# Prioritization Subcommittee 

Meeting Agenda
September 6, 2023
9:30 AM

## Meeting to be held at Land of Sky Regional Council or via

Zoom: https://zoom.us/j/91373453789
Voting Members on the Committee: Jessica Morris (City of Asheville, Vice-Chair), William High (Buncombe County), Autumn Radcliff (Henderson County), Anthony Sutton (Town of Waynesville), Elizabeth Teague (Town of Waynesville, Chair), Jerry Vehaun (Town of Woodfin), Archie Pertiller (Town of Black Mountain)

| 1. | Welcome and Introductions | Elizabeth Teague |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Public Comment | Elizabeth Teague |
| 3. | Approval of August, 2023 Meeting <br> Minutes | Elizabeth Teague |
| 4. | Business |  |
| A. P 7.0 Submittals | Tristan Winkler, MPO Staff |  |
| B. | I-40 Widening Discussion | Tristan Winkler, MPO Staff |
| 5. | News, Events, Updates | Elizabeth Teague |
| 6. | Public Comment | Elizabeth Teague |
| 7. | Adjournment | Elizabeth Teague |

## Item 4A

## P 7.0 Submittals

## What is P 7.0 and the Prioritization Process?

The Prioritization Process (aka SPOT) is the process that determines the majority of capital improvement projects funded through NCDOT and NCDOT's allotment of federal funds. The process is governed by the Strategic Transportation Investments (STI) Law of 2012 that provides the framework for a more data-driven and transparent process that also utilizes local input from NCDOT Divisions, MPOs, and RPOs. In relation to other aspects of transportation planning, the prioritization process serves as the bridge to determine what long-range needs are funded in the TIP/STIP for implementation.


P 7.0 refers to the seventh iteration of the prioritization process in North Carolina and will be the process that determines what new projects are funded in the 2026-2035 TIP/STIP.

Discussion Points for September Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting

- Potential schedule changes
- Revenue projections and the need for potential submittal changes as a result
- Public engagement


## What is the Schedule for Events in P 7.0?

| Date | Event |
| :--- | :--- |
| July, 2023 | Local Government Discussions on Potential Submittals |
| August, 2023 | Draft Submittal List (Board Action Required) |
| August- <br> September, 2023 | Public Comment on Draft Submittal List |
| September, 2023 | Final Submittal List (Board Action Required) |
| February, 2024 | Data Review |
| March, 2024 | Local Input Point Methodology Adoption (Board Action <br> Required) |
| April, 2024 | Statewide Mobility Projects Programmed |
| May, 2024 | Draft Local Input Point Assignment for Regional Impact <br> Projects |
| May-June, 2024 | Public Comment on Draft Local Input Point Assignment for <br> Regional Impact Projects |
| June, 2024 | Final Local Input Point Assignment for Regional Impact <br> Projects |
| August, 2024 | Regional Impact Projects Programmed |
| October, 2024 | Draft Local Input Point Assignment for Division Needs Projects |
| October- <br> November, 2024 | Public Comment on Draft Local Input Point Assignment for <br> Division Needs Projects |
| November, 2024 | Final Local Input Point Assignment for Division Needs Projects |
| February, 2025 | Draft 2026-2035 TIP/STIP Released |
| August, 2025 | Final 2026-2035 TIP/STIP (Board Action Required) |

NOTE: MPO Staff has been informed the deadline for submittals may be moved back one month.

## Revenue Projections

NCDOT provided revenue projections for P 7.0 Notably this includes a negative balance for Region G (the FBRMPO \& LOSRPO's region.)

