



47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93

**Motion: Mr. David Fort made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Delane Jackson and passed unanimously.**

**6. FY 2016 Planning Work Program: *Maurizia Chapman***

Ms. Chapman relayed that the draft PWP was provided to members at the January meeting, and items discussed included fund allocation for next year. The draft approvals from the TAC and TCC were forwarded to the Public Transportation Division (PTD). They have not made any changes based on comments provided. We are still using Federal Highway PL funds as proposed during the January meeting, therefore will go with what was presented.

At this time, we are requesting the Committee approve the PWP for fiscal year 2016 as presented, and recommend TAC approval.

**Motion: Mr. David Fort made a motion to approve the 2016 PWP and recommend TAC approval. Mr. Don Baumgardner seconded. Motion passed by unanimous vote.**

**7. Annual Self Certification of 3C's Planning Process: *Maurizia Chapman, MPO Administrator***

Ms. Chapman relayed that revised copies of the resolution Certifying the Planning Process for the MPO have been provided to members. This is different than what was previously sent out for review. Ms. Loretta Barren with the NCDOT provided us with an updated and revised checklist. Therefore the Resolution has been revised showing the different items that are outlined in the Metropolitan Self-Certification, which was also provided. The 3-C's are referenced, Title VI Act and Assurances, disadvantaged business enterprises and elderly and disabled participation in the planning process as well as the Americans With Disabilities Act. Each item from the self-certification has been addressed, with the exception of Air Quality, as that does not apply to our MPO. Construction was included as well.

**Motion: Mr. David Fort made a motion to approve the Annual Self Certification checklist of the 3C's Planning Process and recommend TAC approval. Mr. Haywood Daughtry seconded. Motion passed by unanimous vote.**

**8. Indirect and Cumulative Effects in Long Range Planning: *Alena R. Cook, P.E., NCDOT-TPB, Dan Thomas***

Ms. Chapman introduced Ms. Alena Cook advising NCDOT is looking to use the NBAMPO as a pilot program for future changes in this process.

Ms. Cook provided handouts to members reviewing the Indirect and Cumulative Effects (ICE) in Long Range Transportation Planning. She then introduced Mr. Dan Thomas.

Mr. Thomas provided a background on integration, a process that began 8 years ago, taking information received during long range planning that assists in decision making

94 with project development and environmental documentation process, once a project is  
95 determined.

96  
97 There are several connections between long range planning and the development process.

- 98 1. The problem statement provides the basis for the purpose and need of the  
99 development process.
- 100 2. The alternatives analysis looks at alternatives and solutions for transportation  
101 projects, which assists in the project development process.
- 102 3. The community impact assessment documents populations and special features  
103 in the area. This assists in developing the public involvement process.

104  
105 There are products that will be rolled out in 6-10 months and will be implemented within  
106 MPOs and RPOs around the state. These are topics that had previously been handled in  
107 the long range transportation process, but documentation has not been done  
108 appropriately, therefore this will document in a useful way and assist in the NEPA  
109 process.

110  
111 Another link identified is indirect cumulative effects, which is relative to land use  
112 development. There are three types of environmental impacts:

- 113 1. Direct Impact. This works with the alternatives analysis and is relatively easy  
114 to determine and understand; what are the physical impacts to the  
115 environment in developing the project.
- 116 2. Indirect Impact. This is what occurs due to a project being developed.
- 117 3. Cumulative Impact. This is everything that has ever occurred to a resource  
118 and anything that may occur to a resource. It is not related to the project.

119  
120 The goal of this process is to identify these issues to make a better connection between  
121 the transportation plan and the land development plan. This process is being developed  
122 in North Carolina and has never been done anywhere in the country prior. This would  
123 improve communication between local government and developers.

124  
125 Mr. Thomas advised due to the detailed nature of this process, they felt it would be best  
126 to use a pilot program to show the benefits of the process as it is rolled out statewide, and  
127 eventually nationwide. Due to the environmental sensitivity in the New Bern Area, and  
128 the newness of the MPO, while developing the Long Range Plan, the New Bern Area  
129 MPO seemed to be a prime candidate for this pilot program.

130  
131 Ms. Alena Cook explained the cumulative effects is a key focus area within the NEPA  
132 process. There will be benefits to the process by generating this information within the  
133 long range plan.

134  
135 Using the handouts provided, Ms. Cook referred to the four products described within the  
136 Integration ICE process.

