Albemarle RPO Board Meetings

Wednesday, January 27, 2016  College of the Albemarle - Foreman Center Room FC121, 1208 N. Road Street
Elizabeth City, NC

Technical Coordinating Committee: Starts at 11:00 AM

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Agenda Approval
4. Approval/ Adoption of Minutes from Last Meeting
5. Pasquotank CTP endorsement Approval
6. Perquimans CTP endorsement Approval
7. Methodology final approval Approval
8. ARPO 2016 Legislative agenda Approval
10. Public Comments
11. Adjournment

Lunch and Presentations

NCDOT update- Discussions/presentations
Ferry update
TPB update
ARPO update

Transportation Advisory Committee: Starts at 1 PM

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Agenda Approval
4. Approval/ Adoption of Minutes from Last Meeting
5. Pasquotank CTP endorsement Approval
6. Perquimans CTP endorsement Approval
7. Methodology final approval Approval
8. ARPO 2016 legislative agenda Approval
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512 South Church Street  P.O. Box 646  Hertford, NC 27944  Phone: 252-426-5775 Fax: 252-426-5435  www.albemarlecommission.org
Proudly serving Northeastern NC Counties: Camden, Chowan, Currituck, Dare, Gates, Hyde, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Tyrrell and Washington
10. Public Comments
11. Old Business - ferry tolling
12. Adjournment

Lloyd Griffin, TAC Chair
Minutes of the Rural Technical Coordinating Committee (RTCC) Meeting
October 21, 2015
11:00 a.m.

The October 21, 2015 RTCC meeting held at the Dare County Administration Building in Manteo NC was opened and called to order by RTCC Chairman Rhett White at 11:05 a.m.

Roll Call
It was determined a quorum was present with the following TCC members in attendance: Chairman Rhett White, Town of Columbia; Donna Creef, Dare County; Dan Porter, Camden County; Dan Scanlon, Currituck County; Bill Rich, Hyde County; Shelley Cox, Pasquotank County; Kaitlen Alcock, City of Elizabeth City; Natalie Rountree, Gates County; Erin Burke, Town of Manteo; Wes Haskett, Town of Southern Shores; Kevin Howard, Chowan County; Jerry Jennings, NCDOT Division 1; Frank Heath, Perquimans County; Joe Heard, Town of Duck; Lee Cowlig, NCDOT-TPB and Gretchen Byrum, NCDOT Division 1

Agenda Approval
Chairman White called for a motion to accept the agenda as presented. A motion to accept the agenda was made by Dan Scanlon seconded by Wes Haskett, and unanimously carried.

Approval of July 22, 2015 TCC Minutes
Chairman White called for a motion to accept the minutes. A motion to adopt the minutes was made by Dan Porter, seconded by Natalie Rountree, and unanimously carried.

Camden CTP Amendment endorsement
Chairman Rhett White called on a Camden County representative to provide a brief overview of the Camden County CTP Amendment. Camden County TCC representative, Dan Porter stated there was a new highway recommendation for the highway map and the routes from the Albemarle Regional Bicycle Plan were added to the Bicycle maps. Chairman White called for a motion. Donna Creef made a motion to recommend endorsement of the Camden CTP Amendment. Her motion was seconded by Natalie Rountree and with no discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

Currituck CTP Amendment endorsement
Chairman Rhett White called on a Currituck County representative to provide a brief overview of the Currituck County CTP Amendment. Currituck County TCC representative, Dan Scanlon stated there was a new highway recommendation, which matched up to the new Camden County highway recommendation, for the highway map and the routes from the Albemarle Regional Bicycle Plan were also added to the Bicycle maps. Chairman White called for a motion. Wes Haskett made a motion to recommend endorsement of the Currituck CTP Amendment.
Amendment. His motion was seconded by Natalie Rountree and with no discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

**Chowan CTP endorsement**

Chairman Rhett White called on a Chowan County representative to provide a brief overview of the Chowan County CTP. Chowan County TCC representative, Kevin Howard gave a brief overview of the CTP and stated the Chowan Board of Commissioners had adopted the CTP at their regular meeting that Monday night. Angela Welsh stated the endorsement is contingent upon the Town of Edenton adopting the CTP at their October 26, 2015 regular meeting. Chairman White called for a motion. Dan Scanlon made a motion to recommend endorsement of the Chowan CTP. His motion was seconded by Dan Porter and with no discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

**Corolla (Currituck) pedestrian grant application resolution**

Chairman White called on the Planning Director, Angela Welsh, to provide an overview of this item. She explained Currituck County was applying for grant funds to draft a Pedestrian Plan from the NCDOT- Bicycle and Pedestrian Division and the application process requires endorsement of the application by the RPO. She went on to say Currituck was first looking to complete the pedestrian plan for the unincorporated area of Corolla but was advised to complete a plan for the entire county by the NCDOT- Bicycle and Pedestrian Division. She showed the revised resolution of endorsement to the RTCC Board. The resolution stated it was a resolution in support of the countywide plan instead of only the unincorporated area of Corolla. Chairman White called for a motion. Bill Rich made a motion to recommend approval of the revised resolution. His motion was seconded by Erin Burke and with no discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

**P4.0 project list final approval**

Chairman White called on Ms. Welsh to provide an overview of this item. Ms. Welsh stated the project list, for the P4.0 cycle, was tentatively approved by the RTAC at their July 22, 2015 meeting. She stated since the tentative approval of the project list, the Town of Edenton revised one of their existing Bicycle and Pedestrian projects and Perquimans County decided to keep one of their road widening projects on the list instead of deleting it. Ms. Welsh went on to say the ARPO held a required 30 day public comment period from September 15, 2015 through October 15, 2015 and only received one comment from the Outer Banks National Scenic Byway Dare County Committee’s in support of two projects on Hatteras island. Chairman White called for a motion. Donna Creef made a motion to approve the P4.0 project list. Her motion was seconded by Natalie Rountree and unanimously carried.
Methodology tentative approval

Chairman White called on the Planning Director to provide an overview of this item. Ms. Welsh stated during August and September, Staff met with workgroups, comprised of RTCC and RTAC members, to review and/or revise the ARPO’s point assignment methodology. After compiling comments, received in the workgroup sessions, Staff drafted the methodology and submitted it to the Transportation Planning Branch for review and they have approved of it. There were numerous revisions to the ARPO’s Methodology and it was consensus to go through them one by one. The RTCC moved through the revisions and provided their comments and requested revisions be made. Ms. Welsh stated the criteria and methodology will be released for a 30 day public comment period sometime in November of 2015 and be brought back before both the RTCC and RTAC Board in January for final approval. Chairman White called for a motion. Bill Rich made a motion to tentatively approve the Methodology with the requested revisions. His motion was seconded by Frank Heath and unanimously carried.

Chairman White opened the floor for public comments and there being no public comments closed the floor.

With no further business to discuss, Chairman White asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Dan Porter made a motion to adjourn the meeting. His motion was seconded by Wes Haskett. The meeting was adjourned at 12:03 pm.

Lunch and Presentations

Division 1 Report
Jerry Jennings provided a presentation on the additional revenue provided in the State budget for transportation needs. Malcolm Fearing provided an update on the additional revenue for transportation needs and ferry discussions.

Ferry Division Report
Ed Goodwin provided an update on Ferry Division needs and funding.

NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch Report
Lee Cowlig gave a brief update on Comprehensive Transportation Plans (CTP) work in the ARPO region.

ARPO Director Report
Angela Welsh gave a brief update on the progress of the Regional Bicycle Website.

The Albemarle Commission Attorney, Dwight Wheless provided his interpretation of the ARPO’s Bylaws regarding whether the RTCC must first review and act on items added to the RTAC agenda before the RTAC Board considers them. Article IV “Agendas” applies to the RTCC and the RTAC and requires that an agenda list “items for consideration by the Committee” and
allows additional items to be placed on the agenda at the “...beginning of a regular meeting with the affirmative vote of fifty percent (50%) plus one (1), of the voting membership of both the RTCC and RTAC. [Comment: I think the correct way to interpret the “and” is that the requirement is the same for each independent committee and the action of one does not require the same action by the other.]