| Funding |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | Including <br> Budget <br> Lookback <br> Law minus <br> DA Funding <br> (starting <br> budget) | Amount of <br> STI <br> Committed <br> Projects | Remaining <br> Available <br> Budget for <br> P7.0 |
| Statewide | $\$ 11.6 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 7.7 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 3.9 \mathrm{~B}$ |
| Region A | $\$ 796 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 756 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 40 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Region B | $\$ 1.108 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 1.074 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 34 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Region C | $\$ 2.4 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 1.1 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 1.3 \mathrm{~B}$ |
| Region D | $\$ 1.477 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 864.5 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 613 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Region E | $\$ 2.54 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 2.48 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 64 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Region F | $\$ 1.28 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 1.05 \mathrm{~B}$ | $\$ 230 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Region G | $\$ 884 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 958 \mathrm{M}$ | $-\$ 74 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 1 | $\$ 806 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 763 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 43 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 2 | $\$ 826 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 881 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$-55 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 3 | $\$ 714 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 753 \mathrm{M}$ | $-\$ 39 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 4 | $\$ 682 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 656 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 26 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 5 | $\$ 518 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 502 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 16 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 6 | $\$ 660 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 461 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 199 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 7 | $\$ 681 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 434 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 247 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 8 | $\$ 831 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 757 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 74 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 9 | $\$ 692 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 587 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 103 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 10 | $\$ 473 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 502 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$-29 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 11 | $\$ 853 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 956 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$-103 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 12 | $\$ 821 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 705 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 116 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 13 | $\$ 748 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 643 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 105 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Division 14 | $\$ 753 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 555 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 198 \mathrm{M}$ |

## Public Engagement

## When Will Public Comment Be Open on Draft Submittals?

Wednesday, September $6^{\text {th }}-$ Wednesday, September $20^{\text {th }}$
NOTE: will extend the window if SPOT deadlines change

## Public Comment Procedures

Via Email, Phone, or In-Person/Zoom at the MPO Board meeting on September $21^{\text {st }}$. The comment period has been advertised in the Mountain Xpress with materials available on the MPO website.

Carryover Projects

| TIP | Route / Facility / Project Name | From / Cross Street / Location | To / Cross Street | Specific Improvemen t Type | County(ies) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}- \\ 0010 \mathrm{AB} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I-26, US 19, US } \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | US 25 / 70 (Weaver Boulevard) | SR 2207 <br> (North <br> Buncombe <br> School Road) | 17 - Upgrade Freeway to Interstate Standards | Buncombe |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A- } \\ & 0010 \mathrm{~A} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I-26, US 19, US } \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | SR 2207 <br> (North <br> Buncombe <br> School Road) | South of SR 2148 (Stockton Branch Road) | 17 - Upgrade Freeway to Interstate Standards | Buncombe |
| I-6018 | I-40 | I-240, US 74 Alternate |  | 8 - Improve Interchange | Buncombe |
| I-6021 | I-40 | SR 2838 (Porters Cove Road) - Exit 55 |  | 8 - Improve Interchange | Buncombe |
|  | US 19 (Smokey Park Highway), US 23 | I-40 | NC 151 <br> (Pisgah <br> Highway) | 11 - Access Management | Buncombe |
| U-6046 | NC 81 (SWANNANOA RIVER ROAD) | US 70 (Tunnel Road) | US 74 (South Tunnel Road) | $16-$ <br> Modernize Roadway | Buncombe |
| U-6162 | SR 1332 <br> (NORTH <br> LOUISIANA <br> AVENUE) | US 19-23 <br> (Patton <br> Avenue) | SR 1338 (Emma Road) | 16 - <br> Modernize Roadway | Buncombe |
| I-6054C | I-40 | SR 1200 (Wiggins Road), Exit 37 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SR } 1224 \\ & \text { (Monte Vista } \\ & \text { Road) } \end{aligned}$ | 1 - Widen Existing Roadway | Buncombe |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { U- } \\ 3403 \mathrm{~B} \end{gathered}$ | NC 191 (BREVARD ROAD - OLD HAYWOOD ROAD) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SR } 3498 \\ & \text { (LEDBETTER } \\ & \text { ROAD) } \end{aligned}$ | North of Blue Ridge Parkway | 1 - Widen Existing Roadway | Buncombe |
| U-5972 | NC 63 (New Leicester Highway | US 19/23 Patton Ave | Newfound Road | 25 - Improve Multiple Intersections along a corridor | Buncombe |


