



U.S. 1 COUNCIL OF PLANNING MEETING
Tuesday, January 18, 2022
Webex Virtual Meeting

Attendees		
MEMBERS	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Tim Gardiner – Chair	Wake County	Tim.Gardiner@wakegov.com
Jennifer Currin	Town of Wake Forest	jcurrin@wakeforestnc.gov
Scott Wheeler	NCDOT Div 5 Dist 1	mwheeler@ncdot.gov
Shelby Powell	CAMPO	shelby.powell@campo-nc.us
Jason Myers	City of Raleigh	Jason.myers@raleighnc.gov
Scott Hammerbacher	Franklin County	shammerbacher@franklincountync.us
Erin Klinger	Town of Youngsville	eklinger@townofyoungsville.org
Jay Heikes	GoTriangle	jheikes@gotriangle.org
Greg Bethea	Franklinton	gbethea@franklintonnc.us
GUESTS/INVITED AGENCIES		
Jason Rogers	Franklin County	jrogers@franklincountync.us
Paul Kallam	City of Raleigh	Paul.kallam@raleighnc.gov
Brad Kimbrell	City of Raleigh	bradley.kimbrell@raleighnc.gov
David Keilson	NCDOT	dpkeilson@ncdot.gov
Pam Williams	NCDOT	prwilliams@ncdot.gov
Terry Farr	NCDOT	tefarr@ncdot.gov
Andrea Neri	GoTriangle	aneri@gotriangle.org
Bonnie Parker	CAMPO	Bonnie.parker@campo-nc.us
David Powlen	Guest	
Anna Walker	Guest	
John Eliuk	Guest	
Mark Van Sickle	Guest	
Dean Boik	Guest	
Jason Evans	Guest	
Jim Wray	Guest	
Timothy Lemoine	Guest	
CAMPO COP Staff		
Brandon Watson	CAMPO	Brandon.watson@campo-nc.us

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome/Introductions

Tim Gardiner, Chair, opened the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves.

Election of Officers 2022

According to the US 1 Council of Planning Bylaws, the Council will elect a Chair and Vice Chair to serve for the upcoming year at the first meeting of each calendar year. The Chair and Vice Chair must be representatives from one of the Regular Member agencies. Officers are eligible for consecutive terms, and no term limit shall be applied. Tim Gardiner turned the meeting over to Brandon Watson, who explained the election procedures and bylaws.

Action: Shelby Powell made a motion for the nominations of Tim Gardiner for Chair and Scott Hammerbacher for Vice Chair. Scott Wheeler seconded and the motion passed unanimously for both.

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes – May 12, 2021

Action: A motion was made by Shelby Powell, seconded by Scott Hammerbacher, to approve the meeting minutes from the May 12, 2021 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Old Business

- None

New Business

Franklin Charter School (Wake Prep Charter) in Franklin County

- Jason Rogers introduced this item, first introducing Dave Powlen and Anna Walker as guests to provide some additional details. This is a revised plan along US 1 just south of Sunset Drive. They are dedicating the required right of way to align with the US 1 Study. The proposal is for a charter school at the old century link building at 14111 Capital Blvd. NCDOT is currently reviewing the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and they are waiting for results of that. Dave Powlen with Little added that they are converting the old CenturyLink building into a K-12 charter school. They will be utilizing as much existing infrastructure as possible as well as the primary driveway that is currently a signalized intersection with Capital Blvd. Approval is expected on TIA sometime in January. There are no plans for improvements in the area to be dedicated for additional right of way but they are showing 20' for a 10' wide multi use path just outside of the right of way. Scott Hammerbacher said their group is handling permitting and site plan review for this plan. The multi-use path is coming from the recently adopted Franklin County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and was also included in the NEAS Update. Tim Gardiner reiterated how important the frontage road will be in this area as how the US 1 Study is currently proposed that would be the only access to this parcel once US 1 is converted to controlled access.

Action: The plan was discussed and acknowledged with no recommendations from the US 1 Council of Planning as it follows the intent of the US 1 Corridor Study.

