

Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting Minutes November 14, 2017 Land of Sky Regional Council Offices

ATTENDING

Voting Members

-Josh O'Conner, Buncombe County
-Matt Champion, City of Hendersonville
-Julie Mayfield, City of Asheville
-Vaidila Satvika, City of Asheville
-John Dockendorf, Village of Flat Rock

Non-Voting

-Tristan Winkler, FBRMPO
-Lyuba Zuyeva, FBRMPO
-Ritchie Rozzelle, LOSRC
-Vicki Eastland, LOSRPO
-LeRoy Roberson, City of Waynesville
-Autumn Radcliff, Henderson County
-Brendan Merithew, NCDOT Division 13
-Steve Williams, NCDOT Division 14
-Brian Burgess, Henderson County

I. Welcome and Housekeeping

I-A // Welcome and Introductions, Approval of Agenda

Josh O'Conner, Subcommittee Chair, presided. Voting members and non-voting members gave their introduction. The Agenda was approved.

I-B // August Minutes

The minutes from October 10, 2017 were approved.

II. Public Comment

No public comment at this time.

III. Business

III-A // PWP Project Selection Methodology, Tristan Winkler

Tristan Winkler informed the subcommittee that the call for planning projects has opened, with a funding amount of \$90,000, requiring a 20% local match with applications due December 31, 2017. He followed this with the introduction of three methodologies that could be used to award the planning project funding.

Select a methodology.

Option A: Quantitative Criteria [see slides for further details]

Projects would be prioritized through a standardized points allocation, with criteria like number of active projects in a municipality and prior planning work.

Drawback: This uses a standard criteria to compare dissimilar projects.

Option B: Vote following open discussion.

The merits and scope of each planning project would be discussed and put to a vote.

Drawback: The strengths and weaknesses of project may not be illuminated in discussion.

Option C: Quantitatively Vote

Following discussion, each voting member rates projects on a simple 1-5 scale related to importance and effectiveness.

Josh O'Conner asks whether projects might receive points for projects that make connections to planned, ongoing, or completed projects. He further suggests taking a quantitative approach to eliminate the lowest scoring projects, leaving the top-ranking projects up for discussion.

John Dockendorf asked how large this funding source could grow to be. Tristan responded that it would ideally be around \$150,000 annually. He further stated that a methodology should help to eliminate politics or voting in blocks to improve a project's chances of being funded.

Regarding Option A, conversation was held about the impact of the "Active Planning Projects" points, with the comment that it seems to be punitive toward larger municipalities with more ongoing project plans. The ultimate consensus was to let this stand as a participation incentive to smaller municipalities.

The consensus was to proceed with Option A as an initial filter, then employ Option C to inform the Subcommittee's final selection.

III-B // STGBGDA Project Selection Methodology, Tristan Winkler

Discussed is a process change that takes a more wholistic approach to funding a complete project, not just the Preliminary Engineering or some similar partial funding of the project without providing assurance of future funds.

Prior to putting out the open call for projects, partially programmed projects would have an opportunity to have the project's next phase funded prior to new STBGDA projects.

Josh O'Conner pointed out that this would help address funding lags, but it also could create a scenario where ongoing projects would receive a very large share of available funds.

Vaidila Satvika asks about capping the amount that can go toward partially programmed projects. The question was discussed whether a cap might leave

projects sitting without the full funding they need or might partial funding spur municipalities to come up the required balance.

With recognition that the intent of this process change is to force municipalities to consider all steps of the project, Julie Mayfield and Autumn Radcliff noted that considering the full cost and commitment of a project may have a deterring effect.

Consensus was to not change the process now, but keep an eye on ongoing project needs.

III-C // CMP Updates – Interstate Travel Time Reliability – Tristan Winkler

Tristan following an earlier discussion of land-use planning as related to the ongoing CMP Updates, introduced the next topic of Travel Time Reliability. TTR is shown by analyzing HERE data, which aggregates GPS data to show the time it takes cars to pass through various areas.

As an example, Tristan showed data for King St. in Hendersonville and I-240 through West Asheville. With King St, a clear pattern, spiking midday, emerged. Conversely, I-240 shows a noisy congestion pattern that indicates many congestion factors at play.

Tristan presented the various indexes available to make comparative use of the Travel Time data to rank our regions areas of frequent congestion: 95% Travel Time, Buffered Time, Average Travel Time, Median Travel Time, Free-Flow Travel Time, and Tristan's own index which blends Median Travel Time and the 95% Travel Time. [See Slide]

The Subcommittee was shown and considered draft pages of the CMP Update related to Travel Time Reliability. Discussion proceeded related to how these metrics could be used to inform project prioritization and CMP recommendations.

Josh O'Conner had to leave the meeting to attend another. Autumn Radcliff was asked and accepted to be a stand-in chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Lyuba Zuyeva noted that the MPO will host a CMP workshop in late winter/spring 2018.

III-D // TAZ Modifications – Lyuba Zuyeva

Lyuba Zuyeva showed the Subcommittee some changes to Traffic Analysis Zones within the Traffic Demand Model area (the MPO and RPO 5-county region). Using the example of Biltmore Village, the existing TAZ will split at Hwy 25 and I-40, due to distinct differences in travel patterns. Another split would occur between AB Tech CC and Meadow Road. Another recommended split is between Mission Hospital Campus and the area around McDowell.

In Enka-Candler, a change will be made to show new road patterns around Hominye Creek and clean up the TAZ boundary around Liberty Rd.

In Biltmore Park, a new TAZ was proposed to split out Biltmore Park shopping area. Near Lake Julian, the boundary line would be moved to follow the river. Another boundary would be shifted to follow Avery Creek, west of Fletcher.

Other TAZs in Madison and Henderson Counties are staying as they are for now, but are being watched for growth or changes that could result in a split.

These proposed changes will be proposed to the TCC and MPO/RPO Boards.

III-E // 2018 Prioritization Subcommittee Schedule – Tristan Winkler

The 2018 schedule was included in the Agenda Packet, and it remains more-or-less the same from this year. Julie Mayfield notes that one of the dates, November 6, is election day. The location may be modified for that date.

IV. Announcement, News, Special Updates

None at this time.

V. Topics for Next Meeting

Next Meeting: December 12 at 9am.

No topics identified

VI. Public Comment 2

No public comment at this time.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.