

## Southeastern Corridors Council – Webinar Notes

6<sup>th</sup> webinar – 11/6/19

Notes taken by Overly, Basques and Findlay. Call started at 11 am ET and ended at 12:15 pm.

### Attendees (16):

AL = Mark Bentley, Phillip Wiedmeyer	KY = Emily Carpenter	TN = Shauna Basques, Mark Findlay, Jonathan Overly
FL = Alex Kolpakov, Doug Kettles, Mark-Anthony Smith	NC = Andrea Eilers, Bill Eaker, Carina Soriano	DOE = Trev Hall, David Kirschner
	SC = Landon Masters, Ben Kessler	

1. Overly took list of attendees
2. The agenda from the planning emails for this call was used:

-----  
A few items as notes or homework (☆):

- a) Trev has noted that we should invite David Kirschner as he is the DOE regional reps corridors expert. I concur and as such have already added David to this email (let us know if you can join David!).
- b) Please be considering the names of those who you would invite to the ensuing call that are from your state DOT or related offices.
- c) ☆-- A question – for any state or non-coalition people that we invite to our next call, **will the primary purpose related to their involvement be ONLY the corridor identification signage?** That is, they won't be interested in discussing with us directional signage to actual DCFC, CNG, etc. stations? I think that is correct but want your input.
- d) ☆-- I have attached the spreadsheet that we started early this year but that has not progressed as a place to hold our data. **My request of you is to just look at that Excel file and simply \*email\* me the fields you think we need to add.** I have already added every coalition sorted by state in that Excel file. I think for our call our main agenda items will be:
  - a. Deciding what information we want to keep/track in this spreadsheet (or in a Google doc if you'd like me to transfer it over for easier editing),
  - b. Deciding who we want to invite on to the next call, and
  - c. laying out our agenda for that call.

-----  
3. MAIN DISCUSSION

Overly started with an update on our planning for the near term (the next few months) and suggesting we dig in on item c) from above first – **do we want to split our signage efforts, and work to tackle IDENTIFICATION signage and then later in 2020 directional/wayfinding signage next?** This is because a) we don't have the DOE-CC agreement in hand for 2020-2021 and b) the directional signage is more complicated. (And we will bleed into item d) above as we discuss this.) Discussion ensued with the following:

- ✓ Shauna (TN) – general service corridor signage is relatively easy to implement; exit/wayfinding signage is more complicated, could require rule promulgation (“Corridor = easier, directional = harder”)

- ✓ Phillip (AL) – One of the goals of Clean Cities is to remove barriers, and the signage is critical on removing these barriers and advancing markets to have **consistent, uniform branding** when it comes to AFV corridors and associated signage—I think it will be difficult to work with individual state DOTs and come to any sort of consistency with the signage because they live in the guidance world and they have the ability to interpret the MUTCD so you don't get the same kind of consistency or branding. **Ultimately because they live in that world, I think we ought to have an effort in trying to impact a revision to the MUTCD with respect to alt fuels.** Certainly there is a need for an update to that manual, because the criteria to even qualify to be put on specific service signs is outdated, certainly for alt fuel stations. Seven criteria on specific service, which is more akin to directional or wayfaring signage and aren't very applicable to modern world especially alt fuel (tire air, oil, public telephone, bathroom, on site attendants, etc). We should also enlist assistance from DOE HQ because they have MOUs and relationships with DOT and they could assist in elevating this issue or to issue some specific guidance, I think it would be important to achieve as much consistency as possible to limit ability of state DOT to interpret.
- ✓ Bill (NC) – alt fuel corridor identification sign guidance are given by MUTCD; are states using that signage design? Is consistency actually an issue?
- ✓ Landon (SC) – FHWA release of signage guidance (corridor identification general services signs) was hugely important to getting signage installed; pilot to put in exit/wayfaring signage, but no best practices to share yet, and no guidance from FHWA. SC used MUTCD guidance to a T—but they're the only state who has done so, so far; MN, GA, and LA used their own signage template for corridor identification; no one else is using this guidance, meaning consistency could be a concern, particularly for regional corridors.
- ✓ Jonathan (TN) – With regard to the conversation of splitting the signage types for discussion, are you trying to say this is the most important thing to do? This is more directional and wayfaring that you are describing—these are different kinds of signs than the corridor signage. What I think is easier is to separate them out.
- ✓ Phillip (AL) – I think this kind of consistency is important for both types
- ✓ Jonathan (TN) – We can take a little more time spent on this work, if you all feel it is vital enough, and we can get into the minutiae of the directional wayfaring next year and all of those details—but for now, focus more on the corridor signage, establish contacts, and see what state DOT folks can join us in the conversation.
- ✓ Phillip (AL) – Are we comfortable with the signage that has been issued? Are we comfortable that that is going to achieve, with respect to identification signage, the consistency and uniformity that we think is important?
- ✓ Unknown – It's kind of silly to think of scenarios where a corridor ends in one state and promptly begins again in another state—this is where it's important to coordinate.
  - *Examples of different signage brought up—all slightly different and nothing “bad” but it's important to nail down some consistency that also looks how everyone wants it.*
- ✓ Trev (DOE) – Go into areas where there is already signage and put more signs for awareness. Also approach those considering doing it and make sure they know what they're doing. Putting in this work ahead of time and getting these partnerships going—having a well thought out plan with beginning to develop some of it—can only further the process and goals.
- ✓ Phillip (AL) – I agree, but we should make an effort to get as many groups together as possible and speak with as singular, strong voice as we can. This increases chance of success in shaping what this regulatory process looks like as well as leads to clean implementation.
- ✓

