

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

1 Fenton Main St.
Suite 201
Cary NC 27511

Thursday, January 8, 2026

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.

(Clerk's Note: Brad West was present in a non-voting capacity as an additional agency representative present. There were thirty-four voting members present.)

- Present:** 35 - Dallas Baker, Kenneth Ritchie, Bynum Walter, Bradley Kimbrell, Margaret Tartala, Barry Baker, Sarah Arbour, Tim Gardiner, Akul Nishawala, Het Patel, Paul Black, Andrea Neri, Ron McCollum, James Salmons, Tracy Parrott, Robert Stone, Kim Nguyen, Fred Wells, Delia Chi, Travis Crayton, Jenna Shouse, Jason Kress, Conrad Olmedo, Chris George, Tracy Stephenson, Chris Garcia, Tucker Fulle, Landon Chandler, Bret Martin, Tanner Hayslette, Emma Linn, Brad West, Kevin C. McCarthy, Lucy Garcia, and Julian Griffiee
- Absent:** 19 - Matt Klem, Thanh Schado, Jason Rogers, Braston Newton, Joe Geigle, Brandon Watson, Anita Davis-Haywood, Reuben Blakely, Neil Perry, Phil Geary, Jeff Jones, Michelle Bryant, Jennifer Ganser, Juliet Andes, Barbara Hollerand, Matt Lower, Matt Day, Bo Carson, and Britt Davis

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

No adjustments were made to the Agenda.

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Minutes

4.1 Minutes - November 6, 2025
Susan A. Owens, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Approve the TCC Meeting Minutes of November 6, 2025

Requested Action: Approve the TCC Meeting Minutes of November 6, 2025

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[November 6, 2025 TCC Meeting Minutes](#)

There were no questions and/or comments.

Paul Black motioned to approve the TCC Minutes of November 6, 2025. Het Patel seconded the motion. The motion carried 34-0.

5. Regular Business

5.1 Election of Chair & Vice Chair for 2026

Chris Lukasina, MPO Executive Director

Requested Action: Conduct elections for Chair and Vice Chair of the TCC for 2026.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

Chris Lukasina noted that the TCC By-Laws require a Chair and Vice Chair to be elected at the first meeting each year, and that there is a three-year term limit for each position. Both the current Chair and Vice Chair are eligible for re-election.

Het Patel nominated Chair Tracy Stephenson as TCC Chair for 2026.

There were no further nominations for Chair.

Chair Stephenson opened the floor for nominations for TCC Vice Chair for 2026.

Het Patel nominated Vice Chair Kenneth Ritchie as TCC Vice Chair for 2026.

There were no further nominations for Vice Chair.

There were no questions and/or comments.

Het Patel made a motion to elect Chair Tracy Stephenson as TCC Chair for 2026. Bynum Walter seconded the motion. The motion carried 34-0.

Het Patel made a motion to elect Vice Chair Kenneth Ritchie as TCC Vice Chair for 2026. Bynum Walter seconded the motion. The motion carried 34-0.

5.2 NCDOT Confident Scope & Cost Estimate (CSCE)

Brian Wert, PE /NCDOT STIP Central Region Manager

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

Mr. Wert provided an overview of the cost estimate challenges and improvements over the last five years and commented that the Confident Scope & Cost Estimate (CSCE) is a new milestone in project delivery for projects selected through prioritization that will help create confidence in cost estimates and result in fewer/smaller cost increases and project delays. He spoke regarding the appropriate times for CSCE documentation based on project size and other factors and the required Project Definition Document (PDD) and Cost Verification Memo (CVM). He noted that, of the 475 projects currently scheduled for delivery (2026-2035 STIP), approximately 300 have not reached the ROW Plans Complete (RPC) milestone. The expectation is that, by September 30, 2027, all projects scheduled for delivery should achieve their CSCE or they may be subject to re-evaluation in P9. NCDOT will be monitoring the progress of the CSCE roll-out with quarterly updates. He stated that many of the approximately 300 projects mentioned above are close to meeting the new milestone and that NCDOT will be reviewing them in more detail to determine if they have actually met the new milestone. He added that NCDOT is informing MPOs, RPOs, and local governments of the September 30, 2027, expectation for LAPs (for projects selected through prioritization).

Responding to Het Patel, Mr. Wert stated that the CSCE is only required for SPOT projects and that transit projects would not necessarily come through.

