



# Meeting Agenda

RPO Technical Advisory Committee

October 21<sup>th</sup>, 2015 –2:30 Blue Ridge (New) Conference Room Land of Sky Regional  
Council

## 1. WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| A. Welcome and Introductions                        | Brownie Newman |
| B. Ethics Statement & Agenda Approval/Modifications | Brownie Newman |
| C. Agenda Approval/Modifications                    | Brownie Newman |

## 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| A. Minutes from the RPO TAC May 27 <sup>th</sup> , 2015 Meeting | Brownie Newman |
|---|----------------|

## 3. PUBLIC COMMENT

## 4. BUSINESS

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| A. Approve LOSRPO SPOT4 DRAFT Project List | Vicki Eastland |
| B. Adopt LOSRPO 2016 Meeting Schedule      | Vicki Eastland |
| C. LOSRPO DRAFT Prioritization Methodology | Vicki Eastland |

## 5. REGULAR UPDATES

- |   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| A. NCDOT Division 13 and 14 updates       | Jay Swain/Ed Green/Designee |
| B. Transportation Planning Branch Updates | Brendan Merithew            |
| C. Legislative Updates                    | Vicki Eastland              |
| D. Staff Updates and Housekeeping         | Vicki Eastland              |
| E. Adjourn LOSRPO Meeting                 | Brownie Newman              |

Next Meeting: January 27<sup>th</sup>, 2:30 PM

# Meeting Agenda

Item 1b: Ethics Statement

## **ETHICS AWARENESS & CONFLICT OF INTEREST REMINDER**

(To be read by the Chair or his or her designee at the beginning of each meeting)

In accordance with the State Government Ethics Act, it is the duty of every Board member to avoid conflicts of interest. Does any Board member have any known conflict of interest with respect to any matters coming before the Board today? If so, please identify the conflict and refrain from any participation in the particular matter involved.

Item 2A: Consent Agenda: Minutes from May. 27, 2015 Meeting

Land of Sky RPO TAC Meeting Minutes from May 27, 2015

Attendees:

Vicki Eastland  
Brendan Merithew  
Brownie Newman

Lawrence Ponder  
Michael Sorrells

Ralph Cannady  
Cole Hood

## **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Brownie Newman called the meeting to order and welcomed attendees. He read the Ethics Statement, asked if there were any conflicts, and members responded that there were none. He then reviewed the Agenda and no modifications were proposed.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

*Michael Sorrells motioned to approve the minutes from March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2015, Lawrence Ponder seconded, and as all were in favor, the minutes were then approved.*

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The public comment period was opened, and as there were none at this time, nor through Facebook or email, the public comment period was closed.

## **BUSINESS**

RPO PIP Amendments: Vicki Eastland highlighted the RPO PIP amendments, these edits consisted of inserting language for minor formatting or technical correction to the plan not requiring TAC action and the addition of Prioritization

# Meeting Agenda

List formerly the Priority Needs List (PNL) on page 6, and on page 14 the addition of processes for public involvement for the approval of the Prioritization Methodology. Brownie Newman asked if there were any questions and none were brought forth.

***Michael Sorrells motioned to approve the RPO PIP Amendments; Lawrence Ponder seconded, and as all were in favor, the motion carried.***

LOSRPO Prioritization Work Group Members: Vicki Eastland explained the duties and task of the RPO Prioritization Sub-Committee and reviewed the list of names the TCC appointed, **Scott Collier, Mark Burrows, Josh Freeman, Kris Boyd and Forrest Gilliam** (or his appointee).

***Michael Sorrells motioned to approve the Five-Year Planning Calendar, Lawrence Ponder seconded, and as all were in favor, the motioned carried.***

SPOT4 updates and schedule: Vicki Eastland reviewed the updates from the SPOT4 work group, explained some of the criteria changes and discussed schedule changes.

FYI only no action needed.

LOSRPO SPOT4 Timeline and Meeting Schedule: Vicki Eastland reviewed the timeline and explained that the RPO TAC meeting schedule would have to be arranged so as to make all the NCDOT Key Dates.

***Michael Sorrells motioned to adopt the Timeline and meeting schedule, Lawrence Ponder seconded, and as all were in favor, the motioned carried.***

## **REGULAR UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- Cole Hood provided Division 13 updates and Ralph Cannady provided Division 14 updates.
- Brendan Merithew presented TPB updates.
- Legislative updates: a handout was provided.
- CPTHSTP update is ongoing; all the stakeholder meetings have been held now holding public input meetings in each county.

With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned.

# Meeting Agenda

LOSRPO Business:

Item 4a: Adopt Land of Sky RPO DRAFT SPOT 4.0 Project List

Attached at end of Agenda

Staff recommended action:

Review and discuss projects as needed, recommend needed changes. Adopt to allow staff to enter projects into NCDOT SPOT Online tool which opens today, Oct 21<sup>st</sup>.