- ✓ Jonathan (TN) – So maybe we need to get 20 coalitions together, get into a room, and don't come out until we look at that MUTCD and come to changes and details we can all agree on for a plan to go forward, and we bring and show that to state DOTs and the DOE. This type of discussion should take place before bringing to DOT.
- ✓ Landon (SC) – AFV corridors can be tricky – it's important to recognize some of the complexities of signage, even along one corridor. Certain fuels can start and stop again along that corridor, while another fuel exists along the entire length of that corridor in that state.
- ✓ Jonathan (TN) – Because we don't know DOE funding for 2020, let's plan to focus on directional and wayfinding discussion for next year—while what Phillip was discussing applies to both kind of signage, it is much more pertinent to the directional than the identification. Let's plan maybe to meet once or twice on corridor identification and we can either see how many DOT people we can get to join us, and for directional we all meet first and approach DOT with what we come up with later.
- ✓ Philip (AL) – Let's also focus on seeing what states have done, comparing to the FHWA guidance, and trying to get some kind of consistency.
- ✓ Trev (DOE) – Also, a competitive funding opportunity may be coming up soon, but maybe corridor planning/development activities could be part of proposed projects? Several states agree that this would be helpful.
  - *Several comments related to this including from Dave Kirschner (DOE).*
  - Unknown – Do a data pool of who has signage and what it looks like—put together a presentation that lays out different kinds of signage to use as a tool for talking with DOT especially for states that are just recently starting to get involved.
  - Unknown – Do an inquiry for all the coordinators and see what information that have regarding signage in their state—might get the information quicker and more current.
- ✓ Bill (NC) – DOT looking into whether CMAQ will fund corridor signage; they'll report back soon. NC's VW EMT ZEV program made applicants allocate funds to pay for wayfinding signage costs, parking lot signage costs, even put in recommended funding levels (we pulled up that plan and showed a few pages to those on the webinar portion of the call).

4. Jonathan (TN) – Associated with corridors but different than our discussion thus far... one of the biggest things for ETCF in the near future is getting TDOT to approve the use of *and set aside* CMAQ funds for public CNG and DCFC stations.
5. *Discussion veered several times into information and columns of questions in spreadsheet and need to fill that out, and see what other information we need to collect. Including discussing that we need to be focusing our answers in that spreadsheet on IDENTIFICATION signage, not directional, even though some data will apply across both (like state DOT contacts). Discussed the need for each state to discuss what goes in here when we have more than one coalition, and need for all state reps to at least complete the questions that are in there now. Overly will send follow-up email to all of team on working on this.*
6. Shauna (TN) – FHWA released a funding opportunity for different DOTs that will be able to work together to lead on alt fuel corridor projects: **TN, AR, and NC put together pitch to work on I-40 corridor that runs through all three states, and won funding.** Collaboration is to leverage different state DOT along the corridor to work together on the primarily CNG and EV corridor and try to identify a number of scopes such as stakeholder sessions, data collection, identifying of problem areas and gaps, narrowing down site hosts,

injection of public-private partnership funds and other funds such as CMAQ. What kind of stations are we hoping to get, specifics such as power capacity, amenities. Final organizational plan still in process now, goal is to have a final deployment plan at the end of the program that will lay out future for area as well as provide guidance for other states across the region.

7. DATES – Group discussed dates and settled on 11/19/19 at 11am to have our next call that will be specifically reviewing what data we all entered in the spreadsheet, and discussing what we want to put on the table to discuss with DOT contact in an ensuing call. We will hold that call first, then look at several dates to send to all our DOT contacts for setting up the call that includes state DOT contacts. Quickly talked about some of those questions like “Who pays for the signs?” and “Can we use CMAQ in our states to pay for them?” and importance of those in discussion with state DOT officials.
8. SUMMARY – Overly needs to send email to all with notes and remind all of tasks