

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

1 Fenton Main St.
Suite 201
Cary NC 27511

Thursday, March 6, 2025

10:00 AM

Conference Room

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Stephenson called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Introductions were made.

Present (35): Chair Tracy Stephenson, Kenneth Ritchie, Bynum Walter, Bradley Kimbrell, Matt Klem, Margaret Tartala, Thanh Schado, Barry Baker, Sarah Arbour, Tim Gardiner, Brandon Watson, Het Patel, Paul Black, Alan Shapiro, James Salmons, Tracy Parrott, Phillip Hart, Bryan Kluchar, Anne Calef, Jenna Shouse, Jason Kress, Juliet Andes, Sandi Bailey, Audrey Duchesne, Chris George, Erin Joseph, Chris Garcia, Andrew Spiliotis, Jason Brown, Jillian Brookshire, Eliot Ward, Emma Linn, Ryan Eldridge-Burch, Lucy Garcia, and Matt Day

Absent (20): Britt Davis-Haywood, Mike Frangos, Scott Hammerbacher, Braston Newton, Akul Nishawala, Joseph Geigle, Anita Davis-Haywood, Than Austin, Brennan Fuqua, Neil Perry, Phil Geary, Catherine Knudson, Michael Landguth, Jeffrey Jones, Dorothy Taylor, Jennifer Ganser, Kenny Cole, Austin Keefer, Matt Lower, and Bo Carson

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

Chair Stephenson noted that Item 5.7 – Amendment #8 to the FY 2024-2033 Transportation Improvement Program – was added to the agenda after publication and distribution.

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Minutes

4.1 February 6, 2025 Meeting Minutes

Requested Action: Approve the meeting minutes.

Attachments: [February 6, 2025 Meeting Minutes](#)

Kenneth Ritchie motioned to approve the February 6, 2025 TCC meeting minutes. Bynum Walter seconded that motion. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Regular Business

5.1**Election of Vice Chair for 2025**

Chris Lukasina, MPO Executive Director

Requested Action: Conduct election for Vice Chair of the TCC for the remainder of the 2025 term.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

Mr. Lukasina turned the item over to Chair Stephenson to open the floor for nominations.

Bradley Kimbrell made a motion to nominate Kenneth Ritchie to serve as Vice Chair. Bynum Walter seconded that motion. After no further nominations, the motion carried unanimously, and Kenneth Ritchie was elected as Vice Chair.

5.2 FY 2026 Wake Transit Work Plan

Steven Mott, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)
[Draft FY 2026 Wake Transit Work Plan](#)

Mr. Mott provided an overview of the draft FY 2026 Wake Transit Work Plan, covered the key dates in the process, the contents of the document, and noted that the Operating and Capital budget ordinances would be included in the final version of the document after adoption.

Steve Schlossberg, GoTriangle, provided an overview of the revenues and expenditures for the Plan. He spoke regarding monitoring of the Half-Cent Sales Tax-Article 43 Trend being a main driver of understanding the financial forecast of a large portion of the Transit Plan's funding. He noted that the reason they are following the Federal Reserve's data is to get better guidance in the forecasts, but that they have also reached out to other similar agencies for data too. He expressed his confidence in meeting the budget and provided an overview of the budget assumptions. He noted that they may be slightly over in revenues and that the Vehicle Rental Tax (VRT) revenue is being listed as TBD until the VRT impacts have been addressed. He noted that Wake Transit receives a small federal contribution that's excluded from this budget as our policy has been that Wake Transit pays for any 5307 expansion work attributable to the Plan. He added that they are requesting \$29 million in capital liquidity from prior year funds leftover since more projects are being put into the Plan than the revenues available for them without those funds. He stated that the FY26 modeled operating expenditures total \$62.2 million, with most of the expenses being for bus operations. He added that the FY26 modeled capital projects expenditures total \$116.7 million, with most of the expenses being for the Bus Rapid Transit corridors. He noted that 70% of the expenditures are allocated for transportation infrastructure and operations. He concluded by stating that the revenues over expenditures are \$0 because they are utilizing the prior year's fund balance in this budget.

