



**WILMINGTON URBAN AREA**  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

**MPO Board Regular Meeting**

**Minutes Wednesday, November 29, 2023**

6th Floor Training Conference Room, 320 Chestnut Street, Wilmington,  
North Carolina

**Members Present in Person**

Lynn Barbee, Town of Carolina Beach  
Eulis Willis, Town of Navassa  
Mike Allen, Town of Belville  
Hank Miller, Town of Wrightsville Beach  
Neil Anderson, City of Wilmington  
Jonathan Barfield, New Hanover County  
Brenda Bozeman, Town of Leland  
Dane Scalise, Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority  
Luke Waddell, City of Wilmington  
Landon Zimmer, NC Board of Transportation

**Others Present Remotely**

Regina Hopkins, WMPO  
Nazia Sarder, NCDOT  
Jamar Johnson, WMPO  
Veronica Carter, Town of Leland  
Adrienne Harrington  
Frank Iler  
Barry Donaghue  
Travis Gilbert  
Travis Henley (COW)  
Jennifer Harris  
AJ Moody  
Jessica Baldwin  
Mike Forte, Brunswick County

**Members Remote**

John Ellen, Town of Kure Beach  
Wendy Fletcher-Hardee, Pender  
County  
Frank Williams, Brunswick County

**Others Present in Person**

Carolyn Caggia, WMPO  
Tera Cline, WMPO  
Mark Hairr, WAVE Transit  
Authority  
Michelle Howes, NCDOT  
Chad Kimes, NCDOT  
Vanessa Lacer, WMPO  
Abby Lorenzo, WMPO  
Rebecca Roth, New Hanover  
County  
Caitlin Melvin, NCDOT  
Amy Passaretti, Port City Daily  
Lauren Haviland, NCDOT  
Jon Dodson, WAVE Transit Authority  
David Roy, Turnpike Authority

**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:

**Present:** Chairman Hank Miller, Mike Allen, Lynn Barbee, Brenda Bozeman, Jonathan Barfield, Jr., Dane

Scalise, Luke Waddell, Frank Williams, Eulis Willis, Neil Anderson, and Landon Zimmer. **Present**  
**Remotely:** John Ellen, Wendy Fletcher- Hardee and Frank Williams.

## **2) Conflict of Interest statement and recusals**

Chairman Miller read the conflict-of-interest statement for the board. No one had a conflict.

## **3) Approval of Board Member Excused Absences**

None

## **4) Approval of the Agenda**

Mr. Barfield made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Waddell seconded. Motion passes unanimously.

## **5) Public Comment Period**

No public sign ups.

## **6) Presentations**

### **a. Cape Fear Memorial Bridge Traffic and Revenue Forecast**

Mike Koslosky, WMPO, said the Board will receive an update from Chad Kimes on the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge traffic and revenue forecast as well as an update on the Bridge Preservation Project. He stated that back in February of 2022, the Board approved a resolution requesting NC DOT explore all potential funding alternatives, including tolls and public and private partnerships. In July of 2022, NCDOT came in front of the Board and presented information regarding several different delivery methods, including the traditional delivery, which is prioritization, conventional tolling, alternative delivery, as well as potential grants. There were a lot of questions that the Board had at that July 27th meeting and NCDOT has undertaken a traffic and revenue forecast to answer some of those questions. Mr. Koslosky stated that Chad Kimes is going to provide an overview of the traffic and revenue forecast as well as talk about some potential grant opportunities that the Department is pursuing. He also applauded the Board for every one of our member jurisdictions endorsing a resolution of support for NCDOT's grant application to the US DOT for the Bridge Investment Program.

Chad Kimes, NCDOT, stated that all the information he is sharing is for informational purposes only. He stated that there is a timeline for a decision on the information of February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024. He stated the information being provided would hopefully help guide the Board on the decision of scoring the replacement of the bridge as a toll project or not.

Mr. Kimes stated that the timeline really started in 2020 when the Department started looking at replacing the bridge. He stated that a feasibility study was completed that identified four bridge replacement options as well as NCDOT received an unsolicited proposal to replace the bridge through a public/private partnership that would require tolls. In 2021, the MPO Board did not support reviewing the unsolicited proposal. The MPO Board did approve a resolution to allow the NCDOT to consider all possible options including tolls and previous proposals for replacing the bridge.

Mr. Kimes stated that they are working on the planning activities as well grant opportunities, the traffic and revenue study, and environmental studies.