Minutes of the Rural Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) Meeting
October 21, 2015
1:00 p.m.

Call to Order
The October 21, 2015 TAC meeting held at the Dare County Administration Building in Manteo NC was opened and called to order by RTAC Chairman Lloyd Griffin at 1:05 p.m.

Roll Call
It was determined a quorum was present with the following RTAC voting members in attendance: Chairman Lloyd Griffin, Pasquotank County; Leroy Spivey, Tyrrell County; Jeff Smith, Chowan County; Wally Overman, Dare County; Matt Peeler, Perquimans County; Vance Aydlett, Currituck County; Ben Simmons, Hyde County; and Malcom Fearing, Board of Transportation member.

RTAC Non-voting members in attendance: Larry Lawhon, Town of Southern Shores; Gary Perry, Town of Kitty Hawk; Brandy Rheubottom, Kill Devil Hills; and John Ratzenberger, Nags Head

Alternates in attendance:
Jack Shea, Dare County and Paul O’Neal, Currituck County

Agenda Approval
Chairman Griffin called for a motion to accept the agenda as presented. Jeff Smith made a motion to amend the agenda and add a ferry tolling resolution and discussion. His motion was seconded by Jack Shea and was thought to have failed with a 5-2 vote. A Roll Call vote was requested but the TAC Chairman decided it was not needed. Note: Upon further review by staff, during the meeting, it was realized the vote was 6-2 in favor of adding the resolution and discussion to the agenda which was the 50% +1 vote needed to do so, For: Smith, Peeler, Griffin, Shea, Spivey, Fearing Against: Simmons, Aydlett. The TAC Chairman was notified along with the rest of the TAC Board of the correction and Board discussion ensued, however, a vote was not taken on the resolution nor was the resolution taken off the floor. Upon consultation with Dwight Wheless, Attorney for the Albemarle Commission, this item will be added as “Old Business” to the TAC’s January meeting agenda.
The Chairman asked for a motion to compile items 5 through 8 as consent agenda items. A motion was made by Jack Shea, seconded by Matt Peeler, and unanimously carried.

Approval of July 22, 2015 TAC Minutes

Chairman Griffin called for a motion to accept the minutes as presented. A motion to adopt the minutes as presented was made by Jack Shea, seconded by Matt Peeler, and unanimously carried.

P4.0 project list final approval

Chairman Griffin asked Ms. Welsh to provide a brief overview of this item. Ms. Welsh stated the project list was tentatively approved by the RTAC at their July 22, 2015 meeting. She stated there were two revisions to the list since tentative approval and the ARPO had held the required 30 day public comment period. She stated the RTCC recommended approval of the P4.0 project list. Chairman Griffin called for a motion. Matt Peeler made a motion to approve the P4.0 project list. His motion was seconded by Jack Shea and unanimously carried.

Methodology tentative approval

Chairman Griffin called on Ms. Welsh to provide a brief review of the methodology and she stated the RTCC recommended approval with minor revisions. Jeff Smith asked Ms. Welsh to clarify one part of the methodology and also had a minor revision for her to make to it. Chairman Griffin called for a motion. Jack Shea made a motion to approve with the minor revision. His motion was seconded by Matt Peeler and unanimously carried.

Ferry discussion

The Board began to discuss the need for new and replacement ferry vessels and how to fund them. Chairman Griffin called on both voting and non-voting RTAC members to take part in the discussion. Concerns were expressed that if the Hatteras-Ocracoke route was tolled, the toll money collected would not be enough to cover all of the costs of the new and replacement ferry vessels needed and the additional funds would still have to come out of the Division pot of money. The Board also discussed how their decision would affect the Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) grant the ferry division applied for. There was discussion about asking Legislators to try, again, to designate a line item in the State budget for new and replacement ferry vessels so they would not have to compete in the “Division” pot of money as well. There were also concerns expressed that legislators have had time to identify alternative sources to fund new and replacement ferry vessels and they have not been able to do so. A suggestion was proposed that the RTAC hold off on voting on tolling the route until after the 2016 short session to give legislators additional time to find alternative funding sources for new and replacement ferry vessels. Other concerns expressed were with new and replacement ferry vessels having to compete under the STI law, the ferry system may not be able to maintain an
adequate level of service if the ferries don’t score well enough to be funded. There were also concerns expressed about how much the tolls would actually generate and a suggestion that the passenger ferries be tolled and the traditional ferries not be tolled.

Note: Upon further review by staff, during this discussion, it was realized the vote was 6-2 in favor of adding the resolution and discussion to the agenda which was the 50% +1 vote needed to do so, For: Smith, Peeler, Griffin, Shea, Spivey, Fearing Against: Simmons, Aydlett. The TAC Chairman was notified along with the rest of the TAC Board of the correction and Board discussion ensued, however, a vote was not taken on the resolution nor was the resolution taken off the floor. Upon consultation with Dwight Wheless, Attorney for the Albemarle Commission, this item will be added as “Old Business” to the TAC’s January meeting agenda.

Public Comments

Chairman Griffin opened the floor for public comments and there being no public comments closed the floor.

Adjournment

There being no further business to conduct, Chairman Griffin declared the meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Angela Welsh, Secretary
ARPO Director
Agenda Item No. 5

Item Title: Pasquotank County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) endorsement

Item Summary: Once approved by local governments, RPO’s are required to endorse Comprehensive Transportation Plans (CTP’s) approved by their member counties and municipalities. Once endorsed by the ARPO, this amendment will move forward for adoption by the Board of Transportation.

Specific action requested: Approval of the attached resolution endorsing the Pasquotank County Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

Number of attachments: 10

Transportation Planning Branch Project Engineer, Nazia Sarder, will present the Pasquotank CTP and answer any questions you may have.
A RESOLUTION FOR ENDORSEMENT OF
THE PASQUOTANK COUNTY
COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) is the duly recognized transportation planning policy board for the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization (RPO); and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation Planning Branch has completed the Pasquotank County Comprehensive Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Pasquotank County Comprehensive Transportation Plan is consistent with the local land use plans, the Albemarle RPO transportation needs and the statewide transportation plan; and

WHEREAS, the Pasquotank County Transportation Plan has been adopted by Pasquotank County and the City of Elizabeth City;

WHEREAS, if any changes are made to the Pasquotank County Comprehensive Transportation Plan as presented prior to adoption by the local boards, the Albemarle RPO shall review and endorse these changes prior to adoption by the Board of Transportation;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle RPO TAC hereby endorses the Pasquotank County Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

A motion was made by _______ and seconded by _____ for the endorsement of the resolution, and upon being put to a vote was duly adopted, on this, the 27th day of January 2016.

Lloyd Griffin, III Chairman
Albemarle RPO TAC

Angela Welsh, Secretary
Albemarle RPO Director
COUNTY OF PASQUOTANK

Resolution
Adopting a Comprehensive Transportation Plan
For Pasquotank County, North Carolina

WHEREAS, Pasquotank County, the City of Elizabeth City and the Transportation Planning Branch, North Carolina Department of Transportation actively worked to develop a comprehensive transportation plan for Pasquotank County; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Department of Transportation are directed by North Carolina General Statutes 136-66.2 to reach agreement for a transportation system that will serve present and anticipated volumes of traffic in the County; and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that the proper movement of traffic within and through Pasquotank County is a highly desirable element of the comprehensive plan for the orderly growth and development of the County; and

WHEREAS, after full study of the plan, the Pasquotank County Commissioners feels it to be in the best interest of Pasquotank County to adopt a plan pursuant to General Statutes 136-66.2;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Pasquotank County Comprehensive Transportation Plan be approved and adopted as a guide in the development of the transportation system in Pasquotank County and the same is hereby recommended to the North Carolina Department of Transportation for its subsequent adoption.