| TIP | Route / Facility / Project Name | From / Cross Street / Location | To / Cross Street | Specific Improvemen t Type | County(ies) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-2513C | $\mathrm{I}-26$ | I-40/I-240 |  | 8 -Improve Interchange | Buncombe |
| U-5837 | SR-2002 <br> Riceville Road | US 70 (Tunnel Road) | SR 2285 (Clear Vista Lane) | 16- <br> Modernize <br> Roadway | Buncombe |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{U}- \\ 5971 \mathrm{~B} \end{gathered}$ | US 19 (Patton Avenue) | NC 63 (New Leicester Highway). Construct Final Intersection Improvements. |  | 10 - Improve Intersection | BUNCOMB E |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { U- } \\ \text { 2801AA } \end{gathered}$ | US 25A (SWEETEN CREEK ROAD) | US 25 <br> (Hendersonvill e Road) | Mills Gap Road | 1 - Widen Existing Roadway | BUNCOMB E |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { U- } \\ 3403 \mathrm{~A} \end{gathered}$ | NC 191 (Brevard Road / Old Haywood Road) | NC 280 (BOYLSTON HIGHWAY) | TO SR 3498 (LEDBETTER ROAD) | 1 - Widen Existing Roadway | Buncombe, Henderson |
|  | NC 280 (Airport Road) | SR 3568 (Rockwood Road) | US 25 <br> (Hendersonvill <br> e Road) | 11 - Access Management | Buncombe, Henderson |
| U-6173 | US 25, US 70 | Approximately 1760' North of SR 1584 (Tillery Branch Road) | SR 1727 <br> (Monticello <br> Road) | 25 - Improve Multiple Intersections along Corridor | Buncombe, Madison |
| I-6054A | I-40 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NC } 215 \text { - Exit } \\ & 31 \end{aligned}$ | US 74 - Exit 27 | 1 - Widen Existing Roadway | Haywood |


| TIP | Route / Facility / Project Name | From / Cross Street / Location | To / Cross Street | Specific Improvemen t Type | County(ies) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U-6160 | US 19 (Soco Road) | SR 1304 (Fie Top Road) at Ghost Town in the Sky | Blue Ridge Parkway | 16 - <br> Modernize <br> Roadway | Haywood |
| I-6054B | I-40 | NC 215 (Champion Drive) | SR 1200 (Wiggins Road) | 1 - Widen Existing Roadway | Haywood, Buncombe |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { U- } \\ \text { 6172A } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { US 23/US } 74 \\ & \text { (GREAT } \\ & \text { SMOKEY } \\ & \text { MOUNTAINS } \\ & \text { EXPRESSWAY } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ \text { 1777(Balsam } \\ \text { View Drive) } \end{gathered}$ | SR 1158 (Old Balsam Rd) | 16 - <br> Modernize Roadway | Haywood, Jackson |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{U}- \\ \text { 6172B } \end{gathered}$ | US 23/US 74 (GREAT SMOKEY MOUNTAINS EXPRESSWAY ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ \text { 1777(Balsam } \\ \text { View Drive) } \end{gathered}$ | SR 1158 (Old Balsam Rd) | $16 \text { - }$ <br> Modernize Roadway | Haywood, Jackson |
| I-4400A | $\mathrm{I}-26$ | US 25 | US 64 (Four Seasons Boulevard) | 1 - Widen Existing Roadway | Henderson |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { R- } \\ 2588 \mathrm{~A} \end{gathered}$ | NC 191 | US 25 (Asheville Highway) | SR 1381 (Mountain Road) | 1 - Widen Existing Roadway | Henderson |
|  | SR 1508 <br> (Signal Hill <br> Road), SR 1519 <br> (Thompson <br> Street), SR <br> 1508 (Berkeley <br> Road), SR 1511 <br> (Berkeley Road) | US 64 (Four <br> Seasons <br> Boulevard) | US 25 Business (Asheville Highway) | 16 - <br> Modernize <br> Roadway | Henderson |
|  | SR 1525 <br> (Duncan Hill Road) | US 64 (Four <br> Seasons <br> Boulevard | Signal Hill Road | 16 - <br> Modernize <br> Roadway | Henderson |
| U-6124 | NC 280 (BOYLSTON HIGHWAY) | NC 191 <br> Northern Intersection (Old Haywood Road) | NC 191 <br> Southern Intersection (Haywood Road) | 11 - Access <br> Management | Henderson |


| TIP | Route / Facility <br> / Project Name | From / Cross <br> Street $/$ <br> Location | To / Cross <br> Street | Specific <br> Improvemen <br> t Type | County(ies) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R-5748 | SR 1127 <br> (KANUGA <br> ROAD) | US 25 <br> Business <br> (Church Street) | Price Road | $16-$ <br> Modernize <br> Roadway | Henderson |