Wrenn Site Plans in Youngsville

- Erin Klinger introduced this item as proposing 179 townhomes and 72 multi-family units along NC 96 east of US 1. The developer has sent in a sketch of proposed backage road on the side of this property to meet the intent of the road shown in the US 1 Study. They are also showing a shared use path along NC 96 as part of their revisions. They will be going through Planning Board for development approval most likely in February and then for Commissioner approval in March. Brandon Watson added that the question that came up with this item is the proposed backage road is being shown a little further to the west closer to behind the Food Lion than what was originally shown in the US 1 Study. The distance from the interchange with the backage road in the US 1 Study was about 700 ft. and the proposed backage road with this site plan is about 420 ft. from the future interchange. Jason Myers asked if this parcel has cross-access to the shopping center and Scott Wheeler responded that what they are proposing now would actually go along the property line. There should be able to have cross-access to the service road because the backage road would be along the property line. Tim Gardiner asked if they would be dedicating half of the right of way for the backage road along the property line. Scott Wheeler responded that the backage road would be all on this development's property. Jason Myers asked if it would make more sense to front houses along the backage road so there is only one 60' right of way, instead of two 60' right of way streets, and then the alleys to support rear loading garages. There was discussion about the potential to accommodate this type of adjustment to the site plan but was determined that was outside of the purview of the US 1 Council of Planning. Shelby Powell asked if the way the developer has proposed to accommodate the backage road on the western end of the property too close to the interchange or appropriate. The US 1 COP would want to make sure this did not preclude an interchange at Holden Road with this development. Scott Wheeler said it looks like the spacing would be ok but can go back to NCDOT Congestion and ask most likely this week. Jason Myers added another consideration is the road opposite of this connection and if it would be feasible to put in the continuation of the backage road. It looks like it could make the two roads offset. It looks like moving the backage road to the south may require moving to road to the north of NC 96 between the properties with existing buildings. Scott Wheeler added that not knowing design of the interchange with these improvements so far out, based on what we know the first property would most likely be affected by the interchange anyway. One of the businesses to the west is Caliber Collision and one is a equipment rental and storage. Erin Klinger added that if we had to we could move the plan going to their Planning Board a month out to gather this information from NCDOT and reevaluate any effects. Jason Myers also brought up an issue that there's a curve on the south end where it starts coming back towards the frontage. Shifting the backage road at NC 96 to the edge of the property line could make that curve harder to accomplish and potentially more impactful. There was further discussion about the curve on the south end near Weathers Street and Atlantic Packaging, and what exactly that curve would look like if the backage road at NC 96 is moved to the west. Erin Klinger asked if a GIS overlay of the linework in this area could be provided that would be helpful. Jason Myers asked if any decisions the Town of Youngsville or US 1 COP has made in regards to the southern curve could be looked to make sure the linework is correctly reflected. The curve on the south side should take into consideration existing buildings and the stream crossing. Scott Wheeler added that Taco Bell in this area showed that a curve radius suitable to NCDOT standards would work in that area and they would handle it similarly with this

development on the northern side. A preliminary plan showing minimum radiuses based on NCDOT design speed that work will need to be provided.

Action: Tabled. The US 1 COP did not have enough information to determine impacts to the study. The recommendation was for Scott Wheeler to discuss with NCDOT Congestion on reactions to interchange spacing and property impacts north of NC 96, turn that information back over to developer, and request developer to present back to the US 1 COP on how this proposed shifted backage road would work to NCDOT standards. Erin Klinger will discuss pushing back submittal to the Planning Board with developer a month. Youngsville will go back to take a look at the street network system, from the north and south sides, and how this site plan will fit into the system. CAMPO will pull any decisions that the US 1 COP made in regards to Atlantic Packaging area near the southern curve to see if any decisions were made about changing the roadway linework.

