

**French Broad River Metropolitan Planning Organization
Prioritization Subcommittee
April 24, 2014 - Minutes**

Attending

Autumn Radcliff, Henderson County
Jack McCaskill, Town of Montreat
Paul Benson, Town of Waynesville
Josh O'Conner, Buncombe County
Matt Cable, Henderson County
Kristina Solberg, NCDOT Division 13
Doug Dearth, Town of Weaverville
Eddie Henderson, Town of Fletcher

Ed Green, NCDOT Division 14
Brian Birch, NCDOT Division 14

Non-Voting/Staff

Vicki Eastland
Josh King
Lyuba Zuyeva
Paul Black

WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING

Jack McCaskill opened the meeting with a round of introductions.

Meeting notes approval-Doug Dearth motion to approve, Eddie Henderson seconded, all in favor, motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

BUSINESS

Initial SPOT 3 Highway Scores & Draft Point Assignment

Paul Black indicated that the FBRMPO has a time reprieve on submitting MPO points for SPOT prioritization-MPOs, RPOs and Divisions now have until the end of August which means that the initial scores and points will need to be assigned during June MPO Board meeting, to allow for a public input and final adoption at the August MPO Board.

Paul Black explained how the local input scores on a scale of 40 to 1 were assigned, based on linear sequence with equal intervals in between scores. The counties with the highest number of projects in a category (regional or division) ended up with the lowest-ranked project assigned a "1". All the highest-ranked projects per county per category (regional or division) are assigned a "40" local input score. Paul asked for comments or questions.

Lyuba Zuyeva-City of Asheville might request to move several projects around, but it should not change the total number of projects or point distribution schema. RADTIP project might get moved up from Buncombe division-level projects spot #11.

Matt Cable-question about whether projects that were delayed in construction and will not make it to construction in 2015 will be included. Paul Black-New Leicester Highway project is moving to construction in 2015 and will not have any points assigned. Erkwood-Shepherd intersection in Henderson County will not make it to construction by 2015 and is included on SPOT prioritization list.

Further discussion regarding whether some of the projects might need additional feasibility studies, planning and design work. Paul Black-there are timing issues and when programming construction in the TIP/STIP, NCDOT takes prior work into account. Number 1 project might not be shown in the first five years of the STIP, if it needs additional preliminary work. Rick Tipton-might have some questions about whether McDowell and Biltmore Avenue projects are feasible but moving forward with planning and preliminary engineering will help. Sweeten Creek Road-likely will not get funded for ROW or CST in the first five years, it just takes a long time for a big project to get to ROW. Paul Black-NCDOT Programming Unit will factor this in. 3-7 years to get through NEPA.

Paul Black-are the local project scores moving in the right direction? Jack McCaskill-support for moving forward. Let's move on to the next steps. Paul Black-if there is a particular project that rises to the top, we will have another month to move things around. We would need to provide a written documentation for why certain projects are being moved to the top outside of the normal MPO scoring process. Paul Benson-question about how those scores will impact MPO points assignment. Paul Black-those local input scores will account for 40% of the total MPO score. Once we calculate the total MPO score we will see which projects rise to the top and which ones do not do so well. The rest of the score will have to be weighted to add up to 100%. Will keep the projects broken up by regional and division categories.

Rick Tipton-still working on Division points assignment.

Paul Black-MPO and RPO Associations were asked for input after the last SPOT process. As the Chair of MPO Association, I had to compile comments. The general consensus is that the process is working ok but there are some questions about Division Engineers assigning points when 60% of Division score is based on NCDOT interest, more interested in local knowledge being reflected instead.

STP-DA Methodology

Transit and Alternative Fuels

Lyuba Zuyeva provided an overview of current draft methodology, as prepared by staff based on last meeting's discussion. Transit Projects and Alternative Fuels Projects Funded with STP-DA are proposed to be scored on a 100-point scale based on the following factors:

- Geographic Equity-40 points to the only transit and/or alternative fuel project submitted per county; 20 points each of only two transit capital and/or alternative fuel projects submitted per county
- Service Connectivity-40 points if the transit capital project will support trips taken across county lines; 20 points of the transit capital project will support a system that directly connects to another operator's route or a Park-and-Ride Lot; for Alternative Fuel-40 points if the alternative fuel station will be accessible to the public and located at a convenient interstate exit location easily accessible to drivers traveling across county lines; 20 points if the alternative fuel station will be open to the public but not right off an interstate exit
- Cost effectiveness: ratio of expected passenger miles per year/proposed project cost (if the project includes only one bus, please provide the average number of passengers per route or

per bus). Cost effectiveness score will be scaled to 20.

