasized that the parking project is crucial due to its revenue generation and the airport’s need to alleviate congestion. He added that the plan involves lengthening the curb line, and adding dedicated passenger vehicle and commercial service lanes. He noted that the project will break ground in January 2024 and is anticipated be complete in two years. Another project is
the widening 23rd Street to alleviate traffic congestion, and improve signage to assist travelers in finding parking and other relevant information.

Mr. Dick said that the terminal expansion project, which has already exceeded its design capacity, will undergo an environmental assessment to justify a future expansion. Additionally, runway rehabilitation, taxiway realignment, airfield drainage, and other smaller projects are also planned. He noted that the airport was awarded a FAA grant to conduct a Part 150 noise compatibility study to assess noise levels from military and commercial aircraft and explore potential mitigation measures. Finally, an update to the airport’s master plan is planned once major construction projects are completed.

Mr. Campbell said that the most recent economic impact study by NCDOT, estimated ILM’s impact on the local economy at $2.5 billion. He commented that extrapolations show impressive figures for an airport of its size, including the generation of more than $9 million in business sales tax. As an example of impact, one additional flight from New Haven, Connecticut, which assumes 53% of 14,210 passengers as visitors to Wilmington, results in over $9 million in visitor spending.

Mr. Campbell reported that the airport is self-sufficient from an operating standpoint and doesn’t rely on local tax dollars for operations. He noted that although expenses increased from FY22 to FY23, revenues increased as well with a 17% increase in passengers. He estimated that the airport is expecting a record of $16 million in operating revenue and $13.8 million in operating expenses. He noted that the $2 million net difference will be allocated toward capital projects that are estimated to cost $24 million in FY24.

Mr. Campbell said that other revenue sources for capital projects include entitlement grants based on enplanements, $6.7 million from the state budget, passenger charges and rental car fees. He noted that over the next five years the airport expects to have access to $106 million. Despite a $60 million shortfall, $30 million in discretionary grants, debt capacity, and the $20 million from reserves released recently by the Airport Authority should cover the capital plan shortfall anticipated over the next five years.

Mr. Campbell said that the airport’s marketing and air service efforts have contributed to its growth, becoming the fastest-growing airport in North Carolina and the third fastest-growing airport in the country. He attributed the increased passenger numbers to the addition of new non-stop routes from Delta and partnerships with airlines like Avelo and Sun Country. He added that the airport’s marketing campaign, "ILM: I Love My Airport," aims to promote the airport as a low-cost option and attract travelers who previously went to Myrtle Beach.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Anderson, Mr. Dick said that the airport terminal and runway can handle expansion of the airport for the next 30 to 40 years. He commented that the only thing the runway can’t handle are wide-body aircraft (Airbus 380 Air Force 1).

Mr. Ellen recommended that the airport work with the cruise ship lines to capture those passengers. Mr. Barbee pointed out that ingress/egress should be addressed with NCDOT and the WMPO, and that signage should be introduced to encourage alternative routes to the airport. Mr. Barfield expressed kudos to the airport and its authority for the economic impact to the region.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Carter, Mr. Dick said that the airport is working with the FAA to have an optimal noise study. She pointed out that not only is the airport growing, but the population is as well. Mr. Ellen suggested that noise from the military be discounted since it is the “sound of freedom.”
c. Cape Fear Memorial Bridge Shared Use Bridge Concept / Bridge Compatibility Study- Roger Rochelle, Hardey & Hanover

City of Wilmington Economic Development Director Aubrey Parsley gave a brief overview of the proposed alternatives for the replacement of the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge, and introduced the concept of a triple-mode alternative compatible with the Rail Realignment Project and the widening of South Third Street.

Alternative Delivery Director Roger Rochelle, Hardey & Hanover, gave a presentation on the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge Shared Use Bridge Concept. He acknowledged the presence of Chief Technical Officer Keith Griesing (New York), and Senior Bridge Engineer Megan Young (Raleigh).

Mr. Rochelle said the study is a detailed concept providing a fifth, high-level option for the Express Design Feasibility Study presented by NCDOT. He noted that the concept is neither a final engineering design nor intended to advocate for any given solution. He said that the final report distributed to MPO Board members provides much greater detail.

Mr. Rochelle described the process of determining the best superstructure or bridge component for spanning the river. He noted that the chosen option is a five-span, steel girder with a steel truss vertical lift span for the rail. He compared alternative options, including a parallel option and a nested or stacked option. He commented that the nested option, where the rail goes underneath the roadway bridge, is favored due to benefits such as improved safety, reduced foundation size, and reduced environmental impact. He compared separate structures to the nested option and pointed out the advantages of separate structures for greater vertical clearance and easier maintenance and constructability, and highlighted the benefits of the nested option for aesthetics and navigability.

Mr. Rochelle gave an overview of the cost estimates for the different options, indicating that the nested option at $548 million is estimated to cost less than separate structures. He said the concept considers the possibility of adding rail to the roadway bridge in the future, which would require adaptations during initial construction.

In response to inquiries, Mr. Kimes said that aesthetic options could be considered. And Mr. Rochelle noted that the concept includes a pedestrian walkway.

d. Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Organizational Assessment- J. Scott Lane, J. Scott Lane & Company

Consultant J. Scott Lane, J. Scott Lane & Company, gave an overview of the WMPO’s Organizational Assessment, timeline and recommendations. He said that the study involved assessing strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities through interviews, remote meetings, stakeholder engagement and comparison of five peer agencies, each of which are unique. He commented that the survey results were positive, indicating good responsiveness. He emphasized the importance of objective opinions and acknowledged the challenges faced by participants. He noted that the report includes recommendations, focusing on survey options, staff behavior, relationships, and collaboration.

Mr. Lane gave an overview of study highlights including the strengths of the organization, which are strong external communications. He noted that for organizations of more than 12, internal communications and relationships become more critical, and are important to improving staff attraction and retention. Other recommendations included creating value for core MPO products, continuing to find innovative ways of engaging people inside and outside of the organization, and
minor documentation and process guidance improvements as well as picking up specializations such as land use integration, technology, and multi-modal transportation planning.

Mr. Lane said that the recommendations focus on staffing, implementation, and organization. He noted that the study suggests hiring a funding specialist, active transportation specialist, communication specialist, addressing implementation challenges, and considering partnerships with smaller entities. Other recommendations include Board member retreat and training, and a joint meeting with the Technical Coordinating Committee in addition to updating documents such as the Lead Planning Agency Agreement, the Unified Planning Work Program, and Memorandum of Understanding, and increasing public participation.

8) Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from May 31, 2023
   b. Resolution requesting Administrative Modifications to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Public Transportation Projects
   c. Resolution requesting Amendments to the 2020-2029 and 2024-2033 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Public Transportation Projects
   d. Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modifications #23-3
   e. Opening of the 30-day Public Comment Period for 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendment #23-4
   f. Opening of the 30-day public comment period for the 2024-2033 State/Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Improvement Programs

Vice Chairman Waddell made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, seconded by Mr. Williams, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:


9) Discussion
   a. 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #23-4
      Mr. Kozlosky said that this item is for information purposes only and will be brought back for consideration at the Board’s next meeting.

   b. 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Logo and Branding
      Associate Transportation Planner Carolyn Caggia presented logo and branding proposals for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Technical Coordinating Committee’s (TCC) recommendations.