Mr. Mott spoke regarding the financial assumptions for the VRT revenues, noting that the "TBD" language will be updated for FY2026 and beyond upon the conclusion of the Conference Committee process. He reported that the "place-holder scenarios" for commuter rail funding and the projected completion dates for those projects have been extended out two years. He noted that this extension will be updated in future Work Plan documents.

Mr. Mott next covered Operating highlights for GoTriangle and GoRaleigh and Capital Project highlights for projects proposed to be funded in the FY 2026 Wake Transit Work Plan. He noted that the public comment period ends on April 2, 2025. He expressed the importance of any TCC feedback as well.

Bynum Walter inquired about any Community Funding Area (CFA) opportunities.

Mr. Mott responded that funding for the CFA would be included in the recommended Plan, noted that the Selection Committee has just completed their recommendations, and spoke regarding examples of CFAP projects, including the Morrisville Smart Shuttle, and detailed the 50% local match requirement of the CFA program.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

5.3 FAST Study 2.0 Update

Greg Saur, WSP

Requested Action: Receive as information.**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)

Mr. Saur provided an overview of the FAST Study 2.0 Update, noting that FAST transit is a scalable approach for quickly integrating “transit advantage” infrastructure along the roadway system to support enhanced transit service. He summarized the list of stakeholders and NCDOT’s units involved and their roles. He presented the Vision for the Study, emphasizing the points related to enhancing the quality of life, meeting diverse needs, and prioritizing buses and BRT and spoke regarding the importance of addressing these areas at the policy level. He then presented the Goals for the Study and mentioned the importance of determining a way forward in this new federal funding and project evaluation world by implementing alternate scenarios and drew attention to the Goal regarding recommending institutional practice changes, especially at the NCDOT level, but also at the local level too. He noted that such modifications can make projects cheaper and that even small changes will add up. He added that NCDOT has been great in working with the City of Raleigh and suggested taking that momentum and permeating it throughout the rest of the process.

Mr. Saur then covered the following priority corridors that are congested and/or have inadequate transit and noted some options for improving them:

- *Portions of US 70*
- *Chapel Hill to RTP*
- *Portions of US 15-501 Corridor*
- *Fayetteville Road Corridor in Durham*
- *NC 98 Corridor: Between Durham and Wake County*
- *VinFast Site in Chatham County*
- *Portions of NC 54*
- *1-40 & I-540*
- *Capital Boulevard*
- *US 64 between Raleigh west to Pittsboro*
- *Portions of US 1*
- *S-Line Rail Corridor for multimodal connections*

He noted that there was no one criteria for which areas made it to this list. He stated that they were identified by the agencies and stakeholders that he spoke with and also noted that the TCC has already seen many of these proposed projects previously. He illustrated the regional networks they wanted to improve, highlighted FAST’s proposed priorities, and summarized FAST’s Transit Priority Infrastructure Toolbox and Transit Advantage Matrix, which shows the estimated levels of advantage, implementation time, costs, where to use the tools, proposed outcomes, and the common lead agencies for several transit improvements, including:

- *A Bus on Shoulder System (BOSS)*
- *Express or Transit Priority Lanes*
- *Transit Signal Prioritization – he especially noted that this tool would benefit all areas*
- *Queue Jump Lanes*
- *Direct Access Stations*
- *RED Bus Lanes*
- *Level and Near-Level Boardings*

- *Floating Bus Stops*
- *Enhanced Bus Stops*

He added that these improvements are all just thoughts at this time and that concept design and cost estimates would be needed from the applicable organizations, and that the improvements would need to be added into the MTP and any other applicable places. He noted that many of the improvements in the toolbox are aimed at freeway projects and that the latest STIP did not include funding for them. He emphasized the importance of not weighing the individual projects, but to consider instead the larger regional impacts and the need to establish policy-level decisions going forward.

Evan Koff noted that many of the improvements have TSMO and ITS elements and asked if they can expect recommendations from NCDOT on incorporating those elements into these corridors and improvement areas.

Mr. Saur responded in the affirmative, stating that they will work with NCDOT on individually tailored plans for agencies.

Responding to Paul Black, Mr. Saur stated that the draft plan is scheduled to be completed by the end of June, with the final presentation to RTA scheduled for early August.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

5.4 North Harnett Transit Study - Project Update

Gaby Lawlor, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

Ms. Lawlor provided an overview of the North Harnett Transit Study, noting that the study area only included the portion of Harnett County within CAMPO's boundaries.

