

**Prioritization Subcommittee  
Meeting Minutes  
May 7, 2018  
Land of Sky Regional Council**

**ATTENDING**

**Voting Members**

-Josh O’Conner, Buncombe County –  
Chair  
-Julie Mayfield, City of Asheville  
-John Dockendorf, Village of Flat Rock  
-Autumn Radcliff, Henderson County  
-Brian Burgess, Town of Mills River  
-Jerry Vehaun, Town of Woodfin

**Non-Voting**

-Troy Wilson, NCDOT  
-Nick Kroncke, FBRMPO  
-Dan Baechtold, City of Asheville  
-Janna Peterson, NCDOT  
-Stephen Sparks, NCDOT  
-LeRoy Robinson, Town of Waynesville

**I. Welcome and Housekeeping**

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

Prioritization Chair, Josh O’Conner, presided calling meeting to order at 9:05am. Members gave their introduction. The Agenda was approved.

**I-B // April 9, 2019 Minutes**

The minutes from the April meeting were reviewed. Julie Mayfield made a motion to pass the minutes as presented. John Dockendorf seconded. All approved.

**II. Public Comment**

None at this time.

**III. Business**

**III-A // P6.0 Update and Preparation**

Tristan Winkler provided the group with a preliminary schedule which is coming up soon. MPO staff have to submit projects in September. Tristan mentioned starting with Henderson TAC, at first presenting projects and then deciding on the final list at the next meeting. Dan Baechtold mentioned sending out projects ahead of time, roughly 1 week before, and letting staff review the projects. MPO staff submitted some projects for pre-submittals that should be considered at the staff level.

Tristan wanted to discuss the process of submittal and see if any changes were requested by the subcommittee. John Dockendorf brought up the concern of limited NCDOT funding and looking at smaller projects, similar to High-Impact Low-Cost, to see if those would be more effective. Tristan mentioned some of the smaller intersections and projects that were submitted for pre-submittal. MPO staff agree that these projects would be the most ideal to submit at this time over larger

projects. Autumn asked if there is a way to split up projects and see which ones are likely to score well, on top of what projects will do well with the public. Autumn mentioned to increase public involvement in the process so people can give public input up front, particularly with a survey. Tristan mentioned the survey the MPO would do between September and March and asked if there would be a conflict doing two different surveys. Julie brought up the question of what to do if a project is brought up that isn't in any existing plans. Tristan believed this would be the last round where we operate with a lot of unpredictability, and in the future we will use project lists for more accurate project selection. Tristan reiterated the draft project list needs to be completed in August. Tristan mentioned that there is 25 submittals for each mode available.

A few changes mentioned by Tristan between P6.0 and P5.0: 90% of transit funding is eligible versus 10% in P5.0 for capital projects (new routes, replacement buses etc.), the committed window is extended to 6 years versus 5 years, modifications to aviation and bike/ped scoring, and modernization projects get special criteria versus mobility/other highway projects. A chart is provided in the packet showing how the scoring changes for modernization.

Julie posed a question about access management and how the division feels about submitting those projects. Stephen Sparks said Division 13 is likely willing to take a look into those projects.

Tristan asked how the subcommittee feels about 1) taking a draft list of projects to each municipality or 2) giving Prioritization more input on the projects. Janna asked about developing a projects expectations report for each project that is submitted and to be sent out to the public. MPO staff said that may be possible to do for Henderson County projects. Questions and discussion took place regarding what "modernization" projects entail. Clarity is needed regarding purpose and need of projects in this round, so detailing what exactly is needed for modernization would be important.

MPO staff will talk to the group more about project input and project selection.

### **III-B // Project Expectations Report**

Tristan said this report would be turned into the MTP amendments section. Looking at funding percentages: 96% was for highway, 3% bike/ped, 1% aviation. MPO staff still have to determine cross-sections for these projects and want guidance on how to determine these cross-sections. MPO Board guided staff four years ago to use NACTO guidelines for determining cross-sections. Julie made mention of using complete streets cross-sections, NACTO standards, NCDOT guidance. Autumn made

mention of using real photographs versus engineering drawings and diagrams for perception to the public and elected officials.

MPO staff will work on this and bring it back to Prioritization next month.

### **III-C // Congestion Analysis**

As part of the CMP, MPO staff wanted to produce a report on a biennial basis to see how projects progress over time. Four sets of data was used for corridors: Planning Time Index (2018 data), AADT, AADTT (trucks), Crash Score (NCDOT). Each criteria was given a different weight and normalized against each other. Tristan showed an example of the freight corridors, and showed how the 9 corridors are ranked. I-26 in South Buncombe, I-240 E Asheville and I-240 W Asheville were the three worst corridors in the region. Tristan made mention that raw data is available to produce these reports if anyone is interested. Julie made brief discussion regarding what projects are in the pipeline to fix these freight corridors. These reports will be done for mobility and destination corridors.

### **IV. Announcement, News, Special Updates - None.**

### **V. Topics for Next Meeting**

Next Meeting: **June 11 at 9am**. No topics identified.

### **VI. Public Comment 2**

No public comment at this time.

### **VII. Adjournment**

Josh O'Conner adjourned the meeting at 10:10 am.