Mr. Kimes went on to explain the timeline for Prioritization 7.0. He indicated that the state gave an exception for this project decision until February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024. He said the MPO must request scoring based on tolling and not DOT. He stated that statewide scores usually start coming out around May 1<sup>st</sup>. The project has already been submitted under the traditional Prioritization 7.0 system, but the state is waiting on the scoring submission as a tolling option.

Mr. Kimes stated the cost that's been submitted is \$437 million to replace the bridge. He then explained a graph showing the cost difference with and without tolls. He explained that the information used came from the traffic and revenue study and the cost to deliver it as a toll project is \$444 million. The difference between that and traditional delivery is basically the equipment needed to set up a toll which is about \$7 million. He explained that with traditional delivery, construction costs would be approximately \$401 million dollars, right of way/utilities relocation approximately \$35 million and ITS/tolling would be around \$1 million based on cost in current year dollars of 2023. The costs based on toll delivery are as follows, Construction in the amount of \$401 million, right of way/utilities relocation \$ 35 million, and ITS/tolling \$8 million. Mr. Kimes stated these numbers are based on a conventional toll delivery model. Mr. Kimes then gave a brief overview of funding analysis using tolling considerations such as assuming lifecycle major maintenance and operations costs that are supported by toll revenues, the 35-year debt repayment period; (per statute, tolls must be removed when project debt is repaid, and by statute, any toll revenues after debt service and operations must remain on the project). These numbers are as follows: Traditional delivery project cost would be \$437 million, Toll revenue supported funding, \$0 million, P7.0 cost to NCDOT of approximately \$437 million. He then explained with a \$1.00 dollar toll rate the project cost would be approximately \$444 million, with toll revenue at \$174 million and P7.0 cost to NCDOT, \$270 million. He then explained the numbers with a toll rate of \$2.00. Those were \$444 million project cost, \$359 million in toll revenue supported funding, with P7.0 cost to NCDOT being \$85 million.

Mr. Kimes explained that because P7.0 scoring is not yet available the hypothetical rank is based on current estimates using the P6.0 scoring methodology. He explained the following options for P7.0 submittals, traditional delivery getting a score of 63.1 based on P6.0 statewide score with a P6.0 hypothetical statewide rank of 119, the projected result would likely not be funded. Based on toll delivery scored submittal at a rate of \$1.00, the statewide score is 74.1 with a hypothetical rank of 22 with a projected result of likely not funded. Toll delivery score of \$2.00, the statewide score of 85.6, hypothetical statewide rank of 1 with cost to NC DOT \$85 million and would likely be funded. He stated once again that this information is hypothetical based on current estimates utilizing P6.0

scoring.

Mr. Anderson asked if it was statewide funding only. He said he wanted to know what the bridge project is competing against across the state. Mr. Kimes explained that it will be scored along with other projects throughout the state.

Mr. Kimes stated that the NCDOT has been putting a lot of work into grants and gave an overview of the grants that are possibly eligible to help with the bridge project. The Large Bridge grant is eligible to receive up to half of the project estimate, around \$215 million to \$220 million. He also stated they can go after multiple grants and gave some other examples of some that are available but stated you cannot go over the 80/20% rule. He thanked several people for helping with the grant work and stated the Bridge Impact Program (BIP) Large Bridge grant will be submitted December 4, 2023. Mr. Kimes went over a timeline of the grant process noting the submission for 2023-24 round of BIP-Large Bridge. He said NCDOT should hear back regarding to this grant in the springtime.

Mr. Kimes then explained a chart showing where the traffic will go if a toll is implemented. Mr. Kimes stated he will be showing AM Peak Hours and PM Peak Hours, one to show the year 2035 and the other year 2045. He explained as an example, if no project is done, Cape Fear Memorial Bridge is just continued to be maintained as it is currently that there will be approximately 1,450 drivers going down Third Street in the year 2035 in the AM peak hours. He explained that with a new bridge and no toll around 1,300 drivers will be on Third Street. Mr. Kimes continued by stating with a \$1.00 dollar toll the volume would go back up to 1,450 and with a \$2.00 toll it would increase to 1,575 vehicles.

Mr. Kimes said the roughly overtime, traffic will start to level out. He explained that in the year 2045 they are showing 1,825 drivers down Third Street with a \$2.00 toll because drivers will eventually want to take the best route.