Responding to Chair Tracy Stephenson, Mr. Wert stated that the role of local agencies will be the same as with any other project delivery process. He added that different agencies want different levels of involvement in the process and that NCDOT will be working with agencies on a case by case basis.

Responding to Bret Martin, Mr. Wert stated that local agencies will be responsible for the CSCE for local bike/pedestrian SPOT projects as a part of the project design process. In response to Mr. Martin's second inquiry, Mr. Wert noted that projects typically compete multiple times in the STIP process and that NCDOT is moving towards requiring express design in order to compete and the CSCE being required before a project gets into the first five years of the STIP. He added that there should be a fair amount of time between these two processes in order for agencies to complete the CSCE.

Mr. Wert emphasized that, while the CSCE is a new milestone, it is primarily just documentation of things already being done, just earlier in the process, and that it should not involve new design work or be a huge lift.

Chris Lukasina noted the ripple effects on project costs and other problems with some of CAMPO's large projects over the years and commented that the CSCE is an important process improvement. He stated that CAMPO currently has 27 projects programmed that do not meet the requirement yet and asked if NCDOT is willing to come back in a few months to help CAMPO create a clear plan, with milestones, for those projects to meet the new requirement. Mr. Wert responded in the affirmative, stating that NCDOT's Program Managers are digging into more detail to see where each project is at and that they will have more information in a couple months.

Mr. Lukasina noted that the term "scheduled for delivery" also means "committed projects" and commented on the different effects the new rule will have on small versus large projects.

Mr. Lukasina asked Mr. Wert what the quickest or average time between CSCE submission and movement into the scheduled for delivery status was. Mr. Wert responded that he was unsure; however, in his experience, it would be no more than ten years, with most projects being within five years.

Responding to Mr. Lukasina, Mr. Wert stated that many projects already have to compete multiple times in the SPOT process and that any additional times are not due to the CSCE process, but rather many facets beyond it.

In response to Mr. Lukasina's inquiry as to whether this rule will require CAMPO's projects to re-compete, David Wasserman, NCDOT, stated that it will depend on how long it takes to complete the CSCE. He noted that projects that involve public comment, are more complex, etc. may take more time to complete the process.

Alex Rickard inquired about which projects on NCDOT's list are led by NCDOT and which are led locally. He specifically asked if the Western Boulevard Tunnel Project would be the City of Raleigh's responsibility. Mr. Wert responded that the project is the City of Raleigh's responsibility.

Mr. Wert had no response to Mr. Rickard's question regarding how agencies should deal with complex projects that are affected by larger projects, such as BRT plans. He did note, however, that NCDOT might consider smaller projects adjacent to larger projects being a mitigating circumstance. Projects will be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

Responding to Mr. Rickard's inquiry, Mr. Wert stated that NCDOT is seeking input from the various MPOs, etc. on their desired level of involvement in the process. He noted that the input received so far indicates that the different MPOs, etc. desire different levels of involvement.

Mr. Lukasina commented that this issue was discussed by the MPO Directors at the last NCAMPO meeting and that there was unanimous agreement that they would like to see a merger-type process. Mr. Wert responded that was good to know.

Chair Tracy Stephenson inquired as to who determines when a CSCE needs to be done and the timeline. Mr. Wert responded that not all items apply to all projects. He commented that determining an acceptable risk level is one factor to look at. He stated that, at some point, it will come down to NCDOT's Project Managers, which is why establishing good relationships with them will be helpful.

Responding to Mr. Rickard's question, Mr. Wert stated that the deadline was determined based upon the current calendar and alignment with the submittal window for the next SPOT round.

Mr. Wert emphasized that the new CSCE requirement should not require a lot of extra work for agencies as it should already be a part of the standard process. It does not require any new design work, just documentation.

Mr. Rickard noted that the track record of STIP/SPOT holding to a schedule is not good and that it has never hit a deadline to his knowledge. In response to his question regarding NCDOT's confidence about meeting the September 2027 deadline, Mr. Wert

stated that Mr. Rickard's point is well taken. This is why the quarterly updates will be so important and that they need to be a collaborative effort.

Chair Stephenson noted that a big concern for local agencies is the consistent delivery of projects to the public. He expressed concern that many such projects that have been in the hopper for a while may now be delayed further, and stated that we want to be on top of how milestones are met. Mr. Wert responded that the goal is not to delay projects and further stated that the CSCE requirement should be delivered in the natural order of things. He then noted these factors as reasons why we need to monitor the rollout of the new requirement.

