

NC Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting Minutes - Final

One City Plaza
421 Fayetteville Street
Suite 203
Raleigh, NC 27601

Technical Coordinating Committee

Thursday, November 3, 2022

10:00 AM

Conference Room

1. Welcome and Introductions

Shelby Powell, CAMPO, conducted roll call.

Quorum was met.

Present: 65 - Michael Clark , Ken Bowers, Jason Brown, Bryan Coates, Travis Crayton, Bob Deaton, David Eatman, Tim Gardiner, Phil Geary, Meredith Gruber, Scott Hammerbacher, Benjamin Howell, Sean Johnson, Brandon Jones, Justin Jorgensen, Paul Kallam, David Keilson, Danielle Kittredge, Erin Klinger, Catherine Knudson, Michael Landguth, Gaby Lawlor, Aaron Levitt, Kevin Lewis, Mark Locklear, Tim Maloney, Julie Maybee, Kevin Murphy, Jason Myers, Braston Newton, Jeannine Ngwira, Akul Nishawala, Terry Nolan, Neil Perry, Stephanie Richter, Jason Rogers, Bill Sandifor, Lisa Schiffbauer, Meg Scully, Jay Sikes, Morgan Simmons, Larry Smith, Mark Spanioli, Andrew Spiliotis, Tracy Stephenson, Darius Sturdivant, Courtney Tanner, Jeff Triezenberg, Mila Vega, Gerry Vincent, David Walker, Scott Walston, Bynum Walter, Kevin Wyrach, Nick Morrison, Sean Ryan, BRANDON WATSON, Paul Black, Daniel Spruill, Meade Bradshaw, James Salmons, Zach Steffey, Alan Coats, Randy Cahoon-Tingle, and Luana Deans

Absent: 4 - Michael Frangos, Joe Geigle, Michael Moore, and Andrea Neri

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

There were no adjustments to the agenda.

3. Public Comments

There were no sign up requests for public comments.

4. Minutes

4.1 Minutes - October 6, 2022 TCC Meeting

Requested Action: Approve minutes

Attachments: [October Minutes](#)

Jason Myers motioned to approve minutes. Akul Nishawala seconded that motion.

The October TCC minutes were moved to the slate vote.

This item was approved by unanimous vote.

5. Regular Business

5.1

NCDOT Project I-5701 - Preferred Alternative

Brandon Jones, NCDOT

Requested Action: Recommend Executive Board endorse Option 2 - Request to Amend 2050 MTP.

Attachments: [I-5701 CAMPO 110322-Presentation](#)
[Staff Report](#)

Alex Rickard, CAMPO, provided some brief background information pertaining to this item for the TCC prior to NCDOT personnel beginning their presentation.

Mr. Rickard informed the TCC that projects that are in the TIP and the STIP has to be identified in the MTP. He shared that the corresponding MTP project for I-5701 is the F43 Project. The F43 project is a 6 to 8 lane widening in the 2050 MTP, which is a 1st decade project. It is scheduled to be completed and open to traffic by 2030.

Mr. Rickard stated that the scope of the project is to widen or convert the auxiliary lanes that are there today in the western portion to general purpose lanes. He stated that NCDOT staff will discuss why there is a design that includes additional auxiliary lanes that the department feel is better. He also shared that the issue with this, from the MTP perspective, is that once auxiliary lanes exceed 1 mile, in the MTP, these have to be identified as projects and cannot be considered as operational improvements. Therefore, if the design that was suggested by the department, is used, that would require an amendment to the MTP.

Mr. Rickard shares that the TCC isn't being asked to endorse this item, he stated that if they agree with this decision, that an amendment to the MTP will be required.

Mr. Rickard turned the presentation over to NCDOT staff.

Brandon Jones, NCDOT, began their presentation by sharing that the purpose and need of the I-5701 project is to improve capacity and mobility on I-40 for the future. He stated that in 2019 a decision was made to not even consider not having auxiliary lanes. He informed the TCC that auxiliary lanes, although greater than a mile, are defined as needed to be reflected in the MTP just like a general purpose lane; But, they do not offer the same type of capacity as a general purpose lane overall. They are seen as primary for operational improvements on and off of the interstate, as it relates to the interchanges and from a safety stand point.

Mr. Jones stated that NCDOT staff are requesting that CAMPO recommend amendment to the MTP based on the information provided.