Leah Weaver, WSP, stated that the Study is in Phase II and the second engagement round is initiating. The Study is scheduled to conclude in June. She reported that the Study Goals were to determine transit-supportiveness in the area and also spoke regarding the upcoming public engagement and stakeholder engagement efforts. She then summarized the Phase I findings:

- *There is a demand for transit services*
- *56% of respondents were very or somewhat interested in using transit*
- *Most respondents stated that they would use transit for shopping, recreational, and medical trips*
- *The need for updated infrastructure and increased land-use density was identified*
- *Travel patterns between Lillington and Angier were strongest*
- *HARTS ridership was strongest near Lillington and Coats*
- *There is support from the public and stakeholders for more enhanced local services and connections to areas locally*

Ms. Weaver then reported that transit propensity, interzonal trips, HARTS ridership, and key destinations were all looked at in order to come up with the proposed Service Area. She presented the Service Types Evaluation results for microtransit, fixed routes, senior shuttle service, and regional routes. A summation of the criteria used to compare the service options was presented in a matrix, which included factors such as estimated operating costs, capital costs, potential ridership, required implementation effort level, service area coverage, the service span, use frequency, convenience/flexibility, and public input received. She stated that the microtransit with external connections service type was selected as the proposed service and also noted its ability to allow for important connections to regional transit service. She then provided an overview of the Study's upcoming public engagement effort and educational campaign around microtransit and provided examples of materials to be used. She concluded with a timeline for the next steps, noting that the Study was scheduled to come before the TCC and Executive Board in June.

Chris Lukasina noted that the TCC members can direct any questions regarding the Study to either Ms. Lawlor or Ms. Weaver.

Tim Gardiner suggested looking at the Rolesville and Johnston County microtransit vehicles.

Paul Black suggested that, if there is transit operating, CAMPO may want to see what they can do about connecting to the Wake Tech Service and noted that the FRX red line should be truncated further north and that the map needs to be updated accordingly.

Chris Garcia inquired as to the goal for HARTS.

Ms. Lawlor responded that the proposed service would supplement HARTS, and both

relieve some of its demand and increase access. She added that the logistics of this were beyond the scope of the Study and that those details would be a part of the implementation process.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

5.5 CAMPO Blueprint for Safety - Safety Performance Measure Target Setting

Kenneth Withrow, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Endorse the goals of a 50% reduction of fatal and serious injury crashes by 2055 and ultimately moving toward zero fatal and serious injury crashes by applying the noted short-term, mid-term, and long-term goals to set annual FHWA safety targets.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[CAMPO Goal and Target Setting Recommendation Memorandum](#)

Lauren Blackburn, VHB, reminded the TCC that, as part of the Blueprint for Safety Plan, CAMPO requested a hybrid approach for next year's safety performance measure target setting to consider realistic conditions and trends. She stated that VHB has created several hybrid approaches and now needs to know what CAMPO's long-term vision is for its Blueprint for Safety. She stated that the focus is on the five FHWA required safety measures that all MPOs are required to report on: the number of fatalities, the rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the number of serious injuries, the rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT, and the number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries. She illustrated the growing gap between NCDOT's Vision Zero Goal and CAMPO's current trajectory for fatalities and serious injuries and discussed some of the factors causing it, including changes in population growth and VMT rates county-wide, not just in the CAMPO region, and recent changes in the proportions of VMT on minor arterials and collectors. She presented a graph illustrating the effects of VHB's proposed alternative scenarios and stated that she is looking for the TCC to recommend one of the scenarios, or blend of scenarios, from the graph.

Ms. Blackburn presented Scenario A as a near-term alternative most aligned with NCDOT's Goals and the most aggressive of the four proposed scenarios. She explained that it just pushes the goal to move towards zero fatalities and serious injuries further out to 2055, to align with the MTP design year. She noted that one factor that can influence the downward slope on the graph includes lags in realizing the results of recently implemented safety projects, programs, and strategies. She added that, in five to ten years, the STIP projects, depending on how much they address safety, can also help push the slope down further. She noted that another influence on the slope is the result of new projects (SPOT) and the story of how much they are invested in and focused on safety.