ADOPTED, this the 7th day of December 2015.

Attest:

Joseph S. Winslow, Jr., Chairman
Pasquotank County Board of Commissioners
Resolution #2015-11-03
Adopting a Comprehensive Transportation Plan
For Pasquotank County, North Carolina

WHEREAS, Pasquotank County, the City of Elizabeth City and the Transportation Planning Branch, North Carolina Department of Transportation actively worked to develop a comprehensive transportation plan for Pasquotank County; and

WHEREAS, Pasquotank County and the Department of Transportation are directed by North Carolina General Statutes 136-66.2 to reach agreement for a transportation system that will serve present and anticipated volumes of traffic in the County; and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that the proper movement of traffic within and through Pasquotank County is a highly desirable element of the comprehensive plan for the orderly growth and development of the County; and

WHEREAS, after full study of the plan and following a public discussion held during a regularly scheduled meeting by the City Council of the City of Elizabeth City, the City Council feels it to be in the best interest of the City of Elizabeth City to adopt the plan pursuant to General Statutes 136-66.2.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Pasquotank County Comprehensive Transportation Plan be approved and adopted by the City of Elizabeth City as a guide in the development of the transportation system in Pasquotank County and the same is hereby recommended to the North Carolina Department of Transportation for its subsequent adoption.

ADOPTED, this the 23rd day of November 2015.

Attest:
Vivian D. White, CMC/NCCMC
City Clerk

Joseph W. Peel
Mayor
CLERK CERTIFICATION

I, Vivian D. White, City Clerk of the City of Elizabeth City, North Carolina, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted after discussion and review and upon a motion by Councilman Tony Stimatz, seconded by Councilman Ray Donnelly and upon being put to a vote was adopted by a vote of 8 to 0 in the meeting of the City Council of the City of Elizabeth City held on November 23, 2015.

WITNESS my hand and the official seal of the City of Elizabeth City this the 24th day of November, 2015.

Vivian D. White, CMC/NCCMC
City Clerk
Pedestrian Map
Inset
Draft
Pasquotank County & Elizabeth City
Comprehensive Transportation Plan
Plan date: 12/08/2015

Sheet 5A of 5
Base map date:
Refer to CTP document for more details
Item Title: Perquimans County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) endorsement

Item Summary: Once approved by local governments, RPO's are required to endorse Comprehensive Transportation Plans (CTP's) approved by their member counties and municipalities. Once endorsed by the ARPO, this amendment will move forward for adoption by the Board of Transportation.

Specific action requested: Approval of the attached resolution endorsing the Perquimans County Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

Transportation Planning Branch Project Engineer, Nazia Sarder, will present the Perquimans CTP and answer any questions you may have.
A RESOLUTION FOR ENDORSEMENT OF THE PERQUIMANS COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) is the duly recognized transportation planning policy board for the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization (RPO); and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation Planning Branch has completed the Perquimans County Comprehensive Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Perquimans County Comprehensive Transportation Plan is consistent with the local land use plans, the Albemarle RPO transportation needs and the statewide transportation plan; and

WHEREAS, the Perquimans County Transportation Plan has been adopted by Perquimans County, the Town of Winfall and the Town of Hertford;

WHEREAS, if any changes are made to the Perquimans County Comprehensive Transportation Plan as presented prior to adoption by the local boards, the Albemarle RPO shall review and endorse these changes prior to adoption by the Board of Transportation;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle RPO TAC hereby endorses the Perquimans County Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

A motion was made by _______ and seconded by _____ for the endorsement of the resolution, and upon being put to a vote was duly adopted, on this, the 27th day of January 2016.

Lloyd Griffin, III Chairman
Albemarle RPO TAC

Angela Welsh, Secretary
Albemarle RPO Director

§

Officers
Lloyd E. Griffin, III
TAC Chairman

Leroy Spivey
TAC Vice-Chairman

Rhett White
TCC Chairman

Dan Porter
TCC Vice-Chairman

§

Proudly serving Perquimans, Perquimans, Currituck, Dare, Gates, Hyde, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Tyrrell, and Washington Counties
Town of Winfall
100 Parkview Lane, P.O. Box 275
Winfall, North Carolina 27985

After further discussion and review, upon a motion of Councilman Preston White, seconded by Councilman Steav Congdon and, upon being put to a vote, was carried
The Town Council approved the following resolution:

Resolution
Adopting a Comprehensive Transportation Plan
For Perquimans County, North Carolina

WHEREAS, Perquimans County, the Town of Hertford, the Town of Winfall and the Transportation Planning Branch, North Carolina Department of Transportation actively worked to develop a comprehensive transportation plan for Perquimans County; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Department of Transportation are directed by North Carolina General Statutes 136-66.2 to reach agreement for a transportation system that will serve present and anticipated volumes of traffic in the County; and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that the proper movement of traffic within and through Perquimans County is a highly desirable element of the comprehensive plan for the orderly growth and development of the County; and

WHEREAS, after full study of the plan, and following a public meeting held by the Town of Winfall, the Town Council of the Town of Winfall feels it to be in the best interest of the Town of Winfall to adopt a plan pursuant to General Statutes 136-66.2;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Perquimans County Comprehensive Transportation Plan be approved and adopted as a guide in the development of the transportation system in Perquimans County and the same is hereby recommended to the North Carolina Department of Transportation for its subsequent adoption.

ADOPTED, this the 11th day of January 2016.

I, Brenda Dillard, Clerk of the Town of Winfall, North Carolina, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted in an adjourned meeting of said municipality held on January 11, 2016. WITNESS my hand and the official seal of the Town of Winfall this the 11th day of January, 2016.

Brenda Dillard
Town Clerk
After further discussion and review, upon a motion of Matthew Peeler, seconded by Wallace E. Nelson and, upon being put to a vote, was carried unanimously, the Board of Commissioners approved the following resolution:

Resolution
Adopting a Comprehensive Transportation Plan
For Perquimans County, North Carolina

WHEREAS, Perquimans County, the Town of Hertford, the Town of Winfall and the Transportation Planning Branch, North Carolina Department of Transportation actively worked to develop a comprehensive transportation plan for Perquimans County; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Department of Transportation are directed by North Carolina General Statutes 136-66.2 to reach agreement for a transportation system that will serve present and anticipated volumes of traffic in the County; and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that the proper movement of traffic within and through Perquimans County is a highly desirable element of the comprehensive plan for the orderly growth and development of the County; and

WHEREAS, after full study of the plan, and following a public meeting held by the Perquimans County, the Board of Commissioners of Perquimans County feels it to be in the best interest of Perquimans County to adopt a plan pursuant to General Statutes 136-66.2;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Perquimans County Comprehensive Transportation Plan be approved and adopted as a guide in the development of the transportation system in Perquimans County and the same is hereby recommended to the North Carolina Department of Transportation for its subsequent adoption.

ADOPTED, this the 4th day of January 2016.

I, Mary P. Hunnicutt, Clerk to the Board of Commissioners for Perquimans County, North Carolina, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted in an adjourned meeting of said municipality held on January 4, 2016. WITNESS my hand and the official seal of the Perquimans County this the 4th day of January, 2016.

Mary P. Hunnicutt, Clerk to the Board
Perquimans County Board of Commissioners
Perquimans County
North Carolina

Draft
Comprehensive Transportation Plan

Plan date: Nov 04, 2015

On-road
- Existing
- Needs Improvement
- Recommended

Off-road
- Existing
- Needs Improvement
- Recommended

Multi-Use Paths
- Existing
- Needs Improvement
- Recommended

Existing Grade Separation
Proposed Grade Separation

Base map date: June 2014
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Agenda Item No. 7

Item Title: Methodology

Item Summary: Session Law 2012-84 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Rural Planning Organizations to develop a ranking process for highway, bicycle/pedestrian, public transit, aviation, rail and ferry projects. The ranking process must be data driven and include a combination of quantitative data and qualitative and local input.

