

Project Oversight Committee
11/25/2019 Meeting Summary

Members: Loretta Barren (phone), Stuart Basham, Gwen Cook, Bill Coxe, Andy Grzymiski, Bjorn Hansen, Wayne Herron, Ashley Landis, David McDonald, Anil Panicker, Dana Stoogenke, Bill Thunberg, Andrew Ventresca, Cami Weckerly

Staff: Curtis Bridges, Neil Burke, Bob Cook, Judy Dellert-O'Keef (phone), 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. Overview of Cost Estimate Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cost estimate review was conducted. The most common questions/ comments were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overlap in project cost contingencies between project phases; ○ Detail vs. lump sum for construction cost when project was in right-of-way acquisition or late in the design process; ○ Including ROW and utility costs within the construction portion of the estimate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agustin reviewed his methodology in conducting the cost estimate review. 	Agustin Rodriguez	

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rounding multiple times between forms and supporting documents; ○ Missing information for aspects of the cost estimate. 			
<p>3. Continue process of reviewing draft roadway project scores</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Purpose: Develop a recommended roadway project list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was discussion that applications submitted vary on the interpretation of what constituted total project cost. Gwen commented that the Greenway scores are probably based only on the total for this project phase, and not the cost of all phases of the project. ● Wayne suggested reviewing the draft non-roadway project scores first, since the roadway project scores were discussed at the last POC meeting. 	Neil Burke	
<p>4. Start process of reviewing draft non-roadway project scores</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Purpose: Review scores for bicycle and pedestrian and transit projects to determine if the scores appear to be reasonable and start the process of developing a recommended non-roadway project list. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bill C. said that if there's consistency in the total project cost for the greenway projects, we should be able to evaluate them. ● Neil reviewed the two transit projects submitted. Andrew asked who is providing the local match for the ICATS project; Neil said we'd have to look at the application. There was also a question about how the facility constitutes a multi-modal facility; since ICATS is a bus system, perhaps there's a park-and-ride component to the facility? Does ICATS hope to tap into the proposed future commuter rail? There were also questions about whether the proposed 700,000 passenger trips quoted in the ICATS project was a realistic figure. 	Neil, Curtis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Neil: Review ICATS transit application to see where the local match is paid from ● Curtis: Review McDowell Creek Greenway project to see if the application mentioned critical need for funding ● Neil: Speak with Sherry and ask for more information

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 bike/ped applications were submitted; 5 are new. None of the projects are actually under construction. • Comments on bike/ped scoring: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The McDowell Creek Greenway project should get a 15 for project readiness, not a 10. TAP criteria score goes to 198. Gwen said if the project doesn't get funding, it won't be built. Curtis will check to see if the application mentioned it's a critical project. 2. Dana said the total project cost for the Matthews project is \$1.281 million; the whole project is \$2.2 million. • Planning projects: Neil said 4 projects were submitted, I-77 and Jane Sowers Road has been moved to become the 5th Planning-level project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was discussion about asking the Division's Feasibility Studies unit to evaluate the I-77 project, but they will be busy with STI for the next few months. ○ The group wanted more information on the Statesville project, a revised cost estimate and a feasibility study. ○ Neil said I-77 and Jane Sowers was in the 2045 MTP but dropped to Tier I. He will talk with Sherry and ask for more data by 12/5. • \$7.5 million available for bike/ped: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 existing projects are Cornelius and Park and Rides. Wayne said we need to go back to each one and get a total project cost. Ashley suggested a column for total project cost and percent local (non-federal) money. • Wayne said CATS' \$9.5 million request will take away from roadway projects. The goal was to spend \$7.5 		

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
		<p>million in bike/ped and transit – if partial funding doesn't help, is it worth funding at all? David said the project is new and gives CATS the opportunity to serve the western part of Huntersville and Highland Creek areas; people will probably also gather here for carpools to the I-77 Express lanes. CATS expects about 450 riders/day and the lot have 500 spaces. Stuart said the state is considering \$2.3 million in funding for this project also.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Philosophical questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Perhaps evaluate projects by score without including existing projects; ○ Perhaps raise the non-highway mode target for this call since we didn't meet the target with the spring call. • For all projects: we want the total cost, the total funds being spent on the project. Due date to receive that information is 12/5; if they don't meet the deadline, we assume a 20% match. 		
<p>3. Upcoming Issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 12: Finalize project scores and develop POC recommendation • December 19: Second meeting to finalize POC recommendation (if necessary) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		