



Virtual Business Meeting

July 16, 2021

1:00 pm

Attendees:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Alex Rickard	CAMPO	Kim Maxey	New Bern MPO
Bob Cook	CRTPO	Leigh Wing	NCDOT STIP
Bob League	Rocky Mount MPO	Mark Hoeweler	Grand Strand MPO
Brian Horton	GHMPO	Mike Kozlosky	WMPO
Byron Brown	WSMPO	Mike Stanley	NCDOT STIP
Chris Lukasina	CAMPO	Phil Conrad	CRMPO
Daniel Newquist	Grand Strand MPO	Randi Gates	GCLMPO
David Wasserman	NCDOT STIP	Sarah Lee	NCDOT SPOT
Eliud De Jesus	Greenville MPO	Travis Johnson	CRTPO
Greg Venable	HPMPO	Tristan Winkler	FBRMPO
Jamal Alavi	NCDOT-TPD	Tyler Meyer	GUAMPO
James Salmons	Upper Coastal RPO	Van Argabright	NCDOT STIP
Jason Schronce	NCDOT SPOT	Wannetta Mallette	BGMPO

1. **Welcome/Introductions** – Chris Lukasina called the meeting to order and opened the meeting by welcoming all present via virtual means.
2. **P6.0, Revenue Estimates, and Funding Availability**
 - Jason Schronce opened by stating that the NCDOT SPOT Office is presenting information in order for NCAMPO to provide comments and/or direction to the P6.0 Workgroup members representing NCAMPO. The Prioritization Workgroup will discuss the revenue forecast for the next STIP at the meeting scheduled for Monday.
 - Jason noted that this is not a cash/fiscal issue. The department is sitting on a good amount of cash right now. These are different issues relating to the ability to add new projects to the upcoming STIP.
 - David Wasserman noted that project cost increases from September 2019-June 2020 were largely responsible for the Summer 2020 STIP Reprogramming. This caused the STIP to be out of fiscal constraint. There is a need to improve accuracy of NCDOT's cost estimation practices.
 - David presented the following Cost Estimation Improvement Initiatives:
 - STIP Cost Review
 - i. CDEs worked with Division staff and PMs to review all STIP highway project cost estimates.
 - ii. STIP Unit requested updated ROW, UTIL, and CON estimates – to be complete by Summer 2021.

- iii. Ensure all cost estimates are based on engineering analysis (Express Designs)
- o STI Committee for Reprioritization (STICR)
 - i. Reviews projects that meet cost thresholds to determine if the project should continue as is, be modified, or be reprioritized in the next Prioritization cycle.
 - ii. A question was asked on how the STICR committee, made up of all NCDOT staff, is working with the POs? David responded that if the scope is being changed, NCDOT would certainly involve the PO in the decision, especially if a project would have to be reprioritized.
 - iii. NCAMPO may want to talk about adding someone from the MPOs to the STICR committee.
- o Cost Estimation Improvement Process (CEIP)
 - i. A workgroup of NCDOT staff reviewed existing cost estimation processes and made recommendations for improvements.
 - ii. Major findings:
 - 1. GIS-based Cost Estimation Tool (CET) results are often low.
 - 2. ROW, UTIL, and CON estimates have not always updated regularly and consistently distributed.
 - 3. Lack of central data-repository for estimates - - led to multiple estimates for the same projects.
 - iii. Goals:
 - 1. Create consistent process for updating estimates throughout NCDOT.
 - 2. Ensure estimates are updated on a regular basis and properly distributed to all parties.
 - 3. Create a single data-repository for all estimates.
 - iv. CEIP Recommendations
 - 1. Ensure all cost estimates for highway projects in the STIP that are selected through STI are based on Express Designs.
 - 2. Establish minimum timeframes for updating cost estimates.
 - 3. Ensure consistency between Project Delivery Networks and proposed STIP costs.
 - 4. Establish that CDEs and PMs will lead the requesting, verification, and distribution of all estimates to all parties.
 - 5. Division Engineers are now required to sign off on all estimates.
 - 6. Establish categories for ROW, UTIL, and CON estimates to guide how estimates should be generated.
 - 7. Establish appropriate contingencies for cost estimates at all phases.
 - 8. Develop a user-friendly application for users to create, store, update, distribute, and document all cost estimates.
 - 9. Establish cost estimation procedures and training.
- o Chris noted that MPOs must be involved in the express designs. Many are being left out on a lot of projects. NCDOT must have buy-in from the MPOs. NCDOT must think through the coordination of these.
- o Van Argabright noted that moving forward, there will be more coordination with MPOs in express designs. An express design is not an environmental document. Coordination will occur during NEPA. NCDOT is being asked to evaluate 1200 projects. An express design with extensive coordination with the POs can't happen.
- o NCAMPO members feel that the POs should be at the table when NCDOT is meeting with the consultants to scope out the express design.
- o Van stated that NCDOT is willing to listen and do more coordination. He noted that he will have to talk to Derrick to see what the process is.
- o Jason noted that the consultants working on express designs are starting with what was submitted through SPOT Online.
- o Van noted that this is worth more discussion to have a way to solicit input without hashing out every detail and prolonging the timeline. Some details are more important to hash out up front than others.