U-5307 – US 1 Capital Blvd North - Project Update and Discussion

- Tim Gardiner introduced this item as a discussion about the public engagement period recently completed for Project U-5307 by NCDOT showing the latest design plans and the US 1 Council of Planning's comments that were submitted. Wake Forest submitted an adopted resolution with specific comments from the Town Board signed on January 4, 2022. Paul Kallam also mentioned that the City of Raleigh has met internally and will be submitting comments in the next week or two. Brandon Watson added that there was a virtual public meeting held in December 2021, and the public comments have not been compiled and distributed yet. Terry Farr added that NCDOT is still working on compiling the comments and has not met yet to debrief on the meeting and comments received. He added that NCDOT is meeting next week and may be able to provide a high level summary by then. Jennifer Currin said that after submitting the Town's resolution, staff met virtually with NCDOT staff to go over some of the comments. The Town of Wake Forest is providing clarification as to how some of the comments do not meeting the purpose and need specifically, and if a comment is not addressed what the impact would be. A discussion was then held on the specific bullet points from the US 1 COP letter and any clarifications or additions that needs to be sent to NCDOT as a follow up to the letter.
 - Frontage/backage and local access roads from the US I Study within the U-5307 project area are vital to the corridor and should be included in the project. Connectivity along the frontage/backage, local, and crossover roads create multi-modal path networks and access in the area, and fulfills the local connectivity element of the defined purpose and need. The local governments along the corridor have worked with private developers for over 10 years to either build these connections or ensure adequate rights-of-way for the connections to be included in the eventual freeway project. In particular, the expenses of the Neuse River access road crossing, the Gresham Lake Road overpass and the disrupted portions of the Neuse River Trail should be part of this project.
- Jennifer Currin commented that what should be included is if these connections are not provided what impact it would have on the purpose and need. For example, would these connections help remove people off of US 1 or without it are we still providing regional connectivity. Regarding the service roads, Wake Forest would like to see the inclusion of the Purnell Road connection as well. Wake Forest will be providing justification language for including the Neuse River crossing as well as the Purnell Road connection and the US 1 COP can build off of those comments. Jason Myers added that Raleigh concurs with Wake Forest regarding the Neuse River crossing. There was also discussion regarding the cross-section over the Neuse River showing ten lanes and whether that frontage road connection across

may better serve the corridor than the additional 2 lanes since the rest of the corridor in the area is only an 8 lane cross-section.

- The language about the disrupted portions of the Neuse River Trail is concerning the Neuse River Trail continuity during and after construction. Jason Myers added that this is a concern for the City of Raleigh in regards to long term closures.
- Jason Myers also said that one of the biggest concerns for the City of Raleigh will be submitting comments regarding the Gresham Lake Road connection. The question will be which of the alternatives makes the most sense but there should be something in addition to Option 1. The City of Raleigh will keep the US 1 COP informed on the preferred alternative.
- Jennifer Currin stated that the Town's resolution did include 23 items with additional road and sidewalk connectivity issues. The Town also requested an additional 30 day comment period based on technical issues and the fact that the public engagement fell over the holidays. Tim Gardiner added that there could be an additional statement added that frontage/backage roads should be built to the adopted standard of the Town and City with both providing specific information on standards. Jennifer Currin also pointed out that the Town requested Ligon Mill Road to be included in the study area because it is serving as a service road currently and this was discussed with NCDOT at the last meeting.
- Jason Myers asked about the design speed and implications the design speed could have on other aspects of the project. The project cost was also brought up as concerning and if one of the ways to spend less regarding the design speed could be to have less width, shorter tapers, have sharper curvature, etc as long as the purpose and need are still met. Terry Farr confirmed the design speed is shown as 70 MPH and would be posted for 65 MPH.
 - There is a concern regarding 4 general purpose lanes in each direction from I-540 to NC 98 Bypass. The US 1 Study shows 3 general purpose lanes and 1 additional special purpose lane serving HOV or transit in each direction. There is a concern that the special purpose lanes originally submitted as part of this project and included as part of the US 1 Study are not included in the proposal.
- Jason Myers said part of the City's point of view is that the non-freeway facilities are meant to reduce traffic on US 1 and if making the investment in corridor it would be better to spread that off of US 1 itself. Frontage/backage roads are redundant to assist if there is a crash for example. Jennifer Currin agreed but said the inclusion of accommodations for transit is important and meets the regional mobility statement in the purpose and need. Terry Farr responded that the general purpose lanes shown are needed for congestion. Shelby Powell added clarification that when the project was originally submitted to SPOT the cross-section that was identified for US 1 was not a cross-section able to be selected for SPOT, specifically regarding the special use lanes. Auxiliary information was included with the submission about the special use lanes but the US 1 Corridor Study did not identify what the special use lanes would be. The intent was that they would be some purpose higher than general purpose such as BRT, HOV, or something similar. However, because it wasn't specified as to what the special use lanes would be and there was no funded BRT project, they could not be included in the designs. There was a discussion about the modeling and if those frontage/backage roads are included would all of the general purpose lanes be needed. It was clarified that if the side road connections are made, the modeling is still showing a need for the additional lanes. Shelby Powell added that if the modeling is showing the inclusion of the frontage/backage roads still shows a need for 8 lanes that it would seem including those frontage/backage roads is even more important for the project. Jason Myers asked what it would take to model an alternative that does include an HOV lane for example. Shelby Powell responded that it would probably be a complex modeling exercise that the modelers would need to discuss. Jason Myers pointed out that the more free flow and faster the traffic