Mr. Jones turned the presentation over to David Keilson, NCDOT, to explain why they feel it is necessary to include auxiliary lanes. He shared slides sharing the benefit of auxiliary lanes when it pertains to traffic. He informed the TCC that NCDOT does not have it's own capacity standard for managed freeways, at the moment, but since their projects were inspired by the Australian managed motorway systems, they looked at the capacity of their systems. Mr. Jones stated that they focus on maximum sustainable flow rates. He shared a slide with these examples of rates in which they believe that you can sustain with the freeway management through out a peak period with a relatively low probability of breakdown.

Mr. Jones briefly discussed a few safety studies of how congestion leads to more motor

vehicle crashes.

Jason Myers asked what does the literature say about fatality rates in congestion, pertaining to safety.

Mr. Jones responded stating that once you are in the very congested conditions, because the speed is at a slower rate, the severity of crashes can be less; However, there is still a problem of people running into to the back of you. Mr. Jones offered to discuss this further with Mr. Meyers after the meeting, if he would like.

Mr. Jones states that in summary, NCDOT believes that the auxiliary lanes are needed for traffic operation which is expected to be challenging by 2035 even with the auxiliary lanes. He continues to state that Including the auxiliary lanes is consistent with most of the nearby sections of I-40, and that the auxiliary lanes provide benefits both for safety and air quality.

Mr. Jones opened the floor for questions and/or comments.

Jason Meyers asked is there a correlation between freeway level of service and average speed?

Mr. Jones responded stating that speeds tend to be fairly consistent at the better levels of service, pointing out numbers shown on the graph presented. He shared that past studies have shown that speed variability correlated the most with crashes.

Brandon Jones, NCDOT, adds stating that all that was discussed is risk analysis, and that higher the level of congestion gets, the frequency of accidents increases which causes a breakdown of the corridor.

Alex Rickard, CAMPO, follows up the presentation with a few extra talking points; Stating that we all absolutely share the same goals of decreasing congestion, improve mobility and improve safety along the corridor. Mr. Rickard shares that as far as the history of the project, that this actually goes back to SPOT 1, and carried over into SPOT 2 then SPOT 3. He informed the TCC that CAMPO tried very hard to get this project included in the Fortify project, stating that the scope at the time was to convert the existing auxiliary lanes between crossroads in Gorman to general purpose, and then add that extra lane between Gorman and Lake Wheeler so that you would end up with a 4 lane cross section through that area. The cost at the time back in SPOT 3 was around \$13M.

Mr. Rickard stated that more lanes wouldn't decrease congestion, but when we look at the recent corridor studies, you realize that widening highways just doesn't solve our problem. He shared that in the past, some members of the Executive Board had expressed that they felt very strongly against widening freeways beyond what is already included in the adopted MTP.

Mr. Rickard stated that in SPOT6, there were more project documentation added, therefore all that had been discussed will be explained and spelled out to further clarification. He reminded the TCC that the options to move forward with this, would require an MTP amendment.

Mr. Rickard stated that option 1 is to agree to leave the project as is, doing nothing, which caps out at 4 lanes of travel. Option 2 is to request an amendment to the 2050 MTP.

Mr. Rickard informed the TCC that an amendment to the 2050 MTP is already scheduled for this Spring, due to needing an MTP amendment in order to adopt the 2024-2033 TIP/STIP. Therefore the amendment could just be added to that one.

Option 3 is to ask more questions to get additional information. Mr. Rickard informed the TCC that there is about a month left before the deadline of finalizing that scheduled MTP amendment. Therefore, he informed the TCC that they have some time, before making a final decision on this, if needed.

TCC Chair opens the floor for additional questions and/or comments.

Brandon Jones, NCDOT, clarified that one reason that Fortify did not include the improvements of adding some pavement between the interchanges to convert the existing auxiliary into a general purpose, was that it did trigger them including noise walls; Which is a humongous cost involved to do so. He reminded the TCC that Fortify's main purpose was to rebuild I-40 and I-440 due to the condition of the pavement.

Jason Meyers stated that he understands that widening the 4 lanes will have some benefits, the down side is that there will be more variability in speed and more room for conflict. He stated that he would rather see the existing scenario where we have auxiliary lanes and those conflicts could be mitigated a bit and we could bank that extra space, right-of-way and structure width for an important project for the auxiliary lanes later.

