

Implementation Workshop Summary

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the discussions from the Implementation Workshops held on June 24th & 28th, 2021 through virtual presentation and conference call (via Zoom) for the Beyond 77 Study.

6/24 Participants

Adam Howell, Atkins
Agustin Rodriguez, CRTPO
Bob Cook, CRTPO
Brian Elgort, CRTPO
Brian Nadolny, CATS
David Hooper, RFATS
David McDonald, CATS
Dominique Boyd, NCDOT-Planning
Erika Martin, Town of Mooresville
Gary Fournier, Town of Cornelius
James Parkhill, Atkins
Julie Eiselt, City of Charlotte
Kathy Cornett, Charlotte Planning
Loretta Barren, FHWA
Machael Peterson, SCDOT
Mark Stafford, NCDOT – Div 12
Matthew Todd, Iredell County
Radha Krishna Swayampakala, RS&H
Travis Johnson, CRTPO

6/28 Participants

Adam Howell, Atkins
Agustin Rodriguez, CRTPO
Alysia Osborne, Charlotte Planning
Andrew Ventresca, Town of Davidson
Kathy Cornett, Charlotte Planning
Bill Coxe, Emeritus Huntersville Planning
Brandon Brezeale, CDOT
Brett Canipe, NCDOT Div 10
Brian Elgort, CRTPO
Catherine Mahoney, Charlotte Planning
Curtis Bridges, CRTPO
David McDonald, CATS
Dr. Mike Miltich, CRTPO Chairman
Gretchen Flores, Charlotte Planning
James Parkhill, Atkins
Jerrell Leonard, CRTPO
Jorge Luna, HDR
Judy Dellert-O'Keef, CRTPO
Kathy Cornett, Charlotte Planning
Stuart Basham, NCDOT Div 10
Tim Gibbs, Emeritus Charlotte CDOT
Travis Johnson, CRTPO
Warren Cooksey, NCDOT-NCTA
Will Washam, CDOT

Summary of Workshop Discussions

- Phase III Engagement Recap

Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Howell provided a summary and successes from the comprehensive Phase III Engagement period that ran between April 1st and May 15th. Mr. Howell informed the group that a similar dashboard to Phases I and II will be published for Phase III survey outcomes by mid-summer.

- Plan Implementation & Framework Development

Mr. Howell provided an overview of the framework development process that has occurred leading up to these workshops. He discussed the initial framework defined by a series of timeframes, as well as perceived levels of effort by an MPO and/or coordinating partners. Mr. Howell then described all the different identifiers (i.e. key areas, evaluation factors, modes, jurisdictions, etc.) being proposed to help inform planning/preparation needs for any of the recommendations in the future.

- Toolkit Components & Geography/Level of Effort

Mr. Howell provided additional background based on the topic of this agenda item, which included awareness of critical assumptions/definitions:

- *Timeframe Assumptions*
 - *Project Infrastructure/Implementation Methods (PI) – timeframe assigned is for when to expect completion*
 - *Policymaking (PM), Programming (PR) & Emerging Technology (ET) S&Ss – timeframe assigned is for when to start the process of each strategy/solution.*
- *Geography Application – PM and/or PR S&Ss are not necessarily geographic-specific*
- *Internal Strategy-Solution Interdependency – Topical and Logical Connections are being identified amongst all S&Ss – direct predecessor, successor and/or indirect relationships (intended to inform multiple audiences of complex planning relationships and assist with future planning efforts)*
- *Level of Effort*
 - *Small Jurisdiction: Small Group of Staff Resources*
 - *Large Jurisdiction: Large Group of Staff Resources*

Mentimeter was used to seek level of agreement with proposed definitions for Level of Effort – average result received from all participants was 4.35 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest level of agreement.

Mentimeter was then used to seek input on what is preferred on how to publish the list of Strategies & Solutions – whether to be done so as Tiers with Priority OR just the Full List. 21 participants

indicated Tiers with Priority; 2 participants indicated Full List. Participants were then asked to indicate and discuss choices & tradeoffs associated with doing one or the other action regarding publishing the list. Some highlights of the dialogue included that the full list is more transparent, but that a prioritized list somehow helps to manage the planning process.

Mentimeter was then used to seek input as to what coordinating agencies should be documented and associated with each S&S where an MPO would 'assign & coordinate.'

Mentimeter was then used to seek further input on what tags/identifiers should be used to help make navigating the list of strategies & solutions as easy to use as possible.

- Final Outcomes & Post-Study Expectations

Mr. Rodriguez showcased proposed final report products, and also included the project sheet template as a part of the discussion. Participants indicated concurrence with proposed approach. Mr. Howell also outlined the pamphlet concept, which was well received and recommended to CRTPO/consultant team to move forward with concept design/development. Mr. Howell showcased the choices available to help showcase the list – the base-level excel sheet, a graph-chart platform, or a customer user interface that is easy to use and meets the needs of multiple audiences. The participants indicated the customer user interface was most desired to help them breakdown the strategies/solutions and focus on particular local and/or regional needs based on the input gathered from the Mentimeter questions earlier.

Please contact Adam Howell at adam.howell@atkinsglobal.com if any changes to these minutes are needed.