



**Planning and Zoning Board  
Comprehensive Transportation Plan Work Session  
September 21, 2017 at 6:30 pm**

**WORK SESSION MINUTES**

**1. Call to Order**

*Chairman Peter Prichard* called the meeting to order at 6:36 pm.

**Attendance**

Board members present for the meeting were:

Chairman Peter Prichard  
Vice-Chairman Craig Groce  
Member Harlean Botha  
Member Vinnie Goel  
Member Rob Taylor, Alternate

Board members absent from the meeting were:

Member Lee Langston, Alternate

Staff members present for the meeting were:

Courtney Tanner, Planning Director  
Benjamin Howell, Long Range Planning Manager  
Michele Stegall, Current Planning Manager  
Marty Saunders, Secretary to the Board

**2. Adoption of the Agenda**

Motion: *Member Groce* made a motion to approve the September 21, 2017 agenda. *Member Botha* seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**3. Public Comment: Draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update**

No one came forward to speak. The public comment session was held open to the October 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**4. Work Session: Draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan**

*Benjamin Howell*, Long Range Planning Manager, informed the Planning and Zoning Board that the goal of the work session was to bring back a revised Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) for public comment at the October 12, 2017 meeting. Ideally, the outcome of the October meeting would be to send an updated CTP along a recommendation to Town Council.

Ms. Fluitt, consultant with Kimley-Horn, noted that the CTP is noted as draft in every section and that dates for the maps indicating when they were produced will be added. For chapter one, the outstanding comment was regarding the Guiding Principles statement that was related to Growth & Development, and the order of the words in the statement.

*Member Groce* questioned the order of the words of the opening statement. He did not believe the intent of the CTP is to drive land use development. He felt the Land Use Plan should take precedence over transportation. *Member Taylor* suggested "Make travel more efficient by complementing the transportation investments with land use decisions". *Member Groce* felt that this was integrating the two key factors. *Mr. Howell* suggested that replacing the word "with" for "and" might clarify the two issues. There was Board consensus on that change.

*Member Groce* also felt the phrasing of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of page one needed adjusting. *Member Botha* suggested "laymen's" as an alternative to "common" English.

*Member Botha* requested that a **Glossary** be added to the CTP.

*Chairman Prichard* noted that Airport Boulevard, which is shown as "Construct New Roadway" on the map on page 1-3 needs to be corrected. *Member Groce* added that Morrisville Parkway, between railroad overpass and NC54, is also shown on the map as "Construct New Roadway," which is incorrect.

Ms. Flutt also brought to the PZB's attention the addition of Appendix C. The better addresses Public Engagement.

There were also comments added to Chapter Two as a result of the Council meeting. More comparisons with Wake County were requested, on the population and employment side. *Mayor Stohman* requested clarity on who was maintaining what roadways within the Town. The number of Amtrak trains was corrected.

*Member Botha* had a question about the "vacant 21%" on the land use on page 2-3. How much of that land was airport overlay?

*Mr. Howell* further explained that *vacant* illustrated on 2-6 currently means there is no building on a piece of property at this time.

*Member Groce* asked if Wake Tech and the coming Parkside Elementary could be added to Figure 2-2.

*Mr. Howell* replied that Parkside Elementary could be added. K-12 would better identify the type of school. He was trying to determine the appropriate classification for Wake Tech. Perhaps Wake Tech could be under an icon for Public Community Colleges.

*Member Taylor* explained that schools such as Wake Tech will definitely impact traffic at different times each day.

*Member Groce* thought there was more recent data about major roadways on Table 2-5 than 2013. *Mr. Howell* said the 2015 data could be used and it would be fairly easy to update Tables 2-5 and Figure 2-16.

*Member Groce* had a question about Figure 2-21 regarding the length of the Davis Drive bicycle facility. Will it run all the way to Parkside Valley Drive? *Mr. Howell* stated that it does now, but will not be extended.

*Member Groce* asked that "Amtrak" be removed from page 2-24, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, line 3 to simply read "Twelve passenger trains".

