

NC Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting Minutes - Draft Technical Coordinating Committee

1 Fenton Main St.
Suite 201
Cary NC 27511

Thursday, September 4, 2025

10:00 AM

Conference Room

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Tracy Stephenson called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. Introductions were then made.

Present: 35 - Dallas Baker, Dylan Bruchhaus, Kenneth Ritchie, Bynum Walter, Bradley Kimbrell, Barry Baker, Jay Sikes, Tim Gardiner, Akul Nishawala, Brandon Watson, Melanie Rausch, Kesha Smith, James Salmons, David Keilson, Philip Hart, Bryan Kluchar, Neil Perry, Delia Chi, Anne Calef, Jenna Shouse, Jason Kress, Juliet Andes, Sandi Bailey, Conrad Olmedo, Tracy Stephenson, Erin Joseph, Chris Garcia, Tucker Fulle, Landon Chandler, Bret Martin, Emma Linn, Lucy Garcia, Matt Lower, Matt Day, and Jeannine Ngwira

Absent: 19 - Matt Klem, Thanh Schado, Scott Hammerbacher, Braston Newton, Joe Geigle, Paul Black, Anita Davis-Haywood, Than Austin, Alan Shapiro, Nick Morrison, Phil Geary, Riley Stout, Jeff Jones, Dorothy Taylor, Jennifer Ganer, Barbara Hollander, Zach Steffey, Tanner Hayslette, and Britt Davis

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

There were no adjustments to the Agenda.

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Minutes

4.1

Minutes - August 7, 2025

Susan A. Owens, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Approve the Minutes of August 7, 2025

Requested Action: Approve the Minutes of August 7, 2025

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Minutes - August 7, 2025](#)

There were no questions and/or comments.

Matt Day motioned to approve the August 7, 2025 TCC Meeting Minutes. Juliet Andes seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Regular Business

5.1 Federal Functional Classification Changes

Alex Rickard, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Recommend Executive Board approval of the Federal Functional Classification changes

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Recommended Federal Functional Classification Changes](#)

Mr. Rickard provided an overview of the federal functional classification changes. He noted that CAMPO conducted a full review after NCDOT-led training in Spring 2025 and that Staff has documented a number of proposed changes that are being provided to CAMPO members and the public for review and comment at: <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/9a77aab327884e1d831cd037af7998ca>. He illustrated the online app, showing both the current layer and proposed changes layer. The public comment period ends on October 14, 2025. He noted that there was one change made since the August Executive Board presentation regarding John Brantley Boulevard at RDU. He added that there will be both NCDOT and federal-level review and encouraged members to review the changes, further noting that this is the biggest update of this scale since 2014.

Responding to Chair Tracy Stephenson, Mr. Rickard stated that comments are still being accepted.

Mr. Rickard clarified that it is FHWA that issues final acceptance of the proposed changes.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

Dallas Baker motioned to recommend the Executive Board approve the Federal Functional Classification changes. Chris Garcia seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

5.2**SPOT 8 Update: Draft Project Submittal Lists**

Daniel Spruill, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Recommend the Executive Board approve the P8 candidate project lists for submittal to NCDOT's prioritization process.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[P8 Schedule](#)
[P8 Carryover List](#)
[Aviation Projects](#)
[BikePed Projects](#)
[Rail Projects](#)
[Roadway Project Package](#)
[Transit Projects](#)

Mr. Spruill provided an overview of the STI Programming Process, STIP funding distributions for statewide mobility, regional impact, and division needs projects, the regions and divisions CAMPO competes in, and the schedule of upcoming SPOT actions. He stated that CAMPO is allowed 34 project submittals per mode this round and noted that any carryover projects already funded and scheduled to start do not count towards the 34 projects per mode cap. He provided an overview of the Executive Board's adopted methodology for project selection and CAMPO's plan to only submit projects in those buckets where they will be the most competitive. He noted that the project submission period ends September 30, 2025. He then presented the P8 Schedule, showing the Draft 2028-2037 STIP being released in Winter/Spring 2027. He illustrated the estimated funding availabilities as of July 9, 2025, noting that these estimates are subject to change. He expressed CAMPO's desire to maximize opportunities for funding by submitting more projects in those pools with more available funds. He noted the significant differences in funding availability versus submitted needs in Region C and Division 5 for the last cycle. He presented the next steps, noting that updates will be posted online at <https://www.campo-nc.us/funding/spot/prioritization-8>, and that the public comment period ends on September 16, 2025. He stated that they are currently up to Version 2 on the website and that, as the lists are updated, they will be posted online with different version numbers. He added that there were some changes regarding the Town of Apex's projects and that CAMPO will continue to coordinate and work with both the member jurisdictions and NCDOT.

