

1 **TRIANGLE WEST TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**
3 **April 7th, 2026**
4 **MINUTES OF MEETING**

5
6 The Triangle West Transportation Planning Organization Technical Committee met on
7 April 7th, 2026, at 1:30 p.m. in the Long Leaf Conference Room at the Central Pines
8 Regional Council, 4307 Emperor Blvd, Durham, NC. The following people were in
9 attendance:

10

Eric Vitale (TC Chair)	City of Durham
Becca Eversole (Member)	Town of Carrboro
Ellen Beckman (Member)	Durham County
Ben Berolzheimer (Member)	Town of Chapel Hill
Stephanie Trueblood (Member)	Town of Hillsborough
Curtis Scarpignato (Member)	Durham County
Erin Convery* (Member)	City of Durham
Aaron Cain (Member)	Durham City-County Planning
Lindsay Smart (Member)	City of Durham
Tasha Johnson (Member)	City of Durham
Sarah Williamson (Member)	Orange County
David Keilson (Member)	Division 5 – NCDOT
Chad Reimakoski* (Alternate)	Division 7 – NCDOT
Justin Richardson* (Alternate)	Division 8 – NCDOT
Julie Bogle* (Member)	Transportation Planning Division
Toya Smith* (Alternate)	NCDOT
Logan DiGiacomo* (Alternate)	GoTriangle
Thanh Schado* (Member)	Chatham County
Eliud De Jesus Santana*	Burlington-Graham MPO
Matthew Day* (Member)	Central Pines Regional Council

Jenna Kolling (Alternate)	Central Pines Regional Council
Doug Plachcinski, CFM	Triangle West TPO
Filmon Fishastion	Triangle West TPO
Samad Rangoonwala	Triangle West TPO
Thomas Porter*	Triangle West TPO
David Miller	Triangle West TPO
KC Chae*	Triangle West TPO

11 ***Denotes virtual attendance**

12 **Quorum Count: 11 of 21 voting members**

13

14 Chair Vitale called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The Voting Members and Alternate
 15 Voting Members of the Triangle West TPO Technical Committee were identified and
 16 are indicated above.

17

PRELIMINARIES:

1. Roll Call

18 Chair Vitale asked everyone to introduce themselves.

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

20 Chair Vitale asked if there were any adjustments to the agenda. There were none.

3. Public Comments

22 Chair Vitale asked if any members of the public were signed up to speak, in person or
 23 online. There were none.

REPORTS:

4. Report from TPO Staff

Doug Plachcinski, CFM, Triangle West TPO Executive Director

27 Executive Director Plachcinski stated that he had nothing to add to the written report.

5. Report from the Technical Committee Chair

Eric Vitale, Technical Committee Chair

30 Chair Vitale shared that he serves on the leadership team of North Carolina's
 31 Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle professionals, which hosts monthly in-person
 32 webinars in the area. He offered to circulate information about the upcoming April
 33 webinar, which includes a lunch, to members who are interested in attending.
 34

35 **6. North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Reports**

36 **Becca Gallas (David Keilson), Division 5 – NCDOT**

37 Division 5 reported that NCDOT has a new Deputy Division Engineer, Mark Craig, who
38 most recently served as the Division's Construction Engineer and brings more than 30
39 years of experience. Members can expect to see Mr. Craig in the future. No additional
40 items were provided beyond the written report.

41 **Wright Archer (Chad Reimakoski), Division 7 – NCDOT**

42 Division 7 reported no additional items beyond the project update included in the written
43 report.

44 **Reuben Blakely (Justin Richardson), Division 8 – NCDOT**

45 Justin Richardson reported no updates for Division 8 and offered to answer questions.

46 **Julie Bogle, Transportation Planning Division – NCDOT**

47 Julie Bogle reported that NCDOT, is updating its statewide multimodal freight plan.
48 Stakeholder engagement meetings were held in Durham, Charlotte, Asheville, and
49 Wilmington during March, and freight forums will be held across the state in April: April
50 22nd at the CAMPO office, April 23rd in Wilmington, April 28th in Charlotte, and April
51 29th in Asheville. A survey for truck drivers is active through April 17th.

52 **Bryan Lopez, Integrated Mobility Division – NCDOT**

53 No report. No representative was present.

54 **CONSENT AGENDA:**

55 **7. Approving March 10th, 2026 TC Minutes**

56 Samad Rangoonwala, Triangle West TPO Transportation Planner

57 **8. FY 2027 UPWP Amendment #2**

58 **Thomas Porter, Triangle West TPO Transportation Planner**

59 **9. TIP Accelerated Amendment #4**

60 **Filmon Fishastion, Triangle West TPO Transportation Planner**

61 Chair Vitale asked if there were any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the
62 consent agenda items. There were none.

63 TC Member Becca Eversole made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. The
64 motion was seconded by TC Member Aaron Cain. The motion passed unanimously.