Item 4b: Adopt LOSRPO 2016 Meeting Schedule

LAND OF SKY

# RURAL PLANNING RURAL ORGANIZATION

## Land of Sky RPO TCC/TAC 2015 Meeting Schedule

**Land of Sky RPO TCC** – 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday at 10:00 a.m.  
(unless otherwise noted)

January 14, 2016  
March 10, 2016  
May 12, 2016  
September 8, 2016  
October 13, 2016 (If Needed)

**Land of Sky RPO TAC** – 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesdays at 2:30 p.m.  
(\*unless otherwise noted)

\*January 28, 2016 at 11:00 a.m.  
March 13, 2016  
May 25, 2016  
September 21, 2016  
October 26, 2016 (If Needed)

**Meeting Agendas and Notes are posted at <http://landofskyrpo.org/committees/>**

All meetings take place at Land-of-Sky Regional Council,  
339 New Leicester Highway, Suite 140, Asheville, NC 28806.

Unless otherwise indicated

[www.landofskyrpo.org](http://www.landofskyrpo.org)

## Important Upcoming Dates for SPOT 4.0

### 2015

#### September 1<sup>st</sup>

--Existing project modifications; anticipated intersections, and anticipated interchanges are due

#### October 1<sup>st</sup>

--Project deletions due

#### October 31<sup>st</sup>

--New project Submissions; final date of submissions **TBD by NCDOT**

### 2016

#### End of March 2016

Draft Statewide Mobility Projects Released

#### April 1<sup>st</sup>

--Deadline for Approval of Local Input Assignment Methodologies (Note: this is the deadline for NCDOT Approval, not RPO approval. The RPO must approve the methodology before this date.)

#### April 1<sup>st</sup>

--Regional Impact Local Point window opens for 2 months

#### End of July

--Draft List of Regional Impact Projects released

#### August 1<sup>st</sup>

--Division Needs Local Input Point window opens for 2 months

#### October

--Final SPOT 4.0 Scores Released

#### December

--2017---2027 STIP Released

#### Staff recommended action:

Adopt schedule as submitted to accommodate upcoming important dates.

### Item 4c: LOSRPO DRAFT Prioritization Methodology

The NCDOT's Strategic Planning Office of Transportation (SPOT) has been tasked with carrying out the project evaluation process outlined in the SL 2013-84 legislation enacted on June 26, 2013. One of the most significant tasks that must be accomplished by each MPO/RPO and NCDOT Division Office is to create a methodology that explains how the MPO/RPO/Division Office will allocate the eligible local input points assigned to projects (of all modes) in the prioritization database.

The following is the updated DRAFT LOSRPO PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY. This methodology has to be sent to NCDOT SPOT office for review and NCDOT approval. LOSRPO TAC will advertise for a Public hearing to be held at the January 27<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting for final adoption of the LOSRPO Scoring Methodology.



DATE: October 16, 2015  
SUBJECT: Prioritization 4.0 (P4.0) – Draft Local Input Point Methodology

## **BACKGROUND**

The NCDOT’s Strategic Planning Office of Transportation (SPOT) has been tasked with carrying out the project evaluation process outlined in the SL 2013-84 legislation enacted on June 26, 2013. One of the most significant tasks that must be accomplished by each MPO/RPO and NCDOT Division Office is to create a methodology that explains how the MPO/RPO/Division Office will allocate the eligible local input points assigned to projects (of all modes) in the prioritization database.

As stipulated by the STI legislation, local points may be assigned to projects in the Regional Impact and Division Needs categories, but not the Statewide Mobility category. The Land of Sky Rural Planning Organization (LOSRPO) may allocate the following number of local points for projects in the eligible categories:

- 1100 points – Regional Impact projects
- 1100 points – Division Needs projects

A committee of TCC members was created to develop a local input point methodology. The contents of this memorandum describe the methodology developed by the committee, which the LOSRPO proposes to use to allocate its local input points. NCDOT requires that the methodology include the following components:

- A minimum of one quantitative criterion
  - A minimum of one qualitative criterion
  - Public involvement (on the proposed methodology, and the preliminary assignment of local input points to projects based on the approved methodology)
  - Dissemination of methodology, local points and public input on LOSRPO’s website ([www.landofskyrpo.org](http://www.landofskyrpo.org))
- 
- LOSRPO will score based on a 100 point system.
  - Safety will account for 20%
  - Destination Served/Existing Employment will account for 20%.
  - Projected Employment Growth will account for 20%
  - \*\*Multimodal Accommodation will account for 10% (for highway projects)



- \*\*Connectivity will account for 10% (for Bike/Ped Projects)
- Local Project Priority will account for 20%.
- The NCDOT Quantitative score will account for 10% of the overall score.

