

1 **NEW BERN AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **TCC MEETING MINUTES**

3
4 **May 14, 2015**

5
6 The New Bern Area Metropolitan Planning Organization held its regularly scheduled meeting on
7 Thursday, May 14, 2015 at 1:30 PM in the Development Services Conference Room, 303 First
8 Street.

- 9
10 **Members Present:** Mr. Jeff Ruggieri – Chair
11 Mr. Gene Hodges – Vice-Chair
12 Mr. Chad Strawn (for Don Baumgardner) – County of Craven
13 Ms. Kelly Walker - CARTS
14 Mr. Jeff Cabaniss – NCDOT
15 Ms. Maurizia Chapman – -New Bern Area MPO
16 Mr. Patrick Flanagan – Down East RPO
17 Mr. David Fort – Town of Bridgeton
18 Mr. Haywood Daughtry - NCDOT
19 Mr. Behshad Norowzi – NCDOT
20 Mr. Farhan Javed – NCDOT
21 Mr. John Rouse - NCDOT
22 Mr. Tom Braaten – NB Regional Airport
23 Mr. Steve Hamilton – NCDOT
24 Ms. Loretta Barren - FHWA

- 25
26 **Members Excused:** Mr. Delane Jackson – River Bend
27 Mr. Chuck Tyson – Trent Woods

- 28
29 **Members Absent:** Mr. Jordan Hughes – City of New Bern
30 Mr. Kevin Roberts – NB Chamber of Commerce

- 31
32 **Guests Present:** Mr. Matt Montayne – City of New Bern
33 Ms. Marlene Connor – MCA LLC

- 34
35 **Staff Present:** Ms. Kimberly Maxey – New Bern Area MPO

- 36
37
38 **1. Call to Order:** Chair Jeff Ruggieri called the meeting to order at 1:30 pm.
39
40 **2. Roll Call:** Roll Call was taken and a quorum was declared.
41
42 **3. Public Comments:** N/A
43
44 **4. Approval of today’s agenda:** The revised agenda was approved.
45
46 **5. Approval of the minutes of the March 12, 2015 meeting:** Reading of the minutes was

47 waived.

48

49 **Motion: Mr. David Fort made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. The**
50 **motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Hodges and passed unanimously.**

51

52 **6. NBAMPO Draft Vision and Goals for the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan:**
53 *Maurizia Chapman*

54

55 Ms. Chapman relayed that staff has been working on the MTP and formed a sub-committee
56 that met in January at which time they created the Draft Vision for the plan. A copy of the
57 Vision and Goals were provided to each member. This Vision is a result of the surveys that
58 were held, comments that were received from public input as well as the considerations from
59 the sub-committee members.

60

61 Ms. Chapman explained the Citizen's Advisory Committee meeting was held earlier in the
62 day and they recommended approval of the Vision and Goals by the TAC. She requested
63 members of the TCC review the Vision and Goals and if acceptable as presented, recommend
64 approval by the TAC.

65

66 Chair Ruggieri expressed his acceptance of the Draft Vision and Goals and feels they cover
67 everything and gives a good foundation to move forward.

68

69 **Motion: Mr. David Fort made a motion to approve the 2040 MTP Vision and Goals and**
70 **recommend TAC approval. Mr. Tom Braaten seconded. Motion passed by unanimous**
71 **vote.**

72

73 **7. NBAMPO Socio-Economic Forecast and Methodology for the 2040 Metropolitan**
74 **Transportation Plan:** *Maurizia Chapman, MPO Administrator*

75

76 Ms. Chapman relayed that consultant Craig Gresham worked on the projections for the
77 base-year numbers. There was a sub-committee that reviewed his work and some
78 changes were recommended. Mr. Gresham made the changes. We are looking at the
79 projections and the methodology that was used to gain the projections. He has worked
80 with Mr. Norowzi and Mr. Javed with NCDOT. The model validation has been
81 completed.

82

83 Ms. Chapman requested members of the TCC review and if accepted as presented,
84 recommend approval by the TAC.

85

86 **Motion: Mr. Steve Hamilton made a motion to approve the Socio-Economic Forecast**
87 **and Methodology for the 2040 MTP and recommend TAC approval. Mr. David Fort**
88 **seconded. Motion passed by unanimous vote.**

89

90

91

92

93

94 **8. Craven Area Rural Transit System Transit Development Plan: *Marlene Connor,***
95 ***MCA LLC***
96

97 Ms. Marlene Conner informed the Committee that her firm began working on the
98 development plan in January 2015, during a period of significant transition. Now that the
99 area has become an urbanized area, through the creation of the MPO, this significantly
100 impacts the way CARTS is funded and how it operates. Starting July 1, funds that were
101 previously filtered through NCDOT processes for rural transit have been eliminated with
102 the creation of the urbanized area. Craven County and CARTS became the designated
103 recipient of 5307 federal funds, which are urban formula funds. With this come
104 additional programs, processes, policies and requirements that are serious in how
105 everything is viewed, received and accounted for. These funds can only be utilized in
106 specific areas.