      Following a lengthy debate, Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve logo and branding concept D3 (Cape Fear Navigating Change with the compass rose), seconded by Mr. Williams, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:

      Absent: Wendy Fletcher-Hardee.

   c. NCDOT Prioritization 7.0 Update
      MPO Deputy Director Abby Lorenzo said that MPO staff has contacted the MPO’s modal planning partners to compile a list of projects for submission. She noted that Prioritization 7.0 (P 7.0) submission window will open July 10th.
A question/answer/discussion period. Mr. Kozlosky clarified that project F3 is a ferry project. He asked Board members to review the list and provide feedback at the next Board meeting. He encouraged members to work with their local jurisdictions to identify projects to be considered and for bicycle/pedestrian funding where there is a willingness to commit to the 20% local match.

Ms. Carter inquired about the widening project on page 94. Mr. Kozlosky responded that the Cape Fear Crossing project is the new location facility from US-17 to the Independence Boulevard area. He noted that its inclusion acknowledges the importance of the project, although it is not on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). He added that the replacement of the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge is in the STIP.

Mr. Anderson asked about projects just short of being funded. Mr. Kozlosky responded that staff would provide the requested information.

Mr. Williams left the meeting.

Mr. Ellen recommended that the State discuss not allowing children under the age of 18 to use electric scooters and electric bikes.

d. Military Cutoff Road/Eastwood Road interchange
Chairman Miller turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Waddell for the discussion of this item.

NCDOT Division 3 Engineer Chad Kimes gave an overview of an alternative design for the Military Cutoff Road/Eastwood Road Interchange, which would save about $6 million and have no impact on the projected level of service, which would be kept at an acceptable level.

Mr. Kimes said that due to the volume of concerns regarding impacts to two areas, NCDOT considered a redesign, which was substantial enough to bring it back to the Board. He gave a brief overview of the project timeline and current design. He noted that the redesign would leave Commonwealth Drive alone except for a cul-de-sac, and the intersection at Progress Point would become a full movement. He provided an overview of the change in turning movements from all directions and the changes in levels of service.

A brief question/answer/discussion period was held to clarify the movements and the cost savings. Mr. Kimes responded the savings would return for use in the Regional Tier. He requested support for the alternative design.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to recuse Chairman Miller, seconded by Mr. Barbee and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:


Mr. Ellen made a motion to approve the recommended amendment to the design of the Military Cutoff/Eastwood Road Interchange, seconded by Mr. Carter, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Lynn Barbee, Johnathan Barfield, Veronica Carter, John Ellen, Dane Scalise, Luke Waddell, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Absent:** Wendy Fletcher-Hardee and Frank Williams. **Recused:** Hank Miller

Chairman Miller resumed presiding over the meeting.
e. **PROTECT Grant**
   Ms. Lorenzo stated that staff requests consensus from the WMPO Board to move forward with applying for a planning grant to develop a Resilience Infrastructure Plan for the WMPO planning area. She noted that the 2020-2021 Bi-partisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) introduced the PROTECT Grant program making available two types of grants: planning and implementation. The FY23 PROTECT Grant Notice of Funding Opportunity was posted in April with applications for this funding cycle due on August 18, 2023. She added that the planning grant award is at 100% federal share, meaning that no local matching funds are required.

   In response to an inquiry by Ms. Carter, Ms. Lorenzo clarified that this grant money would be available to all regional members. Mr. Kozlosky reiterated that only consensus is requested today, and noted that a resolution will be brought to the MPO Board at its next meeting.

   There was no opposition to the WMPO’s application for the PROTECT Grant.

10) **Updates**
   a. **Wilmington Urban Area MPO**
   b. **Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority**
   c. **NCDOT Division**
   d. **NCDOT Transportation Planning Division**
      Mr. Kozlosky said that the updates are included in the agenda packet.

11) **Next meeting – July 26, 2023**
   There being no further business, Mr. Ellen made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Carter, and the motion carried unanimously.

   The meeting adjourned at 5:28 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.**
### Proposed Revisions to 2020-2029 STIP/MPO TIP Programs

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

#### STIP ADDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-556</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE, ADVANCED RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION RIGHT-OF-WAY ACCOUNT. REVOLVING ACCOUNT TO FUND ADVANCED RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION. FUNDS TO BE REPAID FROM THE STIP PROJECT AT THE TIME THE PROJECT IS FUNDED. ADD PROJECT AT THE REQUEST OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY BRANCH.</td>
<td>$5,000,000 (T)</td>
<td>$1,000,000 (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-0020</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>NCDOT, MODIFYING THE FEDERAL FUNDS RECEIVED FROM FTA ADMINISTERED BY IMD BASED ON FY 23, FY 24 GRANTS. ADD PROJECT AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.</td>
<td>$350,000 (S)</td>
<td>$100,000 (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-0032</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>INTERGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION, COMMUNITY PROJECT FUNDING FOR CITY OF WILSON RIDE MICROTRANSIT EXPANSION ADD PROJECT AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.</td>
<td>$2,000,000 (CPF)</td>
<td>$500,000 (L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION APPROVING AMENDMENT #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 amend the adopted 2020-2029 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Amendments #23-3; and

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

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby approves amending the 2020-2029 State/MPO Transportation Improvement Programs for Amendments #23-3.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on July 26, 2023.

__________________________________________
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP MODIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATEWIDE PROJECT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC-0008</th>
<th>STATEWIDE PROJECT</th>
<th>STATEWIDE, 5339(b) DISCRETIONARY GRANT FOR FACILITY CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>FY 2023 -</th>
<th>L $1,500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC-0010</td>
<td>STATEWIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>STATEWIDE, 5339(b) DISCRETIONARY GRANT FOR FACILITY CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>FY 2023 -</td>
<td>L $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MODIFY FUNDING IN FY 23 AT THE REQUEST OF THE INTEGRATED MOBILITY DIVISION.**
RESOLUTION APPROVING ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS #23-4 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 #23-4.

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 #23-4.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on July 26, 2023.

___________________________________________
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

___________________________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
MEMORANDUM

TO: TCC members

FROM: Mike Kozlosky, Executive Director

DATE: July 1, 2023

SUBJECT: Section 5310 Community Grant Awards for FY 2024

On June 27, 2014 the North Carolina Secretary of Transportation designated the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority as “the designated recipient” of the Persons with Disabilities Funding Program (Section 5310). The allocation of these funds required a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) approved Program Management Plan (PMP) which was adopted by the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority Board on April 23, 2015 and supported by the MPO Board on June 24, 2015.

Eligible applicants for Section 5310 funding are non-profit organizations, state or local governmental agencies, and private operators of public transportation services. These applicants provide matching funds (80/20 capital or 50/50 operating). The total expected federal funding available for this grant award is $75,000.

The Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority received four applications for this funding. The Wave Connect Advisory Committee reviewed and scored these applications and recommends awards to these applicants in the following amounts:

New Hanover County (NHC) Senior Resource Center
• $57,000 Federal funding
• $11,400 Local match (80/20 matching funds)
• $68,400 Total project budget
• Accessible Van Trips: 1,731

Elderhaus at the Lake
• $18,000 Federal funding
• $3,600 Local match (80/20 matching funds)
• $21,600 Total project budget
• Accessible Van Trips: 546
Staff recommends support of these grant awards.
WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, on June 27, 2014 the North Carolina Secretary of Transportation designated the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority as “the designated recipient” of the Persons with Disabilities Funding Program (Section 5310); and

WHEREAS, the allocation of Section 5310 funds required a Federal Transit Administration approved Program Management Plan which was adopted by the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority Board on April 23, 2015 and supported by the MPO Board on June 24, 2015; and

WHEREAS, eligible applicants for Section 5310 funding are non-profit organizations, state or local governmental agencies, and private operators of public transportation services; and

WHEREAS, eligible applicants provide matching funds (80/20 capital or 50/50 operating); and

WHEREAS, the total expected funding level available for this grant award is $75,000; and

WHEREAS, the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority received four applications for this funding; and

WHEREAS, the Wave Connect Advisory Committee has reviewed and scored these applications and recommends the New Hanover County (NHC) Senior Resource Center and Elderhaus at the Lake for this funding.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby supports the WAVE Connect Advisory Committee’s recommendation to provide the Section 5310 funding to the New Hanover County (NHC) Senior Resource Center and Elderhaus at the Lake.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on July 26, 2023.

