Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
January 8, 2018
Land of Sky Regional Council

ATTENDING
Voting Members
-Josh O'Conner, Buncombe County
-Matt Champion, City of Hendersonville
-Julie Mayfield, City of Asheville
-Matt Champion, City of Hendersonville
-Brian Burgess, Town of Mills River
-John Dockendorf, Village of Flat Rock
-Elizabeth Teague, Town of Waynesville
-Jerry Vehaun, Town of Woodfin

Non-Voting
-Tristan Winkler, FBRMPO
-Lyuba Zuyeva, FBRMPO
-Nick Kroncke, FBRMPO
-Ritchie Rozzelle, Land of Sky/FBRMPO
-Janna Peterson, Henderson County
-Steve Williams, NCDOT
-Dan Baechtold, City of Asheville
-Troy Wilson, NCDOT
-Hannah Cook, NCDOT
-Stephen Sparks, NCDOT
-Daniel Sellers, NCDOT

I. Welcome and Housekeeping
I-A // Welcome and Introductions, Approval of Agenda
Prioritization Chair Josh O'Conner presided calling meeting to order at 9:00am. Members gave their introduction. The Agenda was approved.

I-B // October 9, 2018 Minutes
The minutes from the October meeting were reviewed. Elizabeth Teague made a motion to pass the minutes as presented. Jerry Vehaun seconded. All approved.

II. Public Comment
None at this time.

III. Business
III-A // MTP 2045 Public Input Process

Tristan Winkler began discussion about how to engage the public about the MTP process. Tristan showed the MTP schedule and how the CTP and MTP play into the SPOT process. The goal is to keep the process transparent for all and make the project selection process seamless.

The project process includes assembling projects to consider, developing a selection process and developing a final list process for the MTP while also undergoing a similar process for the SPOT process. For SPOT in July we will conduct staff level meetings for the draft projects list. The challenge is how to engage the public in a five to six month process with expected August 2019 Board approval of draft project list.

Julie Mayfield echoed concern about how to combine SPOT and MTP projects efficiently. Julie mentioned asking the public about a priority or timeframe for a project to solicit where to include the project. It is always easier for the public to react versus drawing projects up from scratch.

Tristan mentioned the different approaches outlined in the agenda packet including a project submission using Metroquest to "draw on a map". A second approach would be project evaluation where you ask if people love or hate a project with already compiled list from the CTP or local plans. A third way would be project selection similar to SPOT where you give them a pre-configured list and they choose which ones they do and do not want on there.

Elizabeth mentioned taking a list of already funded projects to the public and taking at tiered approach of what is being worked on and then asking for what else needs to be included. Lyuba mentioned the availability of Metroquest for the MPO to use, an enhanced platform for surveys. Tristan mentioned the drawback of it taking away simplicity for the survey takers along with not being available in print.

Elizabeth said it would be good to have additional in-person outreach for both staff level and public outreach beyond the online survey. It would be ideal to gather feedback before June when the SPOT process ramps up.

III-B // Project Expectations Report

 Tristan mentioned we still do not have the draft STIP from NCDOT which is supposed to come out later this week. Tristan mentioned why certain projects get funded through SPOT and it has previously been discussed of putting together a report of what projects are being funded and what the MPO and municipality wants out of them. Tristan showed a one-page sheet of what the project expectations report would look like. It would contain primary goals of the project, secondary

goals, a SPOT cross-section, previous planning efforts, and multimodal expectations.

Janna Peterson mentioned the concern over wording of phrases such as "improve safety." She stated that more specificity is needed and can be done by explaining what the safety measure is. Autumn requested a map or overview of the projects with a link to the report page. She also requested that a cost-share is mentioned where needed so the public understands where local costs may be incurred. Daniel Sellers mentioned that with primary goals, they should be more specific to give them more weight at NEPA-merger meetings. Elizabeth requested putting a purpose and needs statement on each project when available. Steve Williams stated that the purpose and needs can be difficult to demonstrate and that can challenge merger teams and it has to be clearly demonstrated that the project will meet the stated goals. Tristan mentioned the challenges and anomalies of safety data and how it can fluctuate year to year. Dan mentioned including the type of safety improvements (reduce left-turn conflicts, minimize crossovers etc.). Tristan said funding constraints will challenge the selection of projects in the future and regional agreement will be important. Brian Burgess echoed a statement that there should not be a large amount of specificity as that could backfire on getting the project funded. John Dockendorf said as an elected official it is helpful to have the data and the "Why a project is important" information to provide that information to the public. He requested talking points and data to justify these projects to the public. Bullet points of why the project is on the table or being discussed is a good strategy. Discussion took place about what type of data to use and what is the best use of staff resources. The challenge lies within the data available from the safety unit. Julie requested the data is still sought after because the project takes years so might as well request the data and get it before the design process occurs. It was discussed to tackle the small projects such as intersection improvements versus major corridor redesign.

Julie asked about what happens if goals drop off as design moves forward on a project. Tristan mentioned tabling this discussion for the future about how to flag the project to reanalyze elements of it. Discussion of specificity and how much to get into the tradeoff discussions early took place. Having a list or catalog of information between local staff and MPO with internal discussion could be helpful versus putting a lot of information into the public facing report. It was mentioned to include an overview map of the project on the report showing its limits.

III-C // P 6.0 Update

Tristan brought up the preliminary schedule for MPO tasks in P 6.0. The first to do is to pre-submit intersections/interchanges for study. MPO staff request them by January 10th. These projects go to DOTs congestion unit to see if they can take on the project or not. The MPO and each Division will have 10 project submissions.

Tristan mentioned there was a long discussion at the P 6.0 Workgroup about Committed Projects. P 6.0 is expected to have committed projects for six years

instead of five from P 5.0. This would potentially mean losing committed projects with limited funding. It would also mean being committed to projects that were submitted eight years before. Modernization projects are also going to be evaluated differently than widening projects with a higher emphasis on safety (paved shoulder and lane width).

III-D // Regional Trail Workgroup

The MPO Board has preliminary approval of the trail map but questioned the name of the "Hellbender Trail". To determine the workgroup Options were given. Option 1 is make prioritization subcommittee the de-facto workgroup. Option two is to make a list of potential members and then third option being to hold a call for workgroup members.

Josh requested Option 2 with options for TCC and Board approval of members and their duties. There are challenges about including advocates but it was agreed that it is important to have those members at the table present. It needs to be determined who should be at table amongst the group. Names were thrown out among the group to consider. Josh and Julie offered not having too many members on the workgroup especially who share only the view of their trail. Elizabeth mentioned having a 10-12 person committee that develops a report to give back to the MPO bodies. Discussion took place about who and who not to include and the benefits and drawbacks to including different groups.

The overall consensus was to have Prioritization members who want to serve on the committee in addition to advocate/public/other members who may include (list was tentatively proposed and names may be mispelled): Julie White, Mike Sule, Joe Sanders, Ken Shelton, Claire Carelton, Hunter Marks, Andy Williams, Bob Clark, Doug Dearth, Chris Burns, Mark Burrows, Dee Heinmiller, Garrett Artz, Doug Haddaway. It was further discussed that maybe only 1-2 advocates from each municipality should be represented and those names include Asheville on Bikes Representative/Board member, Julie White for Buncombe County, Andrew Bowen from Haywood County, Henderson County to follow back up with MPO, Madison County to be a Mars Hill or Dee Heinmiller appointment, Transylvania County TBD.

IV. Announcement, News, Special Updates
None.

V. Topics for Next Meeting
Next Meeting: **February 12 *at 9am***. No topics identified.

VI. Public Comment 2
No public comment at this time.

VII. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 10:50am.