Modification of carryover projects:

- Kanuga Road (R-5748) modified southern termini from Little River Road to Price Road to avoid impacts to the Flat Rock Historic District
- No projects requested to be removed

New Highway Submittals

| Route | From | To | Improvement Type | County | Funding Tier |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 25 (Hendersonvill e Road) | Blue Ridge Parkway | NC 146 (Long Shoals Road) | Access Management | Buncombe | Regional Impact |
| US 25 <br> (Hendersonvill e Road) | NC 146 (Long Shoals Road) | NC 280 (Airport Road) | Access Management | Buncombe | Regional Impact |
| US 25 <br> (McDowell <br> Street)/Biltmor <br> e Avenue | Vanderbilt Road | College Street | Roadway UpgradeUnbalanced Couplet with Bike Lanes | Buncombe | Regional Impact |
| US 70 (Tunnel Road)/US 74A (South Tunnel Road) | Beaucatche r Tunnel | NC 81 (Swannano a River Road) | Roadway UpgradeRoad Diet on US 70 with Access Management Improvements on US 74A | Buncombe | Regional Impact |
| US 70 (Tunnel Road) | I-240 | Blue Ridge Parkway | Access Management | Buncombe | Regional Impact |
| US 25 <br> (Merrimon <br> Avenue)/US 19 <br> Business <br> (Weaverville Highway) | Elkmont Road | New Stock Road | Modernization | Buncombe | Regional Impact |
| US 25 (Merrimon Avenue) | WT Weaver Boulevard | Beaverdam Road | Modernization - improve intersections and sidewalks | Buncombe | Regional Impact |
| US 25 (Merrimon Avenue) | I-240 | WT Weaver Boulevard | Road Diet | Buncombe | Regional Impact |
| US 70 (West State Street) | Blue Ridge Road | NC 9 | Road Diet | Buncombe | Regional Impact |


| Route | From | To | Improvement Type | County | Funding Tier |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blue Ridge Road | NC 9 | Blue Ridge Assembly Road | Modernization | Buncombe | Division Needs |
| Reems Creek Road | US 19 Business (Weaverville Highway) | Ox Creek Road | Modernization | Buncombe | Division Needs |
| Cane Creek Road | US 74 Alternative (Charlotte Highway) | Mills Gap Road | Modernization | Buncombe | Division Needs |
| Old Fort Road | US 74 <br> Alternative <br> (Charlotte <br> Highway) | Whitaker Road | Modernization | Buncombe | Division Needs |
| Sand Hill Road | Sand Hill <br> School <br> Road | - | Intersection Improvement | Buncombe | Division Needs |
| US 19/23 (Park Street) | Bridge Street | NC 215 | Modernization | Haywood | Regional Impact |
| US 19 (Carolina Boulevard) | Smathers Street | Pleasant Hill Road | Access Management | Haywood | Regional Impact |
| US 19 (Dellwood Road) | Dayton Drive | US 23/74 | Access <br> Management | Haywood | Regional Impact |
| US 276 | Raccoon Road | NC 110 | Modernization | Haywood | Regional Impact |
| US 25 Business (Asheville Highway) | N Main Street | - | Intersection Improvement | Henderson | Regional Impact |
| US 25 Business (Asheville Highway) | Butler Bridge Road | - | Intersection Improvement | Henderson | Regional Impact |
| US 176 (Spartanburg Highway) | NC 225 | Upward Road | Access <br> Management | Henderson | Regional Impact |
| US 64 <br> (Chimney <br> Road Road) | Fruitland Road | Gilliam Mountain Road | Modernization | Henderson | Regional Impact |


| Route | From | To | Improvement <br> Type | County | Funding <br> Tier |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fanning Bridge <br> Road | US 25 | NC 280 | Improve <br> Multiple <br> Intersections | Henderson | Division <br> Needs |
| White Pine <br> Drive | US 64 | Hebron <br> Road | Modernization | Henderson | Division <br> Needs |
| Blythe Street | US 64 | NC 191 | Modernization | Henderson | Division <br> Needs |
| NC 213 | Athletic <br> Street | Gabriel's <br> Creek Road | Access <br> Management | Madison | Regional <br> Impact |

