



**U.S. 1 COUNCIL OF PLANNING  
MEETING  
Thursday, August 17, 2023  
2:00 PM  
Virtual Meeting**

## Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 231 752 967 404

Passcode: hxxJaW

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

## Agenda

### Welcome/Introductions

Tim Gardiner, Chair, will give the welcome and introductions.

Attendees		
MEMBERS	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Tim Gardiner – Chair	Wake County	<a href="mailto:Tim.Gardiner@wakegov.com">Tim.Gardiner@wakegov.com</a>
Jennifer Currin	Town of Wake Forest	<a href="mailto:jcurrin@wakeforestnc.gov">jcurrin@wakeforestnc.gov</a>
Shelby Powell	CAMPO	<a href="mailto:shelby.powell@campo-nc.us">shelby.powell@campo-nc.us</a>
Kenneth Ritchie	City of Raleigh	<a href="mailto:Kenneth.Ritchie@raleighnc.gov">Kenneth.Ritchie@raleighnc.gov</a>
Jason Rogers	Franklin County	<a href="mailto:jrogers@franklincountync.us">jrogers@franklincountync.us</a>
Paul Black	GoTriangle	<a href="mailto:pblack@gotriangle.org">pblack@gotriangle.org</a>
Christopher George	Town of Franklinton	<a href="mailto:cgeorge@franklintonnc.us">cgeorge@franklintonnc.us</a>
Melanie Rausch	GoRaleigh	<a href="mailto:melanie.rausch@raleighnc.gov">melanie.rausch@raleighnc.gov</a>
Daniel Spruill	CAMPO	<a href="mailto:Daniel.spruill@campo-nc.us">Daniel.spruill@campo-nc.us</a>
GUESTS/INVITED AGENCIES		
Ron Lucas	NCDOT Rail	<a href="mailto:rglucas@ncdot.gov">rglucas@ncdot.gov</a>
Tim Richards	Town of Wake Forest	<a href="mailto:trichards@wakeforestnc.gov">trichards@wakeforestnc.gov</a>
Jason Orthner	NCDOT Rail	<a href="mailto:jorthner@ncdot.gov">jorthner@ncdot.gov</a>
Meredith Van Duyn	Guest	
Jason Myers	NCDOT Rail	<a href="mailto:jmyers1@ncdot.gov">jmyers1@ncdot.gov</a>
Bradley Kimbrell	City of Raleigh	<a href="mailto:Bradley.kimbrell@raleighnc.gov">Bradley.kimbrell@raleighnc.gov</a>
CAMPO COP Staff		
Gaby Lawlor	CAMPO	<a href="mailto:Gaby.lawlor@campo-nc.us">Gaby.lawlor@campo-nc.us</a>

Chair Tim Gardiner brought the meeting to order and welcome those in attendance.

### Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes – January 28, 2023, February 28, 2023, March 30, 2023, and May 1, 2023 Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4

**Action Request:** The Council will consider approving meeting minutes from the January 28, 2023, February 28, 2023, March 30, and May 1, 2023 meetings.

Tim Gardiner reviewed the action request and asked CAMPO staff on updates to this list. CAMPO staff stated they are working through the backlog of meeting minutes, at this point the January 28, 2023 and February 28, 2023 (attachments 1&2) are ready with March and May to hopefully be presented at the next US 1 Council of

Planning. Shelby Powell clarified that the meeting minutes for March and May be removed from this section and an adjustment to the agenda should be made to officiate the move. Tim agreed and asked for a motion and second.

## **Adjustment to the Agenda**

**Action:** To approve the meeting minutes that are ready (January 28, 2023 and February 28, 2023 | Attachments 1&2)

**Motioned: Shelby Powell** | **Seconded: Jennifer Currin** | **Passed**

## **Old Business**

- U-5307 Project Updates
  - Attachment 5 - Project Schedule

The Chair moves on to standing Old Business around the U-5307 Project along US 1. Tim comments that Segment A (U-5307A) is scheduled to commence ROW acquisition, utilities and construction October of 2025. Tim points out that Segments B, C, and D (U-5307B, U-5307C, U-5307D respectively) are listed with 'To Be Determined' for their schedules.

Gaby informed the Council that the next Concurrent Point for U-5307A is scheduled for mid-September and that segments B,C,D will have to recompete for funding in future rounds for the State Transportation Investment Program (STIP).

## **New Business**

- 14401 Capital Boulevard | Capital Lifecare Village (Jason Rogers, Franklin County)
  - Attachment 6 - Site Plan
  - Attachment 7 - Traffic Impact Analysis
    - **Action Request:** The Council will consider endorsement or recommendations as applicable

Jason Rogers presented the project as a full life development with apartments, senior living, hospice, and emergency services located off of US 1, just north of the Wake/Franklin County borders. He pointed out the accesses for the site are two right-in/right-outs onto Southbound US 1. The TIA requirements include lengthening of the existing left turn on Northbound US 1. Jason showed that the development will be construction a north-to-south cross connection that will stub to the adjacent properties, this will run parallel to US 1.