Alex Rickard responded stating that what Mr. Meyers was describing could be accomplished in the existing MTP with project F43. He also stated that the project F43 allows for an additional lane to be provided from Gorman Street to Lake Wheeler, which would give you 4 lanes of travel between crossroads and lake wheeler. Mr. Rickard reminded the TCC that an MTP amendment is only triggered if a 5th lane is created.

Chris Lukasina, MTP Director, discussed a few pointers in reference to managed lanes project. Mr. Lukasina stated that there are some challenges with this project that will be revisited before getting to the 2055 MTP. He informed the TCC that part of this could mean removing them from the MTP due to the inability to find a viable funding source for them. He clarified that there is work to be done pertaining to the managed lane but that he just wanted to mention that background information for understanding that this could be a complicated project on its own, that could be potentially very expensive and impactful.

Brandon Jones, NCDOT, informed the TCC that at the moment the latest estimate for the NCDOT I-5701 project, including auxiliary lanes, is around \$68M; Of that, a little bit over \$14M is for the auxiliary lanes. That being said, the auxiliary lanes represents about 20-21% of the overall project cost.

TCC Chair opens the floor for any further questions and/or comments.

Jason Meyers stated that he doesn't like the idea of losing auxiliary lanes, nor does he like the idea of widening in general. He also stated that he would have a hard time voting for option 2, until he could see analysis of other alternatives.

Brandon Jones informed the TCC that in the Draft STIP, both the 5701 and 5703 projects are proposed for design build in about 3 years. He stated that going in and re-evaluating things and going with other options, throws this timeline out of the window for both

projects. He continued to inform the TCC that they have not evaluated 5703 without these additional auxiliary lanes.

Jason Meyers responded stating that the department has been taking it for granted that we are going to amend the MTP, when the Executive Board has been clear with their desire to not amend the MTP. He continued to state that it seemed as if the project development had been in conflict from the start of the adoptive plan.

Brandon Jones responded informing the TCC that the decision for including auxiliary lanes back 4 years ago, in 2018/2019. He stated that engineering was paused engineering, like they did with many other projects across the state, and then picked it back up under the same conditions.

TCC Chair opened the floor for any further comments and/or questions.

Luana Deans asked Alex Rickard for clarification on whether or not auxiliary lanes are classified as operational improvements in the MTP.

Mr. Rickard responded stated that the challenge that had risen with Federal Highways, in previous projects in MTPs, were that when you add auxiliary lanes on a freeway, at some point it becomes a capacity change. He gave an example of, you cannot add 10 miles of auxiliary lanes to an interstate, but then call it an operational improvement. He explained that therefore the understanding/agreement with Federal Highways, was that for auxiliary lanes that exceed 1 mile in length, CAMPO would include these in the MTP and the model, for air quality conformity purposes, as a travel lane; Meaning the model reflects that that lane of travel is there. For auxiliary lanes less than 1 mile, those are permitted through the MTP because they are classified as operational improvements.

Jason Meyers clarified that what he is suggesting is that we should not be doing project I-5701. That we should be keeping it as 3 lanes and keeping auxiliary lanes because of the substantial benefits to safety and reliability and that would make the future project for managed lanes easier because we would be able to use that structure width, originally slated for I-5701, for managed lanes rather than adding new width, new right-of-way and new structure.

Mr. Meyers stated that he would like to explore the alternative of deprogramming project I-5701, with maybe the exception of extending I-5703 a little bit eastward, to get a longer/second auxiliary lane to enter that west bound interchange. Not spending the money widening in a way that is inconsistent with the MTP or in a way that loses the benefit of auxiliary lanes.

Chris Lukasina, stated that he was willing to send out the feasible study report, that was completed by NCDOT, for the managed lanes after the meeting.

Mr. Lukasina clarified that when looking at the study you would see evidence of that for a 1 managed lane in each direction or a 2 managed lane in each direction, both options, if it is at grade of existing I-40, would require a new bridge deck or an extended bridge deck. Basically, in order to put in 1 managed lane, you are actually adding 4 lanes of width because of the shoulder requirements for an interstate.

Luana Deans motioned to recommend Option 2 to the Executive Board. Randy Cahoon-Tingle seconded that motion.

Jason Myers voted no to approval of this item.

This item was approved by majority vote.

5.2

Safety Performance Measures and Targets 2023

Alex Rickard, MPO Staff

Brian Murphy, NCDOT Safety Unit

Requested Action: Receive as Information.