______________________________
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

______________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
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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.
SURVEY RESULTS (PARTIAL)

RECOMMENDATIONS

**Action**
- Staff Going Into the WMPO
- Staff Departing the WMPO
- Staff Retention Actions
- Adopt & Communicate Key Principles that Empower the WMPO
- Link the Site Review Process to Transportation Goals
- Develop Integrated Land & Transportation Guidance
- Key Hires (Multimodal, Communication, Funding)
- Consider Developing an Adjunct Funding Mechanism to Finance Large Projects
- Partner With the Other North Carolina TMAs to Develop Pooled Resources
- Assign or Hire/Contract Staff to Advance Viable Traffic Congestion Projects
- Develop Adjunct Capacities to Expand WMPO Resources

**Action**
- Stand Up a New Non-Profit Partner
- Conduct an Annual Board Retreat
- Conduct One Joint (TCC & MPO Board) Worksession Annually
- Update Member Survey and Compensation Study
- Signature Communications (annual summary/or podcasts)
- Distribute and Focus Communications Simultaneously
- Focus on Board Member Training
- Modify the LPA Agreement to Benefit the WMPO
- Study Voting Procedures
- UPWP Modifications
- Document Updates
- Thinking Ahead on the MTP
- MPO Meetings

**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.
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.

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 superseded 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.

![Figure 1. Workflow. Later tasks built on the information learned from prior tasks.](image_url)
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 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.

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.

Other observations pertaining to the MOU are as follows.
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 prospectus 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.

UPDATES
Some of the documents reviewed should be updated, although none are particularly urgent. Some can be made more accessible, too.

LET'S MEET
Keeping members informed and productive is a key role for the WMPO, so keeping members well-versed in MPO procedures and "refreshed" on key points is helpful.

ALIGNMENT
A review of how some documents are used locally, such as references to a (MTP) map of improvements, might increase the standing and utility of those documents.
[Page Intentionally Blank]
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.
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.

An expression of general ideas is presented below, categorized as a (S)trength, (W)eakness, (Th)reat, 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.

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.
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.):
7. 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.
10. If you could fix or change one thing in your own position or WMPO’s culture generally, what would it be?
11. Describe how you feel on Sunday nights – nervous, resignation, excitement, etc.?
**Staff Survey - Additional Questions for Leadership / Supervisor 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: ____________________________________________________
7. 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.
8. 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?
9. 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?
10. 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: ____________________________________________________
11. 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.
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.
Figure 3. Infographic Summary of Survey Results. Results are based on the input received from 48 respondents; note that not every respondent may have answered each question in the survey.

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.)

一号: 扩展选项

构建交通项目

最少一致的陈述

01 资源现在（和以后）对WMPO是充足的

02 员工流动不是WMPO的问题

03 WMPO董事会公平代表我的社区

提供11个陈述，这三个是最不支持的（不支持）由调查问卷受访者。

“WMPO做得很好！我喜欢它们是创新和前瞻性思维！”

调查受访者
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?
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 tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about WMPO.
11. Please rank 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.
12. 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.
13. 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?
14. Rate the value of each of the following to your organization or community
15. Not every change is incremental; some are game-changers. Choose up to two options below for big priorities to tackle in the coming years.
16. 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.

Figure 4. Summary of Key Findings and Directions Sent to WMPO for Feedback
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.

**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.

**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 refreshement 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.

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.

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.

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.
Peer MPO Assessment Findings Summary (refer to Appendix for an expanded summary)

**PROJECT SELECTION & PROGRAMMING**

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.**

**STAFF ATTRACTION, RETENTION, & EXPANSION**

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.**

**PROJECT & PLANNING FUNDING INNOVATION**

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.**

**BOARD INTERACTIONS**

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

*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 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 effort 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. <strong>STAFF GOING IN</strong> (A) DEVELOP EMPLOYEE &quot;ROADMAPS;&quot; (B) CONDUCT ONE-ON-ONE INFORMAL STAFF GREETINGS</td>
<td>Staff Retention &amp; Attraction</td>
<td>1 = 1/8 FTE and/or $20,000 or less annually</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>STAFF GOING OUT</strong> (A) CREATE A USER MANUAL; (B) CONDUCT EXIT SURVEYS</td>
<td>Staff Retention &amp; Attraction</td>
<td>2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>IN-BETWEEN COMING AND GOING</strong> (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 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>ADOPT — AND COMMUNICATE — KEY PRINCIPLES THAT EMPOWER THE WMPO</strong></td>
<td>(1) Staff Retention &amp; Attraction; (2) Member/Public Awareness of WMPO Functions</td>
<td>2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>LINK THE SITE REVIEW PROCESS TO TRANSPORTATION GOALS</strong></td>
<td>Cross-Training</td>
<td>3 = Full-Time FTE and/or more than $50,000 annually</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>DEVELOP INTEGRATED LAND AND TRANSPORTATION GUIDANCE</strong></td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>3 = Full-Time FTE and/or more than $50,000 annually</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>KEY HIRES</strong> (A) ACTIVE MODE PLANNER; (B) FUNDING SPECIALIST (SEE ALSO #17)</td>
<td>Technical Capacity Expansion</td>
<td>1 = 1/8 FTE and/or $20,000 or less annually</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>CONSIDER DEVELOPING AN ADJUNCT FUNDING MECHANISM TO FINANCE LARGE PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>PARTNER WITH THE OTHER NC TMAS TO DEVELOP POOLED RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>ASSIGN OR HIRE/CONTRACT STAFF TO ADVANCE Viable TRAFFIC CONGESTION PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>DEVELOP ADJUNCT CAPACITIES TO EXPAND WMPO RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <strong>STAND UP A NEW NON-PROFIT PARTNER</strong></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>CONDUCT AN ANNUAL WMPO BOARD RETREAT</strong></td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <strong>CONDUCT ONE JOINT (TCC AND MPO BOARD) WORKSESSION ANNUALLY</strong></td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Process Improvement</td>
<td>2 = 1/2 FTE and/or $50,000 or less annually</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Issues being addressed</th>
<th>Resources time / money</th>
<th>Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SIGNATURE Communications (A) ENHANCE AND REPPOSITION THE ANNUAL REPORT; (B) OPTIONAL: CONDUCT PODCAST QUARTERLY</td>
<td>(1) Communication; (2) Member/Public Awareness of WMPO Functions</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>B</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 1</td>
<td>A</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 1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. MODIFY THE LPA AGREEMENT TO BENEFIT THE WMPO</td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. STUDY VOTING PROCEDURES</td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>A</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 1 1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. DOCUMENT UPDATES (A) MOU; (B) PROSPECTUS; (C) OTHERS</td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>B</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 1 1</td>
<td>B</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 1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“If you fail to plan, you are planning to fail”
— Benjamin Franklin
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.
WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization provides transportation planning services for the City of Wilmington, Town of Carolina Beach, Town of Kure Beach, Town of Wrightsville Beach, Town of Belville, Town of Leland, Town of Navassa, New Hanover County, Brunswick County, Pender County, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority, and the North Carolina Board of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization is 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; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program included funds for the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization 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; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization contracted with the J. S. Lane Company to perform this independent analysis and evaluation; and

WHEREAS, the process used included one-on-one stakeholder interviews, a survey to receive feedback, and peer reviews with other MPOs across the southeast; and

WHEREAS, the recommendations from this assessment will be used to deliver the MPO’s services more efficiently and effectively to our members.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby adopts the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s 2023 Organizational Assessment.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on July 26, 2023.

