

**French Broad River MPO
Prioritization Subcommittee**

**Meeting Minutes
February 4th, 2026**

ATTENDANCE in Person or Remote

Voting Members

Archie Pertiller, Town of Black Mountain
Jessica Morriss, City of Asheville
William High, Buncombe County
Mark Endries, Town of Weaverville
Autumn Radcliff, Henderson County
Elizabeth Teague, Town of Waynesville

Non-Voting Members

Tristan Winkler, FBRMPO	Hannah Bagli, FBRMPO
Daisy O’Conner FBRMPO	Ada McGovern, FBRMPO
Stephen Sparks, NCDOT	Doug Phillips, NCDOT
Daniel Sellers, TPD	Michael Malecek, Mills River
Cody Weddle, NCDOT	Chloe Donohoe, Buncombe County
Vicki Eastland, LOSRPO	Janna Bianculli, Apple Country Transit
Troy Wilson, NCDOT	

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Autumn Radcliff started the meeting at 9:30AM with introductions. A quorum was announced, and roll was called.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Autumn Radcliff opened the floor for public comment. No comments were heard.

APPROVAL of January 2026 MEETING MINUTES AND AGENDA

Archie Pertiller moved to approve the January 2026 Meeting Minutes and agenda. Jessica Morriss seconded the motion which passed unanimously upon a roll call vote.

BUSINESS

4A: Local Input Point Methodology

What a Local Input Point Methodology Does

The Local Input Point (LIP) Methodology establishes how the MPO assigns its limited pool of local priority points as part of North Carolina's Transportation Prioritization (STI/SPOT) process.

Its purpose is to ensure that:

- Local priorities are reflected in a data-driven, transparent, and defensible way
- Projects are evaluated consistently across jurisdictions and modes
- The MPO meets NCDOT requirements for public involvement and objective decision-making

The methodology does not replace SPOT scoring. Instead, it governs how the MPO applies its discretionary points within the broader statewide framework.

Per State requirements, every local input point methodology is required to have at least one quantitative criteria and one qualitative criteria.

What Local Input Points Do

Local Input Points:

- Allow MPOs to reflect regional and community priorities that may not be fully captured by statewide models
- Provide a mechanism to recognize:
 - Multimodal connectivity
 - Local safety concerns
 - Equity, access, and regional networks

In practice, Local Input Points serve as a policy balancing tool, not a technical re-scoring of projects.

In the prioritization process, funding is split into three different tiers. Local Input Points play a different role in generating a total score for projects evaluated in each tier:

	Quantitative Score	MPO LIPs	Division LIPs
Statewide Mobility	100%	0%	0%
Regional Impact	70%	15%	15%
Division Needs	50%	25%	25%

Summary of Targeted Changes Under Consideration

MPO staff is not recommending a wholesale overhaul to the local input point methodology at this time. A few areas of potential changes include:

Highway Projects:

- Modify Safety Scoring Criteria to include the High Injury Network from the Safe Streets for WNC Plan

Bike/Ped Projects

- Add Safety as a component and include the Bike/Ped High Injury Network from the Safe Streets for WNC Plan
- Add the Hellbender Regional Trail as a scoring component to recognize projects that have

regional significance

Existing Methodology

The most recently approved methodology is available here:

https://frenchbroadrivermpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/FBRMPO-P7_Local_Input_Point_Methodology.pdf

Due Date

Final MPO Local Input Point Methodologies are due to NCDOT's SPOT office by the end of March.

Previous Discussion

The subcommittee requested MPO Staff do a trial scoring of P7 projects with the proposed changes. Draft Scores Will Be Provided Before the Meeting.

Highway Projects Consideration

- Status Quo: Maintain Current Methodology
 - PROS
 - No Changes!
 - CONS
 - Safety Scores Tend to Fluctuate Based on Five-Year Crash Histories
- Alternative 1: Modify Safety Scoring to Include the High Injury Network from the Safe Streets for WNC Plan
 - PROS
 - Ties Funding Considerations to the Safe Streets for WNC Plan
 - High Injury Network Routes Adds More Stability to Safety Scoring
 - CONS
 - More Complex
 - Limited Impact on Scoring

Bike/Ped Projects Consideration

- Status Quo: Maintain Current Methodology
 - PROS
 - Emphasizes a Project's Chances of Being Funded
 - Simple
 - CONS
 - Can Dismiss Projects That Score *Slightly* Lower
 - Not Tied to Regional Goals & Plans
- Alternative 1: Add the Bike/Ped High Injury Network from the Safe Streets for WNC Plan (15%), Add the Hellbender Regional Trail (10%), Reduce the SPOT Quantitative Score (50%)
 - PROS
 - Balances Safety & Regional Connectivity
 - Still Closely Tied to a Project's Chances of Being Funded
 - CONS
 - Gives a Slight Bump to More Expensive Projects
 - Most Complex Alternative
- Alternative 2: Add the Bike/Ped High Injury Network from the Safe Streets for WNC Plan (25%), Reduce the SPOT Quantitative Score (50%)
 - PROS
 - Heavily Emphasizes Safety
 - Still Closely Tied to a Project's Chances of Being Funded
 - CONS
 - Marginalizes Greenway/Trail Projects
 - Marginalizes Routes with Lower AADT, Fewer Destinations

Discussion occurred around reauthorizing the federal highway funds and what that might mean for future projects. It was suggested to just keep working with projects we already have and not introduce a new highway project. Discussion around High Injury Network Data and how it is compiled and if any projects are deficient. Discussion around the current DOT safety data. Consensus is that the Highway change is a good addition.