Specific action requested: Final approval of methodology

Both Boards considered the attached Methodology at their October 21, 2015 meetings and Staff was asked to make a few minor revisions. The revisions have been made and are highlighted in yellow. There is also a change based on clarification from the SPOT office; this change is located on the first page. We are not required to hold a public comment period on our project scores so we will only have to hold our usual 4 yearly meetings instead of five this year.

A public comment period, for our Methodology, was held November 6, 2015 through December 6, 2015 and we received no comments from the public.
ARPO Prioritization 4.0 Methodology

Session Law 2012-84 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Rural Planning Organizations (MPO’s and RPO’s) to develop a ranking process for highway, bicycle/pedestrian, public transit, aviation, rail and ferry projects. The ranking process must be data driven and include a combination of quantitative data and qualitative and local input. The following process applies to all projects ranked as “regional” and “division” funding in the counties of Currituck, Camden, Gates, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Chowan, Washington, Tyrrell, Hyde and Dare. Funding levels are as defined in the 2013 Strategic Transportation Investment Law. Following is a timeline for project solicitation, project ranking process and ARPO point assignment. These dates are subject to change as we work through this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May- June 2015</td>
<td>Solicit new projects. If new projects exceed SPOT’s cap for new projects, the TCC will make a recommendation to the TAC at the July 22 meeting.</td>
<td>RPO Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 2015</td>
<td>TAC finalizes and tentatively approves project list</td>
<td>TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August-September 2015</td>
<td>Review local input point methodology and make revisions if needed.</td>
<td>RPO staff – TCC/TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21, 2015</td>
<td>Public Hearing- Final approval of project list and tentative approval of Local Input Methodology and release for a 30 day public comment period.</td>
<td>TCC/TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November - December 2015</td>
<td>Public comment period for Local Input Methodology</td>
<td>RPO Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2016</td>
<td>TAC approves Local Input Methodology</td>
<td>TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February-March</td>
<td>Scores projects based on Local Input methodology</td>
<td>RPO Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>TIP Unit programs Statewide projects</td>
<td>NCDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2016</td>
<td>Public Hearing- Tentative approval of both Regional and Division project scores and release for a 30 day public comment period.</td>
<td>TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18 - April 20, 2016</td>
<td>TAC approves Regional and Division project scores and assigns local input points to regional projects.</td>
<td>TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late May 2016</td>
<td>Regional local input points entered into SPOT Online</td>
<td>RPO Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24, 2016</td>
<td>Review regional scores with TAC and assign final Division local input points.</td>
<td>TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Division scores entered into SPOT Online</td>
<td>RPO Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>Draft STIP released</td>
<td>NCDOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the months of May through June of 2015, the ARPO started soliciting projects from local government Managers and Planners who, in turn, solicited projects from organizations and the public in their respective communities.

In July of 2015, the results of the project solicitation will be reviewed by the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and then be presented to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at their October meeting for tentative approval. If new projects exceed the maximum number allowed, the TAC will choose which projects to submit based on recommendations from NCDOT Division 1, TCC, and RPO staff. The
process and point assignment methods will also be reviewed by the TCC and presented to the TAC, for tentative approval, at their October meeting. The methods described herein are subject to change based on the public comment process described later in this document.

In October of 2015, ARPO staff will submit new projects to NCDOT through the SPOT On!ine system and in November - through December 2015 a 30 day Public comment period will be opened for public review of the ARPO local point assignment methodology.

In January of 2016, TAC members will meet and hold a Public hearing regarding adoption of the local point assignment methodology. During this time, results of the public comment period will also be reviewed and considered by the TAC prior to adopting a final methodology. Once final TAC approval for local point assignment methodology occurs, approved methodologies will be sent to the SPOT office for their final approval no later than February 1, 2016.

The TCC and TAC will also evaluate the list of new and previously evaluated projects for the 10 counties and a 30 day public comment period, for projects and point assignments, will be held in early April of 2016.

In May of 2016, the TAC will hold a Public meeting regarding the final point assignment for projects and results of the public comment period will also be presented and considered by the TAC. Final approval, point assignment and submission to SPOT office will occur by September of 2016.

In the winter of 2016 NCDOT will release the Draft STIP.

Public Input process

Methodology

This methodology will be tentatively approved by the TCC and TAC at their October 2015 meeting. Once approved by the TAC, the RPO will release the draft methodology for a 30-day public comment period. This comment period will be advertised on the RPO website at www.albemarlecommission.org/planning/ and via local media. The results of the public comment period will be presented to the TCC and TAC at their January 2016 meeting where the public will also be able to submit comments. All public comments will be documented and reasonable edits to the methodology may be made prior to TAC approval and submittal to the SPOT office. All public comments will be documented, filed by the RPO and distributed to local entities to consider for future prioritization processes and transportation plans. No new projects will be added to the Prioritization 4.0 list due to the fact the NCDOT deadline for submitting new projects will have passed.

Project ranking

The RPO will present the recommended point assignments and scores of all projects to the TCC and TAC at their March 2016 meetings. Once approved by the TAC, the RPO will release the recommended projects and point assignments for a 30-day public comment period. This comment period will be advertised on the RPO website www.albemarlecommission.org/planning/ and via local media. The results of the public comment period will be presented to the TCC and TAC at their May 2016 meetings where the public will also be able to submit comments and all public comments will be documented. In May 2016, the TAC will be asked to approve the project list and final point assignments. Once complete, the list and points assignments will be available on the RPO website.

Ranking Process

Division level
Projects involving SR routes, bicycle and pedestrian transportation, transit, airports and ferry vessels are evaluated at the Division level. The Albemarle Rural Planning Organization receives 1300 local allocation points at the Division level. Once all projects are scored using the methodology described below, the ARPO staff will develop a ranked list of projects within each county and within the RPO as a whole based on the outcome of the scoring. This ranked list will be used to develop the recommended point assignments that are presented to the public for comment and to the TCC and TAC for approval. The top scoring Division level project, within each county will be allocated 100 points to reach the ARPO's total allocation of 1300 points provided their quantitative score exceeds 10 points in the Division needs category. This promotes
geographic equity of projects. In the event that any counties do not have at least one Division level project, which meets the criteria above, one project from each mode which quantitative score exceeds 10 points in the Division needs category will be selected from the the list of remaining projects within the RPO as a whole in order to reach the ARPO’s allocation of 1300 points. Projects will be selected in the following order, Highway, Aviation, Ferry, Transit and Bike and Ped. Should two or more projects of the same or different modes tie, the Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) score will be used as the tie-breaker. Since funding in the Division category is limited, Statewide or Regional projects, that cost more than $20,000,000, that cascade down to the Division level will not be considered for Division qualitative points.