*Member Groce* brought up the cost benefit ratio that NCDOT uses to determine their priority program for funding. This relates to the intersection of Crabtree Crossing having an impact on NC54.

Ms. Fluit clarified that this references Crabtree Crossing Parkway's impact on NC54. She brought up this being the perfect opportunity to take a more in-depth look at this within the framework of the Travel Demand Model, specifically using the Select Link Analysis. A model run was conducted with the extension, and one without extension, to look at the impact on peak period travel on the links of Town Hall Drive at Morrisville-Carpenter Road and section of Crabtree Crossing Parkway, south of Morrisville Parkway. The model outcome identified total additional trips during am and pm peak travel times in 2040. The model looks at speed, but not factoring in the presence of traffic control treatment in the section on Preston. A lower speed limit would affect the outcome.

*Member Taylor* suggested that the speed limit be lowered to lower the number of trips made in a neighborhood, such as Preston.

*Mr. Howell* added that in considering the smaller connectors, we had to be cautious about applying the model perspective. The benefit of these connectors is one more way to get around Morrisville, and stay off major roads. The model is a good way to look at traffic from a regional perspective, but not to draw the regional traffic.

*Mr. Howell* also brought up an issue identified by Council about emergency responses and the relationship with connectors. He will contact the Fire Department before the next PZB meeting. Fire and Police look at response time from the station to the location. This could mean there may be a need for a new fire station due to traffic.

*Director Tanner* explained that the advantage to having road, greenways, etc. in the Plan is that it allows the Town to seek funding. It is also required infrastructure improvement when property is development. If it is not on the Plan, outside funding is likely not available and private development is not required to construct.

*Mr. Howell* added that the majority of comments from the public, regarding Millicent were in favor of a greenway or a walking path. Two comments supported the road connection. The other connection that has had comments in opposition is Green Drive, at the end of Clements and Green.

*Chairman Prichard* wanted to use Crabtree Crossing Extension as an example. If the Board knew that the majority of the traffic that would use that extension would actually be going to Park West Village or someplace else. That kind of information about travel patterns would be important.

*Mr. Howell* explained that for these connectors Kimley-Horn was able to run some numbers about Crabtree Crossing Parkway. Ultimately, it would be a policy decision from the Council regarding whether some of these connectors stay in the Plan or not.

*Member Groce* brought to NC 54 to the forefront and suggested it be split into 2 action plans instead of one.

Ms. Fluit stated that Kimley-Horn has clarified Table 3-3 regarding the recommended thoroughfare improvements. This would address projects that were funded vs. not funded. The request was to identify the projects "to be" funded. The street design guide has also been cleaned up. Also, the rural designation has been removed from Table 3-2. Council has questions about prioritization scores; and therefore, removed the weighting in the Plan.

*Member Groce* just wanted to be sure that the public understands that all recommendations in the Plan are data driven.

The consultants grouped projects into near, mid, and long term. The document is still at a higher policy level. Language could be added regarding the prioritization process and how it relates to the underpinning of funding.

*Member Taylor* questioned the local vs. state prioritization process.

Another project brought up at the Council Workshop was the Morrisville-Carpenter/NC 54 grade separation. There was not a lot of discussion, just attention to the issue. The comment related to the background data as to how the prioritization was made. The Council did not weigh heavily as to whether or not it be included in the plan. Council wanted to focus our prioritization of the local level, the Town does want to mimic some of CAMPO and NCDOT prioritization. Then if a project scores well and then it could move up on the list for justify potential funding.

*Chairman Prichard* said leaving the grade separation out of the plan was the consensus. *Mr. Howell* said language could be added that talks about the prioritization process that does underpin the whole State funding. One problem with not having it in the plan is that NCDOT could come back with the project and the Town would lose some leverage.

It was then added that NCDOT contracts out a consultant to re-prioritize and re-do the data for every single project that the Town submits for STIP funding.

A policy statement could be made to address a specific grade separation, due to the other grade separations around this location.

