

45 **5. P 4.0 Project Prioritization Ranking and Scoring:** *Maurizia Chapman*

46 Ms. Chapman relayed the spreadsheet provided to the members in the packet shows the
47 rankings as having Bicycle/Pedestrian projects in the first three positions. Staff held a
48 public meeting the week prior with no additional feedback and the comment period will
49 remain open until just prior to the TAC meeting at the end of the month.

50
51 Staff added the committee scores to the quantitative score that shows Bike/Ped projects
52 still ranking high, but the NCDOT at the Division level will give additional 25% only to
53 2-4 non-highway mode projects. The original quantitative scoring showed a number of
54 non-highway projects that ranked higher than ours did. Therefore competition at the
55 regional and statewide level may not result in these Bike/Ped projects getting funded, but
56 staff recommends continuing as shown.

57
58 If members agree to the scoring as shown, the MPO will submit as shown.

59
60 Mr. Sage questioned how the CAC's recommendations as discussed in the September
61 meeting correlate to the scoring being shown. Ms. Chapman advised only one member of
62 the CAC returned any scoring information, and it was not complete, therefore staff was
63 unable to take the partial scoring into account.

64
65 **Motion: Mr. Sage made a motion to approve the P 4.0 Project Prioritization**
66 **Ranking and Scoring as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Olstad and**
67 **passed unanimously.**

68 **6. Amendment No 4. To the FY 2016-2025 Metropolitan Transportation Program:** *Kim*
69 *Maxey*

70
71 Ms. Maxey relayed that the State has added various funds for unspecified projects into
72 the STIP, therefore in order to ensure the MTIP matches exactly, staff requests approval
73 of the Amendment to incorporate the funds.

74
75 Ms. Chapman relayed that part of these funds are for ADA crosswalk improvements
76 within our area.

77
78 **Motion: Mr. Wallace made a motion to approve the Amendment No. 4 to the FY**
79 **2016-2025 Metropolitan Transportation Program. The motion was seconded by Mr.**
80 **Sage and passed unanimously.**

81
82 **7. Discussion:** Ms. Chapman advised the members that due to the specially called October
83 meeting, it probably won't be necessary to hold the regularly scheduled November
84 meeting. Staff will present this suggestion to the TAC and will follow up with all
85 members.

86
87 The board needs to determine if they would like to continue the Citizen Advisory
88 Committee going forward. CAC members agreed they felt it was important to continue
89 this group.

90

91 Therefore, staff will discuss reappointment with 4 members of the CAC whose term will
92 expire in December 2016. Terms are for 2 years, ensuring a staggering of members to
93 ensure continuity.

94
95 Mr. Sage questioned how other Citizen Advisory Committee across the state operate,
96 noting his concern in how the information is being presented to them, feeling this year
97 was on a shortened time line, leaving the members to feel as if their input wasn't valued
98 or required, rather is just a requirement needed in order to process information and
99 projects. Ms. Chapman advised the CAC is not a required group, but the staff feels it is
100 important to have citizen input and engagement which is why this group was formed.
101 There is only one other standing CAC attached to an MPO within the state of North
102 Carolina. Staff values the input and participation of the members. Other MPO's utilize
103 the public meetings as their input from citizens. The information presented to the CAC
104 equals the information provided to the TCC which is held on the same day.

105
106 Ms. Chapman advised the timeline for project ranking this year was shortened due to
107 requirements from the State which is why it seemed so expedited.

108
109 Mr. Olstad questioned if this group has any input into the condition of roads in downtown
110 New Bern. Ms. Chapman relayed the NCDOT has a website, staff can provide the link,
111 allowing citizens the chance to express their concern regarding certain roads. The
112 NCDOT has a required time limit to respond. This only applies to state maintained
113 roads.

114
115 Ms. Maxey noted if the roads are locally maintained by the city, Matt Montayne is the
116 Director of Public Works for the City and would be the proper person to contact with any
117 concerns. She also recommended speaking to the Alderman over their Ward, as well as
118 attending Aldermen meetings in which these topics are being discussed.

119
120 Mr. Olstad noted he obtained information regarding roads that will be repaved within the
121 city, and feels the downtown roads are priority, versus the roads noted, including one in
122 his area which he felt is not in need as much as others.

123
124 Mr. Wallace advised he has the same concerns with roads in the Duffyfield area.
125 Unfortunately the scoring process used within the city doesn't always address the roads
126 that seem to need the most repair.

127
128
129 **8. Adjournment:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.
130
131
132
133
134

Tharesa Lee – Vice-Chairman

Secretary