Chair Stephenson noted that we have been doing cost estimates for a long time and that he does not know how we can get reasonably more accurate. It's one of the hardest things we do. He noted the importance of doing projects as promised for the public and commented that the CSCE rule has the potential for great delays. He added that additional updates and check-ins with NCDOT on this will be important for us.

Mr. Lukasina requested that Mr. Wert come back to the TCC in March/April 2026 to provide a project status update on CAMPO's projects and information on how to improve project delivery timelines. He requested that NCDOT ask themselves the question "how is this making things faster/more effective" as they continue to develop and refine the new requirement.

Mr. Wert noted that the requirement is not as much about speed as it is certainty.

Mr. Lukasina countered that delivery speed is extremely important. He noted that some CAMPO Executive Board Members have not seen any new projects under construction. There needs to be real and tangible results. He commented that this is also a political issue that NCDOT needs to be aware of.

Mr. Wert expressed his understanding of Mr. Lukasina's comments.

Chair Stephenson stated that any further questions on the matter can be referred to Mr. Lukasina or Mr. Rickard.

Mr. Wert offered that members could reach out to him with questions as well.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

5.3 Wake Transit Funding Contribution to NCDOT National Railroad Partnership Program Grant

Ben Howell, CAMPO / Jason Myers, NCDOT Rail Division

Requested Action: Recommend the Executive Board adopt the Resolution of Support and Dedication of Wake Transit Funds as Local Match Towards the NCDOT Raleigh to Richmond (S-Line) National Railroad Partnership Program Grant.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[NCDOT Rail Division Memo](#)
[Resolution](#)

Mr. Howell provided an overview of the 2035 Wake Transit Plan as it relates to regional rail investments and spoke regarding other considerations, including the completion of the Strategic Regional Rail Infrastructure Investment Study and CAMPO, Triangle West TPO, and NCDOT discussions regarding the funding of a feasibility study to determine necessary infrastructure improvements to increase the number of intercity passenger trains serving the Triangle on the S-Line and NCRRC corridors. He stated that the TPAC voted at their December 2025 meeting to recommend approval of a resolution dedicating the necessary matching funds for the NCDOT grant request to the National Railroad Partnership Program for funding of the next phase of the Raleigh-to-Richmond Program. He also noted that the Towns of Apex and Wendell dissented and the two Town of Cary representatives abstained on the vote. He stated that NCDOT has requested clarifying the language in the resolution included in the Agenda packet to refer to the grant application as the Raleigh to Richmond Program application and provided an overview of the next steps.

Jason Myers, NCDOT, with Julie White, NCDOT, also present, presented an overview of the National Railroad Partnership Program. He illustrated intercity passenger rail ridership increases since 2018 and provided an overview of their three congruent plans, including plans to connect the Southeast to Washington D.C. and the Northeast Corridor. He summarized several North Carolina Intercity Rail expansion opportunities and tie ins to the results of the Triangle Regional Rail Investment Study. He next provided overviews of the Rail Grant and NRPP 2024-2025 Strategies and the benefits to Wake County.

Responding to Het Patel's inquiry, Mr. Myers stated that the request is for funds to be committed starting in 2027. Mr. Howell clarified that, if the resolution is approved, Staff would work toward including the money in the FY 2027 Work Plan and partnering with NCDOT going forward. He added that NCDOT will work with the Tax District to work out the reimbursements.

Bret Martin noted that there is a lot of time between resolution adoption and award for the Work Plan to lay out the scope and conditions. As this will be half of Wake Transit's rail funding, then Wake Transit needs to get something out of it in terms of passenger service capacity. Responding to Mr. Martin, Mr. Howell added that Staff is also working with NCDOT to identify other match opportunities to reduce Wake Transit's commitment.

Tim Gardiner expressed his desire that the recommendation to the Executive Board memorialize what the TPAC discussed, as well as the intent to identify alternate funding sources for the match. Mr. Howell responded that the resolution does reflect those items and that Staff will make sure that the same language is reflected in the Work Plan's scope and the Project Funding Agreement.