Josh O’Conner-suggestion to add alternative fuel stations accessible off the NC routes and US routes instead of just interstate for the full 40 connectivity points. Matt Cable—suggestion to use revenue miles instead of passenger miles for Cost Effectiveness ratio. For Alternative Fuels cost effectiveness-use vehicles that can be charged per day/proposed cost, scaled to 20.

STP-DA Roadway and Bike Ped Projects

Lyuba Zuyeva-provided an overview of the current draft methodology for highway, bicycle and pedestrian and planning/feasibility study projects, with total score scaled to 100. Geographic equity score was increased to 20 to make the full amount add up to 100.

- Geographic Equity—20 points to the only roadway or the only bike ped project submitted across all jurisdictions in a county; 10 points each if only two roadway and/or only two bike ped projects submitted across all jurisdictions in a county
 - Local Priority (up to 10 points)
 - o 10 points per agency; all submissions must have at least 1 pt assigned; no more than 10 pts for any project
 - Local Match (up to 15 points)
 - o Local match points: Minimum Match Required – 20% (0 points); if local match is at least 30% - 5 points; If local match is at least 40% - 10 points; if local match is at least 50%-15 points
 - LRTP (10 pts-Roadway)/Plan compliant (5 pts-Bike/Ped)
 - o Roadway 1st Tier in the LRTP (2015) – 10 points
 - o Roadway 2nd Tier in the LRTP (2025) – 5 points
 - o Roadway 3rd Tier in the LRTP (2035) – 3 points
 - o Post-Year (CTP) – 0 points
 - o Bike Ped projects in a local or regional adopted plan—5 pts
 - Project phase (10/5/3)
 - o Construction Projects – 10 points
 - o NEPA and/or Design Projects – 5 points
 - o Feasibility/planning studies – 3 points
 - o ROW-0 points
 - Prior Funding (up to 5 pts)-prior funding from any sources can be applicable including prior local funding for the study/corridor/ROW, etc.
 - Mode-effectiveness (up to 20 pts-roadway; 25 pts-bike ped)
 - Roadway Effectiveness (*must improve traffic conditions): made up of Congestion and Safety
 - Bicycle/Pedestrian Effectiveness: score based on Missing Link factor or Obstacle factor (connecting existing activity centers/transit stops or stations/bike lane/sidewalks/greenways)
 - Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 pts).Cost Effectiveness calculated as:
(Total Points – Local Match Points) / Program Cost ; scaled with top project earning 10 points
- Mode effectiveness-roadway: based on congestion, addressing CMP strategies and safety factor
- Congestion
 - o Current Volume to Capacity Analysis (5 pts)
 - $V/C < .2 = 0$ points
 - $V/C < .4 = 2$ points
 - $V/C < .6 = 3$ points
 - $V/C < .8 = 4$ points
 - $V/C > .8 = 5$ points

- Addresses CMP Strategies (5 pts)
 - 1 CMPS = 1 point
 - 2 CMPS = 2 points
 - 3 CMPS = 3 points
 - 4 CMPS = 4 points
 - 5 or more CMPS = 5 points
- Safety- based on FHWA Crash Reduction Factors (10 pts)
 - CRF < 10% = 0 points
 - CRF > 10% = 2 point
 - CRF > 20% = 4 points
 - CRF > 30% = 6 points
 - CRF > 40% = 8 points
 - CRF > 50% = 10 points
 - <http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/>
 - <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/tools/crf/>

Paul Black-question about incorporating the Congestion Management Corridors into the scoring criteria. Rick Tipton-question about cost effectiveness—Lyuba Zuyeva-already included in the score.

