



**North Carolina Association of RPO's  
July 27, 2006 Quarterly Meeting  
Greensboro Chamber of Commerce  
Greensboro, NC**

**Attendees**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Ann Whitley, Peanut Belt RPO            | 19. Marc Allred, Northwest Piedmont RPO |
| 2. Carrie Runser-Turner, Land of Sky RPO   | 20. Geraldine Dumas, Kerr-Tar RPO       |
| 3. Chris Lukasina, Upper Coastal Plain RPO |   |
| 4. Craig Hughes, High Country RPO          | 21. Travis Marshall, NCDOT TPB          |
| 5. Don Eggert, Cape Fear RPO               | 22. Elina Zlotchenko, NCDOT TPB         |
| 6. Greg Christo, Isothermal RPO            | 23. Matt Day, NCDOT TPB                 |
| 7. Hanna Cockburn, Piedmont Triad RPO      | 24. Ivo Dermev, NCDOT TPB               |
| 8. Janet Robertson, Lumber River RPO       | 25. Beverly Williams, NCDOT TPB         |
| 9. Jim Daughtry, Eastern Carolina RPO      | 26. Jamie Adrignola, NCDOT TPB          |
| 10. Shelby Powell, Kerr-Tar RPO            | 27. Atefe Northcutt, NCDOT TPB          |
| 11. Eddy Davis, Mid-East RPO               | 28. Rupal Desai, NCDOT TPB              |
| 12. Pat Strong, Triangle J RPO             | 29. Hemal Shah, NCDOT TPB               |
| 13. Daniel Van Liere, Down East RPO        | 30. Marta Matthews, NCDOT Enhancements  |
| 14. Dana Stoogenke, Mid-Carolina RPO       | 31. Denese Lavender, NCDOT Enhancements |
| 15. Brandon Shoaf, Albemarle RPO           | 32. Joe Geigle, FHWA                    |
| 16. Bryan Steen, Rocky River RPO           | 33. Jill Stark, FHWA                    |
| 17. Cliff Kendall, Mid-East RPO            | 34. Bill Marley, FHWA                   |
| 18. Matt Roark, Southwestern RPO           |   |

**Minutes**

**Welcome**

J. Marshall called the meeting to order at 1:01 pm.

**Minutes**

J. Marshall called for a motion to accept the minutes of the NCARPO April 2006 meeting. **A motion was made by S. Powell to adopt the minutes as presented; Second by P. Strong.** Discussion: none. There being no discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

**Highway Trust Fund Resolution Discussion**

J. Marshall reminded attendees that the resolution was unchanged from the previous meetings, and that the group has agreed that a supermajority would be needed in order for the resolution to pass. **A motion to approve the Highway Trust Fund Resolution was made by S. Powell; seconded by E. Davis.** Discussion: none. Following a split vote, J. Marshall indicated that a super-majority of RPOs were not present, and the motion failed.

**MPO Update**

Ed Johnson, MPO Liaison, was unable to attend the meeting.

**Transportation Planning Branch Update**

T. Marshall provided attendees updates on several items: TPB has been working to schedule a one-day meeting with Interagency Leadership Team (ILT) members and MPOs to discuss the relationship of SAFETEA-LU requirements in the context of ILT goals. T. Marshall indicated the desire to schedule a similar meeting with the ILT for RPOs. T. Marshall indicated that the branch had a number of transportation plans underway, and that implementation was beginning for the integration project.

## **RPO Update**

E. Zlotchenko provided attendees with updates on several topics. E. Zlotchenko indicated that the revised manual of administrative procedures was now available on-line.

E. Zlotchenko indicated that TIP priorities should be limited to one list per division, and that county-level lists would be accepted. E. Zlotchenko also indicated that a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) must be adopted by each RPO, and that FHWA would be providing education on public participation in the coming months.