- P6.0 Funding Availability
 - 450+ projects – 1000+ new estimates – starting summer 2020
 - Hoping to hit 99% complete by the end of this month
 - Once all estimates are in, they will be looking at what projects meet the STICR thresholds.
 - Value Engineering exercise to see if costs can be reduced. Any scope changes will involve MPO/RPO.
 - 92% of projects that have been completed = \$5Billion in cost increases.
 - When we look out to the next STIP (2024-2033), all STI buckets are over-programmed when you look at committed and non-committed projects.
 - There are still some unknowns, but the department hopes to have a clearer picture in the next few months. Federal transportation bill being passed, etc.
 - When you look at just the committed projects – statewide and regional is still over-programmed. All but 6 divisions are still over-programmed.
 - If we continue to go through a normal process, money would only be available in 6 divisions, and not a lot of money in each to fund any new projects.
 - Initial comments from the BOT when presented this information earlier this month:
 - i. Need to make a determination on P6 sooner than later
 - ii. See a need to make hard decisions to balance the STIP
 - iii. Revisit STICR guidelines (thresholds and projects subject to guidelines)
 - iv. Need to revisit inflation calculations in STIP
 - v. Cost should have a larger role in scoring
 - vi. Need to continue to have open dialogue/communication between NCDOT and POs

- Questions for Prioritization Workgroup:
 1. Continue or modify P6?
 2. Next STIP to include Committed projects only or Committed + Non-Committed?
 3. Approach used to determine funding schedules for 2024-2033 STIP?
 4. Input on STICR guidelines?

- Discussion:
 - Mike Kozlosky asked when is DOT going to communicate the situation we are in? When will it be communicated to the larger group? Will this info be given to MPO Boards, etc.? Division Engineers and BOT members need to update Boards at meetings.
 - NCDOT responded that they are preparing information for Division Engineers right now. More information will be at the work session for the August BOT meeting.
 - Alex Rickard noted that he is trying to fully understand the benefit of having non-committed projects in the STIP. For projects funded during P3 and P4...this should be a done deal and not subject to the STICR committee.
 - What data is needed to make these decisions moving forward?
 - What projects are safe and not looked at for threshold?
 - NCDOT is still moving forward with quantitative scores for 6.0. These scores will be released no matter what decisions are made.
 - Mike made a motion to encourage the workgroup to pause 6.0, retain non-committed projects where needed, and authorize workgroup members to engage in substantive discussion regarding moving forward with a future prioritization process.
 - The motioned was seconded.
 - The motion passed with 12 in favor and 1 against.
 - Brian Horton raised concern about public involvement moving forward with the STIP update.
 - Tristan Winkler noted that deciding what projects stay and go as far as non-committed is going to take more time. POs must be involved in this decision process.

- Mike noted that the time and energy that would be used for local input point assignments needs to go into thinking through how POs can be more involved in express designs, etc.
 - Chris and Neil Burke to possibly set up a meeting with Beau Memory to pass along concerns regarding coordination.
 - FHWA needs to also be aware of NCDOT's collaboration and coordination processes.
 - NCAMPO to follow up with Van to see what he has heard back from the Feasibility Studies Unit on how POs can be more involved.
- OTHER - AMPO-NADO-NARC Joint Request for Increased Funding. Should the NCAMPO do a joint request/statement? Chris is more than happy to draft a letter on behalf of NCAMPO.

3. Adjourn – the meeting was adjourned at 3:06pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Randi Gates, GCLMPO
NCAMPO Secretary