Tim Gardiner opened the floor to discussion, bringing up that the N-S road could serve as the frontage road, removing the need for the frontage road as currently shown on the US 1 plans. Shelby Powell mentions that in the past when developments would put a new driveway onto Capital Blvd we have had notes put into their plans that it is a temporary access that will eventually disappear when the road is converted into a freeway. Tim G. mentions that NCDOT has similar language on the driveway permitting process. Jason R. states that he will communicate that with the developer and engineers.

Bradley Kimbrell asks how much frontage the property have north of their front driveway, Daniel S. zooms the presentation into the north section of the development showing less than 50 feet of frontage north of their northern driveway (Flex Way). Bradley K. states that it is not a lot of frontage and he likes the concept of getting the infrastructure on the ground but worries about the turning movements coming off of Capital Blvd. Bradley K. states he things the developer would have to go beyond their frontage and what that would mean from a stem link standpoint. That when the frontage street comes in we wouldn't want the drive ways to also have access onto Capital Blvd. Tim G. clarifies that in these cases

once the frontage roads are constructed their access to US 1 would be terminated. Jason R. states that both driveways in the plan are not being added, they are existing but will be improved with development.

Bradley K. encourages additional consideration to how the turning maneuvers would operate and what would be an appropriate stem link, greater than a 100' minimum. Bradley continues to clarify he is referring to a protected internal stem access site design element.

Tim G. states that this project does seem to be in conformity with the currently used US 1 plan. He thinks that to limit redundant construction needs that there is a possibility to take advantage of the infrastructure included in this design and puts forward an idea to verify the north/south cross connection would be consistent with the accepted minimum standards of a collector street for this region. Tim G. notes that this is a recommendation and not a strongly worded statement because the plan is consistent with the US 1 plans that are currently used for the purpose of this group. Tim G. also gives guidance to the mapping group that there may be desire to see what this corridor would look like utilizing the site's north/south corridor as the US 1 frontage road.

Tim G sums the conversation and confirms the motion being requested to say the project is in conformity with the US 1 Study, a request for the town to consider/verify that the project includes notes that the driveway connection unto Capital Blvd will be temporary until such time as the freeway is put into place, and recommend the evaluation of the North/South cross connection road as a potential to serve as the US 1 Corridor frontage road.

Bradley K. asks for clarification if as part of the project the development would be required to grade out the frontage road with their development even if they aren't constructing the frontage road. Tim G. states that would probably be outside the bounds of what would be asked for the project, that type of requirement would be a NCDOT question along with their driveway permits. Shelby P. notes that no one from the NCDOT District Office is on the call, and that may be a question to report back to on at the next US 1 CoP meeting.

**Action:** *State the project is in conformity with the US 1 Study, request the town to consider/verify that the project includes notes that the driveway connection onto Capital Blvd will be temporary until such time as the freeway is put into place, and recommend the evaluation of the North/South cross connection road as a potential to serve as the US 1 Corridor frontage road.*

**Motioned: Tim Gardiner | Seconded: Shelby Powell | Passed**

Tim G. requests that separate from the motion that CAMPO team to map the North/South connection as the frontage road to show its viability.

- Expand US Council of Planning Scope to include S-Line coordination
  - Attachment 8 - S-line Corridor
    - **Action:** Discuss US Council of Planning Scope potential changes for incorporation of the S-Line

Shelby P. opens this item reviewing the background, that there has been interest from members of the Council to look at what it might entail to expand the scope of the US 1 Council of Planning to include helping the implementation of the S-Line Project. Shelby continues with additional background on the formation of the US 1 Council of planning in 2006 following the US 1 Corridor Study project to maintain the viability of the recommendations in the corridor study to make US 1 a freeway. The scope is fairly specific and includes all the jurisdictions along the corridor to review site plans to help ensure consistency with the US 1 plans to decrease hindrances and cost to the project as a whole. There has been some thought that a similar vein of thought is needed to help protect the corridor with the S-Line project. It is mentioned that a change to include the S-Line in

the scope would require revisions to the Council's Memorandum of Understanding and the Bylaws to incorporate new members like NCDOT Rail and potentially interested members north of the CAMPO border. Shelby P. asks Daniel S. to go over the mapping work completed by CAMPO to compare the project extents and potential needs.

