

Project Oversight Committee 7/13/2023 Meeting Summary

Note: The meeting was conducted as a virtual meeting through Zoom

POC Members: Andrew Ventresca, Theo Ghitea, Ashley Landis, Cami Weckerly, Bjorn Hansen, Sean Epperson, Alex Rotenberry, Steve Frey, Megan Green, David McDonald

CRTPO Staff and Guests: Bob Cook, Loretta Barren, Neil Burke, Jennifer Stafford, Kendall Clanton, Teresa Robinson, Brian Elgort, Scott Miller,

THE PRESENTATION IS ATTACHED (30 SLIDES)

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
Welcome		Welcomed POC members	Andrew Ventresca	None
Proposed Air Quality Ranking	Continuing conversation about adding air quality ranking methodology	See attached presentation	Megan Green, Meck Co.	POC agreed to use proposed ranking criteria
Shortfall Discussions	Discussions about shortfall limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total shortfall amount should not increase total project cost by more than 125 or 150%. • Should not be able to apply for shortfalls if in the same phase as previous request (i.e., you applied at 30% design plans, you need to make it to real estate before asking for more funds). This increases the likelihood the new estimate is correct. Should we allow shortfall request if the project is still in the early PE phase? • Limit shortfall requests to 1 (maybe 2) per project. 	Andrew Ventresca	Andrew suggested email discussions to wordsmith text. Final text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortfall requests are not allowed if a project has not started design. • Shortfall requests are limited to 100% of the original CRTPO funding award, up to and not-to-exceed \$3 million in total additional funding per individual project. (This revision starts

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
				with 2023 fall call projects.)
Other Possible Policy Clarifications	Clarify current policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Readiness – based off funding requests vs. project phases completed • Funding request amount - 25% of all available funds identified per the mode vs. the total year funding amount. 	Andrew Ventresca Jennifer Stafford	POC recommending revising the policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Readiness – based off funding requests • Funding request amount - 25% of all available funds identified per the mode
Reminders, Notices and Upcoming Issues		Fall call opens August 14 through October 31	Andrew Ventresca	
Questions and adjourn		None		None



charlotte regional **transportation** planning organization

Project Oversight Committee Meeting

July 13, 2023

AGENDA

1. **Welcome** Andrew Ventresca

2. **Proposed Air Quality Scoring/Ranking** Megan Green
 - For Carbon Reduction Program funds and CMAQ

3. **Public Health & Roadway Scoring Criteria** Brian Elgort and Jennifer Stafford
 - Address follow up questions from June's meeting

4. **Shortfall Discussions** (continued from Feb 23) Andrew Ventresca
 - Total shortfall amount should not increase total project cost by more than 125 or 150%.
 - Should not be able to apply for shortfalls if in the same phase as previous request (i.e., you applied at 30% design plans, you need to make it to real estate before asking for more funds). This increases the likelihood the new estimate is correct. Should we allow shortfall request if the project is still in the early PE phase?
 - Limit shortfall requests to 1 (maybe 2) per project.

5. **Other Possible Policy Clarifications** Andrew Ventresca & Jennifer Stafford
 - Bonus Allocation applications rankings
 - Project Readiness – based off funding requests
 - Funding request amount - 25% of all available funds identified per the mode

6. **Upcoming Meeting Schedule** All
 - *July 27*

7. **Adjourn**

Policy Updates Timeline:

July – POC Discussions (gain consensus):

- Air quality ranking methodology
- Continue shortfall scoring discussions
- Wrap up health equity scoring
- Review other Policy statements

August:

- Present at Transportation Staff Meeting
- Recommended Policy updates to TCC and Board for Information

September:

- Request Action - TCC and Board Approval of Policy updates

Megan E. Green

Air Quality Program Manager

Land Use And Environmental Services Agency

Mecklenburg County Government

Air Quality Ranking for CMAQ and CRP Funding

Projects that want to be considered specifically for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) or Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funding must submit a [Federal Highway Administration CMAQ Emission Calculator](#) with their application.

Projects that “opt-in” will be ranked by emission reduction per day.

INPUT

[User Guide](#)

Note: Inputs for this tool should be specific to the equipment to be repowered/replaced.

(1) What is your project evaluation year? [Reset to Default Values](#)

(2) What is the baseline equipment? Baseline equipment assumed to operate on diesel fuel

(3) What emissions Tier is the baseline equipment currently held to? Refer to User Guide for help with determining the appropriate Tier

(4) What emissions Tier will the repowered/replacement equipment be held Refer to User Guide for help with determining the appropriate Tier

(5) How many locomotives or engines for one marine vessel will be repowered/replaced?