Ms. Blackburn next explained Scenario B as a maintenance alternative with emphasis on longer-term reductions to be utilized for several years until long-term investments are completed. Although it may take a while, the goal of reaching zero fatalities and serious injuries could be realized by 2060.

Ms. Blackburn summarized Scenario C, whereby the MTP leads long-term incident reductions by 40% by 2055, with the goal then focusing on reductions rather than a zero-target year. She added that this scenario mitigates safety in the short-term.

Ms. Blackburn then provided an overview of Scenario D, which prioritizes safety in the mid-term. She explained that the goal in this scenario is a 50% reduction in fatalities and serious injuries by 2055, then a move towards zero but not an ultimate goal of zero. She added that this scenario is more of a mid-term push that includes some STIP projects.

Ms. Blackburn requested the TCC's feedback on their long-term goal, including how

aggressive they want to be and how to best balance that with what is realistic. She then provided example strategies/project types that could be incorporated in the near-term, mid-term, and long-term.

Chair Stephenson asked about how much data we have on fatalities and serious injuries on major versus minor roads, to which Ms. Blackburn responded that such data has been analyzed for all crashes by all functional class types.

Chair Stephenson then spoke regarding the problem of not being able to find funding for projects on local streets through federal or state sources. He noted that our ability to fund projects down to secondary roads is almost non-existent; but, if we are trying to meet a goal of zero fatalities and serious injuries, and we are not spending money in these areas, it becomes a point of failure. He inquired into the pain points that CAMPO can actually move the needle on, noting that so much is out of its control. He also asked what scale the 83% change in fatalities and serious injuries listed on Table 2 is based on.

Ms. Blackburn responded that the 83% increase occurred in Chatham County's jurisdiction and affirmed that even slight increases can result in larger percentages depending upon the population of that area.

Chris Garcia stated that he was unsure why zero is not the target. He asked if the intention of setting more realistic goals is to make us feel like we are making progress, or if CAMPO is at risk of losing funding or other penalizations by not meeting the zero target. He asked if there are any funding cuts or drawbacks from setting the targets we have now and reiterated his inquiry into the intention behind setting more realistic goals.

Tim Gardiner asked what the timeframe was for getting the TCC's feedback.

Chris Lukasina responded that the item was scheduled to go before the Executive Board for final approval later in the month and that Staff wanted the TCC to have the opportunity to weigh in on the matter first. He added that the goal is not to abandon Vision Zero, but he just does not see us meeting that goal and we need to look at the trends and targets for the past few years that are pointing to the fact that goal is becoming ever more unrealistic. The goal today is to identify what we can realistically do by 2055 and select a scenario or a hybrid scenario to determine a starting point.

Tim Gardiner asked if Scenario C just accepts that we'll never get to zero and always expect some level of fatalities and serious injuries.

Mr. Lukasina responded that we are not accepting fatalities and serious injuries, this is about not setting a date to get to zero. He added that a more realistic approach would be to set a percentage reduction by a certain year; and, if we want to be more realistic, we need to focus more on moving the curve downwards than on where the curve ends.

Margaret Tartala noted that just moving the goalpost every year as safety goals are not met is not a real goal.

Paul Black noted the necessity of choosing a more pessimistic scenario due to all the factors working against us that are out of our control, including the time it takes to put a project on the ground, case law, funding, etc.

Juliet Andes concurred with Mr. Black's comments.

Barry Baker noted that speed is a significant factor and relayed an incident he witnessed where a car driving 100-mph ran a red light in a 35-mph speed zone. He spoke regarding meetings he has had with law enforcement regarding them having difficulties issuing traffic tickets due to the political will against them. He then stated that infrastructure alone will not get us to zero, and that we also need to address and account for human behavioral factors and work to prevent those causes too.

Mr. Lukasina responded that we can control infrastructure, but changing behavior is harder. The study will encompass all contributing factors. In the past, at the state-level, it was assumed that behavior would be the most significant factor once all NCDOT-identified safety infrastructure was in place. He noted the need to also look at local land use regulations, local speed limits, signage, adding shoulders, etc. He added that it is easy to say that behavior can just be addressed by changing laws and then put the responsibility on law enforcement, but that does a disservice to a lot of what we can actually do and have control over. He stated that he is expecting recommendations in both areas and that some, like local land development regulation changes and speed limit reductions, will be out of our comfort zone and added that some may even require legislative approval.

