



Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)
Meeting Summary/Minutes
June 29, 2016 – 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Capital Area MPO Administrative Offices

Voting Members/Alternates Present:

Chris Lukasina, Co-Chair, CAMPO; Saundra Freeman, Co-Chair, GoTriangle; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Tim Maloney, Wake County; Jerry Jenson, Town of Cary; Tim Bailey, Town of Cary; Mark Matthews, Town of Fuquay-Varina; Kevin Lewis, Town of Rolesville; Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest; Cathy Reeve, North Carolina State University; Jason Brown, Town of Knightdale; Tansy Hayward, City of Raleigh; Eric Lamb, City of Raleigh; Matt Watterson, Town of Zebulon; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; Ben Howell, Town of Morrisville; Brad Bass, Town of Garner

18 voting members/alternates present

Other Attendees:

Eric Keravuori, Town of Wake Forest; Darcy Downs, GoTriangle; Alexander Vazquez, City of Raleigh; Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO; Mike Kennon, North Carolina State University; Bret Martin, CAMPO (TPAC Staff); Katherine Broom, Kimley-Horn

I. Wake County Transit Referendum Campaign: TPAC Involvement – (Information Item – Tim Maloney, Wake County – 10 minutes)

Saundra Freeman opened the meeting and invited attendees to introduce themselves around the room. She then turned the meeting over to Tim Maloney, Wake County, to brief the TPAC on its expected detachment from the transit referendum campaign. Mr. Maloney explained that the TPAC will play no role in the campaign for the referendum. If contacted by members of the public, Mr. Maloney explained that the TPAC should take the approach of providing education about the plan rather than advocacy for the referendum.

II. Lead Agencies for TPAC Tasks/Responsibilities – (Discussion Item – TPAC Co-Chairs – 25 minutes)

Saundra Freeman introduced the item and postponed the item until Chris Lukasina, who was to present the item, returned to the room. After Item III was discussed, Chris Lukasina returned to this item. Chris summarized the items identified in the transit governance ILA in need of lead agencies. Bret Martin then explained that the work plan items are recurring while the other items that are meant to support or inform the work plan are not. He also explained that the TPAC is not the terminal decision maker for work plan items, as the CAMPO Executive Board and GoTriangle Board of Trustees would be the terminal decision makers for those implementation components. He explained that the ILA does not specify that the other items must go to the boards, so the TPAC could be the terminal decision makers on those items unless it decides to forward them to the boards. The TPAC generally agreed to allow the Process Sub-Committee to develop a recommendation on lead agencies for TPAC roles and responsibilities.

III. Sub-Committee/Working Group Examples - (Discussion Item – TPAC Co-Chairs – 20 minutes)

Saundra Freeman introduced the item and turned the item over to Nicole Kreiser to begin the discussion. Nicole explained that she envisioned three natural groupings for sub-committees or working groups and their respective roles within the TPAC: a budget and finance sub-committee, a service planning and prioritization sub-committee, and a process sub-committee. Tim Maloney



asked where capital project planning or development would fit within the proposed sub-committees, and Nicole Kreiser explained that the substantive components of capital planning would fall under a service planning and prioritization sub-committee with the programming of their financial elements developed by a budget and finance sub-committee. The TPAC then discussed whether within the service planning and prioritization group there should be a separate sub-committee concerned with capital projects planning. Arguments were made that that service planning and capital planning should remain linked because of their interconnectedness in a financial programming setting.

Mark Matthews asked which sub-committee would be responsible for evaluating the trade-offs between projects with a concern that sub-committees should not be set up to work in different directions. It was further determined by the group that a planning and prioritization sub-committee could have two working groups within it to focus on service planning and capital projects, respectively. It was explained by Chris Lukasina that the sub-committees should go ahead and begin meeting as soon as possible and that the sub-committees can and should have participating members that are not TPAC members from various agencies that are more intimately involved in the technical components of the sub-committees' respective roles.

For the process sub-committee, there was general discussion on whether that group would cover public participation or public participation would be a separate group. Chip Russell discussed the need for a list of deadlines for TPAC responsibilities that is more detailed than just those dates explicitly identified in the transit governance ILA so the TPAC can better conceptualize and lay out its processes. The group then discussed how the sub-committee rosters would be developed and assigned the parties to the transit governance ILA as the initial sub-committee co-chairs for each sub-committee.

IV. **TPAC Bylaws (Attachment A)** – (Discussion Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO – 10 minutes)

- A. Article V – Officers
- B. Article VI - Meetings
- C. Article IV - Members
- D. Other Provisions (Articles II, III, VII, VIII, and IX)

Bret Martin presented a draft of the TPAC bylaws with a summary of feedback received from TPAC members by topic, including officers, meetings, membership, weighted voting, and other provisions. Members of the TPAC provided further input and held further discussion on the feedback received since the June 20th meeting.

The TPAC discussed additions of agencies to the TPAC voting membership. The TPAC directed staff to speak with NCDOT Division 5 staff to see at what level they may want to be involved in the TPAC. Shelby Powell then explained that the Research Triangle Park Foundation should be included as a voting member agency of the TPAC because of its identification as a community funding area in the Wake Transit Plan. Tim Gardiner, Wake County, moved to include the Research Triangle Park Foundation as a voting member agency of the TPAC, and the motion was seconded by Shelby Powell. During discussion, Tim Bailey, Town of Cary, stated that he was not ready to include additional voting members to the TPAC until the Town was able to evaluate the impact it would have on the entire voting structure. The motion passed with a vote of 16 in favor and Tim Bailey and Jerry Jensen voting in opposition to the motion.

The TPAC then directed staff to further refine the draft bylaws based on TPAC feedback and discussion during the meeting and bring back a draft for its next meeting.



V. **TPAC Weighted Voting** – (Discussion Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO – 25 minutes)

- A. Results from TPAC Membership Feedback – Attachment B
- B. Discussion and Next Steps

Bret Martin presented feedback received by TPAC members on the weighted voting examples presented at the June 20th TPAC meeting, which included various structures based on jurisdictional population and magnitude of fixed-route transit service provision. Discussion among TPAC members centered around a preference, or lack thereof, for additional weighted votes to be assigned based on an agency's existing commitment to transit service provision. After discussion among TPAC members regarding the pros and cons of each, the TPAC directed staff to return to its next meeting with an additional weighted voting structure and scenario based on jurisdictional population (1 vote per 50,000 population), with transit governance ILA parties having equal weight with Wake County based on its population, and an additional nominally assigned single weighted vote based on whether an agency currently reports fixed-route transit service to the National Transit Database after a motion made by the Town of Cary supporting this structure was tabled. The scenario would also include the Research Triangle Park Foundation as a voting member agency.

VI. **Procurement of On-Call Services for TPAC Responsibilities** – (Discussion Item – Erik Landfried, GoTriangle - 10 minutes)

- A. Feedback from TPAC Membership
- B. Next Steps

Erik Landfried provided an update on the development of the RFQ for on-call transit planning services and thanked the TPAC for its feedback. He updated the TPAC that the RFQ would be finalized by the joint procurement agencies and advertised to begin soliciting statements of qualifications for review and selection.

VII. **Other Business** – (Information Item – TPAC Co-Chairs - 10 minutes)

- A. New Business
- B. Next Steps

The TPAC decided that its next meeting will be held July 6th with inaugural sub-committee meetings to be held immediately afterward. The TPAC also discussed items to be put on the agenda for its July 6th meeting.

VIII. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:45 am.