Mr. Barfield asked Mr. Kimes if he had another column that showed the negative tax impact on the City of Wilmington and New Hanover County based on buildings being torn down and no tax revenue coming in for some of the buildings on Third, Fourth, and Fifth Streets. Mr. Barfield stated it would be good to know that because there are other impacts besides what it's going to cost NCDOT, and the county's budget may have to be adjusted to offset those losses as well. Mr. Waddell requested that he would like to see the increase in tax dollars received from the increase in traffic and increase in property value. Mr. Kimes confirmed that the toll would be in both directions.

Mr. Zimmer stated that he wanted to give a brief follow up to the information Mr. Kimes shared. He stated that North Carolina is growing, Wilmington is the 8<sup>th</sup> largest city and Leland is one of the top ten fastest growing cities in the state. We also have the Triangle which is home to 5 out of 10 fastest growing towns. Charlotte has 3 of the fastest growing towns and the Triad has one of the fastest growing towns. He explained that competing statewide is based on data, which means you have to show that you want the money and that all opportunities have been exhausted. Mr. Zimmer stated that this is not voting on a toll road but was voting to further study opportunities. He continued explaining the importance of showing NCDOT that this project is important, and all options will be looked at to get funded.

Mr. Waddell asked Mr. Zimmer if other municipalities that were open to a toll were also replacing existing roadways. Mr. Zimmer and Mr. Kimes both stated they did not know but they voted to look into the option of a toll and never had to implement a toll.

Ms. Bozeman asked if the tolls were private or statewide. Mr. Zimmer stated the tolls would be statewide, but they never were implemented because the legislature gave them the funding and they received a grant as well.

Mr. Waddell expressed that he thought it would be important to know whether or not these other projects were replacements of existing roadways or not.

Mr. Zimmer stated that voting to score the project as a toll road would increase the possibilities of receiving discretionary funding. He went on to share the importance of studying all options.

Mr. Allen expressed concerns about the state not helping with the bridge and other projects.

David Roy, NC Turnpike Authority, stated to date the facilities that are open in North Carolina are new facilities, they are not existing facilities and state law prohibits tolling existing facilities. He said that other regions in the state are also considering similar action to advance their projects that are currently non-tolled but are potentially considering a toll.

Mr. Waddell asked Mr. Roy, are the other areas that are reviewing similar options looking to replace existing roadways with a toll?

Mr. Roy replied, stating upgrading existing capacity, adding new capacity with a toll, and tolling current capacity.

Mr. Allen stated he would like some clarification on the options.

Mr. Kimes explained that the project has already been submitted for scoring without a toll. Division 3 is requesting the Board vote to submit the project as a toll option for scoring so that all options are covered.

Mike Kozlosky, WMPO, stated that the MPO submitted the replacement of the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge as a carryover project and DOT submitted it through their project submittals, so the only way DOT could submit it as a toll project is if this Board supported it as being evaluated as a toll project.

Mr. Williams stated that a few years ago this Board made the project of replacing the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge their number one priority. When something is your number one priority you evaluate all options to get it done. He also stated that they have to be crystal clear on what is wanted and needed in regards to this project.

Mr. Anderson, asked if we submit it as toll project will it hurt the federal grant chance?

Mr. Kimes replied stating every grant has a match required. As of right now, there is no money for a match available. By submitting the project as a potential tolling option this is showing them that we are serious about the project, and we will use the tolls to produce the match.

Mr. Barfield stated that he will never support a toll on an existing road. He said that it is a state bridge and it's their responsibility to fix it. He continued by saying that if the City of Wilmington takes on that responsibility, we get an unfunded mandate and now it's the cities. He stated he would not be a good Commissioner if he said he wanted to put that on the backs of the folks he represents. The state needs to figure out where the money is going to come from.

Mr. Waddell requested confirmation that the \$2,000,000 dollars was just for the Traffic and Revenue Study, or did it include other things?

Mr. Kimes and Mr. Roy confirmed the study was roughly 600,000 to 700,000 hundred thousand and they will probably spend around \$2 million on the merger process. They have already spent about \$18 million on right away.

Mr. Waddell requested to know who did the study and can the Board get a full copy of the report?

Mr. Kimes stated CDM Smith was the consultant that did the study and yes, they can get a copy of the full report.

Mr. Waddell expressed his concern if the study took into consideration the income of the commuter?

Mr. Roy stated income was not looked at.