Jenna Shouse expressed the Town of Apex's objections to the item, noting that the proposed contribution is half of the total budget, yet only 20% of the project is located in Wake County. She added that there are too many other projects needed and that more time is needed to refine and prioritize the results of the Joint Rail Investment Study. Apex's preference is to reserve Wake Transit funds for other projects.

Responding to Bynum Walter's questions, Mr. Myers stated that any potential State contributions would not be much at all and that getting SPOT 8 funding is not very likely.

Chris Lukasina noted that we will have an idea at the end of April 2026 regarding scores for SPOT projects that could potentially provide a state match.

Mr. Patel commented that there were no rail projects identified in the Wake Transit Plan and asked what the process would be for us to make sure that identification of such projects, and any trade-offs, are included. Mr. Howell responded that there is money in the Wake Transit Plan for rail because rail is still very important to the public. He stated that the Plan only outlined types of projects, not specific projects, and the hope was that the Joint Rail Investment Study could provide recommendations. He added that this request from NCDOT came in before those matters could be fully considered; however, the request is an opportunity for the Wake Transit Program.

Kevin McCarthy stated that the Town of Wendell echoes the Town of Apex's concerns.

Mr. Lukasina noted the two steps identified for Wake Transit with respect to regional rail being: 1) Will regional rail be included in the Plan, and 2) How will TPAC prioritize such projects. He commented that the answer to #1 was yes and that, in regard to #2, TPAC has not had the time to develop that process yet. He stated that this grant opportunity will not wait until TPAC can develop their process and added that we do not get such grant opportunities as this that often.

Tim Gardiner noted that the context is regional rail to be provided with NCDOT and Amtrak. He stated that the focus needs to be on how to deliver such service and meet those goals.

Mr. Lukasina noted Mr. Gardiner's point and provided two additional ones: 1) The need to strategically study the list of things to be done for passenger rail and apply the SPOT philosophy of not prioritizing projects if there is no one ready to move them forward, and 2) The need to ask, "What other rail projects are most likely to deliver additional passenger rail service in the next ten years?"

Mr. Martin stated that he respects the Town of Apex's concern regarding there being considerably more benefits to Franklin County than to Wake County and also noted that it's been ten years since voters approved an additional tax to fund commuter rail projects, yet nothing has been done. He stated that this is a good start and asked Mr. Myers to speak regarding the project's benefits to the network.

Mr. Myers stated that capacity was discussed at the TPAC meeting and noted that the additional capacity will allow for trains every 1.5 hours and for additional freight service. The long-term goal is eight trains per day all the way to Charlotte, but a network expansion is needed to accommodate that goal.

Mr. Martin commented that we do not want people to get hung up on the geography and boundaries.

Chair Stephenson stated that it is important to articulate to the Executive Board what we will get versus what we may lose.

Vice Chair Kenneth Ritchie noted that this gets money moving towards service. He asked everyone to think about how many people from Franklin County come into Wake County to work daily. This is a sound investment for Wake County.

Bynum Walter asked if this would displace money for any other imminent projects and noted that she did not see any other projects out there. She stated that building the network in Franklin County is good for Wake County. If service does not go outside Wake County, then it is useless. She added that she appreciated the Town of Apex's concerns.

Lucy Garcia commented that, when the railroad gets to Franklin County, rail projects will continue north of the County. She added that this is about moving forward and that, while the majority of the funds will be spent in Franklin County, this will still be a network improvement.

Paul Black noted that no one gets out of their car as soon as they get to the County Line. Such boundaries are arbitrary. It would be foolish to let this once in a lifetime opportunity pass by.

Akul Nishawala compared not expanding past the County Line to all the sidewalks that end at property lines and their uselessness.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

Conrad Olmedo motioned to recommend the Executive Board adopt the resolution of support and dedication of Wake Transit funds as local match towards the NCDOT Raleigh to Richmond (S-Line) National Railroad Partnership Program Grant. Paul Black seconded the motion. The motion carried 31-3, with Jenna Shouse, Julian Griffiee, and Kevin C. McCarthy dissenting.

5.4

2055 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

Chris Lukasina, MPO Executive Director

Requested Action: Receive as information

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[2055 MTP Summary](#)

[2055 MTP Schedule](#)

Mr. Lukasina provided an update on where we are in the process, the next steps for CAMPO, and the anticipated milestones toward a final adoption in February 2026. He noted that a full draft of the document is online as of today at:
<https://www.campo-nc.us/transportation-plan/in-development-2055-mtp>.

