# French Broad River MPO Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting Minutes June 4th, 2025

# ATTENDANCE in Person or Remote **Voting Members**

Elizabeth Teague, Town of Waynesville William High, Buncombe County Jessica Morriss, City of Asheville Autumn Radcliff, Henderson County

Non-Voting Members
Tristan Winkler, FBRMPO
Sandy Broadwill, LOSRC
Daisy O'Conner, FBRMPO
Janna Bianculli, Henderson County
Mike Malecheck, Mills River
Lucy Crown, City of Asheville
Susan Bean

Hannah Bagli, FBRMPO Steve Williams, NCDOT Hannah Smith, NCDOT Joel Strickland,McAdams Stephen Sparks, NCDOT Emily Scott-Cruz, McAdams Troy Wilson. NCDOT

#### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Elizabeth Teague started the meeting at 9:35AM with introductions. A quorum was announced, and roll was called.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

John Hunter

Elizabeth Teague opened the floor for public comment. No comments were heard.

#### APPROVAL of May 2025 MEETING MINUTES AND AGENDA

Jessica Morriss moved to approve the May 2025 Meeting Minutes and agenda.

Autumn Radcliff seconded the motion which passed unanimously upon a roll call vote.

#### **BUSINESS**

# 4A: Elevate 2050/MTP Update

Elevate 2050, or the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update, is a federally required planning document that MPOs are required to update and maintain to reflect planned transportation investments in the region over the next twenty-five years. The MTP is required to be fiscally constrained, meaning that projects in the MTP have to be reasonably expected to work within projected revenues. The French Broad River MPO is required to update its MTP every five years with the last update completed in September 2020 (not including amendments).

#### **Items for Today:**

- Final Fiscally Constrained Project List Alternatives
- Phase 4 Public Meetings
- Timeline Update

# **Final Fiscally Constrained Project List Alternatives:**

After collecting input from the Steering Committee and the public, the project team developed three funding alternatives for each STI Tier. It is important to note that the mixture of projects affects the fiscal constraints/programmed projects. Also, note that there are some categories that have more flexibility than others. The "Total Available" funding does not change from one Alternative to the next. "Total Available" represents the fiscal constraints approved earlier in the process 1.

In each Alternative, there are benefits and tradeoffs. The high-level descriptions of different Alternatives are described below with the summary table showing the total amount of funding programmed by scenario. While Alternative A shows all tiers of funding in one table, it is also important to note that if the Prioritization Subcommittee prefers funding projects in Alternative A – Statewide Mobility but prefers the Alternative B – Regional Impact projects, a mixture of alternatives can be combined to create the final fiscally constrained project list.

1 Due to the recent trend of project cost estimates increasing, there are multiple STI Tiers across the alternatives that have a significant amount of money unprogrammed to buffer for cost increases.

#### Alternative A:

- A Statewide: Prioritizes I-26 projects
- A Regional Impact: Prioritizes decommitted STIP projects along with key segments of Sweeten Creek
- A Division Needs + Discretionary: Prioritizes defunded STIP projects, previous P7 submittals, and high scoring projects

| 2029-2035                   |                 |               |     |                  |    |            |  |  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|------------------|----|------------|--|--|
|                             | Total Available |               | Tot | Total Programmed |    | Difference |  |  |
| Discretionary (Bike Ped)    | \$ 31,115,026   |               | \$  | \$ 24,830,245    |    | 6,284,781  |  |  |
|                             |                 |               |     |                  |    |            |  |  |
| 2036-2050                   |                 |               |     |                  |    |            |  |  |
| Statewide Mobility          | \$              | 1,031,348,624 | \$  | 971,695,000      | \$ | 59,653,624 |  |  |
| Region G                    | \$              | 457,991,652   | \$  | 457,346,190      | \$ | 645,462    |  |  |
| Division 13 (bike/ped, 10%) | \$              | 41,119,171    | \$  | 40,686,400       | \$ | 432,771    |  |  |
| Division 13 (roadway, 90%)  | \$              | 370,072,541   | \$  | 367,024,465      | \$ | 3,048,076  |  |  |
| Division 14 (bike/ped 10%)  | \$              | 36,087,009    | \$  | 34,785,077       | \$ | 1,301,932  |  |  |
| Division 14 (roadway, 90%)  | \$              | 324,783,088   | \$  | 319,417,013      | \$ | 5,366,075  |  |  |
| Discretionary               | \$              | 64,280,078    | \$  | 64,302,495       | \$ | (22,417)   |  |  |
| Maintenance                 | \$              | 322,333,953   | \$  | 322,333,953      | \$ | -          |  |  |