There were no questions and/or comments.

Erin Joseph motioned to recommend the Executive Board approve the P8 candidate project lists for submittal to NCDOT's prioritization process. Bret Martin seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

5.3 Transit Asset Management Performance Measures & Targets for State of Good Repair

Crystal Odum, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Approve the recommended performance measures and targets for TAM and State of Good Repair and sign the resolution.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Recommended 2026 TAM Performance Measures and Targets](#)
[Resolution](#)

Ms. Odum provided an overview of the federal and CAMPO/transit providers agreement requirements for setting regional measures and targets, noting that CAMPO sets these annually in order to support its transit providers, rather than the federal requirement of every four years. She stated that the transit providers concur with the recommendation that the transit asset management regional targets for 2026 remain the same as 2025. She illustrated the categories, asset classes, and State goals. She noted that GoTriangle (GoT) and GoRaleigh (GoR) fall in Tier 1, and maintain their own agency TAM plans, while GoCary and GoWake fall in Tier 2 and participate in the state group plan and its goals. GoT and GoR also have individual agency goals that are different from the MPO's regional goals. These agencies work towards achieving both the regional goals and their own agency goals for transit asset management. She added that the recommended, annual regional transit asset management performance goals are posted for a 30-day public comment period that ends on September 17, 2025.

There were no questions and/or comments.

Conrad Olmedo motioned to recommend the Executive Board approve the recommended performance measures and targets for TAM and State of Good Repair and sign the resolution. Melanie Rausch seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

5.4**2055 MTP/CTP Update**

Chris Lukasina, MPO Executive Director

Requested Action: Receive as information and provide feedback on additional revenue assumptions.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Preferred Scenario Summary](#)
[2055 MTP Schedule](#)
[2055 MTP Public Involvement Update](#)

Mr. Lukasina provided the monthly 2055 MTP/CTP Update, noting that the Executive Board approved the All Together Scenario as the preferred option in June and that Staff is now applying the fiscal constraints. He stated that the results of all scenarios considered can be found on the MTP landing page at <https://www.campo-nc.us/transportation-plan/in-development-2055-mtp>. He reminded the TCC that the All Together Scenario utilizes a framework that includes the Development Foundation: Opportunity Places and the Mobility Investment Foundation: Complete Communities. He provided an overview of the major transit investments included in the Preferred Scenario Transit Element and the major roadway investments included in the Preferred Scenario Roadway Element. He provided further detail on where the revenue forecasts are derived from, when certain revenues will be realized, and the requirement for all assumptions to be deemed “reasonable”. He stated that the available funding from traditional sources does not align with the region’s identified needs and that additional revenue assumptions can address this. He highlighted the differences between the traditional revenue available and the projected costs of the Preferred Alternative at the statewide mobility, regional impact, and division needs levels. He presented the preliminary 2055 MTP financials, illustrating where the additional/new funding is being assumed and where there are revenue updates pending. He requested that any agencies with new assumptions notify Staff within the next three weeks. He provided an overview of the new revenue assumptions, noting that it is assumed that these revenues will start in the second decade of this MTP, so there’s still time to figure out what is needed and to get things in place before then. He spoke regarding past successes in realizing additional revenue assumptions, past revenue sources, and the final 2050 new regional/local revenue assumptions. He then provided an overview of the three 2055 New Regional/Local Revenue Options explored and presented pie charts illustrating the revenue distributions in each amongst transit, bike/ped, Complete Streets/capacity, road O & M, and road system operations. He noted that, if the TCC is comfortable doing so, they can make a recommendation on these alternatives today. He stated that the primary question is not about how big the “pie” is, which is \$6.896 billion, but rather how much should be invested amongst the five “slices” of transit, bike/pedestrian, complete streets/capacity, road O & M, and road system operations.

