

FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting Agenda

August 11, 2015 – 1:00 P.M.

Agenda

1. **WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING (5 min)**
 - A. Welcome and Introductions, Approval of Agenda Marc Hunt
 - B. May 28, 2015 Minutes Marc Hunt
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
3. **BUSINESS (45-60 min)**
 - A. SPOT 4.0 Tristan Winkler
4. **ANNOUNCEMENTS, NEWS, SPECIAL UPDATES (3 min)**
5. **TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING? (3 min)**
6. **PUBLIC COMMENT 2**
7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Item 1B:

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.



Item 3A:

SPOT 4.0

Important Upcoming Dates

2015

September 1st – Existing project modifications; anticipated intersections, and anticipated interchanges are due

October 1st - Project deletions due

October - New Project Submissions; final date of submissions TBD

2016

April 1st – Deadline for Approval of Local Input Point Assignment Methodologies (NOTE: this the deadline for NCDOT Approval, not MPO approval. The MPO must approve the methodology before this date.)

Regional Impact Local Input Point window opens for 2 months

End of July – Draft List of Regional Impact Projects released

August 1st - Division Needs Local Input Point window opens for 2 months

October – Final P 4.0 Scores Released

December – 2017-2027 Draft STIP Released



What Will Go to the TCC/Board in August?

1. Modifications of Existing Projects
2. Anticipated Interchange/Intersection Projects
3. Requested Project Deletions

Existing Projects to be Modified

MPOs must submit modifications of existing projects to SPOT (with approval from the local Division) by September 1st. Existing projects are those that received local input points, have a completed NEPA document, are in the Development TIP (6-10 years), or are considered a sibling project. This is not to be confused with projects “in the holding tank” that can still receive modifications but are submitted somewhat differently.

During discussions with NCDOT and local staff, only one existing project was requested to be modified:

H090274-A (Haywood County) has been requested to be modified to a Modernization and not be re-entered as a Widening Project. This comes at the request of the Town of Canton with input from Division 14.

Anticipated Intersection/Interchange Projects

MPOs must submit anticipated intersection/interchange projects to SPOT by September 1st. More information will be provided at the meeting.

Projects to be Deleted

MPOs must submit projects that are to be deleted by October 1st. For every deletion the MPO is allowed one additional submissions that does not count towards the MPO’s 14 submissions of each mode.

During discussions with NCDOT and local staff, four projects were requested to be deleted:

B142210 (Buncombe County) has been requested to be deleted due to an overlapping, funded roadway project (U-5837) that is expected to include pedestrian improvements with local match.

B142103 (Henderson County) has been requested to be deleted due to an overlapping, funded roadway project (R-5748) that is expected to include pedestrian improvements with local match.

H090876 (Haywood County) has been requested to be deleted by the Town of Canton to submit another project.

H111158 (Madison County) has been requested to be deleted by the Town of Mars Hill and Madison County.

Full project information is available in the other attachment.



What Will Go to the TCC/Board in September?

1. Full SPOT 4 Project Submissions List

What's the Next Thing We Have to Discuss Concerning SPOT?

1. (Possibly) additional project submissions.

2. METHODOLOGY

Draft List of SPOT Submissions (other attachment)

Attached is a draft spreadsheet with a first draft of SPOT 4 projects for submission. Several changes are likely:

1. Henderson County TAC will be meeting on August 12th to review and discuss roadway project candidates in Henderson County. The projects to be (re)added from Henderson County may change based on the outcome of that meeting.
2. Buncombe County's roadway projects to be (re)added are not reflected on the spreadsheet.
3. Aviation projects are still being considered.
4. Transit projects are still being considered.