**Division Level (Highways and ferries)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>0 points</th>
<th>5 points</th>
<th>10 points</th>
<th>15 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety score</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>26-49</td>
<td>50-74</td>
<td>75-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation based on the crash frequency and severity along sections of a particular roadway. This score is generated in the quantitative scoring process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Plan consistency</td>
<td>Project is not in STIP, CTP, or other locally adopted plan</td>
<td>Project will be incorporated into CTP or other locally adopted plan.</td>
<td>Project is in STIP, CTP, or other locally adopted plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development/Employment access</td>
<td>Provides access within a 20 mile radius of an existing or proposed employment center* with 20 or more employees.</td>
<td>Provides access within a 15 mile radius of an existing or proposed employment center* with 100 or more employees.</td>
<td>Provides access within a 10 mile radius of an active industrial/business park or proposed new employment center* with more than 100 employees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project provide direct connection to a downtown district, business district, government center, educational center healthcare center, prison, military base or agricultural center? Must meet both distance and employment criteria to be eligible to receive points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal elements</td>
<td>Project does not incorporate or connect to facilities of another mode</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project incorporates or connects to facilities of another mode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project incorporate other modes of transportation (a sidewalk along a road etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing deficiency</td>
<td>Existing facility/service available</td>
<td>Existing facility/service available, but contains gap with lower level of service/intermittent service</td>
<td>No existing facility/service available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project address an existing gap in the transportation system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway and shoulder width</td>
<td>Currently exceeds NCDOT minimum standards</td>
<td>Currently meets NCDOT standards</td>
<td>Currently does not meet NCDOT standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the current condition not meet, meet or exceed NCDOT minimum standards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation</td>
<td>The project is not an official NCDOT evacuation route</td>
<td></td>
<td>The project is an official NCDOT evacuation route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project part of an official NCDOT evacuation route?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An employment center is defined as a downtown district, business district, government center, educational center healthcare center, prison, military base, or agricultural center.
Division Level (bicycle and pedestrian transportation, transit, aviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>0 points</th>
<th>5 points</th>
<th>15 points</th>
<th>25 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Plan consistency</strong></td>
<td>Project is not in STIP, CTP, LCP, CTSP, ALP or other locally adopted plan</td>
<td>Project will be incorporated into CTP or other locally adopted plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project is in STIP, CTP, LCP, CTSP, ALP or other locally adopted plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Is the proposed project part of an existing, or proposed, adopted Plan?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development/Employment access</th>
<th>Provides access within a 3 mile radius of a proposed or existing employment center* with more than 20 employees.</th>
<th>Provides access within a 2 mile radius of an existing or proposed employment center* with more than 100 employees.</th>
<th>Provides access within 1 mile radius of an active industrial/business park or proposed new employment center* with more than 100 employees.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project provide direct connection to a downtown district, business district, government center, educational center healthcare center, prison, or agricultural center?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multimodal elements</th>
<th>Project does not incorporate or connect to facilities of another mode</th>
<th>Project incorporates or connects to facilities of another mode</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project incorporate other modes of transportation (a sidewalk along a road etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing deficiency</th>
<th>Existing facility/service available</th>
<th>Existing facility/service available, but contains gap with lower level of service/intermittent service</th>
<th>No existing facility/service available.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project address an existing gap in the transportation system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An employment center is defined as a downtown district, business district, government center, educational center healthcare center, prison, military base or agricultural center.

**Regional level (NC Routes)**

Projects involving NC routes are evaluated at the Regional level and the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization also receives 1300 points for these projects. Once all projects are scored using the methodology described below, the ARPO staff will develop a ranked list of projects within each county and within the RPO as a whole based on the outcome of the criteria below. This ranked list will be used to develop the recommended point assignments that are presented to the public for comment and to the TCC and TAC for approval. The top scoring Division level project, within each county will be allocated 100 points to reach the ARPO’s total allocation of 1300 points provided their quantitative score exceeds 10 points in the Regional needs category. This promotes geographic equity of projects. In the event that any counties do not have at least one Regional level project, which meets the criteria above, one projects from each mode which quantitative score exceeds 10 points in the Regional needs category will be selected from the top of the list of remaining projects within the RPO as a whole in order to reach the ARPO’s allocation of 1300 points. Should two or more projects of the same or different modes tie, the Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) score will be used as the tie-breaker. Since funding in the Division category is limited, Statewide or Regional projects, that cost over 20,000,000, that cascade down to the Division level will not be considered for Division qualitative points.
Regional level (Highways and transit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>0 points</th>
<th>5 points</th>
<th>10 points</th>
<th>15 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation based on the crash frequency and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severity along sections of a particular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roadway. This score is generated in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative scoring process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Plan consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed project part of an existing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or proposed, adopted Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development/Employment access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides direct access within a 20 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radius of an existing or proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment center* with more than 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides direct access within a 15 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radius of an existing or proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment center* with more than 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides direct access within a 10 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radius of an active industrial/business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>park or proposed new employment center* with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 100 employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project provide direct connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to a downtown district, business district,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government center, educational center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>healthcare center, military base, prison, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural center? Must meet both distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and employment criteria to be eligible to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receive points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project does not incorporate or connect to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities of another mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project incorporates or connects to facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of another mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project incorporate other modes of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation (a sidewalk along a road etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing deficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing facility/service available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing facility/service available, but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contains gap with lower level of service/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermittent service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No existing facility/service available,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project address an existing gap in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the transportation system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway and shoulder width</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently exceeds NCDOT minimum standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently meets NCDOT standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently does not meet NCDOT standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the current condition not meet, meet or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceed NCDOT minimum standards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is not an official NCDOT evacuation route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is an official NCDOT evacuation route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An employment center is defined as a downtown district, business district, government center, educational center healthcare center, military base, prison, or agricultural center.

Any justification/rationale for local point assignment deviation from the TAC adopted and SPOT office approved Methodology by the TAC will be posted on the ARPO website for public inspection. Special consideration to deviate from the approved Methodology includes, but is not limited to, projects not being competitive in their respective categories, projects that are not far enough along in the planning process to warrant funding, projects that have strong local government support, and projects that have strong public support. Any deviation from the approved Methodology must be agreed upon by a majority of TCC and TAC members as outlined in the ARPO Bylaws. This allowance is envisioned as a safety net to provide local oversight to the data-driven process and to compensate for any peculiar scores where the prioritization methodology fails to operate as expected. “Any local point assignment deviation from the methodology will be fully disclosed to the public and reason(s) why placed on the RPO website.”
Item Title: 2016 ARPO legislative agenda

Item Summary: The ARPO will be partnering with the Albemarle Commission to present our 2016 legislative agendas to our legislators on March 22, 2016. This forum will be open to all elected officials, county and city managers, and economic developers in our ten county region. Official invitations will be sent in the coming weeks.

Specific action requested: Discussion/approval of the 2016 ARPO legislative agenda

Number of attachments: 1
2016 legislative priorities

Mission
The mission of the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization (ARPO) is to serve as an intergovernmental organization of local and State officials for the purpose of developing long-range local and regional multi-modal transportation plans and securing needed transportation improvements for the Albemarle region.

Position
A core service of government, and vital to the economic development of the ARPO's region, is to ensure adequate funding for the construction and maintenance of bridges, highways, public transportation, airports, bicycle and pedestrian networks and the ferry system.

Proposed solutions
Continued exploration of funding approaches to generate revenue equitably from all users of North Carolina's transportation network.

The ARPO supports these key regional transportation initiatives:

- Ensure funding for future interstate along US 64 and US 17 from Raleigh, NC to the Hampton Roads region in Virginia
- Continue to seek additional permanent sources of funding for new and replacement ferry vessels and support vessels.
- Seek methods to increase the current level of NCDOT Division 1 maintenance funds.
- Ensure funding for widening of, and needed bridge replacements, along hurricane evacuation routes.
Agenda Item No. 9

Item Title: FY 16-17 Planning Work Program (PWP)

Item Summary: The Planning Work program (PWP) is a funding contract between the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization (ARPO) and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). The Plan lists planning priorities anticipated by the ARPO during the next Fiscal year and outlines expenses needs for certain work tasks. The FY 14-15 PWP has been reviewed, and tentatively approved by the NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch.

Specific action requested: Discussion and possible Adoption of FY 16-17 PWP

Number of attachments: 3

The attached word document and spreadsheet explain the various tasks ARPO Staff will complete, and deliverables Staff will provide to the Transportation Planning Branch, for FY 16-17. This item must be approved by May 1, 2016.
**FY 16-17 Planning Work Program (PWP)**

**Summary**
The Planning Work program (PWP) is a funding contract between the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization (ARPO) and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). The Plan lists planning priorities anticipated by the ARPO during the next Fiscal year and outlines expenses needs for certain work tasks. The PWP is reviewed, and approved by the ARPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch. Revisions to the PWP are allowed if the ARPO needs to make significant changes to the overall budget or a specific work task, however, no additional dues will be requested from County members. An approved PWP is required for the Lead Planning Agency, the Albemarle Commission, to be reimbursed for work task expenses incurred by the ARPO.