65

66

67

ACTION ITEMS:

10. Memorandum of Understanding

Doug Plachcinski, CFM, Triangle West TPO Executive Director

70 Executive Director Plachcinski reviewed the updated Memorandum of Understanding
71 (MOU) and accompanying markup, focusing on the items that had changed since the
72 Technical Committee subcommittee discussion. The MOU is a federally required
73 document governing cooperation between the TPO, local partners, NCDOT, and
74 USDOT.

75 Transit Operator Subcommittee: Director Plachcinski explained that the subcommittee
76 recommended establishing the transit providers group as a subcommittee of the
77 Technical Committee, including the region's transit operators, and meeting on a
78 quarterly basis to start. Members discussed the appropriate charge for the
79 subcommittee — in particular, whether its scope should extend to Metropolitan
80 Transportation Plan (MTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) matters or
81 focus on transit operations and coordination. The consensus was to keep the charge
82 open-ended (“may include” rather than prescriptive responsibilities) so that the
83 subcommittee can shape its own agenda and working relationship with the Technical
84 Committee as it begins to meet.

85 TC Member Ellen Beckmann asked whether it could be added to the subcommittee
86 membership, noting that while the County does not directly operate a transit system, it
87 is financially responsible for a portion of trips coordinated through the City of Durham's
88 GoDurham ACCESS system, and expressed concern about being involved if the
89 subcommittee discusses funding. Members discussed the implications of adding
90 members with differing responsibilities and the potential for added complexity,
91 including representation and voting. The Committee agreed to keep the initial
92 membership to the existing transit service providers — GoDurham, GoTriangle, Chapel
93 Hill Transit, Orange County Public Transit, Chatham Connector, and Duke University—
94 while noting that Durham County is welcome to join and that the TPO would coordinate
95 with the County on funding considerations. Staff agreed to draft the membership
96 language so that additional members can be added later by the Technical Committee
97 membership without requiring a full MOU revision.

98 Technical Committee Representation: Director Plachcinski reviewed the membership
99 representation on the Technical Committee. At the Committee's direction, the City of
100 Durham representation was returned to four and Orange County was updated to two.

101 Weighted Voting on the Board: Director Plachcinski presented four options for
102 weighted voting on the MPO Board, as detailed in the memo. Option A would keep the
103 method as currently written (status quo). Option B would adopt a City of Durham-
104 dominant method that raises the relevant percentages. Option C would require a super-

105 majority that always includes the City of Durham plus at least one additional member.
106 Option D would establish a method under the square root law (the Penrose method) —
107 an established voting system used by bodies such as the European Union and United
108 Nations that flattens voting to be more equalized across members of differing size —
109 and included an accompanying table.

110 Members discussed the options at length. Concern was expressed that, under the
111 current method, the City of Durham and Durham County together can outvote the
112 other members; members noted that weighted voting is rarely invoked (approximately
113 twice in the last 25 years) but represents a significant decision, and that the issue was
114 identified in the governance study without prescribing an outcome.

115 TC Member Aaron Cain, speaking personally rather than for the City or County,
116 expressed discomfort with one member being able to overrule the others. Chair Vitale
117 indicated that the City of Durham would not support Option D, which it viewed as
118 diminishing the City’s share too much given its dues and Unified Planning Work Program
119 (UPWP) contributions.

120 Members discussed reducing the NC Board of Transportation’s share — currently 1/38,
121 or approximately 2.7% — to roughly 4%, which would remain above its current share but
122 below that of the elected, dues-paying members; representatives from Carrboro,
123 Hillsborough, and Chatham County expressed reservations about the Board of
124 Transportation holding a greater vote than the municipalities. Several members
125 observed that the question is more political than technical and is appropriately resolved
126 by the Board, and that the Technical Committee could recommend a method while
127 conveying the considerations raised in its discussion.

128 TC Member Sarah Williamson motioned to recommend the Penrose method without
129 specifying the weighted-voting numbers, with the recommendation to include an
130 explanation of the Committee’s discussion and primary considerations — including the
131 dollars contributed by members and the reduction of the State Board of
132 Transportation’s vote. The motion was seconded by TC Member Aaron Cain. Following
133 a hand count, the motion passed by a vote of 7 to 5.

134 A separate motion was then made to address the remainder of the MOU updates. TC
135 Member Sarah Williamson made a motion to approve the remaining updates to the
136 MOU, pending the technical corrections to be forwarded to staff by the end of the week
137 ahead of the Board meeting. The motion was seconded by TC Member Aaron Cain . The
138 motion passed unanimously

139 Staff noted that the new draft includes a provision to reconsider the MOU every four
140 years.

141 **11. Call for Projects Funding Recommendation**

142 **Filmon Fishastion, Triangle West TPO Transportation Planner**

143 Planner Fishastion presented the funding recommendation from the Regional Flexible
144 Funding (RFF) call for projects. He reviewed the schedule: applications were submitted
145 earlier this year, the recommendation would go to the Board in April for release for
146 public comment in June, and following Board approval the projects would be
147 incorporated into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), anticipated in
148 August. He noted that municipal agreements and project work cannot begin until the
149 projects are included in the STIP.