## New Bike/Ped Submittals

All Bike/Ped Submittals are evaluated at the Division Needs Category

| Route | From | To | Project Description | County |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bent Creek <br> Greenway <br> (Hominy <br> Creek/WNC <br> Farmer's Market <br> Segment) | Hominy Creek <br> Greenway | French Broad <br> River <br> Greenway | 2 - Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Buncombe |
| SR 1338 (Emma <br> Road) | Boone Street | SR 1332 (North <br> Louisiana <br> Avenue) | 7 - Protected Linear <br> Pedestrian Facility <br> (Pedestrian) | Buncombe |
| SR 2500 (North <br> Blue Ridge Road) | US 70 | Fortune St | 7 - Protected Linear <br> Pedestrian Facility <br> (Pedestrian) | Buncombe |
| Reems Creek <br> Greenway | Quarry Road | Karpen Soccer <br> Field | 2 - Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Buncombe |
| US 19/23 | Bridge Street | Chestnut <br> Mountain <br> Road | $2-$ Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Haywood |
| Champion Drive | N Canton Road | Thickety Road | $2-$ Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Haywood |
| Richland Creek <br> Greenway | Current Richland <br> Creek Greenway <br> termini near <br> Waynesville Rec <br> Center | Waynesville <br> Greenway | 2-Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Haywood |
| Gaynesville | Junaluska <br> Elementary <br> School | $2-$ Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Haywood |  |
| Greenway | Greenway |  |  |  |


| Route | From | To | Project Description | County |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Above the Mud <br> Greenway <br> Connector | Ecusta Trail | Oklawaha <br> Greenway | 2 - Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Henderson |
| Mills River Valley <br> Trail | NC 191 | NC 191 | $2-$ Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Henderson |
| Oklawaha <br> Greenway <br> Extension | Oklawaha <br> Greenway <br> Southern Termini | Blue Ridge <br> Community <br> College | $2-$ Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Henderson |
| Allen Branch <br> Greenway | US 64 | Clear Creek <br> Greenway | $2-$ Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Henderson |
| Brooklyn Avenue | NC 225 | Old <br> Spartanburg <br> Highway | 7 - Protected Linear <br> Pedestrian Facility <br> (Pedestrian) | Henderson |
| Church \& King <br> Street | US 176 | N Main Street | $8-$ Multi-Site <br> Pedestrian Facility <br> (Pedestrian) | Henderson |
| Fanning Bridge <br> Road | Underwood Road | US 25 | $2-$ Off- <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Henderson |
| Bailey/Banjo <br> Branch Greenway | Dr. Otis T Duck <br> Greenway <br> Northern Termini <br> Road/Separated Linear <br> Bicycle Facility <br> (Bicycle) | Bailey Street | Madison | Braf- |

## New Transit Submittals

| Route / <br> Facility <br> Project <br> Name | From / Cross <br> Street / <br> Location | Description | Specific <br> Improvement Type | County(ies) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Transit <br> Maintenance <br> Facility | City of Asheville <br> Service Area. <br> Location is yet <br> unknown. | Construct a new <br> maintenance facility in order <br> to accommodate additional <br> vehicles and address current <br> maintenance facility capacity <br> through a facility assessment. | 9- Facility - <br> Maintenance | Buncombe |
| Expansion <br> Vehicles | City of Asheville <br> Service Area | Ten (10) expansion vehicles <br> to match service in the <br> Transit Master Plan and <br> improve service throughout <br> the City by increasing <br> headways and implementing <br> new routes. | 1- Mobility (route- <br> specific) - New <br> Service | Buncombe |
| Transit | City of Asheville <br> Service Area <br> and routes <br> provided by <br> ART <br> Current transit <br> facility is 49 <br> Coxe Ave | Construct a new transit <br> multimodal facility to <br> accommodation vehicles that <br> pick-up and drop transit <br> riders. | 5-Facility - <br> Passenger Station | Buncombe |
| Facility |  |  |  |  |

## New Rail Submittals

| Route | From | To | Improvement <br> Type | County(ies) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Norfolk <br> Southern Line | NC 251 <br> (Riverside <br> Drive) | - | $3-$ Highway- <br> Rail Crossing <br> Improvement | Buncombe |
| Norfolk <br> Southern Line | Asheville (near <br> Biltmore <br> Village) | Salisbury | 5- Passenger <br> Rail Service | Buncombe, <br> McDowell, <br> Burke, <br> Catawba, <br> Iredell, Rowan |