## PROPOSED SCORING METHODOLOGY

### Overview

The following principles will be used for the allocation of LOSRPO's local input points:

- LOSRPO will score Highway projects (both Regional Impact and Division Needs) with highway specific methodology and Bicycle, pedestrian projects with Bike and Pedestrian methodology.
- The RPO will by default not assign points to any cascading project, but reserves the right to address cascading projects on a case-by-case basis, and will provide written explanation and justification for any cascading project that justifies an exception.

### Draft Prioritization Methodology (100 point scale)

1. Safety is an important aspect of transportation planning in our region. The Safety Score will account for 20 percent or 20 points of the overall 100 point scale.

The Safety score of projects will be determined using the Safety score provided by the NCDOT SPOT office. The NCDOT SPOT office determines the safety score utilizing the following criteria:

#### NCDOT Highway - Safety

Purpose – measure existing crashes along/at the project

Segments	33% - Crash Density 33% - Crash Severity 33% - Critical Crash Rate
Intersections	50% - Crash Frequency 50% - Severity Index

- All data provided by Mobility & Safety Division (3 year moving average)
- Higher scores indicate poorer performance





NCDOT Bicycle – Pedestrian Safety

**Measure:** Number of crashes \* 40% +  
 Posted speed limit \* 40% +  
 Project safety benefit \* 20%

- **Sources:** – Division of Bike and Pedestrian Transportation (DBPT) 2007-2011 geocoded crash data
- NCDOT (Road Characteristics Data or Other)
- Safety benefit score based on lookup table

Safety Look Up Table

Proposed Project	Type Facilities Included:	Safety Improvement Points
Off-Road/Separated Linear Bicycle Facility;	Multi-use Path; Cycle Track; Side Path; Buffered Bicycle Lane; Bridge/Tunnel	100
On-Road; Designated Bicycle Facility	Bicycle Lane or Other Designated On-Road Space	75
On-Road Bicycle Facility	Shared Lane Markings; Paved Shoulder; Route Signage	50
Multi-Site Bicycle Facility	Bicycle Parking; Bicycle Share Stations; Bicycle Signals; Intersection Improvements	25
Protected Linear Pedestrian Facility	Sidewalks; Multi-Use Path; Side Path; Bridge/Tunnel	100
Multi-Site Pedestrian Facility; ADA Compliance	Curb Ramps; Accessible Pedestrian Signals; Streetscape/Corridor Improvements	75
Multi-Site Pedestrian Facility	Pedestrian signals; Curb extensions; Crosswalks;	50
Improved Pedestrian Facility	Trail Improvement; Sidewalk Widening; Paved Shoulder; Streetscape/Corridor Improvements; Wayfinding signage	25



LOSRPO will follow the following guidelines for applying safety scores to projects:

LOSRPO will put projects in ascending order based on safety scores provided by NCDOT SPOT office for each project. Highway Projects and Bike/Ped Projects will be scored separately.

- Zero (0) points if a project is (1 – 5) with the LOWEST safety scores.
- Five (5) points for a project whose safety score ranks (6 - 11).
- Ten (10) points for a project whose safety score ranks (12 - 17).
- Fifteen (15) points for a project whose safety score ranks (18 - 23).
- Twenty (20) points for a project whose safety score ranks (24 - 29) the HIGHEST.

2. Destinations served and access to existing regional job centers is a critical component of our prioritization methodology. This criterion will account for 20 percent or 20 points of the overall 100 possible points. Projects will be scored based on their direct access to critical destinations, (education, health care facilities, grocery or retail establishments, recreation or entertainment/tourist destination and access to existing job centers). The number/type of destination served will be determined by utilizing GIS data on destinations collected during the drafting of the BLUE RIDGE BIKE PLAN, 2012. The number of existing jobs will be determined by using data developed for the FBRMPO Travel Demand Model (TDM). 2010 Census data was collected on population/housing and employment (Socio-economic (SE) Data) and projected out to 2040. The data was developed for the entire 5 county region with no regard to MPO/RPO boundaries. The SE Data is provided at the TAZ level. A TAZ (Traffic Analysis Zone) is a group of census blocks that has at least one major thoroughfare going through it or touching the zone boundary that can be used for transportation modeling and other purposes.

The breakout for Destination served and access to existing employment will be as follows:

- Zero (0) points if a project provides no direct access to any critical destinations or job centers with less than 25 jobs.
- Five (5) points if a project provides direct access to AT LEAST 1 critical destination or job center with 25 – 49 existing jobs.
- Ten (10) points if a project provides access to AT LEAST 2 critical destinations or job center with AT LEAST 50 – 99 jobs.
- Fifteen (15) points if a project provides access to AT LEAST 3 critical destinations or job center with AT LEAST 100 – 149 jobs.
- Twenty (20) points if a project provides access to AT LEAST 4 or more critical destinations or job center with AT LEAST 150 or greater jobs.