________________________
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2023 WALK WILMINGTON PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

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 City of Wilmington seeks to improve safety, provide equitable access and connectivity, encourage alternative forms of transportation, stimulate economic development, create opportunities for active and healthy lifestyles, enhance the overall quality of life, and improve the City’s chances to qualify for funding opportunities to construct pedestrian facility improvements; and

WHEREAS, to assist in meeting these desired goals, the City of Wilmington applied for and was awarded a grant from the North Carolina Department of Transportation to fund the update to the City’s 2009 Walk Wilmington Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan; and

WHEREAS, the planning effort began in Spring 2022 and included comprehensive stakeholder and public engagement, the culmination of this effort resulting in the final plan; and

WHEREAS, the plan is intended to guide the City’s policies and priorities for pedestrian transportation investments and programs to include capital improvements, future City Ordinance amendments, and general guidance for facility design; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington City Council adopted the 2023 Walk Wilmington Pedestrian Plan update on July 18, 2023.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby adopts the 2023 Walk Wilmington Pedestrian Plan update.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on July 26, 2023.

________________________
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION’S RESILIENCE PLANNING GRANT APPLICATION THROUGH THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION’S PROMOTING RESILIENT OPERATIONS FOR TRANSFORMATIVE, EFFICIENT, AND COST-SAVING TRANSPORTATION (PROTECT) PROGRAM

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 United States Department of Transportation has developed a discretionary grant program to address surface transportation resilience to natural hazards through the new Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Program; and

WHEREAS, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill has appropriated $848 billion for the PROTECT Program through FY 2026; and

WHEREAS, the program supports the development of a Resilience Improvement Plan that addresses immediate and long range transportation network needs related to comprehensive natural hazard preparedness to limit transportation disruptions, and to identify and assess areas of vulnerability within the transportation network to be considered and prioritized for future resiliency projects; and

WHEREAS, the PROTECT Program encourages that entities, including local governments, that are interested in obtaining implementation funds through the PROTECT Program have an adopted Resilience Improvement Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s planning area has observed transportation network disruptions due to natural hazard events such as flooding and has a high likelihood of future flooding and severe weather events such as hurricanes; and

WHEREAS, a Resilience Improvement Plan for the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s planning area would identify priority resilience improvement projects and inform the organization’s short- and long-term planning processes.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby supports the application from the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization to develop a regional Resilience Improvement Plan through the Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Program.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Board on July 26, 2023.
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
| COUNTRY | PROJECT | ACTIVITIES | PROJECT ID | MTO | AGENCY DESCRIPTION | MOBILITY | TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS | TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS FOR UTILITIES | TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS NEEDED FOR CONSTRUCTION | TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS NEEDED FOR UTILITIES | PROJECTED SCHEDULE FOR UTILITIES | PROJECTED SCHEDULE FOR CONSTRUCTION | COST CENTER | FUNDS SOURCE | STI CATEGORY | FISCAL YEAR | PROJECTED SCHEDULE FOR UTILITIES | PROJECTED SCHEDULE FOR CONSTRUCTION | FUNDING PROGRAM | STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | UTILITY PROJECT INDICATOR | UTILITY PROJECT DESCRIPTION |
|---------|---------|------------|------------|-----|--------------------|---------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $680,000 | $680,000 | $680,000 | $680,000 | 2024 | OTHER FUNDS PROVIDED BY ILM | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $3,800,000 | $3,800,000 | $3,800,000 | $3,800,000 | 2024 | OTHER FUNDS PROVIDED BY ILM | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $5,600,000 | $5,600,000 | $5,600,000 | $5,600,000 | 2024 | OTHER FUNDS PROVIDED BY ILM | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $14,000,000 | $14,000,000 | $14,000,000 | $14,000,000 | 2024 | OTHER FUNDS PROVIDED BY ILM | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $393,000 | $393,000 | $393,000 | $393,000 | 2024 | OTHER FUNDS PROVIDED BY ILM | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | COMPLETED | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $3,000,000 | $3,000,000 | $3,000,000 | $3,000,000 | 2024 | OTHER FUNDS PROVIDED BY ILM | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $5,000,000 | $5,000,000 | $5,000,000 | $5,000,000 | 2024 | OTHER FUNDS PROVIDED BY ILM | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $8,500,000 | $8,5000,000 | $8,500,000 | $8,500,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | COMPLETED | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $8,500,000 | $8,500,000 | $8,500,000 | $8,500,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | COMPLETED | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $30,750,000 | $30,750,000 | $30,750,000 | $30,750,000 | 2014 | OTHER FUNDS PROVIDED BY ILM | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2013 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 74/76 NCDOT | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $10,600,000 | $10,600,000 | $10,600,000 | $10,600,000 | 2023 | OTHER FUNDS PROVIDED BY ILM | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK I‐140/US 17 WILMINGTON Bypass | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $30,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $30,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $180,000 | $180,000 | $180,000 | $180,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $275,000 | $275,000 | $275,000 | $275,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $335,000 | $335,000 | $335,000 | $335,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $400,000 | $400,000 | $400,000 | $400,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $428,000 | $428,000 | $428,000 | $428,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| BRUNSWICK | JUL 17 | BIKE/PED | JUL 17 | X | BRUNSWICK US 17 LELAND | PUBLIC TRANSPORT | $548,000 | $548,000 | $548,000 | $548,000 | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | WILMINGTON | WILMINGTON INTERNATIONAL (ILM) | INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | 3 | WILMINGTON, NEW HANOVER | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | 2023 | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | |
| ID | STI CATEGORY | PROJECT ID | AGENCY | DESCRIPTION | COUNTY | TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS | FUNDING SOURCE | NEEDED FOR CONSTRUCTION | PROJECTED UTILITIES SCHEDULE FOR | PROJECTED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE | UTILITY ACTIVITIES NEEDED FOR | TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS | COMMENTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BL‐0075 | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | BIKE/PED | INSTALLATION OF ON‐STREET BICYCLE LANE AND PEDESTRIAN CROSSWALKS ALONG US 76 (CAUSEWAY DRIVE) AND US 74 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) IN WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH. | NEW HANOVER | $337,000 | $337,000 | 2022 | $738,000 | 2023 | | | $1,000,000 | |
| EB‐5600 | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | BIKE/PED | CONSTRUCT MULTI‐USE PATH. BIKES/PEDESTRIAN SAFETY | NEW HANOVER | $30,000 | 2024 | | | | | | | |
| EB‐6039 | STI (PRIORITIZATION) | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | BIKE/PED | CONSTRUCT SIGNALIZED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING AT US 70 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) AND CENTRAL AVENUE IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $61,000 | 2025 | | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003A | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNAL HEADS AT INTERSECTION OF SOUTH 3RD STREET AND ORANGE STREET. | NEW HANOVER | $274,000 | | 2023 | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003B | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF WORTH STREET AND 3RD STREET IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $296,000 | 2025 | | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003J | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH PEDESTRIAN ACCOMMODATIONS AT INTERSECTION OF WORTH STREET AND 3RD STREET IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $66,000 | 2022 | | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003K | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNAL HEADS ON PEDESTAL ON BOTH SIDES OF SR 1217 (17TH STREET) AT DOCK STREET IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $16,000 | | 2020 | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003L | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SR 1217 (OLANDER DRIVE) AT 17TH STREET IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $84,000 | | | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003M | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SR 1209 (INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD) AT US 74 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $23,000 | | 2023 | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003N | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SR 1209 (INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD) AT US 74 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $40,000 | | 2023 | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003O | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SR 1209 (INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD) AT US 74 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $59,000 | | 2023 | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003P | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SR 1209 (INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD) AT US 74 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $16,000 | | 2020 | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003Q | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SR 1209 (INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD) AT US 74 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $84,000 | | 2023 | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003R | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SR 1209 (INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD) AT US 74 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $18,000 | | 2020 | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003V | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SR 1209 (INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD) AT US 74 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $32,000 | 2024 | | | | | | | |
| HS‐2003W | HIGHWAY SAFETY | WILMINGTON URBA AREA MPO | HIGHWAY | INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT INTERSECTION OF SR 1209 (INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD) AT US 74 (WEST SALISBURY STREET) IN WILMINGTON. | NEW HANOVER | $37,000 | 2024 | | | | | | | |