- 137 1. Existing Conditions Assessment: The NBAMPO has already started this with  
138 the development of the MTP. There are a few more categories to be  
139 considered; land availability, water & sewer, expected service areas.
- 140 2. Future Growth Potential Assessment: Tied closely to the development of the

- 141 MTP. Provides an assessment on how we're doing the growth projections and  
142 how it will impact the assessment process.
- 143 3. MTP Indirect and Cumulative Effects Screening: When it comes to doing the  
144 analysis, there are two separate types of considerations. Indirect looks at  
145 effects on the entire study area, and get a sense for indirect effects. This can  
146 also be applied to particular project proposals. Cumulative effects look at it  
147 more from a resource perspective, past actions and adding transportation  
148 proposals and the impacts of it.
  - 149 4. Best Management Practices Recommendations: This step helps individual  
150 communities the most, providing recommendations based on the results of the  
151 screenings to help minimize future cumulative and indirect effects to  
152 development planning.

153  
154 Ms. Cook acknowledged this was a lot of information to absorb, but additional  
155 information will be provided as the study process unfolds.

156  
157 Each of the products will be presented as technical memos, mapping and tools that will  
158 be handled through simple tables.

159  
160 Ms. Chapman requested a history of integration, who's pushing it and who's supporting  
161 the ICE process. Mr. Thomas explained this began with a highway streamlining grant  
162 from FHWA. They talked with a customer base and resource agencies to determine the  
163 connections. The ICE began as a land-use connection, looking at recommendations back  
164 to local government that a project can be built with minimal impact. When it comes to  
165 ICE, the impacts are on getting the permit from water quality. There is only one  
166 mitigation that is allowed to the NCDOT: controlling the access of a road. This is the  
167 only mitigation NCDOT can apply toward indirect cumulative effects. Other mitigations  
168 are typically local land use ordinances. What they are trying to accomplish is get ahead  
169 of future issues by utilizing this process in long range transportation planning. The  
170 Federal Highway Administration Raleigh Division is a strong proponent to this process.  
171 They are very supportive and pushing this process forward.

172  
173 Ms. Cook added that no one is currently doing this but people are viewing it with  
174 excitement about how it will make planning more efficient. Other states are also looking  
175 at improving their processes.

176  
177 Chair Ruggieri confirmed this process, if the MPO determines it would like to participate,  
178 would be a part of the MTP process. The NBAMPO would be the pilot project for this  
179 study. Mr. Thomas added that this would be incorporated into the MTP process, and a  
180 consultant would be brought in to do the work and would work with the MPO staff along  
181 with this process.

182  
183 Mr. Flanagan questioned if they have spoken with the environmental legal teams, as  
184 many times with lawsuits on specific projects, the environmental legal teams try to link  
185 all the by-pass projects, as they link together, that may have impacts. If we do the  
186 process and are working our way through the steps, could we be lending ourselves to  
187 further scrutiny.

188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234

Ms. Cook relayed she feels this process would do the opposite; rather it would show that we are performing due diligence and considering the communities as a whole. She also noted that detailed documentation should also alleviate the risks of being scrutinized.

Mr. Fort questioned how much this would add in effort and time to the current process. Ms. Cook advised there would be no additional time; the MTP is still due March 26<sup>th</sup>. They will hire a consultant to assist, therefore the local resources will not be tapped. Some input from the boards will be requested during the process. The rest is integrated into the MTP process. There will be no additional cost to the MPO.

Mr. Thomas added that when it comes to step 4 in the process, they would like to be able to provide us with their recommendations on what we should do. By no means does that mean we have to agree and move forward with them, but this is the step that could impact developers' perceptions of what they can or can't do, and the communication to developers and community members will be important.

Ms. Chapman relayed that any new projects will have to go through the process as part of the NEPA process anyway. This may validate the need, or prove it's not a necessity. As MPO planners, we must include the Environmental information, Environmental Justice information that would already be covered through the process. The hope is that doing this during the planning process it will shorten the project planning phase. From the MPO Staff perspective, it is recommended. If New Bern opts out, they will find another pilot MPO then potentially come back and require this process be completed, then the MPO will be required to pay for it. She also pointed out that this has never been done before so the NBAMPO would be first in the state, possibly the country. Mr. Norowzi added we would be getting ahead of the game if we agree to the study.