3. Access to areas with Projected Employment Growth is very important in our region. This criterion of our methodology will account for 20 percent or 20 points of the overall possible 100 points. This score will also be based on the SE Data developed for the FBRMPO TDM.

- Zero (0) points if a project provides no direct access to TAZ with AT LEAST 25 projected jobs.
- Five (5) points if a project provides direct access to TAZ with 25 - 49 projected jobs.
- Ten (10) points if a project provides access to TAZ with 50 - 99 projected jobs.
- Fifteen (15) points if a project provides access to TAZ with 100 - 149 projected jobs.
- Twenty (20) points if a project provides access to TAZ with 150 or greater projected jobs.

4. We encourage multimodal connections across our region. This criterion will account for 10 percent or 10 points of the overall possible 100 points.

- Zero (0) points if a project does not include Bicycle or Pedestrian facilities.
- Five (5) points if a projects includes EITHER Bicycle or Pedestrian facilities.
- Ten (10) points if a projects includes BOTH Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities.

5. Local Priority will account for 20 percent or 20 points in the LOSRPO prioritization process. Each county in coordination with their municipalities will rank the projects. The number 1 and 2 ranking projects will receive 20 points; the number 3 and 4 ranking projects will receive 15 points, and so on. This exercise will be completed for projects in both the Regional Impact category and the Division Needs category.

6. SPOT Score - worth 10 percent or 10 points of the overall 100 point scale. The SPOT score of projects will be determined using the following formula:

- $SPOT\ 4.0\ Score = [(SPOT\ SCORE/Max\ SPOT\ Score)*100]*10\%$
- The Highest possible score for Regional Projects = Max Score = 70
- The Highest possible score for Division Projects = Max Sore = 50
- Example: Regional SPOT Score = 65  $[(65/70)*100]*10\%=9.286$  LOSRPO Safety Score 9
- Example: Division SPOT Score + 35  $[(35/50)*100]*10\%=7$  LOSRPO Safety Score 7

## **PROPOSED ALLOCATION OF LOCAL INPUT POINTS**

Land of Sky RPO receives 1,100 points at the Regional Level and 1,100 points at the Division Level to allocate to projects for local prioritization. The maximum number of points any project



can receive is 100. The two top-scoring Regional Level projects within each county will be allocated 100 points each. Additionally, the next highest scoring project within the RPO (regardless of county) will also be allocated 100 points, to reach Land of Sky RPO's total point allocation of 1100 points. In the event that any counties do not have at least two Regional Level projects, then additional projects will be selected from the top of the list of remaining projects within the RPO as a whole. This promotes geographic equity of projects. Only projects that originate at the Regional Level are eligible for scoring and local points allocation under this methodology; Statewide Level projects that are not programmed at the Statewide Level will not be scored at the Regional Level or receive Regional Level local points under this methodology, unless the Land of Sky RPO TAC elects to do so.

The two top-scoring Division Level projects within each county will be allocated 100 points each. Additionally, the next highest scoring project within the RPO (regardless of county) will also be allocated 100 points, to reach Land of Sky RPO's total point allocation of 1100 points. In the event that any counties do not have at least two Division Level projects, then additional projects will be selected from the top of the list of remaining projects within the RPO as a whole. This promotes geographic equity of projects. Only projects that originate at the Division Level are eligible for scoring and local point's allocation under this methodology; Statewide Level and Regional Level projects that are not programmed at the higher levels will not be scored at the Division Level or receive Division Level local points under this methodology, unless the Land of Sky RPO TAC elects to do so.

Notwithstanding any of the above, however, no local points will be assigned to any project requiring local match if the local government in question expresses no desire to provide the required match and no desire to pursue the project at this time. In this case, points will be assigned to the next highest-ranking appropriate project.

The RPO TAC can adjust projects receiving points or adjust the number of points given to a project based on their discretion and/or public input. Any exceptions will require written explanation to be provided to NCDOT SPOT and be part of an open, public process that complies with Chapter 143, Article 33C of the North Carolina General Statutes and will be made available on the RPO's website as part of posting the point assignments per project.

A full table of proposed methodology is available on the Land of Sky RPO website <http://www.landofsky.org/rpo.html>



