

ATTACHMENT A



Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)
Regular Meeting
December 12, 2017 – 9:30 AM – 11:45 AM
Capital Area MPO Administrative Offices

NOTICE: If you are not a TPAC Member/Alternate, please use seating along the walls behind the table. If you are seeking to speak on anything not a part of the agenda, you may do so during Item IV on the agenda and MUST sign in on the Public/Agency Speaks Out Sign-In Sheet outside the board room. If you are seeking to speak on anything on the current agenda, you must be recognized by the TPAC Chair, or an official TPAC Member/Alternate entity representative.

Voting TPAC Members and/or Alternates in attendance:

Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Saundra Freeman, GoTriangle; Bret Martin, Town of Cary; Mark Matthews, Town of Fuquay-Varina; Darcy Downs, GoTriangle; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Benjamin Howell, Town of Morrisville; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO; Het Patel, Town of Garner; Eric Lamb, City of Raleigh; David Eatman, City of Raleigh; Tim Gardiner, Wake County; Danny Johnson, Town of Rolesville; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest; David Bergmark, Town of Wendell; MacKenzie Day, Town of Zebulon.

Other TPAC Alternate Members in attendance:

Christine Sondej, Town of Cary; John Hodges, Town of Garner; Tim Maloney, Wake County; Erik Landfried, GoTriangle; Jeff Mann, GoTriangle;

General Attendees

Michelle Brooks, Town of Cary; Will Allen, GoTriangle Board of Trustees; Bill Martin, VHB; John Hodges-Copple, TJCOG; Anita Davis, Wake County TRACS

I. **Welcome and Introductions** – (*Chip Russell, TPAC Chair*)

Chair welcomed everyone to the December TPAC Meeting.

II. **Adjustments to the Agenda**

None

III. **Meeting Summary/Minutes from October 24, 2017 Regular Meeting** – (*Action Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 5 minutes*) – **Attachment A**

Bret Martin brought forth the point that the Town of Cary submitted some comments and mark ups to the October 24 DRAFT Minutes. Copies of the markup were provided to those who sought to view and understand the comments as submitted by the Town. Mr. Russell asked if anyone would like to view those copies. Mr. Russell confirmed with TPAC Administrator that the comments received from the Town of Cary would be amenable to the October 24th Minutes records. TPAC Administrator confirmed upon prior review that



comments received are all valid and would be incorporated into the current attachment before being approved.

Mr. Russell asked if there were any other comments from TPAC members on the current Attachment A as presented. No additional comments were raised. Mr. Russell called for a motion to approve the DRAFT Minutes from the October 24th TPAC Regular Meeting, with incorporated comments as received from the Town of Cary. The Town of Cary was supportive with that call as confirmed by Mr. Martin.

Mr. Martin made the motion to approve the DRAFT Minutes from the October 24th TPAC Regular Meeting, with incorporated comments as received from the Town of Cary. Second made by Ben Howell.

Mr. Russell called for a vote – item passes unanimously.

IV. General Public or Agency Speaks Out – (Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 5 minutes)

- a. *Limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. Speakers must sign in to speak before the start of the meeting.*

NONE

V. Plan Implementation Spotlight – (Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 5 minutes)

Mr. Howell presented a passenger highlight success story that has come from the new services implemented with plan implementation.

VI. Lead Agency Assignments – (Discussion/Action Item – Shelby Powell & Tim Gardiner, Co-Chairs of Process Subcommittee – 10 minutes) – **Attachment B**

Tim Gardiner presented the current Lead Agency Assignment changes as proposed by the Process Subcommittee.

Ms. Saundra Freeman asked where this information could be found in the attachments with the agenda. Mr. Howell indicated that this particular attachment was not ready in time for TPAC Agenda distribution. Hard copies were provided at the entrance to the board room prior to the meeting.

Mr. Gardiner highlighted the four items that were asked of the Process Subcommittee reviewed for further potential refinement and evaluated which agency/agencies should be leads. These four tasks reviewed were:

*Annual Operating Budget Ordinance
Annual Capital Budget Ordinance
Multi-Year Operating Program*



Update of the Wake Transit Financial Plan and Financial model assumptions

After review and discussion at an earlier Process Subcommittee meeting, it was determined that the lead agencies listed should not be changed. Those highlighted in blue should remain as originally defined in the lead agency assignment matrix.

