

Southeastern Corridor Council – Zoom Webinar Notes

15th webinar – 6/18/20



Notes taken by Rose and Overly. Call started at 2:30pm ET.

Attendees (18):

AL = **Mark Bentley**, Phillip Wiedmeyer

AR = Patti Springs

FL = Doug Kettles

GA = Jennifer Fundora, Frank Morris

KY = Emily Carpenter

NC = Bill Eaker, Claire Kubitschek,

Caitlin Rose, Carina Soriano

SC = Ben Kessler

TN = Shauna Basques, **Jonathan**

Overly

VA = Alleyn Harned, Matt Wade

DOE Clean Cities = David Kirschner

DOT = Mike Scarpino

(Bold = co-chairs)

NOTES

- ✓ Overly took attendance
- ✓ Mike Scarpino update on future federal funding from meeting
 - Good news on the Transportation Reauthorization Bill and FY20 Appropriations Bill! S 2302 and HR 2 (competitive discretionary grant program, CNG and propane being considered as fuels to add --> stronger bill with those added)
 - The way they decide on discretionary competitive grant based on carbon emission reductions (DCFC win against CNG and propane, RNG could also be competitive when thinking about CO2 emissions)
 - Specific service signs (including EV charging on these signs) - good news for MUTCD (formerly just included gas)!!
 - Transportation auth bill: funds can be used to pay for infrastructure to move corridors from pending to ready (but that is not all they can be used for)
 - “Corridor Refresh” process cannot be used to get something designated as pending
 - Remaining call dates are on the SCC SharePoint page for reference (Aug 20 is a DOT meeting) → Request for JO to send calendar invites for the remaining invites for the year
- ✓ Updates/Work Needed from last meeting
 - In process of moving state contact info into State Officials tab in google doc
 - Brief discussion of who is the main point of contact (Jonathan highlighting those people in doc)
 - Discussion of Interstate Grid tab – all need to complete their work in there.
 - Mike memo from Monday - corridors by fuel/state/highway
 - Use interactive GIS map on AFC FHWA page - rounds 1-3 on one map for each fuel, use that when filling out the spreadsheet tab (this can help you)
 - Harned wants to make it clear that in VA, EV signage is coming out the gate first, VA has an alternate logo that he will share (Electric Vehicle Corridor sign with EV logo, rather than AF corridor; see at right)
 - This potential separately suggested VA logo came up pretty quickly in the state a VADOT, different than national plan; begin a dialogue for this as an east coast alternate, or could just be VA and north (reluctant to do VA-only EV corridor sign)
 - Would have to follow up with additional fuel corridor signage
 - This sign is 'compliant enough' with the MUTCD - same colors and designs as previously approved --> considered a corridor ID sign (Scarpino questioned whether it is compliant with MUTCD, although Mike likes it) - reach out to FHWA division office



- Message of consistency that we have been using when talking with state DOTs (important for continuity) - official guidance for state DOTs on SharePoint
 - Clear and uncluttered signs (Overly noted that some of the existing signs [LA] look cluttered with the smaller signs below the AFC large sign because there is no 'white space' around the letters)
 - Overly also mentioned that were better off having some SE states that have slightly different signs, rather than none!
 - Wiedmeyer – Consistency and collaboration between DOTs - what to do at the state borders? No need to have two sets of signs that might say the same thing on both sides of the border. Suggest to the DOTs that at all state borders one state do signs for one direction and the other does the other direction (either on leaving or coming into state sides)
 - Overly noted he liked the idea, however More signs = More opportunities for people to see the signage and acronyms. However, the more we can connect the right state DOT reps in each state with each other to foster collaboration, the better. We could even plan to select certain states for future calls to talk about collaboration across borders so they have that conversation *while we're talking with them* - ex of GA and surrounding states – state DOTs that don't touch GA wouldn't need to be on that call.
 - Signs entering a state as a priority rather than signs when exiting a state (if it continues)
 - For this analysis, if you nominated something for R4, assume it got approved (Scarpino)
 - Overly: frequency helps people understand it is a corridor. Sign position placement at certain mile markers) decision will likely need to take into consideration where certain important stations are.
- ✓ **BEGINNING OF PLAN FOR NEXT DOT ZOOM:**
- a) Review FHWA signage guidance
 - b) Review how pay for examples (we need to track costs for sign installation across our region – this could be an important output from our work)
- ✓ Scarpino – CA signage fact sheet example; nice simple guide ("*Trailblazer*" signs)
- ✓ Discussion of creating a separate website for SE Corridor Council rather than SharePoint? Several spoke in favor of such; none opposed.

HOMEWORK:

- Overly – Send Outlook invitations for the rest of the year; load more presentations and documents on SP page; research website options.
- States – Finish filling out state reps and grid as needed

NEXT CALL:

- Finish developing agenda for August call with state DOTs
- Review what TN created for plan for working with state DOT people to address build-out of corridor identification signage (including Signage Maintenance Plan)

PLANNED FUTURE CALLS FOR REST OF 2020 (all start at 2pm ET):

- ✓ July 16
- ✓ August 20 – state DOT reps will join us
- ✓ Sept. 17
- ✓ Oct. 15
- ✓ November 19 – state DOT reps will join us
- ✓ Dec. 17