**Data Collection and Assessment**
During FY 16-17, the ARPO will continue implementing of the action steps in the Albemarle Regional Bicycle Plan such as; establishing the Albemarle Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (BPAC) which will meet twice per year, set up a regional Walk Bike website by partnering with the NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Division, develop a bicycle count program, help to establish Safe Routes to School Programs in municipalities, help municipalities apply for the “Bicycle Friendly Community” designation by the League of American Bicyclists. The ARPO will also continue to collect ADT maps as well as attend required transit workshops and/or meetings.

**Transportation Planning**
The ARPO will also continue Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) work for counties in the ARPO region in FY 16-17 if they aren’t completed in FY 16-16. The final CTP documentation and closeout will take place for the Chowan, Pasquotank and Perquimans Counties.

**Prioritization and Program Development**
In FY 16-17 transportation project prioritization will take place. With changes made to the SPOT4.0 criteria, the ARPO hopes to be in a better position to compete for funds at the “state” and “regional” categories which would allow us to fund more transportation related projects.

**Project Development**
In FY 16-17 the ARPO Director will continue to participate in the merger process as a member of the merger team. Merger is a process to streamline the project development and permitting processes. Stakeholders include the NCDOT, USACE, NC DENR (DWQ, DCM), and FHWA. The Merger process provides a forum for appropriate agency representatives to discuss and reach consensus on ways to facilitate meeting the regulatory requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act during the NEPA/SEPA decision-making phase of transportation projects.
General Transportation Planning
The ARPO Director will also attend all NCAPO quarterly meetings in FY 16-17 as it is a requirement of funding. The ARPO Director will also continue to attend all CTG Section 9 meetings, Albemarle Commission meetings, Southern Albemarle Association meetings as well as other transportation related meetings throughout the region.

Administration of Transportation Planning and Policies
As a requirement of funding, the ARPO Director will prepare the PWP for FY 17-18 and the 5 year planning calendar for FY 17-18, prepare quarterly invoice and progress reports for FY 16-17, coordinate TAC Ethics requirements, update the ARPO Public Involvement Plan (PIP), update the ARPO Facebook page and web page on a regular basis, draft and distribute ARPO quarterly newsletters, draft a “Citizens Guide to Transportation Planning” and continue to respond to member requests.

![PWP expenditures by line item](image)

![Funding summary](image)
## DATA COLLECTION AND ASSESSMENT

### I-1 DATA COLLECTION AND ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Code</th>
<th>Task Code/Work Product Description</th>
<th>Work Product Format</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Primary Project# (If Applicable)</th>
<th>Data Collection and Assessment</th>
<th>% Budget Spent to Date</th>
<th>TO Date Expenditures</th>
<th>Budgeted Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1.1</td>
<td>CTP Inventory and Assessment</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>1415_000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1.2</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Inventory and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1.3</td>
<td>Parking Inventories</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>1415_000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1.4</td>
<td>Vehicle Occupancy Rates (VOR) Counts and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1.5</td>
<td>Traffic Volume Counts and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1.6</td>
<td>Crash Data and Assessment</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>1415_000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1.7</td>
<td>Public Transportation Service Data and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1.8</td>
<td>Socioeconomic Data Inventory</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>1415_000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUDGETED AMOUNT

**FY 2016-2017**

**Albemarle Rural Planning Organization**

**ANNUAL PROPOSED FUNDING SOURCES TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Work Program</th>
<th>Task Code / Work Product Description</th>
<th>Work Product Format</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Primary Project# (IF APPLICABLE)</th>
<th>Data Collection and Assessment</th>
<th>% Budget Spent to Date</th>
<th>TO Date Expenditures</th>
<th>Budgeted Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPO Program Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RPO Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>FY 2016-2017</th>
<th>Albemarle Rural Planning Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. DATA COLLECTION AND ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK CODE</td>
<td>TASK CODE/WORK PRODUCT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>WORK PRODUCT FORMAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1.1</td>
<td>Environmental and Land use Data Inventory and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1.2</td>
<td>Demographic Data Collection and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1</td>
<td>Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Development</td>
<td>$2,000 $0 $0 $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.1</td>
<td>CTP Study Setup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.1.1</td>
<td>CTP Study Setup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.1.2</td>
<td>Local CTP Vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.2</td>
<td>CTP Needs Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.2.1</td>
<td>Data Collection and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.2.2</td>
<td>Current and Future Year Data Endorsements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.2.3</td>
<td>Deficiency Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.3</td>
<td>Analyze Alternatives and Environmental Screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.3.1</td>
<td>Alternatives Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.3.2</td>
<td>Local Alternative Consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.4</td>
<td>Develop Final Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.4.1</td>
<td>Develop CTP Maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK CODE</td>
<td>TASK CODE/ WORK PRODUCT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>WORK PRODUCT FORMAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.4.b</td>
<td>Local Endorsement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.4.c</td>
<td>Adopt Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.4.d</td>
<td>CT P Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.4.e</td>
<td>CTP and Local Land Use Revisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.4.f</td>
<td>Development of Local Implementation Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPENDING DETAILS PER LINE ITEM ARE REQUIRED EACH QUARTER.

Albemarle PO 3 FY 2015-2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK CODE</th>
<th>TASK CODE/ WORK PRODUCT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WORK PRODUCT FORMAT</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>PRIMARY PROJECT # (IF APPLICABLE)</th>
<th>RPO PROGRAM FUNDS</th>
<th>RPO Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II-2</td>
<td>PRIORITIZATION AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-2.1</td>
<td>Local Project Prioritization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-2.1.a</td>
<td>Local Project Prioritization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-2.1.b</td>
<td>Project Entry and SPOT Prioritization Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3</td>
<td>PROJECT DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3.1</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3.1.a</td>
<td>Purpose and Need Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3.2</td>
<td>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3.2.a</td>
<td>ICE Assessment of Probable Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4</td>
<td>GENERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.1</td>
<td>Regional or Statewide Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.1.a</td>
<td>Regional or Statewide Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BUDGE TE D BUDGET TO DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK CODE/WORK PRODUCT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WORK PRODUCT FORMAT</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>PRIMARY PROJECT #</th>
<th>RPO PROGRAM FUNDS</th>
<th>RPO Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPO PROGRAM FUNDS</td>
<td>HIGHWAY/TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>% BUDGET</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>BUDGETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacing Details per Line Item are Required Each Quarter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.1.b Special Studies and Proposals</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.1.c Transit Meetings</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.1.d Air Quality Assessment</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.1.e Alternative Funding</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.1.f Training and Certification</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.2 Title V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.2.a RPO Affirmation of Title V Compliance</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.2.b Transportation Initiatives and ADA Compliance</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.2.c Environmental Justice Assessment</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4.2.d Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Assessment</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND POLICIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1 ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1.1 Planning Work Program</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1.1.a Prepare and update PWP for FY 16-17</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1.1.b 5-Year Planning Calendar</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1.1.c Quarterly Invoice and Progress Reports</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1.1.d TCC/TAC Work Facilitation</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1.1.e Regulatory Documents</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1.1.f Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spending Details per Line Item are Required Each Quarter.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK CODE</th>
<th>TASK CODE/WORK PRODUCT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WORK PRODUCT FORMAT</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>PRIMARY PROJECT # (IF APPLICABLE)</th>
<th>HIGHWAY/TRANSIT</th>
<th>% BUDGET</th>
<th>TO DATE</th>
<th>BUDGETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens Guide to Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings with and responding to member requests</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.2.a</td>
<td>Public Involvement Plan (PIP)</td>
<td>Update PIP</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.2.b</td>
<td>Documentation of Public Input</td>
<td>Update ARPO website and Facebook page as needed</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List of public workshop attendees and comments</td>
<td>Update ARPO website and Facebook page as needed</td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPO Program Funds</th>
<th>RPO Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$28,906</td>
<td>$115,625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spending details per line item are required each quarter.