Mr. Waddell stated that based on the latest census data that he looked at, 13,000 jobs in New Hanover County are filled by Brunswick County residents. Half of those jobs are at or below a salary of \$40,000. 5,000 jobs in Brunswick County are filled by New Hanover County residents and roughly half of those are at or below a salary of \$40,000. These jobs include our teachers, first responders, etc. He said it's important to bring the actual individual cost into play because he feels people have already paid for it via the gas tax. North Carolina has the highest gas in the Southeast and 7<sup>th</sup> in the nation and this money is used to maintain existing roads and replace existing roads which the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge is. He stated that he realizes we're maybe not as fast growing as Charlotte and Raleigh, but a report from an economist at UNCW that says our tri-county area is one of the fastest growing areas in the state.

Mr. Waddell states that he believes it's a regressive tax that's unfairly shifting the burden back onto the tax paying citizens of southeastern North Carolina that have already been taxed for these projects. That's an important part of the narrative that's just not being discussed, this bridge has been paid for by taxes.

Mr. Anderson, requested to know what the entire process is so that the Board will be clear as to the next steps and expectations.

Mr. Kozlosky offered to establish a workshop to go over the process and answer any and all questions before this vote.

Chairman Miller explained that his understanding is the Board has already told NCDOT to score the project as a toll road and the vote is basically assuring them that the Board still agrees to this as an option. Chairman Miller directed Mr. Kozlosky to put together a workshop date and send to the Board.

Mr. Kimes was directed back to address the Board on the current Rehabilitation Project. He explained (showing pictures), that the stringers that hold the riding deck up are in sag. He stated that a contractor has been chosen; overall completion date of the project is 06/28/2024. The incentive completion date is 5/23/2024. The incentives include \$200,000.00 if completed by 06/28/2024 and \$500,000.00 if completed by 05/23/2024. There will be one week of no work from April 1 through April 7<sup>th</sup> for Azalea Festival. The deck material has been ordered. He gave a brief overview of the detour options.

Mr. Barbee, requested Mr. Kimes clarify what he is saying is, the bridge is safe, and this is work has to be done to keep it that way.

Mr. Williams, requested to know how this information is going to be communicated to the public and when will it start? He also wanted to know if the bridge is not replaced will this type of closure for repairs be more frequent?

Mr. Kimes stated that NCDOT will be holding a media event and based on the new deck they are looking at probably less than a 10-year span on repairs to the riding deck.

Mr. Waddell questioned if there's going to have to be some tree trimming and some preparation for the trucks that will be going down 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, and who pays for that?

Mr. Kimes stated that depending on how that agreement is set up. We will look at tree trimming and signal timing for the major turns to increase the storage length. All that's being reviewed.

Chairman Miller made a motion to let Representative Iler speak, and the motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Waddell.

Representative Iler stated he was very familiar with another MPO further to the South. He knows a lot of the issues from constituents and from mayors and people at the table sitting there about the connectivity between Brunswick and New Hanover Counties. He said the bill that created the STIP was passed in 2013 and he was a co-sponsor of that bill. There are certain criteria like connectivity, mobility, and this type of thing. It's about 10 different criteria that they put data points on. He stated it's hard to change the STIP, but he thinks it needs to be changed due to connectivity between counties and to include giving some weight on bridges. He also wants connectivity to other states. He stated that another option is to try to move the project to the Turnpike Authority, but existing roads have to be majorly improved to fall under the Turnpike Authority. As far as the gas tax it was flattened back in 2013 and it moves with CPI and not the price of oil. He said we have to understand that the gas tax is jeopardized in the future due to electric vehicles.

#### **b) WMPO Transportation Demand Management Update-Carolyn Caggia, WMPO**

Ms. Caggia stated that the first part of her presentation includes overviews of two TDM campaigns: Be A Looker and Get There Greener. The second part of her presentation will provide a brief refresher about the WMPO's TDM program, Go Coast and how it can be used to assist in mitigating traffic congestion during the Cape Fear Memorial bridge preservation project.

Be A Looker is an educational and outreach campaign focused on bicyclists and pedestrians. The campaign was non-biennial around the summer months and the campaign includes messaging for those who bike, walk, and drive. For drivers, we include tips on how to look for bicyclists and pedestrians.

This year, the campaign was held April through October 2023. During that time, we promoted Be A Looker via 14 in person events and through various media and advertising methods. We also received 212 new Be A Looker pledges.

She stated the MPO also applied for 100 children's bicycle helmets through NC DOT's Bicycle Helmet Initiative, so this grant came with the intention that the helmets be distributed to children in low-income families along with a bicycle education or safety education component, which 82 of those helmets were distributed during the campaign and we have plans to distribute the rest in the new year in a partnership with Maids Park and a bike for every child.

Ms. Caggia stated they used brochures, billboards, and WAVE transit to help get the information out.