**9. Draft Title VI Program and Limited English Proficiency Plan: *Kim Maxey***

Ms. Maxey relayed the documents for Title VI have been submitted to Ms. Christy Tillery at the NCDOT and are awaiting approval that documents are ready to move forward. At that point we will post the plan and have public comment periods scheduled. The draft documents are available now for review if interested.

**10. NCAMPO Annual Conference April 29-May 1, 2015: *Kim Maxey***

Ms. Maxey relayed the NCAMPO conference will be coming up at the end of April. It will be held in downtown Raleigh. The MPO has funds to send a total of 4 members of both boards to the conference. The MPO will cover registration and hotel costs. Travel and food will be absorbed by the individual. Registration is required by the end of March. Agendas are available to those who are interested. Replies are required by Wednesday, March 25<sup>th</sup>.

235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281

**11. Updates:**

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

Mr. Norowzi second quarter invoices have been processed. If the money has not already been received, it should be received soon. The Strategic Transportation Corridors were officially adopted by the Board of Transportation on March 4<sup>th</sup>. He has a map, and links to the maps for those that would like to review.

Mr. Norowzi introduced the New Bern Area MPO Coordinator, Mr. Farhan Javed. He has heavy education in various transportation projects. He has been working with Craig Gresham, the model and additional projects for the MPO.

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

Mr. Jeff Cabaniss updated the board on current projects:

- The NC Connector project has been awarded to S.T. Wooten and is expected to be completed by August 1, 2016
- Three bike and ped projects in various stages.
- Resurfacing list hasn't changed. Was available in September, with completion date of June 30<sup>th</sup>.

**c. CARTS Update:** *Gene Hodges, Interim Transit Director*

Mr. Baumgardner advised they continue compiling budgets and working on the TDP plan. Completion date will be May 31<sup>st</sup>.

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

- Ms. Chapman: Thanked all individuals that participated in subcommittee meetings, including the Vision and Goal planning meeting. Strategies discussed included only the land use strategy; therefore she recommends this be presented to the TAC for approval. Will put the draft on the website, open for public comment and take action for Vision and Goals in May, and continue compiling strategies.
- At the last meeting it was discussed that we would present the draft TIP in today's meeting. Due to a meeting in Raleigh, it was recommended we hold this information as the DOT won't approve until June. So if there are additional changes we would have to reproduce and resubmit for approval. We will therefore take action on the TIP in July 2016.
- March 19<sup>th</sup> from 4pm-7pm will be the NCDOT STIP public participation meeting. The meeting is being held in Kenansville, NC.
- We received an email from the SELC through the NBAMPO website

282 requesting location of the final prioritization scoring of our projects. Ms.  
283 Chapman will respond advising the final scores were posted on the River  
284 Bend, Trent Woods, Craven County and the City of New Bern websites until  
285 the draft came out. This was posted prior to the creation of the NBAMPO  
286 website. It was not transferred to the website upon implementation.

287  
288 Mr. Flanagan advised he received the same emails as well, and is considering  
289 linking to the NCDOT website where this information is posted.  
290

- 291 • On March 4, the BOT approved a STIP modification for the Slocum Road  
292 interchange, pushing it back two years from 2015 to 2017. This isn't in our  
293 area, therefore we don't have to go through the modification, but it's close  
294 enough that it may be of interest to members.  
295
- 296 • Ms. Maxey: The Citizen Advisory Committee is getting underway. We  
297 received applications from 8 citizens to be members of the committee. The  
298 applications will go before the TAC on March 26<sup>th</sup> for appointment. We will  
299 schedule initial training meetings in April. By-Laws have been written and  
300 will be presented to the committee members for approval. Mr. Ruggieri had  
301 concerns about the group getting bogged down with By-Laws. Ms. Chapman  
302 noted they are very simple. The meetings will be public, the meetings will be  
303 noticed as all other MPO meetings are. Ms. Maxey noted to Delane Jackson  
304 and David Fort that we were lacking in representation from their areas, and if  
305 they had any suggestions on contacts that may be willing and interested to sit  
306 on this board, to please pass their information along. Ms. Chapman noted we  
307 may recruit individuals to cover specific areas; looking at a freight contact  
308 right now.  
309

310 **12. Discussion: N/A**

311  
312  
313 **13. Adjourn**  
314

315 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m..  
316  
317  
318  
319

320 \_\_\_\_\_  
Jeff Ruggieri, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_   
Maurizia Chapman, MPO Administrator