**Highway Project Methodology**

Criteria	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points	20 points
Safety	5 Highway projects (1 - 5) with the <b>LOWEST</b> safety scores as provided by NCDOT SPOT Office	6 Highway projects whose safety score ranks (6 - 11) as provided by NCDOT SPOT Office	Highway projects whose safety score ranks (12 - 17) as provided by NCDOT SPOT Office	Highway projects whose safety score ranks (18 - 23) as provided by NCDOT SPOT Office	6 Highway projects whose safety score ranks (24 - 29) the <b>HIGHEST</b> as provided by NCDOT SPOT Office
	Highway safety calculated by NCDOT SPOT office				
Destination Served	No direct access to major destination	Direct access to <b>AT LEAST 1:</b> critical educational, health care, grocery/retail recreation/entertainment destination <b>OR</b> TAZ with 25-49 employees	Direct access to <b>AT LEAST 2:</b> critical educational, health care, grocery/retail recreation/entertainment destination <b>OR</b> TAZ with 50-99 employees	Direct access to <b>AT LEAST 3</b> critical educational, health care, grocery/retail recreation/entertainment destination <b>OR</b> TAZ 100-149 employees	Direct access to <b>4 OR MORE:</b> critical educational, health care, grocery/retail recreation/entertainment destination <b>OR</b> TAZ 150 or greater employees
	Does the project connect directly to a critical educational, health care, employment, grocery/retail or recreation/entertainment destination?				
Projected Employment Growth	No direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth = 25 employees	Direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth 25-49 NEW employees	Direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth 50-99 NEW employees	Direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth 100-149 NEW employees	Direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth 150 OR greater employees
	Does the project connect directly to a TAZ (Traffic Analysis Zone) with projected employment growth? (Based on Employment Growth Projections used in FBRMPO TDM)				
Multimodal Accommodations	Project does not include bike/ped facilities or connections	Project includes <b>EITHER</b> bike/ped facilities or connections	Project includes <b>BOTH</b> bike/ped facilities or connections		
	Whether the project includes facilities such as sidewalks, bicycle lanes, etc, or a connection to these type facilities.				
Local Priority	The #9 and #10 projects for both Regional and Division level project lists	The #7 and #7 projects for both Regional and Division level project lists	The #5 and #6 projects for both Regional and Division level project lists	The #3 and #4 projects for both Regional and Division level project lists	The #1 and #2 projects for both Regional and Division level project lists
	Based on Regional Impact and Division Needs Prioritised lists from each county				
SPOT 4.0 Score from NCDOT	SPOT 4.0 Score = $\left(\frac{\text{SPOT SCORE}}{\text{Max SPOT Score}}\right) * 100 * 10\%$	Regional Max Score =70 Division Max Score = 50	ie. Regional $\left[\left(\frac{65}{70}\right) * 100\right] * 10\% = 9.286$ ie. Division $\left[\left(\frac{35}{50}\right) * 100\right] * 10\% = 7$		
	The Quantitative SPOT 4.0 Score provided by NCDOT will account for 10% of overall score.				

**Bike and Pedestrian Project Methodology**

Criteria	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points	20 points
<b>Safety</b>	No Bike/Ped crashes or safety improvements	Adds sidewalk on a road that currently only has sidewalk on <b>ONE SIDE</b>	Adds sidewalk or bicycle facility on a road that does not currently have any sidewalks or Bicycle facility or adds crossing improvements on a road or along a corridor with 1 bike/ped crash in the last five years.	Off-road greenway project that is accessible to pedestrians and/or cyclists and is physically separated from a roadway or along a corridor with 2 bike/ped crash in the last five years.	Adds Pedestrian or Bicycle facility along corridor with or along a corridor with 3 or more bike/ped crash in the last five years.
	Bike or Pedestrian safety calculated by NCDOT SPOT office, LOSRPO will				
<b>Destination Served</b>	No direct access to major destination	Direct access to <b>AT LEAST 1:</b> critical educational, health care, grocery/retail, recreation/entertainment destination or TAZ with 50-99 employees	Direct access to <b>AT LEAST 2:</b> critical educational, health care, grocery/retail, recreation/entertainment destination or TAZ with 100-149 employees	Direct access to <b>AT LEAST 3</b> critical educational, health care, grocery/retail, recreation/entertainment destination or TAZ with 150-199 employees	Direct access to <b>4 OR MORE:</b> critical educational, health care, grocery/retail recreation/entertainment destination or TAZ with 200 or greater employees
	Does the project connect directly to a critical educational, health care, employment, grocery/retail or recreation/entertainment destination?				
<b>Projected Employment Growth</b>	No direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth >= 50 employees	Direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth of 50-99 employees	Direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth of 100-149 employees	Direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth of 150-199 employees	Direct access to TAZ with projected employment growth of 200 or greater employees
	Does the project connect directly to a TAZ (Traffic Analysis Zone) with projected employment growth? (Based on Employment Growth Projections used in FBRMPO TDM)				
<b>Connectivity</b>	Project does not include bike/ped facilities or connections		Projects that connect two previously disconnected (or inconveniently connected) sections of bicycle or pedestrian infrastructure (missing links)		
	Whether the project includes facilities such as sidewalks, bicycle lanes, etc., or a connection to these type facilities.				
<b>Local Priority</b>	The #9 and #10 projects for both from Bike/Ped project lists	The #7 and #7 projects from Bike/Ped project lists	The #5 and #6 projects from Bike/Ped project lists	The #3 and #4 projects from Bike/Ped project lists	The #1 and #2 projects from Bike/Ped project lists
	Based on Bike and Pedestrian Prioritized lists from each county				
<b>SPOT 4.0 Score from NCDOT</b>	SPOT 4.0 Score = $\frac{[SPOT SCORE/Max SPOT Score]*100}{10\%}$	Regional Max Score =70 Max Score = 50	Division ie. Regional $[(65/70)*100]*10\%=9.286$ ie. Division $[(35/50)*100]*10\%=7$		
	The Quantitative SPOT 4.0 Score provided by NCDOT will account for 10% of overall score.				