Alex Rickard, CAMPO, reminded the TCC that this presentation is annual, and that every year there is a safety performance measures.

Mr. Rickard informed the TCC that the two options are either to develop our own safety targets or to endorse those developed by the Department of Transportation.

Brian Murphy, NCDOT, presented this item discussing updates on data collected at state level and the targets for the state. Mr. Murphy briefly discussed the North Carolina's Strategic Highway Safety Plan in which he explained sets the stage for how the state wants to tackle highway safety. He also informed the TCC that this plan is updated at the state level every 5 years. Mr. Murphy informed the TCC that the goal of this plan is to reduce all fatalities and serious injuries by half by 2035, moving towards 0 by 2050. Mr. Murphy presented a slide on the traffic safety fatality numbers which showed a trend of increased fatalities from 2011 onto 2019. He stated that the numbers of fatalities severely increased during the pandemic. Mr. Murphy informed the TCC that in 2021, we experienced the highest level of fatalities we had in North Carolina since the early 1970's. In 2022, numbers have showed a trend of going back down. Mr. Murphy presented slides which demonstrated trends of behaviors which plays a role in fatalities and safety in the area.

Mr. Murphy discussed the Safety Performance Measures in which CAMPO goes through annually. He stated that this is required by federal legislation. He discussed the goals and targets that will be implemented to help meet the targets and goals set for 2025. Mr. Murphy informed the TCC that based on FHWA's review, North Carolina has not met or made significant progress towards achieving its safety performance targets.

Mr. Murphy opened the floor for questions and/or comments.

Mr. Rickard informed the TCC that at the next meeting, there will be an agenda item presented to provide some recommendation from staff of some future planning efforts that may be used to better address the presented safety concerns.

This item was received as information.

5.3**Preliminary DRAFT 2024-2033 TIP & U-5751 Status Update**

Alex Rickard, MPO Staff

Brandon Jones, Division 5 Engineer

Jason Schronce, NCDOT Central STIP Manager

Requested Action: Receive as information

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Franklin County Letter](#)

[Franklin County Resolution](#)

Alex Rickard, CAMPO, presented this item.

Mr. Rickard informed the TCC that this is an update on the development of the Draft STIP. He reminded the TCC that normally a new STIP is adding projects based on prioritization. He stated that this time it is different, as this time projects are being culling projects out of the existing STIP, in order to meet financial limits for the 2024/2033 TIP.

Mr. Rickard stated that last month there were specific questions from the Town of Fuquay-Varina, regarding U-5751. he stated that the goal is to provide an update on where CAMPO is on the development of this Draft STIP.

Mr. Rickard presented a slide of the following specific questions that the Town of Fuquay-Varina asked at the last TCC meeting:

1- SPOT 3 was developed in 2013-2024 and U-5751 is the only SPOT 3 project that does not have committed funding - Why?

2- SPOT 4 was developed in 2017 and SPOT 5 was approved by CAMPO Board in 2019. Why are there SPOT 4 and SPOT 5 projects that have committed funding ahead of U-5751, which is a SPOT 3 project and should be first in line?

3- What is the opportunity for doing STIP swaps to get this project into the committed funding list?

4- Requests a presentation on status of U-5751 as the only SPOT 3 project that is unfunded and what the MPO can do to move it forward.

Mr. Rickard turned the presentation over to Jason Schronce, NCDOT STIP Manager, to assist in answering the noted questions. Mr. Schronce briefly went over the geographical breakdown of North Carolina's regions and divisions. He explained that the STI legislation has 3 categories of funding, Statewide Mobility, Regional Impact and Division Needs. Mr. Schronce further explained that despite of it being 3 categories, it is technically 22 buckets of funding. He explained the breakdown of the funding in each category. Mr. Schronce stated that initially each bucket are funded equally, however there are many items that comes off of the top of each of the funding categories.

In reference to the 1st and 2nd question, Mr. Schronce clarified how a project that was higher scoring or selected in a previous round of prioritization be scheduled behind a project that was picked up later, by stating that when a prioritization or SPOT result is received in the STIP unit, and the programming process begins, a project cannot be skipped. Therefore they have to put funding on project 1 before applying funding to project 2, but where that funding is applied is more subjective and has many other inputs

to it. He explained that regardless of prioritization score, projects cannot be programmed for Right-Of-Way (ROW) or construction (CON) prior to completion of project delivery planning, environmental/design work. Therefore, a lower-scoring project that can be delivered soon may be scheduled prior to a higher-ranking project that still needs extensive work.