Discussion around the Bike Ped scoring being overwhelming because of how many changes there are. Further discussion around the scoring occurred. This was decided to be moved until next month.

No voting or motions were made, it was decided to move vote for bike/ped until next meeting and to change the highway projects consideration and send it to the TCC.

4B. 5310 Project Selection

Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) funds are allocated to the Asheville Urbanized Area, with the City of Asheville serving as the designated recipient for these funds. The application process for Section 5310 ran from October 16, 2025, to January 15, 2026. Additional information about Section 5310 is available at: <https://frenchbroadrivermpo.org/5310-and-jarc/>

FY2025 Call for Projects Application Timeline	
October 16, 2025	5310 and JARC Call for Projects opens
January 15, 2026	5310 and JARC applications due to FBRMPO
February 4, 2026	FBRMPO Prioritization Subcommittee meets to review 5310 and JARC applications
February, 12 2026	TCC approves 5310 and JARC project selection
February 19, 2026	MPO Board votes on 5310 and JARC project selection
March 19, 2026	MPO Board approves TIP Amendments for 5310 and JARC projects

The 5310 Grant has two categories for funding:

- Traditional/Capital projects: at least 55% of the total funding amount has to go to “traditional” projects.
- Other/Operations projects: no more than 45% of the total funding amount can go to these projects

FY 2024 FTA Section 5310 Funds Available to Asheville UZA	\$486,152	55% of Funds (Traditional)*	\$267,384
Section 5310 Admin at 10%	\$48,615	35% of Funds (Other)*	\$170,153
Remaining Section 5310 after Admin	\$437,537	*note: percentage divisions were calculated before 10% admin.	

MPO Staff reviewed the 5310 applications, rating them based on a scorecard (out of 100 points). The following pages show recommendations for awarding 5310 funds based on scores. The quantitative scoring methodology was simplified for this round of funding. The Prioritization Subcommittee will select a project award scenario for recommendation to the Technical

Coordinating Committee and subsequently the MPO Board.

	Hendersonville Pedestrian Signals (Traditional)	Buncombe County SEDTAP (Traditional)	Buncombe County RIDE (Other)	Council on Aging Buncombe County (Other)
Project Code	HPS	BC SEDTAP	BC RIDE	COA
Score (out of 100 points)	95	95	90	85
Requested Amount	\$163,518	\$267,384	\$65,849	\$35,353
Proposed Local Match	\$66,355	\$66,846	\$65,849	\$35,353
Propose Local Match %	29%	20%	50%	50%
Proposed Total Project Amount	\$229,873	\$334,230	\$131,698	\$70,706
Scenario 1 (82% Funding)	\$134,457	\$219,864	\$54,146	\$29,070
Scenario 2 Awarded by Points	\$163,518	\$267,384	\$0	\$0
Pro-Rated by Points	\$155,342	\$254,015	\$59,264	\$30,050
Scenario 3 (pro-rated by Points)	\$136,298	\$222,874	\$51,999	\$26,366

Discussion occurred around clarification of funding at 82% if that is feasible. Also discussion on if there were any other applications, there were not.

Mark Endries moved to recommend Scenario #1 to the TCC and Board for 5310 project applications. Elizabeth Teague seconded the motion and it passed upon a roll call vote.

4C. JARC Project Selection

JARC (Jobs Access Reverse Commute) funds are allocated to the Asheville Urbanized Area, with the City of Asheville serving as the designated recipient for these funds. The application process for JARC ran from October 16, 2025, to January 15, 2026.

Additional information about JARC is available at: <https://frenchbroadrivermpo.org/5310-and-jarc/>

FY 2025's Section 5307 (JARC) Allocation

Regional JARC - FY 2025 at 10% of FTA
5307 Amount allocated to Asheville
Urbanized Area

\$ 420,732

Applicant	Project Title	Period of Performance	Project Description	Funding Requested	Local Match	Total Cost	Project Score
City of Asheville	ART Routes 170, S3, S6, and Transit Operations Funding Request	7/2026-6/2027	<p>The City of Asheville is seeking support through the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC, Section 5307) grant to sustain the operations of its pivotal public transportation routes, Routes 170, S3, and S6. These services are essential in bridging the mobility gap for low-income individuals, enabling seamless access to employment opportunities, and fostering community and region connectivity.</p>	\$420,732	\$420,732	\$841,464	100

Scoring was based on a scorecard (out of 105 points). The following pages show recommendations for awarding JARC funds based on scores. The quantitative scoring methodology was simplified for this round of funding.

Discussion about which route 170 was, it is Black Mountain. Discussion around knowing how the riders qualify for the JARC program. JARC is Job Access Reverse Commute, its about the route not the riders. It's a commute route, providing access to the Ingles distribution center and Black Mountain.

Elizabeth Teague moved to recommend the City of Asheville's JARC Application to the TCC and Board. William High seconded the motion and it passed upon a roll call vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Autumn Radcliff opened the floor for public comment. No comments were heard.

ADJOURNMENT

Autumn Radcliff adjourned the meeting at 10:43 AM.