Approved by the TAC on ___________________________________________________________________________ 2016.

__________________________________________________________
Signature, TAC Chairman

__________________________________________________________
Signature, RPO Secretary
TAC Old Business
Agenda Item No. 11

Item Title: Ferry tolling

Item Summary: This item was added to the October 21, 2015 agenda by a 50% +1 vote of Voting TAC members. The Board discussed this item in detail, however, a vote was not taken on the resolution nor was the resolution taken off the floor. Upon consultation with Dwight Wheless, Attorney for the Albemarle Commission, this item will be added as "Old Business" to the TAC's January meeting agenda.

Specific action requested: Discussion of this item

Number of attachments: 8
I have read the Bylaws of the ARPO several times. It seems clear to me that the Bylaws require the RPO Coordinator to serve as the Secretary to the RTAC (Article III-A, par.5) and the RTCC (Article III-B.4).

Article III par. 6 provides that the Chairperson presides, signs official documents and “assist(s) in the drafting of meeting agendas and decide(s) points of order or procedure.”

Exactly who would the Chairperson “assist” except the Secretary who puts together the draft of an agenda for a coming meeting?

Article IV “Agendas” applies to the RTCC and the RTAC and requires that an agenda list “items for consideration by the Committee” and allows additional items to be placed on the agenda at the “…beginning of a regular meeting with the affirmative vote of fifty percent (50%) plus one (1), of the voting membership of both the RTCC and RTAC. [Comment: I think the correct way to interpret the “and” is that the requirement is the same for each independent committee and the action of one does not require the same action by the other.]

I also note that Article IV “Records” assigns the following duty to the Secretary: maintain all files, records and correspondence of the ARPO, including the preparation and distribution of minutes, agendas and meeting notices…” [With special emphasis on “preparation”].

Finally, Article IV “Rules of Order” refers us, “(I)n the absence of guidance from these Bylaws or other to procedural policies” to “Modern Rules of Order”, presumably the book published by the American Bar Association with recommendations for business meetings. Page two of that publication recites: The Chair shall be responsible for establishing the order of business, or agenda, in consultation with the Secretary, and shall ensure that the order of business is posted or circulated as required by the bylaws, articles or law.” My reading of the Bylaws leaves no absence of guidance necessitating reference to the book.

I might add that ROBERT’S RULES OF ORDER, Newly Revised, Section 46 (10), provides that a duty of the secretary is “To prepare, prior to each meeting, an order of business for the use of the presiding officer.”

So, to make things move along smoothly I suggest that it should be agreed that the Secretary will prepare the first cut on the Agenda, forward it to the Chairman who will assist by directing what additional items should be included or deleted. The Agenda then belongs to the Chairman until submitted to the Board which can amend the agenda, if it sees fit, and it then belongs to the Board for the Chairman to preside over. The Board is the authority.

Please let me know if I have missed any points that need to be addressed.
Hello Angela,

As you know and you can explain to the TAC members it is the role of TCC is to gather information and to do the Technical work for the TAC and make a recommendation to the TAC for most items. The TAC could have had a discussion about an item and then sent the back to the TCC for them to give advice or a recommendation for the TAC to consider and approve. As you know the TAC could have something that comes to them for review and discussion from one of the TAC members and that is fine by adding it to the agenda for discussion or approval if the board votes that way. The TAC can discussion items they feel are important for the RPO and make those decisions without it going to the TCC but in most cases they should vote to send it back to them for more information and a recommendation. I have seen this happen in the Greensboro MPO where a topic came up and the TAC didn’t vote but sent it to the TCC for them to review and make a recommendation to the TAC for approval.

Finally, the attorney is correct that the TAC can act without having the TCC act on it but my recommendation is that this should be an outlier and not happen every time because that brings into question any technical support that the issue may have since it was not brought to the technical experts in your area that make up the TCC. Remember that the TCC has Division, District and Transportation Planning Branch staff along with county and municipal staff and others to help discuss technical issues that develop good recommendations for the TAC. There is a need for the TCC and all 37 planning organizations across the state have this body to help inform the decision makers on most if not all topics brought to them for approval. Also remember the TAC doesn’t have to act on something that is brought before them and can send it back to the TCC for more information. I hope this helps and covers your issue. If you need more information please contact Behshad or me. Travis
### Prioritization 4.0 Tentative Schedule (Two 60 Day Local Input Periods) - Option A (Recommended by P4.0 Workgroup)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPOs, RPOS, Divisions</th>
<th>Provide Modifications of Existing Projects</th>
<th>MPOs, RPOS, Divisions</th>
<th>Submit New Candidate Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Key Dates:**
- September 2015 – SPOT Online available for Entering and Scoring Projects
- March 2016 – Quantitative Scores and Draft list of Programmed Statewide Mobility Projects released
- July 2016 – Draft list of Programmed Regional Impact Projects released
- December 2016 – Draft STIP released

### Notes:
- Green Box = Decisions / Approvals
- Yellow Box = NCDOT Work Tasks

---

1. **November 17, 2014**
2. **2015**
3. **2016**
4. **MPOs, RPOS, Divisions**
5. **Provide Modifications of Existing Projects**
6. **MPOs, RPOS, Divisions**
7. **Submit New Candidate Projects**

---

**Notes:**
- Green Box = Decisions / Approvals
- Yellow Box = NCDOT Work Tasks
December 13, 2015

Bill Rich, County Manager
County of Hyde
30 Oyster Creek Road
P.O. Box 188
Swan Quarter, NC 27885

Dear Bill,

This letter is in response to a request to support a "Resolution Requesting the Albemarle Regional Planning Organization to Delay Consideration of Tolling Ferry Routes".

Please make all those concerned well aware that I not only fully support this resolution to delay but, more strongly support NO TOLLING on ferry routes. The negative financial impact on North Carolinians 12 months of the year in the effort to capture revenue from none North Carolinians four months of the year is a very poor process and we as North Carolinians can and should do much better. I have requested a full and complete updated report from our Ferry Division due to me in January that will define the appropriate dollars needed for a long term
replacement schedule for our ferry fleet. Upon receipt of that document I plan on working thru the process to direct funding to the department to remedy this issue once and for all. My ultimate goal is to have the Ferry Fleet be part of the current road system highway funding. At this time we, as North Carolinians, should be working closely together for the betterment of all our NC friends and neighbors and not to the contrary. The dollars needed for vessel replacement over a twenty year cycle, previously estimated at 5 million annually, is large personally but very manageable within a four billion dollar transportation budget.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond and articulate support for this important issue impacting all North Carolinians.

Representative John Torbett
December 9, 2015

Representative John A. Torbett
Rm. 538 Legislative Office Bldg.
300 N. Salisbury Street
Raleigh, NC 27603-5925
John.Torbett@ncleg.net

Representative Paul Tine
Rm. 1307 Legislative Building
16 W. Jones Street, Room 1307
Raleigh, NC 27601-1096
Paul.Tine@ncleg.net

Angela Welsh, Planning Director/RPO Coordinator
The Albemarle Rural Planning Organization
512 S. Church St.
P.O. Box 646
Hertford, NC 27944
awelsh@albemarlecommission.org

RE: Delay Consideration of Tolling Ferry Routes

Representatives Tine and Torbett, Angela Welsh and ARPO Members,

At its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, December 7, 2015 the Hyde County Board of Commissioners unanimously adopted and is respectfully requesting your support of the attached resolution.