**Note:** All projects are under construction as of the date of the document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY(S)</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>STI (PRIORITY)</th>
<th>COUNTY (MPO)</th>
<th>FUNDS NEEDED</th>
<th>SCHEDULE FOR</th>
<th>DOCUMENTED</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 74 (EASTWOOD ROAD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$20,500,000</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR ENGINEERING ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 74 (EASTWOOD ROAD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$21,182,000</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 74 (EASTWOOD ROAD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$26,800,000</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 74 (EASTWOOD ROAD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$36,200,000</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR ENGINEERING ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 76 (OLEANDER DR)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$1,912,000</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR ENGINEERING ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 76 (OLEANDER DR)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 76 (OLEANDER DR)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$628,000</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 76 (OLEANDER DR)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$15,360,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$16,410,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$17,319,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$20,600,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$21,182,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$24,100,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$24,755,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$33,800,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$36,900,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$38,800,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$39,000,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$51,800,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$52,600,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$53,900,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$54,900,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 1175 (KERR AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$55,100,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 17 (BURNETT AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$22,100,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR UPGRADE INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 17 (BURNETT AV)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$22,600,000</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>US 421 (CAROLINA BEACH ROAD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WILMINGTON URBAN AREA MPO</td>
<td>$20,500,000</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>FUNDED FOR WIDEN EXISTING ROADWAY AND CONSTRUCT FLYOVERS AT US 421 AND NC 132.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY(S)</td>
<td>ROUTE/CITY RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>STBGP/STI</td>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>STI CATEGORIZATION</td>
<td>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 2048 (GORDON ROAD)</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U‐6202</td>
<td>STI (PRIORITIZATION) 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAROLINA BEACH SR 2048 (MARKET STREET)</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$3,747,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U‐6234</td>
<td>STI (PRIORITIZATION) 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 9 (SCALING BRIDGE ROAD)</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TA‐5222</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT CAPITAL (NON-STI) 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>$9,327,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TA‐5224</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT CAPITAL (NON-STI) 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>$314,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TG‐5245</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT ROUTE 201 IN WILMINGTON, UPGRADE AMMENITIES AND BUS STOPS 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>$346,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TK‐6176</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT MAINTENANCE 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TP‐5110</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TP‐5112</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT MAINTENANCE 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>$9,327,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TO‐4751</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT MISCELLANEOUS/OTHER 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TP‐4752</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT CAPITAL (NON-STI) 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>$346,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TP‐5246</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT PLANNING 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TP‐5247</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT PLANNING 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CAPE FEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TP‐5248</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT ROUTE 205 LONG LEAF PARK WHICH SERVICES NOVANT HOSPITAL AND THE MEDICAL CENTER. THIS ROUTE PROVIDES OPERATING ASSISTANCE. 3</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY(S) RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>MILES</td>
<td>FUNDING PROGRAM</td>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>ON CATEGORY FUNDED</td>
<td>FUNDED UNDER FUNDING SOURCES Tab FOR MORE INFO</td>
<td>SCHEDULE FOR UTILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2024-2033 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: July 18, 2023
Subject: P7.0 Draft Project Submittals Summary of Changes

In June, WMPO staff presented draft modal project submittal lists for NCDOT Prioritization 7.0 to the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and MPO Board for initial discussion. These lists were derived from project recommendations in the WMPO’s adopted Cape Fear Moving Forward 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, and as advised by modal planning partners that include ILM, NCDOT Ferry and Rail Divisions, NCDOT Division 3, and the Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority. Since development of the initial draft lists, WMPO staff have continued coordination with these partners to further refine and develop these modal project lists. The following sections overview the changes to the draft modal project lists made since June.

Aviation

The SPOT Office released an updated list of automatic carryover projects on July 10th that included projects AV-5799, AV-5730, and AV-5796 from the June draft aviation project list. These projects have been removed from the list included in the Board’s July packet. Project names and descriptions are currently under review by ILM staff which may result in minimal project name changes to final aviation project list to be presented in August.

Bicycle and Pedestrian

No changes. Staff is underway collecting necessary data for project submittals that include points-of-interest and future connection points.

Ferry

The SPOT Office released an updated list of automatic carryover projects on July 10th that included project F-5705 (F-3) from the June draft ferry project list. Staff is underway collecting necessary data for project submittals and awaiting clarification from NCDOT SPOT Office regarding eligibility of F-22.

Public Transportation
No changes. Staff is underway collecting necessary data for project submittals and awaiting clarification from NCDOT SPOT Office regarding eligibility of Demand Response Vehicle Expansion project (#5).

Rail

Staff has received general feedback from NCDOT Rail Division regarding the initial draft project list. While coordination continues regarding project descriptions and scopes, revised and/or additional project submittals are as follows:

- **R192058 (FR-18A) New Freight Rail Connection from Cape Fear Memorial Bridge to NCSPA-owned Tracks at Surry Street.** This is a portion of the overall Wilmington Rail Realignment project with NCDOT defined “independent utility.” Would coordinate with U-5729 US421/South Front Street Widening project.

- **FR-7B Re-Establish Passenger Rail Service from Wilmington to Raleigh (via Goldsboro).** This project aligns with NCDOT Rail Division’s application to the Federal Railroad Administration’s (FRA) Corridor ID Program application to establish passenger rail service.

- **R150128 (FR-7C) Construct Passenger Rail Station to Accommodate Future Passenger Rail Service from Wilmington to Raleigh.** This project further supports both the region’s and NCDOT Rail Division’s vision to establish passenger rail service between Wilmington and Raleigh.

- **FR-23 Freight Rail connection from Malmo to Whiteville.** Identified during the development of the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan to increase freight rail capacity and connectivity between the Port of Wilmington and CCX Transload Facility.