## Item 4B:

## I-40 Widening Discussion

There are three sections of the I-6054 project:
Section A: US 23/74 (Smokey Mountain Expressway) to NC 215 (Champion Drive)
Section B: NC 215 (Champion Drive) to Exit 37 (Wiggins Road)
Section C: Exit 37 (Wiggins Road) to Monte Vista Road

## Topic for Discussion

Each of these projects are currently in P 7.0 as carryover widening projects. The topic for today's discussion is to consider requesting the I-6054 project move forward as a managed lanes project.

## Information from FHWA:

## What Are HOT Lanes?

Traditional high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes require passenger vehicles to have a minimum number of passengers. "HOT" lanes is short for "high-occupancy toll" lanes. HOT lanes are HOV lanes that allow vehicles that don't meet occupancy requirements to pay a toll to use the lane. Variable pricing is used to manage the lane so that reliable performance is maintained at all times. HOT lanes have proven to be more efficient than traditional HOV lanes. In addition, in many cases the adjacent General Purpose lanes also benefit from the resulting reallocation of vehicles in the corridor. While communities may call them by different names, such as Fast Lanes or Express Lanes, the basic operation is the same-HOT lanes encourage carpooling and other transit alternatives while offering vehicles that do not meet standard occupancy requirements another option.

What Are the Benefits of HOT Lanes?


Future I-495 Express Lane, Virginia
HOT lanes provide mobility options for individual drivers while encouraging the use of transit and carpooling. Tolls collected from HOT lanes can supplement the operations, enforcement and maintenance costs for the facilities. Even buses benefit from HOT lanes-research shows that communities with HOT lanes are often able to increase transit service as was the case with I-15 in San Diego. Solo drivers know they can count on getting where they need to be on time.

For example, Minneapolis has increased the number of vehicles using the I-394 MnPASS lanes by 33 percent since the facility's opening in 2005 without degrading transit and HOV use.
Furthermore, travel speeds of 50 to 55 mph have been maintained for 95 percent of the time in the lanes. Denver originally projected 500 toll payers during the peak hour travel along I- 25 but in fact achieved 1,400 in the first year of operation. Use of the I-25 HOT lanes has grown by almost 18 percent since the HOT lanes opened in 2006 and the lanes remain uncongested. Additionally, transit ridership in the HOT lanes has remained high.

## Why Charge Travelers for Using Roadways?

By charging travelers for use of roadways, agencies can help mitigate traffic congestion while generating revenues to supplement operating costs. Common sense dictates that for a user to be willing to pay for a service, then he/she must benefit in some way from it. For priced facility users, this benefit is most likely travel-time savings or reliable travel. Often, a priced facility will offer a more reliable trip than an adjacent or nearby route. Drivers can choose to use the priced facility if they judge the travel-time savings worth paying the requisite toll.

Do HOT Lanes Help the Environment?


I-25 Express Lane, Denver
Like their HOV counterparts, HOT lanes have the potential to help improve air quality where they are implemented. High-occupancy lanes might help to reduce harmful impacts to the environment associated with congestion, especially by encouraging the use of multi-passenger vehicles or mass transit systems. On SR 167 in Seattle, general purpose lane speeds increased 10 percent and HOT lane speeds increased 7-8 percent and transit ridership increased 16 percent from the year before implementation of the HOT lane. As a result, the federal government allows HOV lanes to be considered a transportation control measure (TCM) for air quality conformity analysis.

## Why Are Variable Tolls Used for HOT Lanes?

Congestion pricing, or "variable pricing," changes the amount charged for road use based on demand. On a typical roadway, a flat toll would not be the optimal toll throughout the day. During off-peak periods it may be too high for drivers to benefit from paying it. Conversely, during times of peak demand, the toll may not be high enough to make optimal use of the facility. Variable pricing offers a solution to this problem by increasing the toll during periods of peak demand and reducing it during off-peak times.

