

May 28, 2015 Minutes

Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting Minutes May 28, 2015

Historic Henderson County Courthouse

ATTENDING

Marc Hunt, City of Asheville
Eddie Henderson, Town of Fletcher
Josh O'Conner, Buncombe County
Matt Cable, Henderson County
Claudia Nix, Blue Ridge Bike Club
Reuben Moore, JM Teague Engineering

Ricky Tipton, NCDOT Division 13
Kristina Sohlberg, NCDOT Division 13
Ed Greene, NCDOT Division 14

Non-Voting

Tristan Winkler, FBRMPO
Vicki Eastland, LOSRPO
Brendan Merithew, NCDOT TPB

I. Welcome and Housekeeping

A. Agenda Approval

Motion to Approve: Eddie Henderson, Second: Claudia Nix. All in favor- agenda approved.

B. March 5 Minutes

Motion to Approve: Eddie Henderson, Second: Claudia Nix. All in favor- December 11th Minutes approved.

II. Business

A. Revised STP-DA/TAP Scoring Methodology

Tristan Winkler presented a slide show on some of the problems with the scoring methodology pointed out in the last meeting. The first problem pointed out was geographic equity- subcommittee members had previously noted that the adopted scoring methodology did not reflect the methodology previously discussed and another problem was noted when Division 14 submitted projects for STP-DA. Tristan Winkler suggested that the latter problem be dealt with by putting geographic equity points based on geographic location of the submitted project, not just on the submitting party. The one question that remains is if there are multiple projects submitted in one jurisdiction by multiple submitters, how should geographic equity points be divided? Rick Tipton suggested that geographic equity points could be awarded to the project submitter whose project has the most points. Marc Hunt added that this conversation would be better if scenarios could be a part of it. Tristan Winkler replied that scenarios will be available, but there are too many questions right now to begin to do scenarios.

Tristan Winkler then presented three scenarios to change geographic equity points to better reflect the subcommittee's intentions for geographic equity. Discussion followed. Claudia Nix noted that small projects should not result in the same kind of penalty as large projects. Reuben Moore asked why population is not considered in this category. Rick Tipton replied that geographic equity is intended to attempt to spread projects based solely on location. Marc Hunt and Rick Tipton requested that past projects be scored with 2 or 3 scenarios to make the results of these recommendations more helpful.

The group then discussed the local priority points. Tristan Winkler pointed out that there was a loophole in the way the methodology was written that every jurisdiction could theoretically submit points on projects no where near them. Discussion followed. Josh O'Conner recommended that local points should be allowed for jurisdictions affected by these projects, Claudia Nix recommended that the number of points given to non-submitting jurisdictions be capped. Matt Cable agreed with limiting the number of points, but that number should be as high as 5 points. All agree that this is a good opportunity to encourage regional cooperation.

Slides continued to environmental justice- there is no environmental justice criteria currently in the MPO's methodology, but MPO is required by the feds at all levels of transportation planning. Tristan Winkler recommended that the MPO's methodology be incorporated into the scoring methodology as bonus points. Rick Tipton and Reuben Moore replied that environmental justice issues generally have more to do with property acquisition; evaluating projects as "good" or "bad" to environmental justice groups may be too subjective.

B. SPOT 4.0

Tristan Winkler presented to the subcommittee on SPOT 4.0. A timeline was provided to the group with deadlines and a presentation was given to go over some of the changes to SPOT. The first important deadline is in October- projects need to be submitted by the MPO by the end of the month; MPO staff will be meeting with local staff to discuss project submissions. Kristina Sohlberg asked if the MPO should wait until October to get final board approval for the project submissions, Tristan Winkler replied that the MPO can enter draft projects into SPOT online so the work required after final Board approval is minimal.

The subcommittee was informed that one of the recommendations from the SPOT workgroup was that the SPOT database be reduced. For the MPO, this means that 63 projects have been deleted from the database due to lack of local input points or completed NEPA document. The MPO does, however, have the ability to submit 14 projects per mode. The group discussed how these new projects could be divided- the old methodology of dividing project submissions based on proportion of population was discussed, but will need to be looked at again after discussions with local staff.

IV. Announcements, News, Special Updates

Tristan Winkler informed the group that there will be a training session on Locally Administered Projects for municipal staff on June 12th at Land of Sky offices. Kristina Sohlberg asked if attending the training is

required for a municipality to be awarded STP-DA/TAP funds, Tristan Winkler replied that it is not currently but that can be considered by the subcommittee. Marc Hunt requested that more training sessions be made available should some staff be unable to make a summer training session.

V. Topics for Next Meeting

Marc Hunt requests that scenarios for the scoring methodology be brought to the next meeting and that SPOT project submissions be looked at as well.

No public comment.

Meeting adjourned.