Roadway

Staff met with NCDOT Division 3 to review proposed roadway project list and discuss the Division’s identified needs. Coordination will continue as Division continues to develop its project list. One project revision has been made based on the initial meeting:

- **RW-99 Murrayville Road Extension (Military Cutoff Extension to US17 BUS/Market Street).** NCDOT Division 3 intends to submit the existing roadway modernization and interchange project.
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: July 18, 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>A-24 Airline and Customs Apron – Clean/Seal Joints, Pavement Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A-36 2nd GA Hangar Aircraft Taxi Lane (North GA #2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A-33 Perimeter Road Improvements (Ph. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A-23 Perimeter Road Improvements (Ph. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A-25 Overlay Airport Blvd, Building Circulation and Surrounding Roadways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A-19 Apron Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A-37 Runway 35 Wind Cone/PAPI Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A-30 Upgrade Visual Approach Aids &amp; Runway Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A-7 GA Apron Development (Ph. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A-39 1st Paved Aircraft Taxi Lane (East Ramp Lane #1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A-38 Emergency Boat Ramp Access Launch Rwy 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A-26 Northside FBO #2 GA Apron and Hangar Development (Ph. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A-29 Runway 17/35 Extension and Safety Area Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A-27 Map Utilities and Provide GIS Airport Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A-18 Land Acquisition for ASR Site Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</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: July 3, 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></td>
<td>Central College Road Trail (from Gordon Road to Northchase Parkway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BP-212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South College Road Trail (from 17th Street to Piner Road)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BP-619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolina Beach Road &amp; Antoinette Drive Crosswalk Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BP-561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolina Beach Road &amp; Myrtle Grove Road Crossing Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BP-584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Road &amp; Shopping Center Drive Crossing Improvements (Monkey Junction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BP-298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chappel Loop/Belville Trail Extension (Rice Hope to Brunswick Street SE)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MUP recommended with U-5702B in 2045 MTP

**MUP recommended with RW-51 in 2045 MTP
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-22 Fort Fisher Mooring Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F-24 Fort Fisher Pedestrian Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: July 6, 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: July 6, 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>R192033 (FR-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R150125 (FR-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FR-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R150127 (FR-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R192058 (FR-18A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>R192672 (FR-7A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FR-7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-Establish Passenger Rail Service from Wilmington to Raleigh (via Goldsboro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>R150128 (FR-7C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Passenger Rail Station to Accommodate Future Passenger Rail Service from Wilmington to Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FR-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freight Rail Connection from Malmo to Whiteville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Rail projects FR-7A, FR-7B, and FR-23 extend beyond WMPO’s planning area.
MEMORANDUM

To: MPO Board Members
From: Abby Lorenzo, Deputy Director
Date: July 6, 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></td>
<td>SR1175/Kerr Avenue Widening (Patrick Avenue to SR1411/Wrightsville Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U-4738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Fear Crossing (I-140/US17 to US421/Carolina Beach Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>U-4738A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Fear Crossing (I-140/US17 to NC133/River Road SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>U-4738B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Fear Crossing (NC133/River Road SE to US421/Carolina Beach Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RW-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Fayetteville Road Interchange (US74/76/Andrew Jackson Highway at SR1437/Old Fayetteville Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RW-220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US17 BUS/Market Street Road Diet (16th Street to Covil Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RW-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC133/River Road SE Widening (US17/74/76 to SR1599/Jackey’s Creek Lane)</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></td>
<td>NC133/River Road SE Widening (SR1599/Jackey’s Creek Lane to Rabon Way SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RW-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US17/76/Oleander Drive Access Management (Independence Blvd to US117/NC132/College Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RW-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US17/76/Oleander Drive Access Management (Pine Grove Road to Greenville Loop Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>RW-222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence Blvd Widening (US421/Carolina Beach Road to River Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RW-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC210 and Island Creek Road Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>RW-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US74/76/Heide Trask Bridge Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>RW-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR1521/Piner Road Widening and Intersection Redesign (with Myrtle Grove Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RW-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidbury Road Interchange (SR1572/Sidbury Road at Future NC417/Hampstead Bypass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RW-226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US421/74/NC133 &amp; US17/76 Merge Lane Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RW-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenville Loop Road Widening (US76/17/Oleander Drive to Pine Grove Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>RW-221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US421/Snow's Cut Bridge Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>RW-181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-140 at Blue Clay Road Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RW-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murrayville Road Extension (Military Cutoff Extension to US17 BUS/Market Street)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wanted to provide you with this update and clarification regarding the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge replacement and how the project will be scored during the P7 prioritization cycle. Currently, the project is a carryover and will be considered in the P7 cycle without the use of a project submittal slot. The current iteration of the project includes a non-tolled bridge replacement. If nothing changes, a single score will be developed for this non-tolled option.

If the Wilmington MPO would like to evaluate a tolled option for the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge, there are two options which they can pursue:

1. Leave the current iteration in as a carryover and use a submittal slot for a tolled iteration of the bridge project. In this scenario both alternatives would be evaluated in the P7 cycle and a score would be developed for each.
2. Modify the existing carryover project so that it is analyzed as a toll project. In this scenario only one score would be developed for the tolled version of this project. For this project we would be able to handle a modification request up to the project submittal deadline, which is September 29th.

Please also know that submitting a project does not necessarily constitute a local commitment to carrying a project forward if it were to score high enough to be programmed. This means that a project, or alternate project scenario, could be submitted during the submittal window and removed from consideration later. This removal could occur before scoring is complete or after scoring is complete through coordination of all affected partners. There is also the ability to influence programming using local input points if this project were to cascade down to the Regional Impact or Division Needs categories. This is to say that even after a project is submitted there is still considerable local control that is retained by the submitting agency. This local control can be used to keep a project from being programmed or to remove a programmed project from the STIP.

Regards,

Brian

---

From: Wert, Brian M <bmwert@ncdot.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2023 9:58 AM
To: Mike Kozlosky <Mike.Kozlosky@wilmingtonnc.gov>
Cc: Wing, Leigh M <lmwing@ncdot.gov>; Argabright, Van <vargabright@ncdot.gov>; Hopkins, Joey R <jhopkins@ncdot.gov>; Johnson, Benjamin L <bljohnson2@ncdot.gov>; Bowen, Kevin G <kgbowen@ncdot.gov>; Lacy, Kevin <jklacy1@ncdot.gov>; Kimes, D. Chad <ckimes@ncdot.gov>; Roy, David W <dwroy@ncdot.gov>
Subject: Cape Fear Memorial Bridge Clarification for P7 scoring

Mike,

I wanted to provide you with this update and clarification regarding the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge replacement and how the project will be scored during the P7 prioritization cycle. Currently, the project is a carryover and will be considered in the P7 cycle without the use of a project submittal slot. The current iteration of the project includes a non-tolled bridge replacement. If nothing changes, a single score will be developed for this non-tolled option.

If the Wilmington MPO would like to evaluate a tolled option for the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge, there are two options which they can pursue:

1. Leave the current iteration in as a carryover and use a submittal slot for a tolled iteration of the bridge project. In this scenario both alternatives would be evaluated in the P7 cycle and a score would be developed for each.
2. Modify the existing carryover project so that it is analyzed as a toll project. In this scenario only one score would be developed for the tolled version of this project. For this project we would be able to handle a modification request up to the project submittal deadline, which is September 29th.