Kenneth Ritchie noted that this is about the long game and that we need to just flatten the curve and be consistent in its decrease. If we happen to over deliver, that is great.

Mr. Lukasina stated that this is the TCC's opportunity to weigh in on their frustrations over the years about the lack of progress and setting a future target. He emphasized that it is not about giving up, just being more realistic, which is what the Executive Board has asked for. He recommended that, if the TCC wants a zero by date, that it be aligned with the MTP. He stated that the TCC's options are to recommend one scenario or a hybrid scenario to the Executive Board, recommend something different, or let the Board know that it needs more time and will make a recommendation at its April meeting. He asked that, if the TCC requests more time, that the members tell Staff in advance of the April meeting if they need any further information.

Lucy Garcia stated that, if we decide to not have a zero target, then we need a disclaimer somewhere stating that CAMPO is not okay with fatalities or serious injuries and that it wants to be aggressive about safety; however, these are the goals that are realistic given its capacity. She noted that the top priority for the Town of Youngsville is safety, but that it is a struggle to understand what we are actually capable of doing and our capacity to audit all of these projects.

Kenneth Ritchie noted the need for the financial resources to deal with our capacity constraints and that even a 50% reduction by 2055, with our projected growth, would be a major win. He stated that the end goal is still how to get to zero.

It was noted that the word "maintenance" in Scenario B could make people think that CAMPO is okay with not getting to zero and that the word should be taken out.

Chair Stephenson stated that we cannot have any goal but zero but also emphasized that there are many significant factors outside of our influence. He then asked if Staff has any particular recommendation.

Mr. Lukasina responded that Scenarios C and D offer significant reductions by 2055 and extend the timeline. He noted that the intention of the dotted lines on the curves was just to provide guidance since there is nothing incredibly technical that will change them. He added that Staff can change the content of those scenarios to reflect today's comments.

He asked what the TCC wanted the goal to be in 2055, on our way to zero, if it wants to align with the MTP cycle.

Kenneth Ritchie stated that Scenario D seems the most realistic. He added that we need to make the necessary investments and see how the numbers respond. He noted that the flattening of the curve in Scenario D depends on significant funding.

Bynum Walter stated that Scenario D, with a time-specific goal tied to the MTP year, is the most honest scenario, but it should also layout the expected progress to be made in the interim.

Margaret Tartala stated that we could use such metrics to program projects, see if CAMPO is meeting the expected goals, and what we can do if we are not meeting those goals.

Ms. Walter noted that the goals would be meant to be aspirational.

Chair Stephenson emphasized the importance of the underlying data on the factors leading to fatalities and noted that education was a possibility for reducing them. He stated that we need to determine the areas where we can make large impacts and move the needle.

Mr. Lukasina noted the lack of data on behavioral factors in forecasting models and their difficulty in prediction but stated, however, that there were a few federal crash reduction factors that have been identified. He added that, looking ahead, we would be relying more on the hard data from historical trends since there is not a lot of concrete data on behavioral factors.

Mr. Lukasina then stated that Staff can adjust the scenario graphics based on today's feedback and that ultimately the decision will be about how aggressive versus how realistic the TCC wants to be. He recommended that the decision be tied to the other processes to make it easier to manage and track over time.

Paul Black noted that the TCC seems to be all over the board and asked if they could request a recommendation from Staff for the April meeting.

Ms. Blackburn responded that waiting until the April meeting is fine. She explained that this is just a visionary goal for the Plan and that the TCC has several more months before it needs to set its safety targets.

Paul Black recommended that the TCC request additional time to review the matter and direct Staff to provide a balanced and realistic recommendation, based on today's feedback, for the TCC to consider at their April 3, 2025, meeting.

Chair Stephenson confirmed that this was the consensus of the TCC.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

It was the consensus of the TCC to request additional time to review the matter and to direct Staff to provide a balanced and realistic recommendation, based on today's feedback, for the April 3, 2025, TCC meeting.