E. Zlotchenko shared that new Comprehensive Transportation Plans would be assigned to TPB staff twice a year, in April and October. RPOs were reminded to submit their priority list in December for consideration. E. Zlotchenko again addressed the issue of using consultants. She recognized the desire to use consultants for various services, including conducting CTPs. D. Stoogenke, S. Powell and M. Roark indicated their concerns and the need for guidance on appropriate use of consultants from TPB. T. Marshall indicated that consultants had been used on occasion, but that a high level of coordination with NCDOT would be needed, including input into the process and a strong commitment from all parties to stick to the plan as outlined. S. Powell inquired about identifying standard check points in the process, T. Marshall indicated that not enough background information was being provided, and that at the moment, limited resources were available at TPB to oversee such projects. S. Powell further inquired about the hiring of consultants to collect specific information or conduction land development plans to support a future CTP. T. Marshall indicated that this was something TPB would be willing to consider, but in the context of its impact to the RPOs and TPB. D. Eggert inquired about the level of interest at NCDOT in getting land development plans completed. T. Marshall indicated it was only in the context of the transportation plans, and described efforts underway with the Division of Community Assistance to establish standards for plans, specifically related to the need to address interactions with transportation. D. Eggert indicated that the required coastal management plans did not consider transportation in any significant way. B. Williams indicated that the General Statutes related to this requirement stop short of directing NCDOT to approve or development land development plans, but allows for comment. B. Williams went on to say that the Land Development Plan should come first, and be used to drive the outcomes of the transportation plan, giving opportunity to revise or respond to transportation problems. T. Marshall indicated that TPB considered getting plans completed as a high priority, and are continuing to seek ways to address the non-highway elements of the plans, and that he would continue the discussion of the use of consultants with Alena Cook at TPB. M. Allred inquired if the availability of a land development plan should be factored into CTP priorities. T. Marshall indicated that modeling demands were a stronger criteria at TPB. D. Stoogenke indicated a need for documented criteria that could be use for prioritization purposes. T. Marshall indicated these would be developed.

P. Strong shared that an ITRE study was being conducted to address the issue of consistency of plans across boundaries. B. Williams responded by indicating that a model may be used within a county, with an alternative analysis tool for rural areas, and that checks should be completed at the boarders. To wrap up, E. Zlotchenko indicated that consultants can vary greatly, and that a written policy would be produced, and that a training session for Transportation Planning Basics (Tad) would be scheduled for early next year.

## **Committee Reports**

**Officers Report** –H. Cockburn described the idea of developing a state-wide association of TAC chairs, to possibly include both RPOs and MPOs as a vehicle to advocate for transportation related issues with a single voice at a state level. H. Cockburn indicated a short description of the idea would be drafted and sent out in order to combat potential misunderstandings and keep LRO directors informed.

J. Marshall shared the outcomes of the meeting with state legislator Lucy Allen. J. Marshall indicated the biggest issue at the moment is funding, particularly for future years. J. Marshall stated that Len Sanderson wanted a paper on how to bring the program along, and to support this, a letter highlighting RPO accomplishments would be drafted on behalf of the RPO association. J. Marshall indicated an e-mail requesting information would be sent out. J. Marshall also indicated that Rep. Allen supported revisions to the Highway Trust Fund, and discussed the use of GARVEE bonds, Toll funds, and the issue of local control of funds by MPOs and RPOs. D. Eggert brought up the issue of the disparity of funding between MPOs and RPOs.

With additional RPO representatives now present, **a motion to reconsider the Highway Trust Fund Resolution was made by S. Powell, with a second by C. Hughes.** The motion carried without discussion. **A motion to approve the Highway Trust Fund Resolution was made by M. Roark, with a second by C. Runser-Turner.** With 16 for, and 2 against, the motion carried.

Due to scheduled speakers, **a motion to suspend the meeting until later in the afternoon, following the presentations, was made by S. Powell; second by C. Hughes.** Discussion: none. With no discussion, the motion carried unanimously, and the meeting was suspended at 1:55 pm.

J. Marshall reopened the meeting at 4:50 pm, the same day.

#### **Committee Reports, Continued**

**Finance** – B. Hansen was not present to provide a report.

**Legislative** – P. Strong discussed several items of interest, including a report from the National Conference of Legislators and an update on the federal rural consultation guidelines.

**GIS** – G. Christo provided an update on state-wide GIS efforts, referring to an e-mailed update from Paul Black on the subject. G. Christo discussed data sharing agreements, TAZ structures and that presentations were scheduled at the upcoming state GIS conference and at the NADO Conference.

**Nominating Committee.** A call was made for members of the nominating committee, headed by D. Eggert. E. Davis and J. Daughtry were recruited.

**Future Topics and Future Meeting Locations.** J. Marshall stated that the October meeting would precede the MPO Conference in Concord.

**Adjournment.** With no other business to consider, J. Marshall adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.