Please also know that submitting a project does not necessarily constitute a local commitment to carrying a project forward if it were to score high enough to be programmed. This means that a project, or alternate project scenario, could be submitted during the submittal window and removed from consideration later. This removal could occur before scoring is complete or after scoring is complete through coordination of all affected partners. There is also the ability to influence programming using local input points if this project were to cascade down to the Regional Impact or Division Needs categories. This is to say that even after a project is submitted there is still considerable local control that is retained by the submitting agency. This local control can be used to keep a project from being programmed or to remove a programmed project from the STIP.

Regards,

Brian

---

Brian M. Wert, PE
Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

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

Introduced By: Anthony N. Caudle, City Manager

Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Request Additional STBGP-DA Funding from the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization in the Amount of $960,000 with a Required $240,000 Local Grant Match from the City for the Hooker Road Multi-Use Path, Hinton Avenue Multi-Use Path, and Wrightsville Avenue and Greenville Avenue Intersection Improvements Projects [Budget Impact - N/A]

LEGISLATIVE INTENT/PURPOSE:

WHEREAS, this resolution authorizes a request for additional funding from the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization ("WMPO") for the Hooker Road Multi-Use Path, Hinton Avenue Multi-Use Path, and the Wrightsville Avenue and Greenville Avenue Intersection Improvements Projects; and,

WHEREAS, these projects are federally funded through the WMPO via the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program - Direct Attributable ("STBGP-DA"), which is passed through the North Carolina Department of Transportation ("NCDOT") and requires a twenty percent (20%) local grant match from the City; and,

WHEREAS, although these projects are separate, they have been combined for the design and construction phases to expedite their respective project schedules and to realize potential construction cost savings through economies of scale; and,

WHEREAS, this request, if granted, would increase STBGP-DA funding from the WMPO in the amount of $960,000, and require a $240,000 local grant match from the City, for a total of $1,200,000 for all three (3) projects, and with the total increase in funding intended to cover anticipated construction and related costs, primarily associated with property acquisition and utility relocations; and,

WHEREAS, the local grant match of $240,000 will be covered with available City funds that currently exist in the projects.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

THAT, the City Manager hereby is authorized to request additional funding in the amount of $960,000 from the WMPO via the STBGP-DA for the Hooker Road Multi-Use Path, Hinton Avenue Multi-Use Path, and the Wrightsville Avenue and Greenville Avenue Intersection Improvements Projects, and to commit the required $240,000 local grant match from the City.
Adopted at a regular meeting on June 20, 2023

ATTEST:

Penelope Spicci-Sidbury, City Clerk

Bill Saffo, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney
WILMINGTON URBAN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BOARD

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE ALLOCATION OF ADDITIONAL DIRECT
ATTRIBUTABLE FUNDS TO THE CITY OF WILMINGTON FOR THE HOOKER ROAD
MULTI-USE PATH (U-5534G), HINTON AVENUE MULTI-USE PATH (U-5534H), AND
WRIGHTSVILLE AVENUE/GREENVILLE AVENUE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT (U-
5534C) 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, on July 18, 2012, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) designated the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization as a Transportation Management Area (TMA); and

WHEREAS, Surface Transportation Block Grant- Direct Attributable (STBGP-DA) funds are available for all designated TMAs; and

WHEREAS, the STBGP-DA program was previously known as the Surface Transportation Program-Direct Attributable (STP-DA) program under Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board allocated FY 2013 STP-DA funds to the City of Wilmington for the Wrightsville Avenue/Greenville Avenue intersection improvement (U-5534C) project to realign the intersection and install sidewalks from Wrightsville Avenue to Hinton Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board allocated FY 2014 STP-DA funds to the City of Wilmington for the Hooker Road Multi-use path (U-5534G) project to construct a multi-use path on Hooker Road from Wrightsville Avenue to Mallard Drive/Rose Avenue and Hinton Avenue Multi-use path (U-5534H) project to construct a multi-use path on Hinton Avenue from Park Avenue to Greenville Avenue; and

WHEREAS, in February 2022, the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization allocated additional Direct Attributable funding to the City of Wilmington in the amount of $2,400,000 (Hooker Road Multi-use path $1,220,000, Hinton Avenue Multi-use path $530,000 and Wrightsville Avenue/Greenville Avenue Intersection Improvements $650,000); and

WHEREAS, the City of Wilmington has requested additional STBG-DA funds in the amounts of $292,080 for the Hooker Road Multi Use Path, ($73,020 Local Match), $339,840 for the Hinton Avenue Multi Use Path, ($84,960 Local Match), and $328,080 for the Wrightsville Avenue and Greenville Avenue Intersection Improvements ($82,020 Local Match); and

WHEREAS, the City of Wilmington’s total additional STBG-DA funding request for all 3 projects is $960,000 with the city having committed the 20% local match in the amount of $240,000.
NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby supports the allocation of additional Direct Attributable funding in the amount of $960,000 to the Hooker Road Multi-use Path (U-5534G), Hinton Avenue Multi-use Path (U-5534H) and Wrightsville Avenue/Greenville Avenue Intersection Improvement (U-5534C) projects.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board on July 26, 2023.

_________________________________
Henry E. Miller III, Chair

_________________________________
Mike Kozlosky, Secretary
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:
- Final plan was presented to Wilmington City Council on June 20, 2023
- Wilmington City Council to consider a resolution for adoption at its July 18, 2023 meeting
- Final plan to be presented to WMPO TCC and Board in July 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.
- From June 7th to June 23rd, the Draft Plan was open for public comment and WSP, WMPO, and Pender County staff hosted pop-up events to collect public feedback on the Draft Plan.
- The Draft Plan is currently being finalized and public comments are being reviewed.
• The Plan is expected to go before the Pender County Board of Commissioners for approval in late summer/early fall of 2023 and before the WMPO Board for approval in fall of 2023.

**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 provided a scoping document which was reviewed by WMPO and City staff.
- A project team kickoff meeting with the consultant, WMPO staff, and NCDOT IMD staff was held on June 22, 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 provided a scoping document which was reviewed by WMPO and City staff.
- A project team kickoff meeting with the consultant, WMPO staff, and NCDOT IMD staff was held on June 22, 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: 17 reviews
- New Hanover County Informal Plan Reviews: 1 review
- New Hanover Concept Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Leland Concept Plan Reviews: 0 reviews
- Town of Leland Formal Reviews: 6 reviews
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
- Waiting response from NCDOT regarding ROW certification
- Waiting final approval from CFPUA

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, 2022
- Advertise for Bid – August 2023
- Begin Construction – January 2024
- Construction Complete- September 2024

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 package compiled and sent to finance.
- Revised bid schedule tentatively set for July/Aug
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
- Construction & activation complete as of May 09, 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
- Removed the exterior masonry from the east wall pilasters.
- Began installing the 1st floor HVAC ductwork.
- Completed the repairs for the windows in the north and south walls.
- Began repairs of the south wall parapet.
- Filled the diamond cuts in the concrete foundation slab.
- Began prepping the concrete foundation slab for the topping slab pour.

**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. JOESPH 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.
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.
- Supplemental scope of services for project management activities, NCDOT and CSX rail coordination, and additional survey tasks submitted on April 13, 2023 with NTP on additional services issued on June 12, 2023.
- NCDOT Rail Division is contracting with WSP on the preliminary concept design for rail track layout to determine final alignment of the Downtown Trail facility. The trail design schedule will be amended to align with NCDOT Rail’s design schedule, anticipated for August 2023.
- Public meeting date 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 approved by Kure Beach Town Council in June 2023
- Meeting with NCDOT, WMPO, WithersRavenel, and Town of Kure Beach scheduled for late July 2023 Survey can start in September 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 submitted on June 9, 2023 – currently under review

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
• Awaiting response from NCDOT regarding ROW certification
• Awaiting final approval from CFPUA

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 package compiled and sent to finance.
• Revised bid schedule tentatively set for July/Aug.