# Alternative B:

- B Statewide Mobility: Prioritizes I-40 projects and excludes I-26 projects
- **B Regional Impact:** Prioritizes defunded STIP projects, segments of Sweeten Creek, and key roads across the region, giving greater geographic distribution of projects.
- **B Division Needs + Discretionary:** Prioritizes defunded projects as well as higher cost priority projects identified through P7 and MTP scoring

| 2029-2035                  |                                  |               |            |               |    |           |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|----|-----------|--|--|--|
|                            | Total Available Total Programmed |               | Difference |               |    |           |  |  |  |
| Discretionary (Bike Ped)   | \$                               | \$ 31,115,026 |            | \$31,376,468  |    | (261,442) |  |  |  |
|                            |                                  |               |            |               |    |           |  |  |  |
| 2036-2050                  |                                  |               |            |               |    |           |  |  |  |
| Statewide Mobility         | \$                               | 1,031,348,624 | \$         | 1,030,620,091 | \$ | 728,533   |  |  |  |
| Region G                   | \$                               | 457,991,652   | \$         | 455,642,940   | \$ | 2,348,712 |  |  |  |
| Division 13 (bike/ped, 10% | \$                               | 41,119,171    | \$         | 40,961,642    | \$ | 157,529   |  |  |  |
| Division 13 (roadway, 90%) | \$                               | 370,072,541   | \$         | 370,111,166   | \$ | (38,625)  |  |  |  |
| Division 14 (bike/ped 10%) | \$                               | 36,087,009    | \$         | 36,038,077    | \$ | 48,932    |  |  |  |
| Division 14 (roadway, 90%) | \$                               | 324,783,088   | \$         | 323,058,866   | \$ | 1,724,222 |  |  |  |
| Discretionary              | \$                               | 64,280,078    | \$         | 64,556,566    | \$ | (276,488) |  |  |  |
| Maintenance                | \$                               | 322,333,953   | \$         | 322,333,953   | \$ | -         |  |  |  |

### Alternative C:

- C Statewide Mobility: Funds priority sections of I-26 and I-40 while keeping defunded STIP projects in the Statewide Mobility Tier in the Elevate 2050 horizon years. Focuses on interchanges on I-26.
- C Regional Impact: Prioritizes defunded projects and high scoring, low-cost projects while maintaining P7 priorities.
- C Division Needs + Discretionary: Prioritizes defunded projects and high scoring, lower cost projects throughout the region.

| 2029-2035                   |                 |               |                  |               |            |           |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
|                             | Total Available |               | Total Programmed |               | Difference |           |  |  |  |
| Discretionary (Bike Ped)    | \$              | 31,115,026    | \$               | 31,080,328    | \$         | 34,698    |  |  |  |
|                             |                 |               |                  |               |            |           |  |  |  |
| 2036-2050                   |                 |               |                  |               |            |           |  |  |  |
| Statewide Mobility          | \$              | 1,031,348,624 | \$               | 1,031,203,821 | \$         | 144,803   |  |  |  |
| Region G                    | \$              | 457,991,652   | \$               | 456,638,025   | \$         | 1,353,627 |  |  |  |
| Division 13 (bike/ped, 10%) | \$              | 41,119,171    | \$               | 40,722,853    | \$         | 396,318   |  |  |  |
| Division 13 (roadway, 90%)  | \$              | 370,072,541   | \$               | 369,832,371   | \$         | 240,170   |  |  |  |
| Division 14 (bike/ped 10%)  | \$              | 36,087,009    | \$               | 35,251,217    | \$         | 835,792   |  |  |  |
| Division 14 (roadway, 90%)  | \$              | 324,783,088   | \$               | 321,921,003   | \$         | 2,862,085 |  |  |  |
| Discretionary               | \$              | 64,280,078    | \$               | 64,014,715    | \$         | 265,363   |  |  |  |
| Maintenance                 | \$              | 322,333,953   | \$               | 322,333,953   | \$         | -         |  |  |  |