107
108 They have been evaluating the pieces of who uses CARTS to know who will be affected
109 by these changes. This will give them an opportunity to create a process understood and
110 accepted by the entities (CARTS, MPO, County) a greater knowledge of how to
111 incorporate these new funds to bring operating dollars into the system without
112 disaffecting the riders . To do this they analyzed data on who rides the system, where the
113 money comes in currently, what DSS pays for, what the other agencies pay for, who rides
114 the loop, where do they ride the loop, who's paying for that. The federal money used for
115 operating has a requirement for a local 50/50 match.

116
117 One of the ways the government organizes their programs and processes is through an
118 audit program which has 18 categories and 250 pages of rules and restrictions, to
119 determine what CARTS is doing, how does this change what they've been doing.
120 Because the previous funds were through the NCDOT, the NCDOT provided the master
121 plan for CARTS processes. They are going through each of the federal funding program
122 requirements to prioritize needs prior to July 1st.

123
124 From a process perspective the two most important pieces will be managing and
125 understanding the financial managing process through the audit process, which will take
126 place in 2017.

127
128 The second piece required for July 1st is services associated with the Americans with
129 Disabilities Act. The loop which will become a fixed route as of July 1st, now requires a
130 complementary para-transit service that provides access to individuals that are not able to
131 access the loop service due to a disability or lack of accessibility to reach the fixed route
132 stop. Individuals that haven't been before will need to be ADA certified.

133
134 Mr. Flanagan questioned if the ADA changes are brought on by the Urban funds and if so
135 will it apply to the rural areas as well. Ms. Conner replied this only applies to the fixed
136 route in the urban area. Mr. Flanagan questioned if the budget has increased with the
137 new urban funds. Ms. Conner advised it has increased a bit. Mr. Hodges noted it's more
138 of a swap out rather than an increase. In response to the 50/50 match, Mr. Flanagan
139 asked if there are transit agencies that are unable to meet the match, do they lose the
140 funds or can they be left on the table. Ms. Conner advised funds can always be left on

141 the table. There are different ways to capture. Many riders are associated and subsidized
142 by different agencies (DSS for example). This will likely not change, just rather if the
143 subsidized level will cover the urban or rural portion of the service. The other piece is
144 what appropriate care will need to be on the loop service. Right now these funds are
145 being subsidized by NCDOT, and that will not be the case as of July 1. This means the
146 loop service will be coming out of the 5307 funds. The way the budget is currently
147 structured the trips operated for DSS in the urbanized area will be enough to cover the
148 difference, meaning a sufficient match for the 5307 funds. The intent would be to not
149 leave any funds on the table. The 5307 funds, the 50% match is if you use that money for
150 operating expenses. They can be used for other things; capital and planning, which is an
151 80/20 match.

152
153 For CARTS to use the 5307 funds for operating costs they will need to have the Program
154 Of Projects approved through the MPO that will be part of the Transportation
155 Improvement Program. How the 5307 funds is spent and allocated will be a part of that
156 program of projects.

157
158 Mr. Flanagan questioned if they had begun putting together a list of capital projects. Mr.
159 Hodges replied that for the next budget year they have ordered 3 replacement vehicles.
160 All the current vehicles are for the rural portion, which cannot be used for the urban
161 portion. Their first initial capital will replace three rural vehicles with urban vehicles.
162 Right now they have been working on the assumption that it's a 60/40 split; 60 rural and
163 40 urban. They don't currently have the data to backup exactly what they are doing. As
164 the software becomes more customized they will have a better idea if this split is accurate
165 and therefore what the fleet makeup needs to be. Mr. Flanagan explained his reason for
166 questioning is to submit these in the SPOT process, vehicles have not fared well in
167 getting funded, and suggested CARTS not count on the 20% from the State. Ms.
168 Chapman noted that the replacement vehicles were already included in the TIP. The
169 MPO boards approved the budget amendment last year and there were no state funds.
170 Mr. Hodges advised they do not plan on the 20% funds.

171
172 Mr. Ruggieri asked if they are looking at the overall system and if the routes will
173 effectively cover where the citizens want to go. Ms. Conner advised that was the initial
174 scope but was adjusted over time to ensure all requirements were met by the July 1
175 deadline. They will be putting together a phased implementation strategy. Once they
176 know the program is secure for July 1, they will work on recommendations for what
177 needs to be accomplished in later years; a planning process for future growth.

178
179 Ms. Walker advised the first year they will maintain status quo and review the process to
180 determine areas that have greater needs and address. Ms. Chapman questioned if the
181 5307 funds be used for a more in-depth study after the first year to determine these needs.
182 Ms. Conner advised that is the plan.

188 **9. Projects Prioritization Program 3.0 – Lessons Learned: Patrick Flanagan, Down East**
189 **RPO**
190

191 Mr. Flanagan advised this is a lessons learned presentation from the SPOT 3 process.
192 They found 3,100 projects scored in the new SPOT online tool, but went very well for the
193 amount of data submitted. He presented a timeline to the group. The draft review of the
194 STIP went from September – December 2014. The Peer Review prioritization held in
195 December 2014 with NCDOT, who also brought in other state MPOs for a two-day
196 meeting in which the major topic was normalization and how to compare scores for all
197 modes. No one else in the country is doing this so we are setting the precedence with
198 this. They have had 15 4.0 workgroup meetings and last coming up. Everything should
199 be finalized in this last meeting and then go before the Board of Transportation for
200 review.

