

Project Oversight Committee
11/14/2019 Meeting Summary

Members: Brett Canipe, Gwen Cook, Bill Coxe, Andy Grzymiski, Bjorn Hansen, Wayne Herron, Ashley Landis, David McDonald, Anil Panicker, Bill Thunberg, Andrew Ventresca, Cami Weckerly

Staff: Curtis Bridges, Neil Burke, Bob Cook, Judy Dellert-O’Keef, Catherine Mahoney, Agustin Rodriguez, Theo Thomson

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
1. Welcome & Introductions		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wayne Herron asked POC members to introduce themselves. 	Wayne Herron	
2. Review of Discretionary Project Approval Schedule and Roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify tasks for upcoming meetings and project milestones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neil reviewed the approval schedule and staff roles, as well as the sources for the available funding balance of \$55 million. Funding targets by mode are 80% highway, 20% transit and bike/ped, and less than 1% for planning projects. Neil reviewed funding request totals for the different project types. 	Neil Burke	
3. Review of Discretionary Project Received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the submitted projects are properly classified (i.e. roadway, transit, bike/ped, planning project) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neil reviewed the process under which the draft scores were developed. There was general agreement about when to classify projects as existing or new projects. • There were questions about the scoring process, about how points were awarded for some of the categories, particularly with regard to Lost Opportunity and whether all jurisdictions understood the “Total Project Cost” to be the same (total cost for the entire project, or total cost for this funding 	Neil Burke	

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
		submission). Neil said that the high percentage outliers have BA or STI funding attached.		
4. Begin process of reviewing draft scores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the draft scores appear to be reasonable 			
3. Upcoming Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 25: Continue process of reviewing draft discretionary project scores; begin process of developing POC recommendation on project list December 12: Finalize project scores and develop POC recommendation December 19: Second meeting to finalize POC recommendation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group went through the list of project submissions. Questions included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How was the percent match calculated? Some of the projects that are listed as “new” are actually existing projects that haven’t requested discretionary funds before, so they are new projects for discretionary funding What constituted a “Lost Opportunity?” Not sure that everyone interpreted “Total Project Cost” the same way. Some may have calculated the cost for the entire project, some may have calculated the cost for the phase of the project for which discretionary funding was requested Apparent inconsistencies in crash data are probably due to the fact that some crashes are counted as being at intersections that were close to the crash location, but the crash didn’t actually occur AT the intersection 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neil will revise scores based on the local priority scores Neil to ask Loretta about Jane Sowers Road and make sure that Statesville knows they would have to pay the funds back if they don’t build the interchange