Responding to Bradley Kimbrell regarding the difference between maintenance and road system operations, Mr. Lukasina stated that maintenance includes your typical maintenance projects, like fixing potholes, and that road system operations includes projects that enhance operations via technology, like the expansion of the ITS footprint. He responded to Mr. Kimbrell’s second question confirming that these numbers include the additional revenue above and beyond the current revenue for transit in the Wake Transit Plan.

Responding to Bynum Walter’s question regarding what “Complete Street/Capacity” means, Mr. Lukasina stated that it includes targeted funding for secondary road

improvements, including widening and bike/ped elements into those projects.

Responding to Tim Gardiner's question regarding whether the decision not to use STI deficiency terminology was made in order to be able to include multimodal elements, Mr. Lukasina responded in the affirmative, noting that the language was intentional. He reiterated that the funding being assumed is above and beyond the Wake Transit Plan revenue.

Mr. Lukasina noted that Alternative 2 moves more revenue from transit and Complete Street/capacity to bike/ped, but that it also reduces the number of secondary road projects that would be funded under Alternative 1 by 13.

Mr. Lukasina noted that Alternative 3 moves more revenue to the Complete Streets/capacity "slice" of the pie, moves funding away from standalone bike/ped projects, and allows us to add 27 secondary road projects above the 27 that would be funded under Alternative 1.

Responding to Chris Garcia, Mr. Lukasina stated that the number of bike/ped projects to be included has not been calculated, noting the difficulties in doing so and the fact that such projects are primarily locally driven. He added that we can look at cost data to determine the cost-per-mile for such projects instead.

Responding to Mr. Kimbrell's request for an example of a bike/ped project, Mr. Lukasina referred him to the Triangle Bikeway project. He added that definitions are not needed at this stage and that they will be decided after enabling legislation is approved.

Responding to Mr. Kimbrell's inquiry regarding the discussions related to the reduction in maintenance funding in Alternative 3, Mr. Lukasina noted that a lot of the projects are on NCDOT's existing network and are not maintained locally. He added, however, that some level of funding needs to be allocated in the event NCDOT cannot maintain their areas to our standards. He commented that they wanted to provide at least one alternative that assumes NCDOT funding can keep up with our maintenance standards in order to show the differences in maintenance needs. He stated there is time to continue working on these percentages.

Regarding to Chair Tracy Stephenson's question regarding the 20% O&M allocation and whether that was due to the size of the network, Mr. Lukasina stated that we are assuming that our improvements will have no impact on NCDOT operations, so it made sense to reduce the O&M allocation to 20%.

Mr. Gardiner commented on the need for specific projects to be listed in the MTP, noting that more secondary road improvements will lead to more named projects and that rules need to be developed. We don't know what projects are coming and we need more conversation on what we want to fund so that we do not wind up limiting projects. He noted that the bike/ped and safety issues also need to be addressed.

Mr. Lukasina responded that our record of support for bike/ped and multimodal projects shows how important they are, including the earmarking of funding for standalone bike/ped projects. He suspects there will be serious conversations with elected officials if efforts to hold a referendum become more viable. He noted the many good and bad lessons learned with Wake Transit that will allow us to move forward.

Ms. Walter expressed concerns regarding there being no rules yet for what qualifies in the different categories and her belief that there should be some definitions before

deciding on how to allocate the revenues. Mr. Lukasina responded that he meant to say that we don't need detailed rules at this point, the TCC's general guidance in support of Complete Streets, standalone bike/ped projects, and the inclusion of multimodal improvements in projects is sufficient to proceed forward.

Responding to Ms. Walter's inquiry as to whether, under Alternative 2, there is any reason we cannot use bike/ped revenues to supplement Complete Street/capacity projects, Mr. Lukasina responded that bike/ped revenues can be used to supplement Complete Street/capacity projects.