**Public Involvement Process**

Public Involvement Process for the Prioritization List will include the following steps based on the draft LOSRPO Public Involvement Plan, section VII. page 14:

- After consideration and preliminary adoption by the TAC, the draft Prioritization List will be published for a minimum two-week (14-day) public comment period and the notice will be advertised using our media resources provided in Appendix B.
- A Committee of TCC members was created to develop a local point methodology. After consideration and preliminary adoption by the TAC, the draft Prioritization Methodology will be published for a minimum four-week (28-day) public comment period and the notice will be advertised using our media resources provided in Appendix B.





- The notices for the public comment period and the public hearing will include an announcement stating that persons with disabilities will be accommodated. Special provisions will be made if notified 48 hours in advance (i.e. having available large print documents, audio material, someone proficient in sign language, a translator or other provisions as requested). The Prioritization List and Prioritization Methodology will be on file for review at the Land of Sky Regional Council Office, and available in a PDF format for downloading from the LOSRPO homepage. Written comments will be received during the comment period and will be directed to the LOSRPO. The LOSRPO's contact person, phone number and e-mail address will be included in the public notice. The LOSRPO will assemble all comments and forward comments to the TAC.
- The RPOTAC will hold a public hearing on the draft Prioritization List and the Prioritization Methodology. The public hearing will be held at a location which is accessible to persons with disabilities. The RPOTAC will approve a final Prioritization List and Prioritization Methodology after considering the public comments received. The public review periods for the Prioritization List and the Prioritization Methodology will sometimes be concurrent and sometimes will run separately, depending upon which schedule is more practical. The Prioritization List shall be submitted to the NCDOT at or before the NCDOT public hearings for input into the STIP. The RPOTAC may elect to open a dialogue with the State on specific project priorities.

**When possible the Land of Sky RPO is duplicating timelines, meetings, and notices with the FBRMPO**

**NEXT STEPS/TIMELINE**

- RPO Board and NCDOT approve local input point methodology (October 15 – January 2015) with 28 day public comment period provided.
- Quantitative scores are given to P4.0 projects and STIP Unit Programs Statewide Mobility Projects (March 2016)
- Proposed Local input points for Regional Impact projects are allocated and posted on the LOSRPO website and endorsed by LOSRPO TAC (May - 2016) with minimum 2-week public comment period provided.
- STIP Unit Programs Regional Impact Projects (June – July 2016)



- Proposed Local input points for Division Needs projects are allocated and posted on the LOSRPO website and endorsed by LOSRPO TAC (September 30th- 2016) with minimum 2-week public comment period provided.
- NCDOT STIP Unit releases the NCDOT 2018 – 2017 DRAFT STIP



Staff recommended action:

Review and recommend changes. Adopt as LOSRPO DRAFT PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY. Draft document will be sent to NCDOT SPOT office for review and will be adopted by the LOSRPO following Public Hearing January 27<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

**5. REGULAR UPDATES**

- A. NCDOT Division 13 and 14 updates
- B. Transportation Planning Branch Updates
- C. Subcommittee/Workgroup Reports,  
Staff Updates and Housekeeping
- D. Legislative Updates (attached to Agenda)

NCDOT Staff  
Brendan Merithew  
Vicki Eastland  
Staff  
Vicki Eastland

**Announcements, News, Special Updates**

Construction reports available from the LOS RPO Website:  
[http://www.landofskyrepo.org/resources\\_and\\_links](http://www.landofskyrepo.org/resources_and_links)

SPOTID	Project Category	Improvement Type	Specific Improvement	Specific Improvement Number	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	First County	Highest Division	SPOT 4 Status
H090854	Division Needs	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		SR 1395	Cove Creek Mountain Road	Boyd Mountain Road	Great Smoky Mountains National Park	Boyd Mountain Road to Great Smoky Mountains National Park - Upgrade and Pave	Haywood	14.00	Database
H141279	Regional Impact	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		US 276	Jonathon Creek Road	US 19	I 40	Install paved shoulders on the median and outside shoulders with rumble strips. Construct or upgrade left turn lanes at various crossovers.	Haywood	14	Database
?	Regional Impact	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		NC209		SR 1501 (Silvers Cove Road)	SR 1334 (Max Patch Road)	Highway 209 - Silvers Cove Road (SR 1501) to SR 1334 (Max Patch Road) (at Ferguson's Store) - Upgrade, Widen, and Guardrails	Haywood	14	Modification
?	Regional Impact	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		NC210		SR 1334 (Max Patch Road)		Highway 209 - SR 1334 (Max Patch Road) to Madison County Line - Upgrade, Widen, and Guardrails	Haywood	14	Modification