Daniel S. begins with an overview map showing the full extent of the S-line project from Raleigh to the Virginia border. The map includes the existing rail corridor and the proposed realignments that the project would involve. Daniel S. moves to zoomed in maps to show the two corridors are in proximity and goes through each area of the corridor within the bounds of the US 1 Corridor Study. Shelby P. notes that there are a few places where the corridors are a bit farther apart spatially and this is something to consider when thinking about the administration of the Council of Planning. Shelby P. states that with the US 1 study we have more details like with estimated right-of-way lines and what projects will be needed, if we want to include the S-Line in similar consideration we would need to have more specificity in the project than we currently do from NDOT Rail Division.

Ron Lucas introduces himself as the Planning and Project Development Branch Manager with NCDOT Rail Division and gives additional context to the S-line project: that the project is under a federal discretionary grant advancing design to 30% and at this point they want to engage with stakeholders who can provide detailed input and liaison with the public and development communities. Shelby P. mentions a way to keep this on the record would be to have a standing agenda item for updates and discussion. She goes on to say if NCDOT Rail would like to have recommendations to the development community around the S-Line corridor similar to the way the US 1 Council provides for the US 1 corridor, the council would need further support from the Rail Divisions. She gives the example that the group would need some kind of specificity in S-Line project to perform this task.

Ron L. states that this partnership would be very valuable, the near future development information is needed to accomplish the long-term goals of the S-Line. Particularly as the project continues into advancing design. Shelby P. says that could be accomplished through the US 1 Council of Planning and explains that the Memorandum of Understanding for the council includes the signatures of everyone along this corridor so that whenever a site plan comes in within the study area, they have to bring it to the Council of Planning for their recommendations. She states that doing this along the rail corridor would probably provide great value, it would be up to the jurisdictions that are participating to commit to bringing those additional set of development plans forward to the council which would require expanding the scope for the US 1 Council of Planning. Shelby P. mentions that another option would be to create another Council of Planning just for the rail line rather than including it into the US 1 group.

Jason Myers introduces himself to give some background on both NCDOT Rail and US 1 Council of Planning having been part of both. Jason M. clarifies that the roll of the Council of Planning is advisory to the jurisdictions to help wade through issues with the developers, the recommendations themselves are not legally binding. He states that it is in the interest of NCDOT Rail to get those conversation to happen for the rail project to do protective purchases when necessary and to ease project development down the road. Jason M. asks if this would need a new MOU for the group and if so, the Rail division would be interested in helping to facilitate that. Shelby P. confirms that the MOU and bylaws would need to be changed because the tasks laid out for the council are very specific. She states that the recommendations are meant to provide positive peer pressure on jurisdictions instead of by force.

Tim G. states that essentially what we would need to do this work would be the railroad data including center line for the proposed railway to perform buffers on to generate the ROW corridor. This could then be used to determine when a project needs to be brought to the Council for discussion. Tim G. states this would provide the engagement and local liaison that NCDOT Rail Division is looking for. Jennifer Currin answers that Wake Forest is open to the idea and taking to their board for consideration, assuming there is some level of specificity in where this corridor will be and it won't significantly delay the development process. Jason M. asks if Jennifer C. is asking a question on the level of specificity that NCDOT Rail can provide. He mentions that the S-Line project is farther in project development than U-5307 and have more developed plans that could be used for this corridor. These mapping products were created as part of the approved environmental documents that show ROW impacts against parcel data. Jason M. notes that the maps may change slightly as the project undergoes further development, but the existing maps should be enough to help facilitate these conversations.

Bradley K. states that from the city's perspective they would love to see additional coordination and talking on how this would work. He mentions that Raleigh sees both as these as one infrastructure network instead of two. Chris George states that Franklinton may not have always followed the recommendations from the council in the past but believe that further coordination with everyone to plan out thing properly is a great plan.

Shelby P. asks if there were opinions on expanding the council to include jurisdictions to the north of CAMPO's boundaries, noting that it could impact how nimble the council is in responding to development. Jason M. responds that the Rail Division is mostly concerned about the areas closest to the major metro area for corridor preservation and doesn't see value in a broader group. He mentions that further coordination with CAMPO can start with Jason and Meredith Van Duyn. Shelby P. mentions that CAMPO and NCDOT Rail Division will coordinate and report progress at the next US 1 Council of Planning meeting.

## **Other Business**

Shelby P. states that Daniel Spruill will be taking over the administration of the US 1 Council of Planning from Gaby Lawlor. She states that Gaby L. will still be engaged with the group, particularly around the development of the U-5307 project.

Tim G. points out with new people coming on board it brings the question on how to get NCDOT Division 5 involvement back with the council. He states that there have been a lot of retirements with who we normally invite to these and their input in highly valuable. Tim G. mentions if there is anyone new to the council and would like more information to reach out to Daniel S. for a US 1 Council of Planning 101 type conversation.

## **Adjourn**

Chair Tim G. adjourns the meeting.