Ms. Walter expressed concern regarding not having a statement of priorities, noted that the budget is a place for a statement regarding our values, and inquired if there was a budget statement that supports multimodal projects. Mr. Lukasina responded that there is a write-up that expresses the importance of multimodal projects.

Mr. Gardiner commented that none of that matters until we secure these revenues.

In response to Ms. Walter's inquiry, Mr. Gardiner stated that he would like to be ready for Alternative 2 but noted that a statement of goals, more flexibility to incorporate unlisted future projects, and a real conversation about balance and how to get to Alternative 2 is still needed. He responded that, without that, Alternative 3 is better because it includes more named projects.

Responding to Dallas Baker's inquiry as to whether Complete Streets only apply to widenings or if also to restriping and other similar improvements, Mr. Lukasina stated that he was corrected and noted the Avent Ferry Road project in Holly Springs as an example.

Responding to Bret Martin's question, Mr. Lukasina stated that Complete Streets/capacity will include intersections if we say it will.

Mr. Martin commented that Alternative 3 makes the most sense because of its all-encompassing nature and the local control of funds.

Mr. Lukasina noted that the TCC can recommend a blend of Alternative 1 and 2. We just wanted to provide a variety of options to choose from.

Mr. Baker commented that Alternative 3 would be more helpful because it allows for a more robust regional transit network.

Chair Stephenson commented that a lot of safety discussions live in the secondary road network, yet there is no funding there. Mr. Lukasina responded that Complete Streets can be modified to include safety improvements.

Mr. Lukasina stated that the TCC does not need to make a decision today. Staff will be bringing back a map and list of potential projects for initial consideration at the October 2, 2025, TCC meeting, with a second opportunity for consideration at the November 6, 2025, TCC meeting. He noted that having some of these items settled today would make that process easier. He stated that, in the absence of that happening, they might move forward with Alternative 1. He noted that the Executive Board will be getting the same presentation, but that they want TCC's input.

Brandon Watson asked if we know what the road projects are for Alternative 3 and what projects we could lose if we cut the transit "slice". Mr. Lukasina responded that they would go with whatever scenario showed the most surplus funds. He noted that, with a

\$60 billion plan, you definitely want to show more revenues than expenses.

Mr. Baker commented that, as a voter, he would want the scenario that gets things done.

Mr. Lukasina stated that, when it comes to a referendum, we would use our past track record to show voters what these additional revenues will buy them. He noted that it may look different for different areas as sometimes transit agencies have different goals. Variations over time and geography are okay.

Mr. Martin expressed his support for Alternative 3.

Responding to Sandi Bailey's inquiry, Mr. Lukasina stated that the reason for not having more named bike/ped projects is to allow flexibility for local agencies to do the implementation.

Ms. Bailey commented that, because there is no funding for bike/ped projects, we don't know how many are out there. If there was funding, we would see a lot more municipal projects out there.

Mr. Lukasina noted the flexibility issues that would occur if they had three decades worth of named bike/ped and greenway projects. He recommended that the TCC think about flexibility in the MTP where they can.

Ms. Walter asked how CAMPO can help agencies get organized so that they can ask for more funding for other modes. Alex Rickard responded that CAMPO is working on that. It had to first get all of the data into a common network schema and now it is working to reconcile boundary differences. Mr. Lukasina added that CAMPO has a history going back ten or more years of coordinating bicycle and pedestrian planning through area studies, corridor studies, and other planning efforts.

Ms. Walter inquired whether Alternative 3 only allocates 30% for non-car modes.

Chair Stephenson noted that, in all of the alternatives, multimodal improvements are included. He stated that the most public complaints come from secondary road issues. Regarding flexibility, he noted that they would have another opportunity in four years to make modifications and update assumptions.

Responding to Margaret Tartala, Mr. Lukasina stated that where the funds go depends on where the enabling legislation says they go. He commented that he would be happy to discuss ideas in a sub-committee. In short, we would take the best parts of what we've learned from Wake Transit and apply them here.