201
202 The basic results: 1,073 projects in 100 counties; 824 highway projects, 70 bike/ped
203 projects, 55 aviation projects, 10 public transit projects, 5 rail projects and 1 ferry boat
204 replacement. 87% of the projects are highway with 13% non-highway. Funding was
205 divided up at 90% to highway, 4% to non-highway and 6% divided between both groups.
206

207 Important to remember is how the process works, how projects are programmed based on
208 the finalized scores which include local input points. They start with the SPOT score and
209 ranking highest to lowest. Then they look at what exempt and transition projects are
210 already taking up funds and where they fit in. Many projects are multi-year so we will
211 still deal with these in 4.0. They then look at the developmental timeline, where it is in
212 the NEPA process and where it fits into the overall 10 years of the STIP within the NEPA
213 process. Lastly they look at other fiscal constraints.
214

215 Results were discussed. 1, 731 highway projects evaluated in the SPOT 3 process,
216 totaling \$67 Billion; 427 total projects were programmed totally \$9.7 Billion; out of the
217 427, 18 were greater than \$100 million projects. Out of those 18, 13 were statewide, 3
218 were regional and 2 were division, one of which was the Havelock Bypass. Out of these,
219 not all projects received local input points. Some got funded, but most did not.
220

221 The average cost by statewide, regional and divisional tiers were shown.
222

223 Consider the cost and the length of projects. Sometimes it is better to break a project into
224 phases to have a better opportunity to score well enough to be funded.
225

226 Lessons learned and how to apply going forward include being aware that this process is
227 a competition. In addition, there are 22 separate competitions going on at the statewide
228 level, competition within regions of which there are 7 in the state, and division
229 competition of which there are 14. Knowing your competition is important when
230 considering projects. There is a rule book that defines many of these things. Once you
231 have the data scores, it's pretty predictable. Because of this, NCDOT is essentially
232 providing you an outline of what has the best chance of being funded.
233
234

235 Four main areas to focus on are: 1) project scoping, 2) recognizing funding constraints
236 and competition projects, 3) identifying competitive short-term projects, and 4) ensuring
237 local methodology and strategies allow points on projects that really need the points.
238

239 **10. FY 2016 Meeting Schedule:** *Kim Maxey*

240
241 Ms. Maxey provided a copy of the proposed meeting schedule for the upcoming fiscal
242 year and requested the committee review and discuss. The questionable November 12th
243 meeting date was discussed. Members collectively agreed the November 12th date was
244 acceptable and the meeting schedule will go as presented to the TAC for approval.
245

246 **11. Updates:**

247 *a. Transportation Planning Branch Update: Behshad Norowzi, NCDOT TPB*

248
249 Mr. Javed provided an update on the model, which is ready for scenario analysis.
250 Socio-economic data is not final and can be modified as needed.
251

252 *b. Division 2 Update: Jeff Cabaniss, NCDOT Division 2 Planning Engineer*

253
254 Mr. Jeff Cabaniss updated the board on current projects:

- 255 - The NC 43 Connector project has been awarded to S.T. Wooten and is
256 17% complete. It is expected to be completed by August 1, 2016.
- 257 - Clark's rest areas are under renovation.
- 258 - Safe Routes to school project is in second Phase with some grade work
259 to complete.
- 260 - Planning for 10-foot multi-use path along Glenburnie Rd. continues, as
261 well as sidewalk down Neuse Boulevard.
- 262 - Resurfacing list hasn't changed.
- 263 - Highway 55 has been paved and needs shoulder work to complete.
- 264 - Governor's Bond proposals have a website that went live this week and
265 shows all proposed projects under the bond, including completion of the
266 43 Connector.

267
268 *c. CARTS Update: Kelly Walker, Transit Director*

269
270 No additional information that wasn't already discussed previously.
271

272 *d. New Bern Area MPO Update: Maurizia Chapman, AICP, NBAMPO*
273 *Administrator, Kimberly Maxey, MPO Planner*

- 274
275 • Ms. Chapman: Provided draft schedule to the board, advising we may need to
276 call a special June meeting in order to cover. Methodology needs to be
277 reviewed to ensure no changes need to be made. Considering eliminating
278 some projects. Our goal is to have candidate projects in an approved plan, to
279 have a highway portion of the MTP. If we miss this window for project
280 submission we will have to wait until 2017.
281

282
283
284
285
286
287
288

- Staff will attend NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) training in Raleigh in June. A signatory will need to be selected by the TAC who will be authorized to represent the MPO at Projects Merger meetings. Usually the MPO Director/Administrator is the primary person authorized to do so, with a staff member as the alternate. After the training staff will request that the TAC appoint Ms. Chapman as the Signatory and Ms. Maxey as the Alternate.

289
290
291

12. Discussion: N/A

292
293

13. Adjourn

294
295
296
297
298

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m..

299

Jeff Ruggieri, Chairman

Maurizia Chapman, MPO Administrator