

## Project Oversight Committee 3/22/2018 Meeting Summary

**Members:** Dennis Rorie (POC Chair); Loretta Barren; Brett Canipe; Tim Gibbs; Andy Grzymiski; Susan Habina Woolard; Bjorn Hansen (phone); Bill Thunberg; Andrew Ventresca (phone); Cami Weckerly

**Staff:** Curtis Bridges, Neil Burke, Robert Cook, Erin Kinne

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/Follow Up/Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up Status
<b>1. CRTPO Discretionary Policies &amp; Administration</b>	Review the results of the survey used to identify and prioritize policies related to locally administered projects and other issues which can be documented in a report to be adopted by CRTPO Board	1. See Locally Administered Projects Policy Survey discussion summary memo for results.	Dennis Rorie	See discussion summary memo for follow-up statuses
<b>2. Brief update on STBG-DA Funds Available for Reallocation</b>	A total of \$1,802,447 in STBG-DA funds have been recently made available from two projects:	1. \$880,745 in STBG-DA funds were freed up from the New Town Road and Waxhaw-Indian Trail Road roundabout project, which will receive NCDOT safety funds and no longer needs the awarded \$880,745 in STBG-DA funds.  2. \$921,702 in STBG-DA funds were freed up from the NC-200 & Old Charlotte Highway (SR 1009) Intersection Improvements project in Monroe, which was awarded these Small Roadway DA funds in the 2017 call for projects and no longer needs them. The City of Monroe based this on the decision to include the project within the Old Monroe Road Widening	Erin Kinne	Funds available for reallocation, possibly in next STBG-DA call for projects

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/Follow Up/Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up Status
		project (U-6031).		
<b>Upcoming Issues</b>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4/9/2018 POC Agenda               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Proposed BA and STBG-DA funding exchange: Fairview Flyover project (Mooresville) and Bethlehem Road relocation project</li> <li>b. Proposed scope change: Hornets Nest Park Access Improvements project</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Future agenda items               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Review 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2018 statuses of discretionary funded projects</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	#1a: Neil Burke #1b: Curtis Bridges / Scott Correll #2a: Erin Kinne	#1a: In progress; see memo #1b: In progress #2a: In progress; updates due 3/30 COB

TO: TCC Members  
FROM: Dennis Rorie, P.E.  
POC Chair/TCC Vice-Chair  
DATE: May 8, 2018

**SUBJECT: Locally Administered Projects Policy Survey Summary**

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the results of a survey distributed to Project Oversight Committee (POC) members regarding the development of a locally administered projects policy (LAPP) for CRTPO, and the discussion of the survey results at the March 22 POC meeting. Thirteen survey responses were received, and the following POC members participated in the discussion on March 22:

Dennis Rorie (POC Chair); Loretta Barren; Brett Canipe; Tim Gibbs; Andy Grzymiski; Susan Habina Woolard; Bjorn Hansen (phone); Bill Thunberg; Andrew Ventresca (phone); Cami Weckerly

**1. Policy Document:**

Survey Results: All respondents favored the development of a policy document for the LAPP. The majority preferred the focus on the general policies rather than a prescriptive document.

Meeting Discussion: Review the POC mission document (2015) and develop a purpose statement. Outcome of this process may include the development of a program document and LAPP policy document.

Next Steps: Develop a framework/outline following the next POC Meeting.

**2. Project must be on Federal Aid System to be eligible for LAPP funding:**

Survey Results: The majority of the respondents agreed with this statement.

Meeting Discussion: Group was unsure of how to treat new location projects in this situation. FHWA may be able to offer a conditional pre-approval. CRTPO staff believe that the project sponsor should lead the process of having a project added to the FAS in advance of applying for funding. Staff is also in favor of giving priority to projects on the existing FAS. Suggested that, if a project is not on the FAS, NCDOT could provide a preliminary assessment of how likely it is to be approval for inclusion, prior to application submission.

Next Steps: Discuss FAS policy for LAPP with CAMPO staff.

**3. Only consider projects for LAPP funding if they are included in MTP or CTP?**

Survey Results: The majority of the respondents disagreed with this statement.

Meeting Discussion: POC members were unsure of how intersections would be considered eligible for this potential criteria since the CTP and MTP generally do not identify intersection deficiencies. Staff suggested that the local priority category (10 points) within the existing

STBG-DA criteria could be modified to allow for a 5 point bonus if a project is identified in these plans.

Next Steps: Further discussion at a future POC meeting.

4. **Can POC members participate in scoring review process if they have submitted a LAPP application?**

Survey Results: Seven respondents indicated no and five respondents answered yes.