Neil Perry noted that his legislator wants local roads improved. Mr. Lukasina concurred, noting that the feedback from the Executive Board is the same.

Ms. Tartala noted that the concern regarding capacity may be alleviated if flexibility is there to have just the multimodal part of Complete Streets, not just capacity. Mr. Lukasina commented that Alternative 3 reduces transit by 10% from Alternative 2 and puts that into Complete Streets, bike/ped, and safety improvements.

Chair Stephenson noted that it appears that the discussion is leading to recommendation of Alternate 1 or 3 or a modified version of Alternative 3.

Tim Gardiner motioned to recommend the Executive Board consider Alternative 1 and

Alternative 3, subject to the following modifications:

- *Acknowledge the importance of Bike/Ped and safety by modifying the allocation for Complete Street/Capacity to 40% and the Bike/Ped allocation to 30%*
- *Show the trade-off in Transit capacity*

Matt Lower inquired as to why Alternative 1 is also being recommended. Mr. Lukasina responded that staff would present the full process to the Executive Board and show that the TCC is recommending a modified Alternative 3.

After further discussion on the motion, Tim Gardiner amended his motion to recommend the Executive Board approve Alternative 3, as modified above. Dallas Baker seconded the amended motion.

Discussion ensued regarding what to do with the O&M "slice" based on the modification to Alternative 3. Mr. Lukasina stated that they would rely on NCDOT for more of the maintenance costs. There was no consensus about putting more into O&M and Mr. Lukasina stated that they would show the Board everything.

After the amended motion was further clarified to remove recommendation of Alternative 1, it carried 34-1, with Dylan Bruchhaus dissenting.

After the motion was approved, Mr. Lukasina noted that the data for all of the Scenarios is still online and asked that any requests for modifications be sent to Staff as soon as possible. He provided an overview of the anticipated schedule and noted the two-step adoption process.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

Tim Gardiner motioned to recommend the Executive Board consider Alternative 1 and Alternative 3, subject to the following modifications:

- **Acknowledge the importance of Bike/Ped and safety by modifying the allocation for Complete Street/Capacity to 40% and the Bike/Ped allocation to 30%**
- **Show the trade-off in Transit capacity**

After further discussion on the motion, Tim Gardiner amended his motion to recommend the Executive Board approve Alternative 3, as modified above. Dallas Baker seconded the amended motion.

After additional discussion, the amended motion was further clarified to remove recommendation of Alternative 1, and it carried 34-1, with Dylan Bruchhaus dissenting.

(Clerk's Note: Although Alternative 1 was not included in the final motion, all three Alternatives will be presented to the Executive Board, noting the TCC's recommendation for approval of the modified Alternative 3.)

Aye: 34 - Dallas Baker, Kenneth Ritchie, Bynum Walter, Bradley Kimbrell, Barry Baker, Jay Sikes, Tim Gardiner, Akul Nishawala, Brandon Watson, Melanie Rausch, Kesha Smith, James Salmons, David Keilson, Philip Hart, Bryan Kluchar, Neil Perry, Delia Chi, Anne Calef, Jenna Shouse, Jason Kress, Juliet Andes, Sandi Bailey, Conrad Olmedo, Tracy Stephenson, Erin Joseph, Chris Garcia, Tucker Fulle, Landon Chandler, Bret Martin, Emma Linn, Lucy Garcia, Matt Lower, Matt Day, and Jeannine Ngwira

Nay: 1 - Dylan Bruchhaus

5.5

Recommended 2035 Wake Transit Plan Update

Ben Howell, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Recommended 2035 Wake Transit Plan - August 2025](#)