is, the farther people will drive and the more people will drive on this corridor to get there. While the additional lanes may be needed from an engineering standpoint because of congestion and travel time, there's also the consideration that the project would facilitate growth in a more spread out way. Tim Gardiner wrapped up this bullet point that further conversation may be needed with NCDOT in regards to flexibility of what those lanes are used for.

- Shoulder width and pavement depth should be able to accommodate future bus on shoulder.
- Jennifer Currin asked specifically whether the 12' shoulder could accommodate BRT. Terry Farr responded that they would be 12' full depth shoulders and could. Jay Heikes added that 12' is enough to accommodate Bus on Shoulder which generally has a top speed of 35 MPH and a speed differential from traffic of no more than 15 MPH. If there was an HOV lane they would still look into considering having the Bus on Shoulder on the right side because it is difficult for buses to weave back and forth in congested conditions to the HOV lane. He also stated that GoTriangle will also be submitting comments, one of which will be that the road will be ready for Bus on Shoulder (including signage) at the time that each phase is completed. Terry Farr responded that the project is including the 12' shoulders, and if there is a structure along US 1 the structure would be widened an additional 4' to give a 16' offset. Also, any bridges crossing over US 1 are being lengthened 4' on either side to provide the offset as well.
 - The 2045 and 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plans show an 8 lane cross-section to Burlington Mills, and 6 lanes north of Burlington Mills. The extent and cross-sections of Sections B and C should be discussed and should match between the design plans, current STIP, and adopted MTP.
- Brandon Watson stated that the current proposed maps for the project show an 8 lane cross-section from I-540 to NC 98 Bypass while the 2045 and 2050 MTP showed the 8-lane cross-section ending at Burlington Mills with a 6-lane cross-section north of Burlington Mills. There will need to be additional conversation with NCDOT about matching the MTP with the final project design.
- There was also additional questions that came up regarding extents of Sections C and D. The 2020-2029 STIP states that Section C is from North of Burlington Mills to South of NC 98 Business and the U-5307 project website states that Section C is from Burlington Mills to north of the NC 98 Bypass. Terry Farr added that it is essentially saying the same the same thing, one just states north of the bypass and one south of NC 98 Business. The US 1 COP letter should say Sections C and D, not B and C. For clarification, the interchange of NC 98 Business is not included in Section C but would be in Section D according to both the STIP and the project maps.
 - Stadium Drive/Jenkins Road - A future interchange has been added at this location to the MTP through a local study area process. The final design should be able to accommodate a future interchange at this location.
- Wake Forest included language regarding this issue in the resolution and will be providing any additional details/justification.
 - Other more specific comments have been submitted from US 1 Council of Planning members and a meeting has been set up for January 18, 2022 to review and discuss comments received. Any high-level information regarding public comments received on this project would be appreciated at this meeting. Considering ongoing discussions with members, the US I Council of Planning would anticipate submitting additional clarifying comments after this meeting.

- No further comments on this point. The US 1 COP will be waiting to see what other comments are submitted from GoTriangle, Raleigh, and Wake Forest to see if anything additional besides what was discussed today should be added. Brandon Watson did ask Terry Farr about if collecting all of these comments from jurisdictions and the US 1 COP is going to affect the project schedule in anyway. Terry Farr responded that the public comment period closed January 7 and they are gathering all of them now to prepare responses. They also understand local governments along the area are still pulling together comments and will still be coming in. However, if they could be submitted in the next week or so that would be great. Tim Gardiner asked what the best way to frame some of the biggest questions would be. Terry Farr responded that strong justification would be helpful for any requested changes to the project. Most of these comments will affect the cost of the project so there will have to be further conversations on anything that is requested.

Action: No action was taken. Comments from today's meeting will be sent along to provide clarification and additional information regarding the letter submitted from the US 1 Council of Planning.

Other Business

- Round Robin
 - i. No updates.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Tim Gardiner thanked attendees and presenters, and adjourned the meeting.