There were no questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

5.5 Unified Planning Work Program - FY 27
Shelby Powell, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Draft FY 27 UPWP](#)

Ms. Powell provided an overview of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2027, highlighting the FY 2026 continuing studies, the new studies proposed for FY 2027, the technical projects proposed, the other ongoing work for FY 2027, the per capita Member share, and the indirect costs estimate. She noted that the Member share of \$0.95 is lower than originally projected.

Bret Martin spoke regarding the 5303 funding increase for the Raleigh Urbanized Area and asked, if the City of Raleigh gets that money, can we be more transparent about how that is used for regional efforts. Ms. Powell responded in the affirmative and stated that the money is going towards the BRT regional program and that she will work with Het Patel to get further details. Chris Lukasina added that some of those funds are going towards a regional survey.

Mr. Martin added that the 5307 funds being used for TRM for FFY 2026 and FFY 2027 need to be reflected in the text of the UPWP. Ms. Powell responded that it is reflected in the Wake Transit portion; however, it may not be spelled out in the rest of the document, but that she will check.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

5.6 FFY 2027 LAPP Program

Alex Rickard, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[FFY27 LAPP Program](#)
[FFY27 LAPP Selection Panel Discussion](#)
[Atlantic Ave MUP Questions](#)
[LAPP FFY27 Recommended Projects Map](#)

Mr. Rickard provided an overview of the LAPP process and schedule and summarized the 19 projects submitted (12 roadway and seven bicycle/pedestrian). He noted that no transit projects were submitted and that a decision is needed regarding the \$2 million allocated for them in the Target Modal Investment Mix. He compared the Target versus Recommended Modal Investment Mixes. He provided detailed information on the project selection process and noted that the recommendations today are just that and added that both the TCC and Executive Board are free to select the projects and mix that they want. He spoke regarding the unofficial rule that all projects are expected to score at least 50% of the points awarded to the top-scoring project in each mode or the Selection Committee will determine if the project should be funded or if the funds from that mode should be reallocated to another mode to fund higher-scoring projects. He presented the roadway projects submitted and explained the Selection Committee's recommendation to fund the top four highest scoring projects. He noted that the last project scored below the 50% mark of the top scoring project. He next summarized the bicycle/pedestrian projects submitted, noting that the City of Raleigh's Atlantic Avenue Project was submitted as a design-build project, so it gets scored as a construction project, which gets a higher score. Although the Town of Wake Forest's Smith Creek Project scored second, there was not enough funding available for it and, so, the project that scored third, NCDOT's Vandora Springs Safety Project, is being recommended for funding. He compared the FFY2027 LAPP Recommended Investment Program of \$27,964,300 to the Board-adopted Target Modal Mix Recommendation of \$25,000,000, noting that the Committee's recommendation is \$2,964,300 above the Board's Target recommendation. He summarized the next steps and stated that all adopted projects will be included in the February 2026 TIP Amendment.

Emma Linn expressed her concerns regarding scoring using the 100% multiplier for design-build projects. She thought that was not being incorporated until FFY2028 and stated that Staff's interpretation is not transparent. She thought that cost-benefit was supposed to be considered, but it appears not to have been. Projects with larger matches should be prioritized, but this seems contradictory.

Mr. Rickard responded that past Selection Committee's discussed local governments' desire for phase certainty to fund local phases earlier and that LAPP is not set up to do that. There were concerns about not being able to obligate funding out over multiple years. They thought that design-build would be a compromise as it obligates all funding for all phases at once. The Committee felt that, because it allows for the obligation of construction funds, it justified scoring those projects as construction projects. As to the way projects with higher matches are scored, he clarified that total cost-benefit scores are based on the cost to the Program, which is calculated by totaling the benefits and dividing them by the costs to CAMPO, which explains why the Atlantic Avenue Project received a higher benefit score than the Smith Creek Project. He added that the benefit score does not only take the project match into consideration.

Paul Black stated that the Smith Creek Project ties the Town of Wake Forest into the rest of the network and asked if that piece was factored into the scoring. Mr. Rickard responded in the affirmative, but stated that both projects scored similarly in that category. He explained that the big difference in the scores was the connections given the urban environment.

Tim Gardiner noted that both projects scored well, but that there was just not enough funds for both.