H090092	Regional Impact	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16	R-2426	NC 208		US 25/70	Tennessee State Line	US 25/70 to Tennessee State Line. Upgrade Two Lane Roadway.	Madison	13	Database
H090157	Regional Impact	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16	R-2589	NC 209		NC 63 at Trust	US 25/70 in Hot Springs	NC 63 at Trust to US 25/70 in Hot Springs. Upgrade Two Lane Roadway.	Madison	13	Database
H090317	Division Needs	Capacity	Construct Roadway on New Location	5	R-5117		New Route	Marshall	Spring Creek Community	Construct Facility on New Location	Madison	13	Database
H111159	Regional Impact	Capacity	Widen Existing Roadway	1		US 25		NC 251	Smith Hollow Rd (SR 1393)	US 25/US 70 - Widening (Marshall) from NC 251 to Smith Hollow Road (SR 1393)	Madison	13	Modification

SPOTID	Project Category	Improvement Type	Specific Improvement	Specific Improvement Number	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	First County	Highest Division	SPOT 4 Status
?	Regional Impact	Capacity	Widen Existing Roadway	1		US 25		Smith Hollow Rd (SR 1393)	North Main Street (US 25/US70 Bus)	US 25/US 70 - Widening (Marshall) from Smith Hollow Road (SR 1393) to North Main Street (US 25/US70 Bus) Incorporate Complete Streets Elements	Madison	13	Modification
H090092-B?	Regional Impact	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16	R-2426	NC 208		US 25/70	NC 212	US 25/70 to NC 212. Upgrade Two Lane Roadway.	Madison	13	Modification
?	Regional Impact	Construct Auxilliary Lanes or Other Operational Improvements	Add 2 turn lanes	22		US 25		Long Branch Rd (SR 1582)		US 25/US 70 - Add turn lanes at Long Branch Rd (SR 1582)	Madison	13	Modification
?	Regional Impact	Capacity	Widen Existing Roadway	1		US 25		North Main Street (US 25/US70 Bus)	Brush Creek Rd (SR 1143)	US 25/US 70 - Widening (Marshall) from North Main Street (US 25/US70 Bus) to Brush Creek Rd (SR 1143)	Madison	13	New
?	Division Needs	Bike and Ped	Construct Pedestrian improvements to include Pedestrian Signal and Crossing treatments	6		US 25		SR 1601 Deringer Drive/US 25/US70/Student Dropoff Way		Construct Pedestrian improvements to include Pedestrian Signal - Crosswalk and Pedestrian Refuge Island on US 25/US 70 and Sidewalk along one side of US 25/70	Madison	13	New B/P
?	Division Needs	Bike and Ped	Construct Pedestrian improvements to Curb/gutter, sidewalk and mid block crossing	6		US 25/70 BUS	US 25/70 BUS (South Main Street Marshall)	In Front of Town owned Depot		Construct Pedestrian improvements to include Curb and gutter, Sidewalk and mid block crossing in front of Depot	Madison	13	New/B/P

H090162	Division Needs	Capacity	Construct Roadway on New Location	5	R-2594	NC 215	Balsam Grove Sunburst, FH 32	US 64 at Cherryfield	SR 1326 (Macedonia Church Road) South of Balsam Grove	Construct Two Lanes on New Location	Transylvania	14	Database
---------	----------------	----------	-----------------------------------	---	--------	--------	------------------------------	----------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------	----	----------

SPOTID	Project Category	Improvement Type	Specific Improvement	Specific Improvement Number	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	First County	Highest Division	SPOT 4 Status
H090855	Division Needs	Capacity	Construct Roadway on New Location	5	R-5743		New Route - West Loop Minor Thoroughfare	US 64/276	US 64	New Route - US 64/276 to Nicholson Creek Road/US 64 - West Loop Minor Thoroughfare	Transylvania	14	Database
H129070-D	Regional Impact	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16	R-2409D	US 64		Indian Creek Road (East end of R-2409C)	East of the east intersection with Flat Creek Valley Road (SR 1147)	Widen, Realign and Climbing Lanes	Transylvania	14	Database
H090858	Regional Impact	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		US 178		SR 1156 (Main Street) in Rosman	South Carolina State Line	Widen, Realign, and Climbing Lanes	Transylvania	14	Database
H111135	Division Needs	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		SR 1540	Wilson Road	SR 1504 (Old US 64)	US 276	Upgrade Roadway. Proposed Typical Is 20' Paved Roadway with 6' Grass Shoulders. Current Typical Is Two Lane 18' Paved Roadway with 4' Grass Shoulders	Transylvania	14	Database
H111128	Division Needs	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		SR 1533	Everette Farm Road	SR 1528	SR 1504	Upgrade Roadway. Proposed Typical Is 22' Paved Roadway with 6' Grass Shoulders. Current Typical Is Two Lane 18' Paved Roadway with 3' Grass Shoulders	Transylvania	14	Database
H111133	Division Needs	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		SR 1546	Neely Road	SR 1504 (Old US 64)	SR 1544 (French Broad St)	Upgrade Roadway. Proposed Typical Is 20' Paved Roadway with 6' Grass Shoulders. Current Typical Is Two Lane 18' Paved Roadway with 4' Grass Shoulders	Transylvania	14	Database
H111136	Division Needs	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		SR 1534	Hart Road	SR 1534 (Hart Rd)	SR 1533 (Everett Rd)	Upgrade Roadway. Proposed Typical Is 20' Paved Roadway with 6' Grass Shoulders. Current Typical Is Two Lane 16 - 18" Paved Roadway with 4' Grass Shoulders	Transylvania	14	Database