“Resolution Requesting The Albemarle Regional Planning Organization to Delay Consideration of Tolling Ferry Routes”

Sincerely,

Bill Rich
County Manager

cc: County Commissioners
Albemarle RPO Committee Members
Camden County - Michael McLain mmclain@camdencountync.gov
Camden County - Randy Krainiak, Alternate rkrainiak@camdencountync.gov
Currituck County - H.M. "Butch" Petrey Butch.Petrey@CurrituckCountyNC.gov
Dare County - Jack Shea jisheabg@peoplepc.com
Dare County - Wally Overman, Alternate wallyo@darenc.com
Hyde County - Benjamin (Ben) Simmons III twsbsciil@aol.com
Pasquotank County - Lloyd Griffin III legriffin111@gmail.com
Chowan County - Jeff Smith jeffsmith@net-change.com
Perquimans - Edward Muzzulin e.muzzulin@mchsi.com
Tyrrell County - Leroy Spivey lspivey@tyrrellcounty.net
Gates County - Jack Owens jowens@gatescountync.gov
Washington County - Bill Sexton sextonfarms@embargmail.com
NCDOT Board Member - Malcolm Fearing mac@108budeigh.com
RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE ALBEMARLE REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION TO DELAY CONSIDERATION OF TOLLING FERRY ROUTES

WHEREAS, the North Carolina General Assembly adopted the Strategic Transportation Investment (STI) law in 2013; and,

WHEREAS, the STI law, also established a method for prioritizing transportation projects, the Strategic Mobility Formula, which is a new way of allocating available revenues based on data-driven scoring and local input.

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula funds projects in three categories: Statewide Mobility, Regional Impacts and Division Needs; and,

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula dictates that new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels can only be considered under the Division Needs category; and,

WHEREAS, the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization is within the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Division One and NCDOT Division One hosts more North Carolina ferry routes and vessels than any other Division along the coast; and,

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Ferry Division has determined the costs of ferry vessel replacements for Division One to be $5,000,000.00; and,

WHEREAS, NCDOT Division One is scheduled to receive roughly $33,000,000.00, in the Division Needs Category, per year in Strategic Transportation Investment funding to fund Highway, Bicycle and Pedestrian, Aviation, and Ferry projects within its fourteen County region; and

WHEREAS, inclusion of new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels in the Division Needs category will place an undue financial burden on all NCDOT Division One transportation projects;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Hyde County Board of Commissioners request that the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization refrain from considering tolling ferry routes until the 2016 session of the North Carolina General Assembly has an opportunity to explore and consider alternate funding sources for new and replacement ferry vessel and ferry support vessels.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Hyde County Board of Commissioners are requesting that all the members of the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization support this endeavor.

ADOPTED this 7th day of December, 2015.

Barry Swindell, Chairman

ATTEST:

Lois Sizemore, Clerk to the Board
RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE ALBEMARLE RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION TO DELAY CONSIDERATION OF TOLLING FERRY ROUTES

WHEREAS, the North Carolina General Assembly adopted the Strategic Transportation Investment (STI) law in 2013; and,

WHEREAS, the STI law, also established a method for prioritizing transportation projects, the Strategic Mobility Formula, which is a new way of allocating available revenues based on data-driven scoring and local input,

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula funds projects in three categories: Statewide Mobility, Regional Impacts and Division Needs; and,

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula dictates that new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels can only be considered under the Division Needs category; and,

WHEREAS, the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization is within the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Division One and NCDOT Division One hosts more North Carolina ferry routes and vessels than any other Division along the coast; and,

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Ferry Division has determined the costs of ferry vessel replacements for Division One to be $192,000,000; and,

WHEREAS: NCDOT Division One is scheduled to receive roughly $30,000,000, in the Division Needs Category, per year in Strategic Transportation Investment funding to fund Highway, Bicycle and Pedestrian, Aviation, and Ferry projects within its fourteen County region; and,

WHEREAS, inclusion of new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels in the Division Needs category will place an undue financial burden on all NCDOT Division One transportation projects; and,

WHEREAS; tolling the ferry routes does not generate the necessary funding to acquire new and, replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels and will still require consideration under the STI,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Perquimans County Board of Commissioners request that the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization refrain from considering tolling ferry routes until the 2016 session of the North Carolina General Assembly has an opportunity to explore and consider alternate funding sources for new and replacement ferry vessel and ferry support vessels.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Perquimans County Board of Commissioners are requesting that all the members of the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization support this endeavor.

Adopted this the 4th day of January, 2016, in Perquimans County, North Carolina.

Janice McKenzie Cole, Chair
Perquimans County Board of Commissioners

ATTEST:
Mary P. Hunnicutt, Clerk to the Board
RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE ALBEMARLE RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION TO DELAY CONSIDERATION OF TOLLING FERRY ROUTES

WHEREAS, the North Carolina General Assembly adopted the Strategic Transportation Investment (STI) law in 2013; and,

WHEREAS, the STI law, also established a method for prioritizing transportation projects, the Strategic Mobility Formula, which is a new way of allocating available revenues based on data-driven scoring and local input.

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula funds projects in three categories: Statewide Mobility, Regional Impacts and Division Needs; and,

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula dictates that new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels can only be considered under the Division Needs category; and,

WHEREAS, the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization is within the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Division One and NCDOT Division One hosts more North Carolina ferry routes and vessels than any other Division along the coast; and,

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Ferry Division has determined the costs of ferry vessel replacements for Division One to be $192,000,000; and,

WHEREAS, NCDOT Division One is scheduled to receive roughly $30,000,000, in the Division Needs Category, per year in Strategic Transportation Investment funding to fund Highway, Bicycle and Pedestrian, Aviation, and Ferry projects within its fourteen County region; and,

WHEREAS, inclusion of new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels in the Division Needs category will place an undue financial burden on all NCDOT Division One transportation projects; and,

WHEREAS, tolling the ferry routes does not generate the necessary funding to acquire new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels and will still require consideration under the STI.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Currituck County Board of Commissioners request that the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization refrain from considering tolling ferry routes until the 2016 session of the North Carolina General Assembly has an opportunity to explore and consider alternate funding sources for new and replacement ferry vessel and ferry support vessels.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Currituck County Board of Commissioners are requesting that all the members of the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization support this endeavor.

ADOPTED this 7th day of December, 2015.

ATTEST:

Clerk to the Board
RESOLUTION
REQUESTING THE ALBEMARLE RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION TO DELAY CONSIDERATION OF TOLLING FERRY ROUTES

WHEREAS, the North Carolina General Assembly adopted the Strategic Transportation Investment (STI) law in 2013; and

WHEREAS, the STI law, also established a method for prioritizing transportation projects, the Strategic Mobility Formula, which is a new way of allocating available revenues based on data-driven scoring and local input.

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula funds projects in three categories: Statewide Mobility, Regional Impacts and Division Needs; and,

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula dictates that new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels can only be considered under the Division Needs category; and,

WHEREAS, the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization is within the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Division One and NCDOT Division One hosts more North Carolina ferry routes and vessels than any other Division along the coast; and,

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Ferry Division has determined the costs of ferry vessel replacements for Division One to be $192,000,000; and,

WHEREAS, NCDOT Division One is scheduled to receive roughly $30,000,000, in the Division Needs Category, per year in Strategic Transportation Investment funding to fund Highway, Bicycle and Pedestrian, Aviation, and Ferry projects within its fourteen County region; and,

WHEREAS, inclusion of new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels in the Division Needs category will place an undue financial burden on all NCDOT Division One transportation projects; and,
WHEREAS, tolling the ferry routes does not generate the necessary funding to acquire new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels and will still require consideration under the STI.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Washington County Board of Commissioners request that the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization refrain from considering tolling ferry routes until the 2016 session of the North Carolina General Assembly has an opportunity to explore and consider alternate funding sources for new and replacement ferry vessel and ferry support vessels.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Washington County Board of Commissioners are requesting that all members of the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization support this endeavor.

ADOPTED this 4th day of January, 2016.

D. Cole Phelps, Chair
Washington County Board of Commissioners

Attest:
Julie J. Bennett, CMC, NCCCC
Clerk to the Board