Get There Greener is a Go Coast annual sustainable transportation challenge. We recently worked this year to rebrand the challenge from its former name of the commuter challenge with the intent of streamlining messaging and in the spirit of the campaign. Participants could track their miles traveled by walking, bicycling, carpooling, riding the bus, and teleworking. Any trip that was replacing a single occupancy trip. When participants track their trips, they were entered to win prizes that were donated by local businesses. This year we received \$935 in gifts, which the Board formally accepted at the October meeting. Prizes were distributed in November. They had 26 participants that logged trips and 39 people indicated interest in the challenge. Overall, the participation resulted in the savings of 1542 kilograms of carbon dioxide emissions.

Ms. Caggia went on to cover TDM and the strategies that are being used in the Go Coast program. Go Coast has an advisory committee with representatives from local employers, staff from member jurisdiction, and WAVE Transit. This committee assisted in the development of the short range TDM plan, Cape Fear Change in Motion 2020 which was adopted by the Board in April 2021.

Ms. Caggia shared 7 strategies recommended by the TDM plan. She explained the different strategies to include ways to mitigate traffic and diversify mode use. MPO staff developed a 2 prong approach for promoting strategies to assist in mitigating the impacts of congestion on the regional network during the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge preservation project. She states the first prong is geared towards outreach to major employers. We are promoting a tool kit, which includes an overview of alternative transportation options available in our region as well as how and why employers should support their use. The toolkit will also include a model telework and alternative work schedule policy that was endorsed by this Board in June 2022. The toolkit also contains sample emails and presentation slides.

Ms. Caggia then explained the Go Coast Commuter friendly challenge which is a recognition program which designates employers as gold, silver, or bronze depending on what TDM strategies they utilize.



**c) “Wave Reimagined” Short Range Transit Plan-Mark Hairr, Wave Transit**

Mark Hairr, Wave Transit, introduced Keaton Wetzel with Nelson Nygaard, Mr. Wetzel stated they are partnering with WAVE Transit to help support them in the development of a short-range transit plan that has been recently branded Reimagine Wave Transit. The project brand has been to evoke a comprehensive nature of this study. He stated like all transit agencies across the country Wave has experienced a dip in ridership for 2021 and 2020 but has since been steadily rising. Mr. Wetzel explained that the pandemic really changed the way that people traveled, what time of day they travel, what days of week they travel. Transit agencies across the country are taking a look at when and where they're operating service to better match the change in travel.

Mr. Wetzel explained that Wave is looking at 3 scenarios that reflect different levels of funding. The first being a conceptual plan using the resources we have today. The second is a 30% revenue reduction which would reflect federal money that is drying up to support transit operations. The third is a 30% revenue increase that would reflect the amount of service Wave could operate, say in the future if a ballot measure Wave to help provide a dedicated local funding source.

Mr. Wetzel then explained the likelihood that different socioeconomic groups are to take transit compared to an average resident. He highlighted the value for people who don't own a car are 17.6 % more likely to take transit. In the Wilmington region, it costs about \$10,000 a year to own and operate a fuel vehicle. For folks who don't have that discretionary income, they tend to take Wave in much larger numbers and higher proportions. That statistic correlates across other socioeconomic groups, young people, those under the age of 20 are more likely than the average, Senior citizens, those over the age of 55 or people of color and residents below 150% of the poverty level. He stated they want to consider the population density and job density, which really drive transit demand by the likelihood of different residents in transit and try to get a picture of how much service in ideal world should Wave operate.

Mr. Wetzel explained how they are going to use all this information, market analysis, and travel flows to build on Wave strengths to better serve the market and connect those trips that people are already making in large numbers. It is believed that this is a really strong system that we think we can build on in some pretty simple and easy ways.

Mr. Wetzel stated that Wave doesn't have unlimited funding and so some trade-offs will be needed. There are several different guard rails. One is you can turn up or down the frequency of service, you can make service every half hour. This saves a lot of money to make service every hour, although in return you're getting a much lower quality service at the same time, you can also reduce the number of streets that a bus operates on. You want to focus more on the service in the core of the region rather than in the suburbs. We have 20 stakeholders from 16 regional organizations. He requested that all involved share the Wave survey and participate in public outreach.

**d) Pender County Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan- Fred Frank, WSP**

Mr. Frank explained that WSP worked with the Steering committee of about 10 members, Pender County staff, and a number of people from the community. They met three times throughout this project. They had a pretty intense public engagement campaign. They also had an online survey and most people stated that they want to bike more and drive less.