SPOTID	Project Category	Improvement Type	Specific Improvement	Specific Improvement Number	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	First County	Highest Division	SPOT 4 Status
H111137	Division Needs	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		SR 1116	North Country Club Road	Brevard City Limit	US 64	Upgrade Roadway. Proposed Typical Is 26' Paved Roadway with Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, and in Compliance with Complete Streets Policy. Current Typical Is Two Lane 20' Paved Roadway with Curb and Gutter	Transylvania	14	Database
H111138	Division Needs	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	16		SR 1554	Azela Avenue	SR 1504 (Old US 64)	SR 1551 (Oak Dale Rd)	Upgrade Roadway. Proposed Typical Is 26' Paved Roadway with Curb and Gutter. Current Typical Is Two Lane 18' Paved Roadway with 4' Grass Shoulders	Transylvania	14	Database
H140969	Division Needs	Widen Existing Roadway	Modernize Roadway	16		SR 1156	Main Street	SR 1388 (Old Rosman Highway)	US 176 (Pickens Highway)	Widen road to include auxiliary lanes where needed, curb & gutter, sidewalks and bike lanes	Transylvania	14	Database
?	Division Needs	Capacity	Construct Roadway on New Location	5			New Route - West Loop Minor Thoroughfare	US 64/276	US 64 (North to Allison Road)	New Route - US 64/276 to Nicholson Creek Road/US 64 - West Loop Minor Thoroughfare (Adjust northern termini to NORTH OF ALLISON ROAD)	Transylvania	14	Modification
?	Regional Impact	Access Management	Modernize Roadway	11		US 64/276		N. Caldwell St	Approx 550' North of Allison Rd (termination of existing median)	Convert TWLTL to Median and general Access control. Build to Complete Streets standards. Include Pedestrian and Bicycle accommodations	Transylvania	14	NEW HWY
?	Divison Needs	Intersection Improvements	Realign Multiple Intersections	21		Old US 64	Old Hendersonville HWY	Wilson Rd	Ecusta Rd	Realign Intersections at Wilson Rd/Old US 64/Ecusta Rd	Transylvania	14	NEW HWY
?	Regional Impact	Upgrade at Grade Intersection	Safety Improvements	16		US 64/NC 280	Asheville Hwy	US 64/US 276/NC 280		Safety Improvements, including Bike and Pedestrian Crossing accommodations	Transylvania	14	NEW HWY
?	Regional Impact	Access Management	Modernize Roadway	11		NC 280	Asheville Hwy	Deavor Road	Hudlin Gap Road	Install Median in existing 4 lane roadway and general access management to increase safety.	Transylvania	14	NEW HWY

SPOTID	Project Category	Improvement Type	Specific Improvement	Specific Improvement Number	TIP #	Route Number	Route Name	From/Cross Street	To	Description	First County	Highest Division	SPOT 4 Status
?	Division Needs	Modernization	Modernize Roadway	11		SR 1512	(Ecusta Rd)	US 64	Old US 64 (Old Hendersonville Rd)	Modernize/Upgrade roadway to include curb/gutter. Build to Complete Streets standards.	Transylvania	14	NEW HWY
?	Divison Needs	Bike/Ped	Construct 5' Sidewalk	5		SR 1350	Probart Street	US 64/276 N. Caldwell ST	Music Camp Rd	Construct 5' Sidewalk along one side of roadway	Transylvania	14	NEW B/P
? YET TBD IF IN SPOT4	Divison Needs	Bike/Ped	Construct Multi-use trail/greenway/or on-road bike lane	2		US 276	Greenville Hwy	SR 1540 (Wilson Road)	Barclay Road	Construct multi-use trail / greenway / sidepath or on-road bike lane on local roadway (Blue Ridge Bike Plan Transylvania Co Priority Corridor #1)	Transylvania	14	NEW B/P