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
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. 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. Bicycle helmets received from an NCDOT grant will be distributed during this campaign to children from low-income families. So far there have been 143 Be A Looker pledges from 6 events attended since April as well as online pledges.

3. Printed map updates – staff has updated and is reprinting maps for the Gary Shell Cross City Trail and River to Sea Bikeway.
RIDERSHIP UPDATES
Through June 2023, Wave Transit is showing 6% growth in ridership compared to the previous June. Average monthly ridership for the current fiscal year is 57,156.

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 the three routes that received increased frequency in July of 2022, combined showing 24% growth compared to the previous fiscal year, with Route 108 showing a 30% growth compared to FY22.

RideMICRO’s (Microtransit) FY23 ridership average is 1,464 trips per month.

FY23 Low and No Emission Grant Award
The FTA awarded Wave Transit their full ask of $2,860,250 for five CNG buses. Five diesel buses will be replaced as part of the grant, all of which have exhausted their useful life. The award would place the agency’s fixed-route fleet at fully CNG. Shuttle services would be 60% on their way to CNG conversion. The award funds 85% of the cost with the remaining 15% coming from local match. The local funding for shuttle is rolled into an existing agreement with the University, leaving the remaining 15% local match for the four 30-foot vehicles at $405,000.

OTHER PROJECTS
Wave Transit is discussing a partnership with Cape Fear Community College to offer GoPasses. GoPasses are subsidized passes allowing students and faculty to ride transit in the area for free. Specialized passes would be produced and distributed by the College. The Community College would pay a discounted rate per trip, with the bundled amount paid out the following month. This program mirrors those already offered by GoTriangle and GoRaleigh. The program would be expected to launch for Spring 2024.
## WMPO JULY PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<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 FAYETTEVILLE ROAD) (Previously 17BP.3.R.84).</td>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>2025.06.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Pielech</td>
<td>DPOC</td>
<td>BP3-R012 17BP.3.R.93</td>
<td>BRIDGE 208 OVER STURGEON CREEK ON SR 1472 (VILLAGE ROAD).</td>
<td>BRUNSWICK</td>
<td>2025.07.03</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 AT-GRADE INTERSECTION TO AN INTERCHANGE.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2026.09.15</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 BRIDGE) TO US 421 (BURNETT BOULEVARD) WIDEN TO MULTI-LANES.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2027.06.15</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). CONVERT AT-GRADE INTERSECTION TO INTERCHANGE.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2027.06.15</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 BOULEVARD) IN WILMINGTON UPGRADE ROADWAY.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2028.07.18</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 INTERCHANGE.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2029.06.19</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 GREENVILLE AVENUE. UPGRADE INTERSECTION.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2029.06.21</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) TO STATION ROAD &amp; INTERCHANGE.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2029.08.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS, WILMINGTON CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEM.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2030.01.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON, INDEPENDENCE BLVD EXT FROM RANDALL PARKWAY TO MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PARKWAY.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2031.06.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 132 (COLLEGE ROAD) FROM SR 1272 (NEW CENTRE DRIVE) TO US 117 (SHIPTYARD BOULEVARD).</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 132 (COLLEGE ROAD) FROM US 117 (SHIPTYARD BOULEVARD) TO US 421 (CAROLINA BEACH ROAD) ACCESS MANAGEMENT AND TRAVEL TIME IMPROVEMENTS.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 132 (COLLEGE ROAD) AT US 76 (OLEANDER DRIVE).</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 17 FROM SR 1582 (WASHINGTON ACRES ROAD) TO VISTA LANE. CONVERT TO SUPERSTREET.</td>
<td>PENDER</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 421 (CAROLINA BEACH ROAD) FROM NC 132 (SOUTH COLLEGE ROAD) TO SANDERS ROAD IN WILMINGTON. WIDEN EXISTING ROADWAY AND CONTRACT FLYOVERS AT US 421 AND NC 132. INCLUDES U-5859.</td>
<td>NEW HANOVER</td>
<td>2040.01.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Update provided: 7/05/23
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>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>90.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C203980</td>
<td>Joshua Pratt</td>
<td>U-4751</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>MILITARY CUTOFF ROAD EXTENSION FROM MARKET STREET TO THE WILMINGTON BYPASS WITH AN INTERCHANGE AT THE BYPASS.</td>
<td>2024.01.30</td>
<td>89.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC00249</td>
<td>Joshua Pratt</td>
<td>B-4590</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>BRIDGE #29 OVER SMITH CREEK ON SR 2812.</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 STREET (US 17 BUS) FROM MARSH OAKS DRIVE TO LENDIRE DRIVE.</td>
<td>2023.09.19</td>
<td>60.48%</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 BEATINGS, EPOXY CAPS.</td>
<td>2023.09.29</td>
<td>42.74%</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 DRYSDALE TO US 74.</td>
<td>2025.02.27</td>
<td>29.41%</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>DC00427</td>
<td>David Sawyer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>US 421 BETWEEN VITMIN DRIVE TO SR 1109 (COWPEN LANDING ROAD) IN PENDER COUNTY AND US 421 AT I-140 RAMP IN NEW HANOVER COUNTY.</td>
<td>2023.10.30</td>
<td>7.65%</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 JULY 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>77.91%</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>2023.10.13</td>
<td>73.46%</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 (Highway Maintenance Improvement Program) GIS maps](https://ncdot.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=ceae1d0cf870473fb7d35294ac6b71c)
JULY TPD UPDATES WILMINGTON MPO

JULY 2023

Brunswick County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP): There were three in-person public involvement (PI) sessions throughout Brunswick County for the Brunswick County CTP and a virtual session from May 1st – May 15th. The engineer compiled the PI comments and made recommendations for modifications to the committee. The CTP steering committee met on June 27th to review the recommendations for modifications, this was the last steering committee meeting. The committee approved the recommendations that were made. The next steps are to update the CTP with the agreed upon modifications, go through reviews internally (TPD management and steering committee), and then go to adopting agencies for presentations.

Wilmington Model: The 2050 Travel Demand Model (TDM) work started on 3/1/2022. The TDM is being developed for the next Wilmington MTP. In June, the engineer and modeler compiled the certification of occupancy (CO) data provided by the MPO as well as other data sets. TPD then created socio-economic (SE) data sets for the MPO’s review. The data was sent to the MPO mid-June and TPD is waiting for completion of review.

Helpful Links:
Click on links below to learn more:
· NCDOT home page—ncdot.gov
· Real-Time Traffic—DriveNC.gov | North Carolina Traffic & Travel Information
· Report a pothole—NCDOT Contact Us Form
· NCDOT: State Transportation Improvement Program—ncdot.gov/sti
· Interactive Bicycle Routes Map—https://www.ncdot.gov/bikeped/ncbikeways/default.aspx
· Links to all traffic count data information—Traffic Survey Group (ncdot.gov)
· NCDOT Interactive Traffic Volume Map—Interactive Traffic Volume map (ncdot.gov)
· Traffic Safety Data & Engineering—NCDOT: Traffic Safety Data & Engineering
NCDOT Statewide Plans:
To learn more, click on the following links:
- NC Moves 2050 Plan (or go to ncdot.gov/nemoves)
- 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)
- IMD 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)