Mr. Schronce stated that a new swap procedure was approved by the board. This procedure would provide a one time opportunity to swap projects. He clarified that in this procedure, if you could find a project that was in the 1st half of the STIP and not the back half and you wanted to swap those, and the cost was within 10% of the same cost and they were funded in the same category, then they would take that guidance, along with the Division's approval, and make that change in the STIP. Mr. Schronce informed the TCC that the swap request by the Spring of 2023, in order to finalize those into the Draft STIP that would be approved by the Board in the Summer of 2023.

Mr. Schronce then gave a brief overview of the history of U-5751 STIP using information pulled from the project's website.

Alex Rickard explained that all of the SPOT 5 projects for CAMPO that are currently in the Draft STIP are in different funding categories. He stated that for Fuquay-Varina there are no SPOT 5 projects that has jumped over the U-5751 project; For SPOT 4, however, that is mostly the case. Mr. Rickard continued, stating that there are 4 region C projects that are programmed ahead of U-5751.

Mr. Rickard asked Mr. Schronce for clarification on when going through the seniority approach, when you program the SPOT 3 projects 1st, how does U-5307 get programmed ahead of U-5751? responded stating that it is still based on the existing schedule in the STIP after the reprogramming of the 2020/2029 STIP. He stated that this was the guidance on what schedule ended up in the draft.

Leigh Wing, Eastern STIP manager, responded to Mr. Schronce stating his statement was correct. She clarified that when they programmed delivery projects that actively had ROW underway, and a federal grant was associated with it; Those were done in order 1st, then they went to P3, P4, P5 seniority approach. Ms. Wing stated that, like Jason Schronce previously explained, they went in seniority order to put the project back on the schedule that it was already on in the 2020/2029 STIP.

Alex Rickard asked when using the seniority approach, was any consideration included to try to keep those projects committed?

Mr. Schronce stated that he doesn't believe that was one of their considerations. He stated that the swap option was added to allow the MPO's to rearrange based on their priorities; But keeping that schedule not showing accelerations when everything else was being delayed were more of the steps taken.

Ms. Wing agreed, stating that this was why the swap option was brought to the table.

Tracy Stephenson asked what took away the seniority for U-5751?

Mr. Schronce responded stating that many of these conversations are had with the project delivery team and he doesn't truly have an answer for that other than the fact that when we programmed, they put it back onto its existing schedule.

Mr. Stephenson expressed his frustrations and concern that the project has been passed

but not committed with no specific reasoning of why. He stated that he is going to push to do a swap to include this project.

In response, Mr. Rickard clarified the requirements in place in order to do a swap, stating that a swap has to be an unanimous agreement between all Divisions, RPOs and MPOs that includes that project, as well as the division engineer. He also stated that STI funding tiers still apply and has to be respected, along with the delivery timeline. Mr. Rickard also stated that project cost must be somewhat similar as well.

Mr. Rickard informed the TCC that on November 16, 2022 CAMPO is holding an MTP/TIP subcommittee meeting to present potential swap scenarios to TCC members; In hope of coming up with a recommendation at the TCC in January so that the Executive Board can take action at that time.

TCC Chair Ben Howell opened the floor for further questions and/or comments.

5.4 Wake Bus Plan Project Prioritization Policy

Anna Stokes, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Draft Bus Plan Prioritization Memo](#)

Anna Stokes presented this item.

Ms. Stokes stated that the original Project Prioritization Policy (PPP) was created in 2018 for the 1st Wake Bus Plan and then re-ran in 2020 for the Wake Transit Plan Vision Update. She briefly discussed the key challenges with the 2018 adopted policy.

Ms. Stokes provided a snapshot of the overall Wake Transit Plan Prioritization context as it is detailed on the project prioritization and reprogramming guidance memo of the Wake Transit Plan.

She stated that the policy that is being updated today only applies to bus service expansion projects, which is the last of the 8 tiers in the adopted transit plan guidance.

Ms. Stokes informed the TCC that the purpose of the Wake Bus Plan Project Prioritization Policy is to be a decision making framework that provides transparent and easily understandable process for making choices between competing investment needs.

She noted the difference between prioritization and programming stating that the prioritization is guided by the project prioritization policy, and ranks projects in order based on agreed upon criteria in the policy, but does not consider available funds or timing. Programming is funding constrained.