Meeting Discussion: Participants suggested that an independent committee could be formed to review project scores and make programming decisions to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest. CAMPO has an independent group that reviews the scoring of projects and develops the recommended project list. Another participant suggested that all TCC members could be invited to participate to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Next Steps: Discuss committee formation process and compensation (if any) with CAMPO staff.

5. **Public Comment Period on draft project list**

Survey Results: Six respondents indicated that a public comment period was not necessary for a draft discretionary project list and seven POC members answered yes.

Meeting Discussion: POC members stated that the responsibility for public engagement should fall within the discretion of the member jurisdiction. In addition, participants explained that projects should originate from local and regional adopted plans.

Next Steps: N/A

6. **Should CRTPO host a pre-application workshop prior to the call for projects?**

Survey Results: All respondents answered yes.

Meeting Discussion: POC members discussed the most appropriate audience for the training, since some jurisdictions have different staff members submitting projects and acting in the role of project manager.

Next Steps: Discuss pre-application workshop format with CAMPO staff.

7. **The CRTPO should require member jurisdictions that are recipients of its discretionary funding to attend periodic project management training prior to completing any work on the project.**

Survey Results: Eleven respondents answered yes and two respondents answered no.

Meeting Discussion: POC members supported this statement.

Next Steps: CRTPO staff to plan on holding a project management training session within the next 1-2 years.

**8. The POC should work towards a single call for projects for all of the CRTPO's discretionary funding sources.**

Survey Results: Five respondents *strongly agree*, five POC members answered *agree*, and three POC members responded with *neutral* for the benefits of working towards a single call for projects.

Meeting Discussion: POC members generally supported this concept. Members suggested attempting to first develop an annual schedule for STBG-DA and TAP funds, because the CRTPO has a greater amount of control over the distribution of these funding sources than CMAQ. Ultimately, the goal would be to have one annual call for projects, with a reduced emphasis on the type of funding that the member jurisdiction is applying for.

Next Steps: Staff to develop a potential schedule to consolidate STBG-DA and TAP funding to a single call for projects. Staff to discuss annual CMAQ call for projects with NCDOT.

**9. Frequency for holding a call for discretionary project funding:**

Survey Results: Six POC members supported an annual call for projects, five members indicated support for a bi-annual call for projects, and two members responded *once every two years*.

Meeting Discussion: Several POC members expressed support for a bi-annual call for projects; however, staff was concerned with the amount of work that this would require. Staff expressed support for an initial annual call for projects, with the option of considering a biannual call for projects after several years.

Next Steps: Continue discussion at an upcoming POC meeting.

**10. Reallocation of CRTPO's unobligated discretionary funding should be considered:**

Survey Results: Five POC members responded with *quarterly*, four respondents answered *in conjunction with the annual call for projects* two POC members answered *biannually* and two respondents answered *on an as-needed basis*.

Meeting Discussion: This question was discussed jointly with the previous question during the meeting. No single consensus was reached during the meeting.

Next Steps: Continue discussion at an upcoming POC meeting.

**11. Should CRTPO's unobligated discretionary funds be eligible to fund projects that were not scored during the most recent project call?**

Survey Results: Seven members responded no and six POC members responded yes.

Meeting Discussion: Several options were discussed, and no single option was supported.

Next Steps: Continue discussion at an upcoming POC meeting.

**12. Should discretionary projects be eligible to receive funding for a specific project phase each year during each project call? (i.e. PE in year 1, ROW in year 2, CON in year 3)**

Survey Results: Nine survey respondents answered yes and four respondents answered no.

Meeting Discussion: Several options were discussed, and no single option was supported.

Next Steps: Continue discussion at an upcoming POC meeting.

**13. Discretionary projects that experience funding shortfalls should be subject to the following:**

Survey Results: Six respondents answered *consider on a case-by-case basis*, four POC members expressed support for providing an additional local match to receive additional funding, three members supported an additional local match and receive secondary priority in project prioritization. POC members did not support the option of limiting each project one allocation of CRTPO discretionary funding.

Meeting Discussion: Several options were discussed, and no single option was supported.

Next Steps: Continue discussion at an upcoming POC meeting.

**14. Should a project receive additional points within the scoring process when the member jurisdiction commits to a greater local match?**

Survey Results: Eleven respondents answered yes, and two POC members answered no.

Meeting Discussion: Several POC members explained that awarding additional points to member jurisdictions that can provide additional funds disproportionately favors larger communities with more substantial budgets. Another POC member suggesting the removal of the extra points but require each jurisdiction to complete PE using local funds.

Next Steps: Continue discussion at an upcoming POC meeting.

**15. Should the CRTPO adopt an annual discretionary funding target by transportation mode?**

Survey Results: Eight respondents answered yes, and five POC members answered no.

Meeting Discussion: Several options were discussed, and no single option was supported.

Next Steps: Continue discussion at an upcoming POC meeting.