5.6 2055 MTP Update - Deficiency Analysis & Alternatives Analysis

Chris Lukasina, MPO Executive Director

Requested Action: Receive as information.**Attachments:** [Staff Report](#)[Preliminary Deficiency Analysis](#)[2055 MTP Summarized Development Schedule](#)

Mr. Lukasina provided an overview of the 2055 MTP Update, noting that there was not a lot of difference from last month's update. He stated that they are in the Analysis & Evaluation part of the update process and that the results are scheduled to come before the TCC in the next three months. He reiterated that the Preliminary Deficiency Analysis is meant to measure the Worst-Case Scenario, it utilizes the Triangle Regional Model, and it is an unrealistic but useful scenario as it sets a baseline for all other alternatives. He noted that the Alternatives Analysis & Scenario Planning are used to explore alternatives for growth, development, and transportation investments in the region, as well as measure against regional goals and community values. He covered the Development Foundation and the CommunityViz Growth Tool, as well as the Mobility Investment Foundation, which incorporates future transportation networks, a Scenarios Framework, and an illustration of the Key Performance Measures for the Alternate Scenarios. He added that the goal is to select a preferred option, and budget for it, by Summer. The final Plan is scheduled to be adopted in the Fall. He noted that it will be a multi-step process whereby the TCC will make their recommendation in late Fall/early Winter, then the Plan will undergo air quality review and finally come back for adoption by the Executive Board in January or February 2026. He concluded by reminding the TCC members of their respective CAMPO Liaisons and the anticipated milestone dates.

There were no questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

5.7 Amendment #8 to FY2024-2033 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Chandler Hagen, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Recommend approval of Amendment #8 to the FFY 2024-2033 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[FY2024-2033 TIP Amendment #8-Version 2](#)
[Public Comment - Hindu Society of North Carolina](#)
[Public Comment - Town of Cary](#)

Ms. Hagen provided an overview of Amendment #8, which includes amendments to transit projects to adjust schedules, update funding amounts, and add new projects. She highlighted the GoTriangle and GoRaleigh projects as examples of some of the projects included in this TIP Amendment and reported that the public comment period ends on April 15, 2025, and that the public hearing is scheduled for the April 16, 2025, Executive Board meeting.

Het Patel requested a full list of the projects included in this TIP Amendment.

Chris Lukasina stated that the full project list will be posted before the April 3, 2025, TCC meeting.

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: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[2025 Budget Projection Q2](#)

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: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[2025 Projected Member's Dues Q2](#)

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.

Attachments: [March Project Updates](#)
[Division 6 Project Report - CAMPO March 2025](#)

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: [TCC Public Engagement Updates March 2025](#)

There were no questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

8. Informational Item: Staff Reports

MPO Report:

Chris Lukasina reminded the TCC of the following items:

- The previously cancelled MTP 101 Training and Alternatives Analysis Sessions have been rescheduled for March 12, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. respectively.*
- Registration for the April 15-17, 2025, NC AMPO Conference in Wilmington is still open.*

NCDOT Transportation Planning Division:

No report.

NCDOT Division 4:

No report.

NCDOT Division 5:

No report.

NCDOT Division 6:

No report.

NCDOT Division 8:

No report.

NCDOT Rail Division:

No report.

NC Turnpike Authority:

Alan Shapiro reported that the I-540 ramp closures previously scheduled for last month have been rescheduled for this Sunday-Wednesday evening and that Phase II of the major clearing at US 70 and Poole Road have started.

NCDOT Integrated Mobility Division:

No report.

TCC Members:

No reports.

9. Adjournment

Chair Stephenson adjourned the meeting at 11:41 a.m.

Upcoming Meetings/Events

<i>Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting</i>	<i>March 19, 2025</i>
<i>CAMPO Board Room</i>	<i>4:00 - 6:00 pm</i>
<i>1 Fenton Main St, Ste 201</i>	
<i>Cary, NC 27511</i>	

<i>Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting</i>	<i>April 3, 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>Capital Area MPO TAC Meeting</i>	<i>April 16, 2025</i>
<i>CAMPO Board Room</i>	<i>4:00 - 6:00 pm</i>
<i>1 Fenton Main St, Ste 201</i>	
<i>Cary, NC 27511</i>	

<i>Capital Area MPO TCC Meeting</i>	<i>May 1, 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>	