Matt Cable-question about geographic equity. Recommendation to change geographic equity score to be based on projects submitted per unit of government, not across a county. Suggestion to add bonus for Inter-jurisdictional cooperation—add 5 points. Regarding Congestion Management Plan corridors- under LRTP-will add 10 points for projects addressing a Congestion Management Plan hot spot for projects that will address congestion. Question about whether operational and intersection improvements would fit very well into this methodology. Roundabout in Canton is part of a CTP project.

Paul Benson-motion to approve the methodology with changes proposed, Eddie Henderson-second. All in favor, motion carried.

TA Methodology

Lyuba Zuyeva provided a brief overview of current draft TA methodology for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Based on latest communication with FHWA, feasibility and planning studies will not be eligible for TA.

Selection Criteria for Bike Ped Projects funded with TA (Maximum of 100 points):

- Local Priority (up to 15 points)
 - 15 points per agency; all submissions must have at least 1 pt assigned
- Local Match (up to 15 points)
 - Local match points: Minimum Match Required – 20% (0 points); if local match is at least 30% - 5 points; If local match is at least 40% - 10 points; if local match is at least 50%-15 points
- Plan Compliant (up to 10 points)
 - Bicycle or pedestrian projects in a local or regional adopted bicycle, pedestrian or greenways plan—10 pts;
 - Comprehensive plan-5 pts
- Project phase (10/5/3)
 - Construction Projects – 10 points
 - NEPA and/or Design Projects – 5 points
 - ~~Feasibility/planning studies – 3 points (not eligible for TA)~~
 - ROW-0 points
- Prior Funding (up to 10 pts)
- Mode-effectiveness (up to 30 pts-bike ped)
 - Missing Link factor (5 pts)
 - Overcoming an obstacle factor (10 pts) overcoming an obstacle such as a river/creek crossing, interstate or major arterial crossing
 - Connections within ½ mile to other mode, greenway or activity center (up to 10 pts)

- Safety (up to 5 pts)
- Cost effectiveness (up to 10 pts). Cost Effectiveness calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{Total Points} - \text{Local Match Points}}{\text{Program Cost}}$$
 Discussion followed. Under project phase-will need to take out feasibility/planning studies.
 Bump up ROW phase to 3 pts.
 Doug Dearth-move to accept TA methodology with proposed modifications , Matt Cable-seconded, motion carried.
 Draft TA methodology adopted for adoption by MPO TCC and MPO Board in May.

TIP Amendment Form

Lyuba Zuyeva-in the past, it was fairly rare to get TIP Amendment requests from local government project sponsors. Going forward, expecting to have some TIP Amendment request for STP-DA and TA projects. Would like to adopt a standardized TIP Amendment request form.

All in favor. TIP Amendment form recommended by consensus.

Discussion about STP-DA and TA Project Timeline Extension

Lyuba Zuyeva-some MPOs are stricter on the time extensions than others; staff suggestion to allow two-year extension by right but request a letter of explanation after the first two one-year extensions. This is to protect the funding availability in our region and make sure it does not expire.

Rick Tipton and Matt Cable-municipal agreement will have an expectation to build a project by a certain date as well.

Matt Cable-what about scope revisions. Lyuba Zuyeva-would like to leave scope revisions open and flexible for now. If it becomes an issue in the future, MPO committees can make recommendations to address it.

Consensus to allow two-year delays and require an explanation for any STP-DA or TA project delay beyond the first two years.

Announcements, News, Special Updates

MPO staff provided some announcements.

- I-26 Connector Public Input meeting scheduled for May 12 4-7 PM at the Renaissance Hotel; Local Officials Input meeting the same day from 2-3 PM
- CTP/LRTP plan--meeting for the Executive Committee to kick-off the plan discussion on May 9th
- CAC –asking to meet prior to May 9th to pick four delegates to participate in the Executive Committee meetings
- Sign Retro-Reflectivity Workshop with Teague Engineering hosted at Land of Sky offices on May 8th after TCC (at 2 PM), \$75/per person or \$100/per two.
- NCAMPO Conference in Wilmington May 14-16th.
- Lyuba Zuyeva shifting to another position at Land of Sky Regional Council; last day with the MPO on May 23rd.