(6) What is the repowered/replaced engine type?

(7) Input the activity for one locomotive or marine vessel being repowered/replaced. Refer to User Guide for typical values.

Load Factor	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text" value=""/>	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text" value=""/>	
Fuel Use	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text" value="12,523"/>	gal/yr (diesel or diesel equivalent)	
Operating Hrs	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text" value=""/>	hr/yr (of the marine vessel)	
Power Rating	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text" value=""/>	kW	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text" value=""/>

Conversion factor for engines rated in horsepower (hp): 1 hp = 0.7457 kW

OUTPUT	
Emission	Total (kg/day)
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	2.863
Nitrogen Oxide (NO _x)	16.584
Particulate Matter <2.5 μm (PM _{2.5})	0.349
Particulate Matter <10 μm (PM ₁₀)	0.360
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	0.939
See User Guide for more information on CO ₂ e and TEC.	
Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO ₂ e)	329.372
Total Energy Consumption (MMBTU/day)	N/A

OUTPUT	
Emission	Total (kg/day)
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	2.863
Nitrogen Oxide (NO _x)	16.584
Particulate Matter <2.5 μm (PM _{2.5})	0.349
Particulate Matter <10 μm (PM ₁₀)	0.360
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	0.939
<i>See User Guide for more information on CO₂e and TEC.</i>	
Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO ₂ e)	329.372
Total Energy Consumption (MMBTU/day)	N/A

Input for CMAQ ranking

Input for CRP ranking

- [Adaptive Traffic Control Systems \(ATCS\)](#)
- [Alternative Fuel Vehicles and Infrastructure](#)
- [Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements](#)
- [Carpooling and Vanpooling](#)
- [Congestion Reduction and Traffic Flow Improvements](#)
- [Diesel Idle Reduction Strategies](#)
- [Diesel Truck and Engine Retrofit & Replacement](#)
- [Dust Mitigation](#)
- [Electronic Open-Road Tolling \(EORT\)](#)
- [Electric Vehicles and EV Charging Infrastructure](#)
- [Locomotive & Marine Engine Retrofit and Replacement Tool](#)
- [Managed Lanes](#)
- [Non-Road Construction and Intermodal Equipment](#)
- [Transit Bus Upgrades & System Improvements](#)
- [Transit Bus Service and Fleet Expansion](#)
- [Travel Advisories](#)

These should cover >90% of projects

Projects that want to be considered specifically for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) or Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funding must submit a completed FHWA emission calculator with their application.

CMAQ project list will be ranked by kgNO_x/day.

CRP project list will be ranked by kgCO₂e/day.

Other eligible projects may be considered if funding available exceeds funding requested.

CRTPO staff with work with those applicants to gather necessary data.

Public Health & Roadway Scoring Wrap-up

Public health scoring criteria on roadway projects

- Up to 10 points available
- **Use NCDOT's Transportation Disadvantaged Index (TDI)**
 - Zero-vehicle ownership
 - Poverty level
 - Youth aged 15 and under
 - Seniors aged 65 and older
 - Mobility impairments
 - Black, Indigenous, and Persons of Color (BIPOC)
- **Use FHWA's Crash Modification Factors**
 - Promotes safe design and allows the applicant to have some control of points

Scoring Criteria	Points	Weight
Local Match	25	29%
Critical Opportunity	5	6%
Project Readiness	15	18%
Safety	10	12%
Congestion	15	18%
Cost Effectiveness	15	18%
Current Total	85	
Local Match	25	
Critical Opportunity	5	
Project Readiness	15	
Safety	15	
Congestion	15	
Cost Effectiveness	15	
Health Equity (Placeholder)	10	
Proposed Total	100	

Wrap up Shortfall Discussions

- Total shortfall amount should not increase total project cost by more than 125 or 150%.
- Should not be able to apply for shortfalls if in the same phase as previous request (i.e., you applied at 30% design plans, you need to make it to real estate before asking for more funds). This increases the likelihood the new estimate is correct.
- Should we allow shortfall request if the project is still in the early PE phase or if the project hasn't started?
- Limit shortfall requests to 1 (maybe 2) per project.