Mr. Howell provided an overview of the recommended Wake Transit Plan update, noting that it is going out for public comment tomorrow. He noted that the Plan includes language recognizing that there is ongoing discussion about the regional vehicle rental tax revenue by the Wake Transit Conference Committee, and that the Plan may be amended once the Conference Committee makes a decision. He added that the current Plan shows the traditional proration of vehicle tax revenues. The recommended Plan sticks with the four Big Moves of connecting the region, connecting all Wake County communities, creating frequent reliable urban mobility, and enhancing access to transit. He stated that \$3 billion dollars in projected investments is planned and provided an overview of the project type funding allocations. He commented that one of the major changes in this Plan is the investment in regional rail instead of commuter rail. He provided an overview of the key projects, transit plan updates, and key benefits for all of the four Big Moves. He stated that the new Access to Transit metric will use ½ mile distances instead of ¾ miles and illustrated the differences between the existing and proposed metrics and goals. He provided an overview of the three engagement plan phases and their results. He then delineated the next steps, noting that there will be a 30-day public comment period, followed by a joint CAMPO Executive Board and GoTriangle Board of Trustees public hearing on September 17, 2025. Final actions will be requested by TPAC, TCC, the Executive Board, and the GoTriangle Board of Trustees at their respective November meetings.

Responding to Tim Gardiner's questions regarding the Access to Transit metric change, Mr. Howell stated that this change will be more refined because we'll be using stops, not lines. He added that the MTP conversations will also help those connections via bike/ped.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

6. Informational Item: Budget

6.1 Operating Budget, FY2025

Brenda Landes, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Received as information.**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[2025 Projected Operating Budget Q4](#)*There were no questions and/or comments.***This item was received as information only.****6.2 Member's Shares, FY2025**

Brenda Landes, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Received as information.**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[2025 Projected Member's Dues](#)*There were no questions and/or comments.***This item was received as information only.****7. Informational Item: Project Updates****7.1 Project Updates****Requested Action:** Receive as information**Requested Action:** Receive as information**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[Project Updates - September 2025](#)[Project Update - NCDOT Div 6 - September 2025](#)[Corrected Project Update - NCDOT Div 6 - September 2025 -
Distributed at Meeting](#)*There were no questions and/or comments.***This item was received as information only.****7.2 Public Engagement Updates**

Bonnie Parker, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[TCC Public Engagement Updates - September 2025](#)*There were no questions and/or comments.***This item was received as information only.**

8. Informational Item: Staff Reports

MPO Report:

Chris Lukasina reported the following:

- *The One-Call-for-All is open until October 31, 2025.*
- *The LAPP Manager position is open. He then solicited referrals for applicants.*
- *Caleb Allred is now officially a CAMPO employee.*
- *There will be a regional safety summit in late Fall 2025.*

NCDOT Transportation Planning Division:

No report provided.

NCDOT Division 4:

No report provided.

NCDOT Division 5:

No report provided.

NCDOT Division 6:

Philip Hart noted that the Division's updates were included in the agenda package and that he had no further updates.

NCDOT Division 8:

No report provided.

NCDOT Rail Division:

No report provided.

NC Turnpike Authority:

No report provided.

NCDOT Integrated Mobility Division:

No report provided.

TCC Members:

No reports provided.

9. Adjournment

Chair Tracy Stephenson adjourned the meeting at 11:44 a.m.

Upcoming Meetings/Events

<i>CAMPO Executive Board Meeting</i>	<i>September 17, 2025</i>
<i>CAMPO Board Room</i>	<i>3:00 - 5:00 pm</i>
<i>1 Fenton Main St, Ste 201</i>	
<i>Cary, NC 27511</i>	

<i>CAMPO TCC Meeting</i>	<i>October 2, 2025</i>
<i>CAMPO Board Room</i>	<i>10:00 am - Noon</i>
<i>1 Fenton Main St, Ste 201</i>	
<i>Cary, NC 27511</i>	

<i>CAMPO Executive Board Meeting</i>	<i>October 15, 2025</i>
<i>CAMPO Board Room</i>	<i>3:00 - 5:00 pm</i>
<i>1 Fenton Main St, Ste 201</i>	
<i>Cary, NC 27511</i>	

<i>CAMPO TCC Meeting</i>	<i>November 6, 2025</i>
<i>CAMPO Board Room</i>	<i>10:00 am - Noon</i>
<i>1 Fenton Main Street, Suite 201</i>	
<i>Cary, NC 27511</i>	