Ms. Stokes stated that not all projects go through prioritization. She briefly goes over the old adopted methodology from 2018 and updates in which have been added into the new proposed methodology.

Ms. Stokes informed the TCC that comments are requested to be emailed to her by 11/23/2022, the public review and comment period is online from 11/9/2022 through 11/23/2022 and that the PPP is anticipated to come to the CAMPO and the GoTriangle Boards for action in January 2023.

TCC Chair Ben Howell opened the floor for questions and or comments.

5.5**FY 2023, Q2 Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Requests**

Anna Stokes, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Recommend the Executive Board approve the FY 2023, Q2 Wake Transit Work Plan amendment requests.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[FY 2023 - Q2 Amendment Requests](#)

Anna Stokes presented this item.

Ms. Stokes went over the anticipated schedule for the amendment request for FY23 2nd Quarter Amendments to the Wake Transit Work Plan. She informed the TCC that the amendments were submitted by August 26th, then went out for public comments September 1st through the 30th. She stated that they were reviewed by the Joint Budget and Finance and Planning and Prioritization subcommittee at the TPAC, and also reviewed by the TPAC who recommended they were moved onward. She stated that assuming that the TCC recommends these, they will move onto the Executive Board for approval at the November meeting.

Ms. Stokes informed the TCC that the 1st amendment was received by CAMPO and was an operational amendment. She stated that though the 1st amendment was originally listed as a minor amendment, it was adjusted and met the criteria to be considered a major amendment. This funding request was to add \$89,667 to the requested FY23 funding allocation for CAMPO. The increase in funding is necessary to cover additional and direct expenses related to office space rent and CAMPO's relocation to Cary expenses, and increases in labor expenses.

Ms. Stokes stated that the 2nd major amendment was submitted by City of Raleigh who is requesting \$16,610,000 to meet updated project cost for the Wake BRT Southern Corridor.

Jason Myers motioned to approve this item. Daniel Spruill seconded that motion.

This item was moved to the slate vote.

This item was approved by unanimous vote.

5.6 Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Policy Update

Stephanie Plancich, CAMPO

Requested Action: Adopt the updated Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Policy**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[Updated Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Policy
\(Recommended\)](#)*Stephanie Plancich presented this item.**Ms. Plancich informed the TCC that this item is an update to the Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Policy. She stated that through the continued implementation of the Wake Transit Plan it became clear that there was a need to update several components of the policy to add additional guidance and clarify some elements.**Ms. Plancich stated that CAMPO staff has worked closely with the TPAC and the subcommittee members to draft the update that has been included in the agenda packet for today's TCC meeting. She presented a slide that listed the process and policy changes that has been integrated into the policy update. She then gave a brief overview of the development completed to date, which included the dates of August 1st through the 15th which was the public review and comment period.**Ms. Plancich informed the TCC that the TPAC reviewed and recommended adoption of this policy at their September meeting, and today they request that the TCC recommend it for adoption to the Executive Board.**TCC Chair opened the floor for questions and/or comments.**Daniel Spruill motioned to approve this item. Paul Kallam seconded that motion.**This item was moved to the slate vote.***This item was approved by unanimous vote.**

5.7**Wake Transit Community Engagement Policy**

Stephanie Plancich, CAMPO

Requested Action: Adopt the recommended Wake Transit Community Engagement Policy.

Attachments: [Wake Transit Community Engagement Policy](#)
[Update DRAFT 102522](#)
[Staff Report](#)

Stephanie Plancich presented this item.

Ms. Plancich informed the TCC that the draft will update and replace the original engagement policy that was adopted in 2018. The public engagement for this draft ran from the 15th of August through the 29th of September. She stated that 3 comments were received during the public engagement process, that only resulted in some minor formatting and grammar changes being made. After the presentation at the TCC and Executive Board in October, there was 1 additional comment which also resulted in a few modification, but no extensive changes.

Ms. Plancich stated that on October 12th at the TPAC meeting, they recommended adoption to both the CAMPO and GoTriangle's Boards. She informed the TCC that the request today is for the TCC to recommend it's adoption for the Executive Board's consideration on November 16th.

The TCC Chair opened the floor for questions and/or comments.

Akul Nishawala motioned to approve this item. Paul Black seconded that motion.

This item was moved to the slate vote.

This item was approved by unanimous vote.