Mr. Frank continued by explaining the boundary and proposed greenways, side paths, sidewalks, and on street facilities.

The steering committee focused on the area along US 17, determining if better facilities are needed there. That's where a lot of people live and want to walk to commercial areas along US 17. The committee then started prioritizing projects. They set in place the framework and also gave the county a policy, a step-by-step guide of how to get from this paper map to actually getting some things going quickly. Getting some pedestrian and bike overlay districts approved through their zoning district, working with developers to get improvements to site plans as development occurs, especially along US 17 start to get pieces of this network built together. Also coming up with a maintenance budget so once they start getting these greenways and sidewalks in place, they can't just build them and forget about them.

Mr. Frank stated the Pender County Board of Commissioners approved the plan in October.

**7) Consent Agenda**

- a) Approval of Board Meeting Minutes- October 25, 2023, and Special Meeting on November 3, 2023**
- b) Resolution adopting the Pender County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan**
- c) Resolution approving 2024-2033 STIP/MPO Administrative Modifications #23-2**
- d) Resolution approving 2024-2033 STIP/MPO Amendment #23-1**
- e) Opening of the 30-day public comment period for 2024-2033 STIP/MPO Amendment #23-2**
- f) Resolution adopting the Wilmington Urban Area MPO 2024 Meeting Schedule**
- g) Resolution supporting the endorsement of Safety Target Performance Measures for 2024**

Mr. Waddell made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, seconded by Mr. Scalice, and the motion was carried unanimously.

## 8) Discussion

### a) NCDOT's recommended process improvements for the use of the Wilmington Urban Area MPO's Direct Attributable Funds

Mr. Kozlosky stated that NCDOT recommended process improvements for the use of WMPO's Direct Attributable funds back in September. The NCDOT will provide the funding amount on an annual basis for a five-year period. The MPO will continue to select the projects and NCDOT will identify the most appropriate funding source. Then NCDOT would work with the MPO to manage the projects and could potentially switch funding as needed. MPO staff does not oppose this approach. The resolution will be brought back to the next meeting.

### b) Wilmington Urban Area MPO 2020 Decennial Census Member Jurisdiction Population Estimates

Greer Shivers, WMPO, presented to the Board a memorandum that details the changes in population for each member jurisdiction within the WMPO's Planning Area Boundary based upon the 2020 Decennial Census. Following the 2020 Decennial Census, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in collaboration with the US Census Bureau, published population estimates for all Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) nationwide. The 2020 Census results indicate the total population within the WMPO's planning area reached 297,183 residents, a 17.4% increase from the 2010 Census. The memo provides a breakdown by member jurisdiction.

### c) 2024-2033 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #23-3

Mr. Kozlosky, stated this item is for informational purposes only and will be brought back to the Board at the next meeting.

### d) Cape Fear Memorial Bridge Aesthetics Subcommittee

Mr. Kozlosky stated that NCDOT is submitting a grant to replace the Cape Fear Memorial Bridge. As part of that grant, one of the things that has come up is for the region to identify what the replacement bridge should look like. A subcommittee has been requested that would identify what this Board desires this bridge replacement project to look like as far as aesthetics and cost sharing. A committee would be similar to what was done back in 2010 or 2013 when the Cape for Memorial Bridge was painted. There was a subcommittee of this Board that was established to come up with the paint colors.

There was brief discussion on who would be on this subcommittee, it was decided that Chairman Miller would choose three additional members to join Commissioner Barfield and Commissioner Bozeman that volunteered.

Chairman Miller made the motion and Mr. Barbee seconded, all in favor.

**9) Updates**

**a) Wilmington Urban Area MPO**

Mike Kozlosky, WMPO, stated that updates are in the packet.

**b) Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority**

Mark Hairr, Cape Fear Wave Transit, stated updates were including in the packet.

**c) NCDOT Division**

**d) NCDOT Transportation Planning Division**

**7) Announcements**

**a) Cape Fear Navigating Change 2050 MTP Outreach Period- through November 30, 2023**

Mr. Kozlosky congratulated staff on a job well done with this project.

**b) WMPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Meeting-December 12th**

**c) WMPO Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting- January 17th**

**d) MTP Technical Steering Committee Meeting -January 18th**

**Next meeting – January 31, 2024**

Mr. Barbee and Chairman Miller thanked Mr. Anderson for his service on the WMPO Board.

There being no further business, Mr. Barfield made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Waddell, and the motion was carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 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.**