150 Planner Fishastion provided background on the RFF policy. Seven agencies submitted 19
151 projects requesting a total of approximately \$97.9 million in federal funds against
152 approximately \$35.3 million available, resulting in 14 recommended projects.

153 Members discussed the NCDOT project at Cheek Road and Junction Road. Director
154 Plachcinski explained that the project addresses an offset intersection with railroad
155 tracks running through it and a significant grade change, flagged during the City of
156 Durham’s development review, and that substantial private and leverage funding would
157 be lost if the project were not advanced. The request is for engineering and right-of-
158 way only, not construction, with right-of-way to be reserved for future sidewalks.
159 Members raised concern that the project has a very minor bicycle and pedestrian
160 component despite the call for projects being a key opportunity to secure local bicycle
161 and pedestrian funding, and that a state roadway projects would be limit bike-ped
162 projects. Director Plachcinski agreed to check on cost figures for adding bicycle and
163 pedestrian facilities and the possibility of designing them as a future phase. It was noted
164 that opinions on the project could be raised during the public comment period for the
165 Board’s consideration.

166 TC Member Bergen Watterson moved to release the Call for Projects funding
167 recommendation for public comment. The motion was seconded by TC Member Sarah
168 Williamson. The motion passed unanimously.

169 **12. Environmental Justice Report**

170 **Samad Rangoonwala, Triangle West TPO Transportation Planner**

171 Planner Rangoonwala presented the 2026 update to the Triangle West TPO
172 Environmental Justice (EJ) Report, which outlines the steps the TPO will take to ensure
173 Title VI compliance and includes an updated methodology for identifying EJ
174 communities. He noted that, upon Board adoption, the TPO will release the full data
175 package supporting the report — two spreadsheets, one at the Technical Committee
176 level and one at the block-group level — containing the performance measures, the
177 underlying American Community Survey (ACS) data, and the full scoring methodology,
178 intended to support demographic analysis.

179 Planner Rangoonwala explained that the methodology has not changed significantly
180 since prior presentations. Staff corrected the disability metric, which had included some
181 non-disabled populations, producing a small change to the Transportation
182 Disadvantage Index (TDI) at the margins.

183 Planner Rangoonwala reported that the high-TDI areas show consistently better
184 walking and transit access than the TPO overall, reflecting their more urban character.
185 Staff mapped the region’s Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) properties onto the
186 index. Tracking the relationship between LIHTC properties and shifting TDI areas over
187 time was identified as a potential indicator of displacement. Planner Rangoonwala also
188 mapped the High Injury Network from the safety plan onto the data, finding that
189 approximately 12% of high-injury network segment mileage and 35% of high-injury
190 intersections fall within high-TDI TAZs.

191 TC Member Becca Eversole made a motion to recommend that the Board adopt the
192 Environmental Justice Report. The motion was seconded by TC Member Sarah
193 Williamson. The motion passed unanimously.

194 **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

195 **13. Triangle Transportation Choices FY25 Annual Impact Report**

196 **Jenna Kolling, Central Pines Regional Council**

197 **David Miller, Triangle West TPO Transportation Planner**

198 Jenna Kolling presented the FY25 Annual Impact Report for the Triangle
199 Transportation Choices Program, the region’s Transportation Demand Management
200 (TDM) program. In FY25, the program awarded approximately \$2.1 million in total
201 funding (approximately \$600,000 from Triangle West), with the Capital Area MPO
202 (CAMPO) and NCDOT’s Integrated Mobility Division as the other funders, and 20
203 organizations received grants. The program supported approximately 479 events
204 across the region and directly engaged more than 24,000 people.

205 Jenna Kolling reported FY25 impacts including approximately 5 million vehicle trips
206 avoided, 3 million gallons of gasoline saved, 74 million commute miles reduced, and
207 approximately 25,500 alternative-transportation users supported. The program
208 continues to exceed its target and generated an estimated \$30 million in monetary and
209 societal benefits against approximately \$2.1 million in funding, for an approximately 14-
210 to-1 benefit-cost ratio. She also summarized a fall student travel survey with nearly
211 3,000 responses from NC State University, UNC-Chapel Hill, Wake Technical
212 Community College, and North Carolina Central University, in which 38% of students
213 reported trying or increasing their use of alternatives compared to the prior year, and
214 66% of that group reported that school TDM programs and services influenced their
215 choice.

216 The program’s budget for FY26 is approximately \$1.7 million (\$622,000 from Triangle
217 West), supporting seven traditional grantees and five community-based nonprofit
218 recipients in the region.

219 In response to a question about regional data tracking return-to-office trends, Jenna
220 Kolling noted that the program’s upcoming employee survey would provide comparison

221 data and referenced the biennial Triangle Travel Survey conducted by NC State's
222 Institute for Transportation Research and Education (ITRE), with 2024 results expected
223 to be published soon.

224 **14. Recent News Articles and Updates**

225 The Technical Committee received a set of recent news articles and updates provided in
226 the agenda packet.

227 **ADJOURNMENT:**

228 There being no further business the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting is
229 scheduled for June 2nd, 2026.