*Director Tanner* suggested that there could be a consensus regarding intersection improvements being needed at the Aviation/Morrisville-Carpenter/NC 54. A suggestion could be to evaluate all options including at-grade options, lighting options or some other improvement.

There still needs to be more attention to the intersection improvements, and typical enhancements such as signal or turn lanes. A caveat would be added regarding further engineering studies being needed.

*Member Taylor* wanted to know if the priorities align with existing zoning and the Future Land Use Plan along the major transit routes.

*Member Goel* asked about the grade separations at McCrinmon Parkway and Airport Boulevard at NC 54. He wanted to know what the priority is for each project by NCDOT. *Mr. Howell* answered that the McCrinmon Parkway is funded and committed. Airport Boulevard is being submitted in the NCDOT prioritization process that is getting ready to start. Airport Boulevard and Aviation Parkway were both submitted by CAMPO. It comes back to the point of making a policy recommendation.

Ms. Fluit expanded on *Mr. Howell's* comments by adding the choices for Aviation/NC 54 intersection recommendations: at the current location to improve safety, intersection improvements at a re-aligned location, intersection improvements in general, or advocate for the grade separation.

*Member Goel* wanted to know what the frequency of train trips would be. If the numbers are planned to increase, that information should go in the Plan.

*Mr. Howell* clarified that there will only be commuter rail in Wake County, not light rail.

*Member Botha* said that the Town still needs more options regarding the grade separations.

*Mr. Howell* stated that the consultants need guidance on grade separations. Should the consultant prepare something that states that with the information currently available, suitable needs must be demonstrated or more suitable alternatives identified to the Board for a grade separation. There was consensus among the PZB member to prepare such language that addresses the current history and a recommendation to evaluate all options. Goals could be included in the form of recommendations.

*Chairman Prichard* said that the statement could go back to the two Guiding Statements regarding Culture & Environment and Safety & Security.

*Member Taylor* does feel that people in the community are concerned with transportation issues and talk has been generated.

*Chairman Prichard* wanted to know if there were any comments on the connection on Grace Point Road. It did not come up Tuesday night, but one council member had previously stated that if that 147 extension were to be built, he would want to see more connectivity in this area.

*Mr. Howell* also added that Marcom Drive was in the Plan since part of it is through the Wake Tech campus. It would be built between Wadkins Road and Paramount Parkway.

There was consensus among the PZB to remove the Green Drive and Clements connection. *Member Groce* had a different opinion since two cul-de-sacs would be removed. The consensus ruled. Pedestrian or bicycle connections could possibly be made between the two neighborhoods in conjunction with future development.

There was some clarification that there should be wide outside lanes along Morrisville-Carpenter. Also, there was a note that neighborhood connectors should include connections for pedestrians that could take the look of a greenway or sidewalk section. Changes were made to Table 4-2, on page 4-7, centered on the funding partners and making sure the potential funding was identified.

In the revised version of the CTP, everything was added from the Wake Transit Plan to the transit map in the Plan for more clarification. There was also a potential secondary TOD location added east of NC 54 to add future enhanced connectivity to Wake Tech.

A paragraph was added to Chapter 5 regarding electric vehicles and charging stations.

The table of Near Term projects was cleaned up to remove McCrimmon Parkway, which was a committed project.

*Member Groce* suggested that the word "Completion" be changed to "Implementation" in the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence of the Introduction to Chapter 5. He also pointed out the word "patchwork" under Funding Opportunities needs to be changed. In the same sentence, it is not clear what "the receipt of private contributions" means. *Mr. Howell* stated that "development contributions" could be substituted. *Member Groce* added that under Action Plan, the second sentence wording needs to be strengthened. The first sentence under Policy Measures needs changes to reflect the competitive nature of these decisions, rather than *tension*.

## **5. Adjournment**

Motion: *Member Groce* made a motion to adjourn the meeting. *Member Botha* seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Peter Prichard  
Peter Prichard,  
Planning and Zoning Board Chair  
Date 11/09/2017

Marty Saunders  
Marty Saunders,  
Secretary to the Board  
Date 11/09/17

The meeting adjourned at 9:42 p.m.