# Alternative D:

- **D Statewide Mobility**: Mix of I-26, I-40, and Four Seasons Interchange and funds a railroad crossing on Riverside Dr.
  - **D Regional Impact:** Funds priorities including portions of Sweeten Creek, Asheville Highway, NC 215, US 19/23, US 176. Other Regional Impact projects are funded via cascading projects (Swannanoa River Road, US 64, US 19/23 in Haywood) through Division Needs.
  - **D-Division Needs + Discretionary:** Funds cascaded Regional Impact projects (Swannanoa River Road, US 64, US 19/23 in Haywood) and prioritizes P7 projects and key regional connections for bike/ped infrastructure.

|                             |                 | 202           | 29-203 | 5            |            |             |  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|--------------|------------|-------------|--|
|                             | Total Available |               |        | Programmed   | Difference |             |  |
| Discretionary (Bike Ped)    | \$              | 31,115,026    |        | \$31,000,000 | \$         | 115,026     |  |
|                             |                 |               |        |              |            |             |  |
|                             |                 | 203           | 6-205  | 0            |            |             |  |
| Statewide Mobility          | \$              | 1,031,348,624 | S      | 982,769,000  | \$         | 48,579,624  |  |
| Region G                    | \$              | 457,991,652   | \$     | 455,856,000  | \$         | 2,135,652   |  |
| Division 13 (bike/ped, 10%) | \$              | 41,119,171    | S      | 23,181,000   | \$         | 17,938,171  |  |
| Division 13 (roadway, 90%)  | \$              | 370,072,541   | \$     | 322,100,000  | \$         | 47,972,541  |  |
| Division 14 (bike/ped 10%)  | \$              | 36,087,009    | \$     | 23,100,000   | \$         | 12,987,009  |  |
| Division 14 (roadway, 90%)  | \$              | 324,783,088   | \$     | 205,770,900  | \$         | 119,012,188 |  |
| Discretionary               | \$              | 95,395,104    | \$     | 80,500,000   | \$         | 14,895,104  |  |
| Maintenance                 | \$              | 322,333,953   | \$     | 322,333,953  | \$         | -           |  |

Any mixture of alternatives can be blended to arrive at a recommended fiscally constrained project list. In other words, if the Steering Committee prefers the projects in Alternative A – Statewide Mobility but Alternative B – Regional Impact and Alternative C – Division Needs, we can finalize the list for TCC and Board accordingly so that those projects are represented.

\*\* See agenda for project lists (

#### **Phase 4 Public Engagement:**

The fourth phase of Public Engagement kicks off in July. There will be three public meetings held. This phase will provide an opportunity for comment on the fiscally constrained project list and the draft Elevate 2050 plan. The following dates/times are set for the public meetings:

- Monday, July 7<sup>th</sup> from 4-8PM at the Dr. Wesley Grant Sr. Southside Center (285 Livingston St., Asheville, NC 28801)
- **Tuesday, July 8<sup>th</sup> from 4-8PM** at the Mills River Town Hall (124 Town Center Drive, Mills River, NC 28759)
- Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup> from 4-8PM at Waynesville Town Hall (16 S Main St, Waynesville, NC 28786)

#### **Timeline Update:**

- June 27 July 18, 2025: Draft Elevate 2050 Plan available for Public Comment
- July 28 August 25, 2025: Final Elevate 2050 Plan available for Public Comment
- September 3, 2025: Prioritization Subcommittee recommends Elevate 2050 for adoption by FBRMPO Board
- September 18, 2025: FBRMPO Board adopts Elevate 2050

Discussion occurred around the alternatives for statewide mobility and the I26 connector. More context was given between Alt C and Alt D of statewide mobility. Discussion around park and rides as part of 40 widening. More discussion around differences between Alt C and Alt D of statewide mobility. Alt D for statewide was chosen. Lengthy discussion occurred about the alternate options for Regional Impact, including discussion on cascading projects in alt D. Discussion around only doing a smaller section of Sweeten Creek. Alt A double check for fiscal constraint. Discussion occurred around alt options for bike /ped + discretionary. Alternative D across all tiers is what we are proposing. This is a complicated process, limited money and we've generated a lot of projects as a region. So it's not a perfect plan but it allows us to allocate funding towards important projects.

Jessica Morriss moved to recommend approving the MTP Fiscally Restrained Project list decided today to the TCC and Board. Autumn Radcliff seconded and it passed by a roll call vote.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Elizabeth Teague opened the floor for public comment. No comments were heard.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Elizabeth Teague adjourned the meeting at 11: 30AM.