Ms. Linn requested that the LAPP Selection Committee re-evaluate the definition of "connections" in order to consider network connections and there being greater connectivity when a longer network is involved. Mr. Rickard responded that there is a planning consistency with scoring, but he supposed that they can look at connection points at the statewide, regionwide, and local levels. Ms. Linn commented that there is more to consider. Chris Lukasina stated that this would be great for the Committee to look at in the Spring. He directed any further ideas for process improvement to Mr. Rickard.

Responding to Bradley Kimbrell, Mr. Rickard stated that the unused transit funds were reallocated to the Roadway Mode because there was a stronger pool of roadway projects than bicycle/pedestrian projects. The Committee also noted that both the Towns of Holly Springs's and Youngsville's projects had bicycle/pedestrian elements, and that was another reason for not reallocating transit funds to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Mode.

Bret Martin asked if, in Spring, we can consider ditching Wake County Transit eligibility and allow other counties to be eligible for funding if no transit projects are submitted, or establish a policy that excess transit funds be reallocated to bicycle/pedestrian projects first.

Mr. Gardiner asked if we have done anything on the design-build project side in the past. He would like to review roadway projects to make sure they are ready. Mr. Rickard responded that we have not yet.

Ms. Linn stated that the Town of Wake Forest has a project ready to be built and inquired if any projects could be identified that could be allocated less funding so that those projects can just get things started for now.

Mr. Rickard asked if what was being requested was a review of roadway projects' scope and schedule to make sure that they are what they are and that they can be obligated on time.

Mr. Gardiner responded that we could ask agencies, if they were to get less funding, what they could do. He is not in favor of delaying projects that are ready just because we ran out of funds. We need to find a way to look at allocating funds differently and devote less funding to those projects that are less ready.

Mr. Rickard noted that the right-of-way for the Youngsville Bypass Project has already been acquired. We can look at the Town of Holly Springs project's right-of-way obligation in February 2026 to see what might be done there.

Ms. Linn requested that the Committee also fully evaluate what a "major obstacle" is and that they consider including wetlands, environmental impacts, etc. in that definition.

There were no further questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

5.7 Amendment #2 to FY 2026-2035 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Alex Rickard, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Attachments: [FY 2026-2035 TIP Amendment #2](#)

Mr. Rickard provided an overview of Amendment #2, noting that it includes all NCDOT adjustments from November-December 2025 and the recommended list of FFY 2027 LAPP projects. He noted the possibility of additional funding requests coming forward and the next steps toward final approval in February 2026.

There were no questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

6. Informational Item: Budget

6.1 Operating Budget, FY2026

Brenda Landes, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Received as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[FY2026 Projected Operating Budget](#)

There were no questions and/or comments.

This item was received as information only.

6.2 Member's Shares, FY2026

Brenda Landes, MPO Staff

Requested Action: Received as information.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[FY2026 Member's Dues Projection](#)

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](#)

[CAMPO Project Updates - January 2026](#)

[NCDOT Div. 6 Project Report - January 2026](#)

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](#)

[Public Engagement Updates - January 2026](#)

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:

- MPO 101 training is on February 20, 2026. He encouraged everyone to attend and sign-up online.*
- He requested any new TCC/Executive Board Member updates so that Staff can ensure that their ethics requirements are met.*
- He offered to schedule one-on-one meetings with any new Members. The meetings can include TCC members too as it's important for continuity. He requested that anyone interested in meeting let him know.*
- Completion of the Employment Analyst Review is due by the end of January 2026. For those that have not started, he suggested starting with their largest employer and working their way down their list.*
- Please see Cara Russell on your way out to pick-up your Triangle Bikeway Project materials.*

NCDOT Transportation Planning Division:

No report provided.

NCDOT Division 4:

No report provided.

NCDOT Division 5:

No report provided.

NCDOT Division 6:

No report provided.

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 12:14 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings/Events

CAMPO Executive Board Meeting January 21, 2026
CAMPO Board Room 3:00 - 5:00 pm
1 Fenton Main St, Ste 201
Cary, NC 27511

CAMPO TCC Meeting February 5, 2026
CAMPO Board Room 10:00 am - Noon
1 Fenton Main St, Ste 201
Cary, NC 27511

CAMPO Executive Board Meeting February 18, 2026
CAMPO Board Room 3:00 - 5:00 pm
1 Fenton Main St, Ste 201
Cary, NC 27511