## Who Is Implementing HOT Lanes?

Communities around the nation are installing HOT lanes in response to increased congestion. There are 10 HOT lanes currently operating in eight states:

- I-15 FasTrak in San Diego, California
- US 290 Northwest Freeway QuickRide HOT Lanes in Houston, Texas
- I-394 and I-35W MnPass in Minneapolis, Minnesota
- I-25 Express Lanes in Denver, Colorado
- I-15 Express Lanes in Salt Lake City, Utah
- SR 167 HOT Lanes Pilot Project in Seattle, Washington
- I-95 Express Lanes in Miami, Florida
- I-680, Alameda County, California
- I-85, Atlanta, Georgia

Where are HOT Lanes Operating?


HOT lanes have been implemented in eight states.

There are currently ten operating HOT lane projects for a total of over 100 miles in the U.S., and many states have projects in the planning stages. All of the operating projects were conversions of HOV lanes to HOT lanes, although some have extended the HOT lanes. The average length is approximately 12 miles.

## How are the Current Projects Operating?

The operating projects are either one- or two-lane facilities in each direction. Most strive to maintain speeds of at least 45 miles per hour. The variable toll ranges from $\$ 0.25$ in the off-peak to $\$ 9.00$ in heavily congested periods.

## What does the Public Think about HOT Lanes?

The operating projects enjoy support from both users and non-users. While most people don't use the HOT lane every day, research shows that travelers like having a choice in their travel options. On I-25 in Denver, 62 percent of survey respondents say they use the Express Lanes because it saves time. Likewise in Houston, focus group respondents thought that using the HOT lane saved them as much as 50 percent of total commute travel time. Reliability is also often cited as a benefit of the HOT lane. In San Diego and Miami, users there want the projects expanded.

What about Equity? Are HOT Lanes More of a Burden on Lower-Income Drivers?


I-394 MnPass

Research on I-394, SR 167, and I-15 indicates that drivers of all socioeconomic backgrounds support HOT lanes. In fact, data from the San Diego Association of Governments indicate that the lowest income group expressed stronger support from the project than the highest income group. Research shows that people of all income levels support HOT lanes. Users of all incomes see the value in having a reliable trip when they need it. A 2004-2006 longitudinal panel survey of I-394 residents in Minnesota found support levels at over 60 percent for the congestion priced HOT lane. This number varies only slightly when sorted by income levels, gender, and education levels, suggesting that the arrangement is perceived as equitable. I-15 in San Diego had a 77 percent approval rating after opening with nominal differences between high and low income users. Specific focus groups of low-income travelers in Washington found that low income drivers are typically as supportive, if not more supportive, of the HOT lanes concept than other drivers.

## Data:

Hours of Delay For the Five-County (Buncombe, Haywood, Henderson, Madison, and Transylvania) Area with 2023 Projected Through End of Year

Total Hours of Regional Delay (INRIX)
Five-County Region


Hours of Delay By County for 2023:


Top-10 Bottleneck in the Five-County Area - August, 2023

| Rank | Route | Location |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $\mathrm{I}-40 \mathrm{WB}$ | Exit 27 |
| 2 | $\mathrm{I}-26 \mathrm{WB}$ | NC 146 |
| 3 | $\mathrm{I}-26 \mathrm{~EB}$ | NC 280 |
| 4 | $\mathrm{I}-26 \mathrm{WB}$ | NC 280 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{I}-26 \mathrm{~EB}$ | US 64 |
| 6 | $\mathrm{I}-40 \mathrm{WB}$ | Exit 15 |
| 7 | $\mathrm{I}-26 \mathrm{WB}$ | NC 191 |
| 8 | US 25 NB | Beaverdam Road |
| 9 | $\mathrm{I}-40 \mathrm{~EB}$ | Exit 37 |
| 10 | $\mathrm{I}-40 \mathrm{WB}$ | Exit 37 |

Roadway Fatalities in the Five-County Area (36 Fatalities Reported Through June 30, 2023) *2023 Projected Based on Data Through June 30, 2023


Pedestrian Involved Fatalities in the Five-County Area (Two Fatalities Reported Through June 30, 2023) *2023 Projected Based on Data Through June 30, 2023


Bicycle-Involved Fatalities in the Five-County Area (Two Fatalities Reported Through June 30, 2023) *2023 Projected Based on Data Through June 30, 2023