1. If a shortfall is prior to the construction phase, then move funds from CON to supplement funds in ROW.
 - Pro: This allows plans and ROW to be complete and a better estimate for construction.
 - Pro: Should be a one-time request for shortfall funds.
 - Con: If supplemental funds are not available from CRTPO, the members need to pay for all overruns at once on the construction phase.
2. When funds are moved due to a shortfall, request approval from CRTPO Board.
 - Pro: Accountability.
 - Con: May be confusing with TIP amendments. Could spark lots of conversation (micromanagement) of a project.

- **Add** – Information about Bonus Allocation funds and scoring
- **Modify** - Project Readiness – based on funding requests
- **Modify** - Funding request amount - 25% of all available funds identified per the mode

- **Add** – Information about Bonus Allocation funds and scoring
- **Modify** - Project Readiness – based on funding requests
- **Modify** - Funding request amount - 25% of all available funds identified per the mode

Bonus Allocation - Add information about ranking/scoring

For allocating Bonus Allocation (BA) funds use of one, two, and three-mile buffers of the express lanes (or toll) project.

- Projects within the one-mile buffer will be scored and given the highest priority.
- Secondary priority will be given to projects within two miles of the express lanes project.
- Third priority will be given to projects within three miles of the express lanes project.
- If any BA funds remain, they will be prioritized and scored for eligible roadway projects throughout the remainder of the County where the express/toll project originated.
- Projects that are considered for BA funding from an express lanes project shall be prioritized and recommended for funding based upon the [CRTPO Discretionary Funds Policy Guide](#).

Bonus Allocation – Scoring Example



Highway Ranking Report

2021 Fall Call Discretionary Project Applications

Project Name	Jurisdiction	I-485 BA Tier Meck.Co.Only	LOCAL COMMITMENT					SYSTEM BENEFIT			Total Points	Rank
			Problem Statement	Local Priority	Local Match	Critical Opp.	Project Readiness	Safety (10)	Congest. (15)	Cost Effect. (15)		
Greylock Ridge Road Extension (E Charles St - Tank Town Rd)	Matthews*	0 - 1 Mile	Yes	Yes	0	5	0	1.77	4.02	1.36	12.15	1**
Eastway Dr at Shamrock Dr Intersection Improvement	Charlotte	3 or > Miles	Yes	Yes	25	5	15	10.00	15.00	3.08	73.08	2

- ~~Add – Information about Bonus Allocation funds and scoring~~
- **Modify** - Project Readiness – based on funding requests
- **Modify** - Funding request amount - 25% of all available funds identified per the mode

Current Policy:

Project Readiness

... Points will be scaled based on the status of the project at the time of application...

Modify to read:

Points will be based on the funding requested per phase

Purpose for modification - We program projects up to 5 years out, and we do not want to slow the project. For example, if the applicant applies for construction only, we do not want to have ROW standing still after completed and until funds are available for construction. In this case, if PE and ROW are complete, the town has a sizeable stake in the project.

Criteria	Y/N	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points
Problem & Solution Statement					
Local Priority / Adopted Plans					
Local Match		20% match	25% match	30% match	35% match
Critical Opportunity		N/A	States & documents opportunity		
Project Readiness		All other projects	Design / Survey Complete	Right-of-Way Acquired	Bid Phase

Criteria		0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points
Project Funding Request		Funding All phases	Funding Engineering Only	Funding Right-of-Way and Construction Phase	Funding Construction Phase
Project Funding Request		?	?		

- ~~• Bonus Allocation applications rankings~~
—
- ~~• Project Readiness – based on funding requests~~
- Funding request amount - 25% of all available funds identified per the mode

Current Policy:

F. Funding Request Amount

Member jurisdictions may request a minimum discretionary fund amount of \$250,000 and a maximum of not more than 25% of all available funds for the particular federal fiscal year.

Proposed modification:

Member jurisdictions may request a minimum discretionary fund amount of \$250,000 and a maximum of not more than 25% of available funds per mode for the current call for projects.

Purpose for modification:

- Typically, we do not know the funding for an entire year.
- For bicycle/pedestrian projects, they are scored using the available amount (80/20)
- A bicycle/pedestrian project can't be 25% of the available funds
- If a roadway project is 25% of the available funds, is the 80/20 split calculated afterward?

Upcoming Fall Call Schedule

2023 Fall Call Timeline



Upcoming Meeting Schedule:

- Project Tracking
- NCDOT updates on Bonus Allocation funded projects
- Fall Call funding availability

Questions?