5.8 Amendment #10 to FY2020-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Alex Rickard, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Recommend the Executive Board adopt Amendment #10.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[FY 20-29 TIP Amendment #10](#)

Alex Rickard presented this item.

Mr. Rickard reminded the TCC that this is a normal TIP amendment that is processed which includes the item in package from the Board of Transportation for July, August and September this year. He stated that there are a number of STIP projects that are having either cost increase or schedule changes. There are also some economic development projects from the Town of Holly Springs on US-1 for the engine development. There are some changes to LAPP projects and some small budget and schedule changes for two intersection projects that are being funded through the 540 Bonus Allocations Funds.

Mr. Rickard informed the TCC that the TIP Amendment has been posted to the CAMPO's website on November 17th through November 15th. He stated that the public hearing is scheduled for the Executive Board meeting on November 16th, where the request would be for them to approve this TIP Amendment.

The TCC Chair opened the floor for questions and/or comments.

Jason Myers motioned to approve this item. Daniel Spruill seconded that motion.

This item was added to the slate vote.

This item was approved by unanimous vote.

5.9 Roadside Landscaping & Forestation Program

Chris Lukasina, CAMPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[Roadside Landscaping & Forestation Research Summary](#)*Chris Lukasina, MPO Director, presented this item.**Mr. Lukasina stated that this is a follow up to June's presentation completed by Jeff Lackey of NCDOT. He stated that during Mr. Lackey's presentation, was provided on NCDOT's roadside environmental, landscaping and reforestation policies and**Mr. Lukasina explained that after that presentation, there were discussion by the TCC and a request to do further research into possible policy, programs and/or resolutions that the MPO could look into. He stated that this is the purpose of this presentation, to fulfill this request.**Mr. Lukasina stated that CAMPO's research identified several examples of state DOT guidelines and policies for roadside re-vegetation. He stated that their research effort has not identified instances of MPO level or regional policies or guidelines. The research effort also identified several positive benefits of strong roadside vegetation and reforestation efforts including safety, economic, and health/environmental.**Mr. Lukasina stated that a summary of this research has been included in the agenda.**TCC Chair opened the floor for questions and/or comments.***This item was received as information.****6. Informational Item: Budget****This item was received as information.****6.1****Requested Action:** Receive as information.**Attachments:** [Q4 Budget Projection FY 2022](#)**This item was received as information.****6.2****Member Shares FY 2022**

Lisa Blackburn, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as Information**Attachments:** [Q4 Member Dues Projection FY 2022](#)**This item was received as information.****7. Informational Item: Project Updates**

7.1 Project Updates - November 2022

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [November Project Updates](#)

7.2 Public Engagement Updates

Bonnie Parker, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [TCC Public Engagement Update 2022_10_27](#)

8. Informational Item: Staff Reports

MPO Director:

Mr. Lukasina stated that an update on December meetings possible cancellations will be sent out once our Chair has made a decision. He also informed that CAMPO is on schedule for relocation for early December. NC AMPO will be releasing a call for sessions for the NC AMPO April 2023 conference. He stated that there are several public engagement efforts coming up over the next few months, for the BRT Extension Study, US401 Corridor Study, the Wake Transit Work Plan and the Wake Transit Bus Plan.

Bonnie Parker noted that the US 401 Corridor Study public meetings has been moved from November 15th & 17th to December 6th & 8th.

Division 6:

Darius Sturdivant informed the TCC that a \$61M contract was rewarded last week to start construction on the NC 55 project in Wake and Harnett counties. Construction is scheduled to start in the Spring and is expected to finish in 2026. Construction on the A-section from South of Angier to NC 210 is scheduled for March of 2023.

NC Turnpike Authority:

Dennis Jernigan stated that Phase 2 of complete 540 is approaching. Approval through the Board of Transportation with the advanced funding to accelerate that project, currently showing in the Draft STIP as 2526. To kick off that procurement, an industry forum is being held on November 14th. A DVE contractor work session in the morning, and several networking opportunity will be provided through out the day with an information session for contractors in the afternoon. They also anticipate putting out their request for qualification immediately there after that same week.

NCDOT Integrated Mobility Division:

Nick Morrison reminded the TCC that their next webinar is November 10th from 11am to noon. He stated that he will send out a reminder along with the registration link this afternoon.

TCC Members:

Tracy Stephenson wanted to thank CAMPO's and NCDOT's staff for their presentation and continued efforts.

9. Adjournment

Upcoming Meetings/Events