Mr. Gardiner also mentioned three items that are presented as new tasks. Those tasks, with associated recommended lead agencies in parenthesis, are:

Oversee and Manage Community Funding Area Program (CAMPO)

Oversee and Implement Project-Level Concurrence Check Process (TBD – Wait for Projects)

Technical Assistance for Community Funding Areas (TBD – wait for final Community Funding Area Program Management Plan)

Ms. Kelly Blazey asked a question about the Technical Assistance for CFA's as submitted by CAMPO as a FY 2019 work plan request. Ms. Blazey sought clarification about the FY19 project request submitted by CAMPO and how the money would be funneled and managed – would CAMPO be the entity to manage?

Mr. Gardiner explained that role has not yet been defined, but the FY19 request is to serve as a placeholder to allow for money to be available for CFA's to utilize for technical planning assistance.

Mr. Martin stated to the Chair that the Town of Cary desires to review action items prior to the day of the meeting so as to be better informed on how to vote on such action. He stated that the Town prefer that this item be just for information during this meeting, and to be tabled for action until January.

Mr. Gardiner stated that the Process Subcommittee recognizes that these recommendations are not pressing.

Mr. Russell asked the Town of Cary if it would be willing to take on a few more roles and responsibilities as outlined in the Lead Agency Assignments matrix.

Mr. Martin responded that the Town of Cary would not be willing to take on a few of the assignments. Mr. Martin continued to state that the Town is not necessarily in agreement with the Process Subcommittee's recommendations as presented with the current Attachment B, and would like more time to discuss internally before taking action.



Ms. Freeman commented that anything GoTriangle as Tax District Administrator completes will be sent to Budget & Finance Subcommittee, but is not necessarily highlighted for process control and feedback loop/flow.

Ms. Shelby Powell noted that there are a few places in the Lead Agency Assignment matrix lines where subcommittee involvement structures are highlighted, but may not necessarily detail how Tax District responsibilities/information should flow between the Tax District, subcommittees and the TPAC.

Ms. Nicole Kreiser noted that the Work Plan product itself has multiple agencies that play a part in producing the document. There should be the notion of how to incorporate all supporting agencies along with the lead agency responsible for initiative development/production. This should incorporate feedback loops and structures to allow for institutionalization of roles and sub roles.

Mr. Russell asked for clarification from Process Subcommittee Co Chairs on the intent of this document – to specifically and solely highlight lead agency roles and assignments. Ms. Powell confirmed that intent.

Mr. Gardiner stated that the Process Subcommittee intentionally adopted the document as originally presented to TPAC, which incorporated additional notes to provide more definition and structure. Mr. Gardiner stated that Process Subcommittee is seeking more direction as to how Process Subcommittee should review and address based on comments received from TPAC members to the TPAC Administrator. Comments should be specific on how to refine the notes sections and provide more structure to Lead Agency Assignments/Responsibilities.

Mr. Mark Matthews stated that if the notes section may get lengthy, to note to reference to a separate document highlighting such desired structures.

Mr. Martin motioned to table this item until the January 17, 2018, TPAC meeting, and leave it open for TPAC members to submit comments to TPAC Administrator.

Mr. Erik Landfried raised a second to Mr. Martin's motion.

Mr. Russell called for a vote.

Ms. Cox made a point to have a deadline set for comment submission to the TPAC Administrator. January 2nd was brought forth as recommended deadline from TPAC members. The motion to table this item until January 17, 2018, TPAC meeting, and leaving it open for TPAC members to submit comments to the TPAC Administrator by January 2nd passes unanimously.



VII. Multi-Year Bus Services Implementation Plan: Project Prioritization Framework Policy – (Discussion Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 45 minutes) – Attachment C

Mr. Dan Berez of Nelson Nygaard presented the Project Prioritization Framework as the most updated draft through the CTT.

Upon conclusion of Mr. Berez's presentation, Mr. Martin noted that the Town of Cary did not mean to state transit provider equity, but meant more how to address geographic equity.

Mr. Martin also clarified that the Town would potentially like to see target allocations built in for service/project typologies for each 3 year period.

The Town of Cary may also like to see the opportunity to break county down the County into quadrants or geographic breakdown, and ensuring that those regions get equal levels of service distribution to meet the eventual 70%/30% ridership/coverage split through each of the defined 3 year increments.

Mr. Martin noted that the term 'Develop' and its emphasis should be reevaluated on its definition as a key objective and associated prioritization metrics.

Town of Cary is comfortable with either of the first two points mentioned brought forth into the next version of the document.

Mr. Matthews agrees with geographic equity concept for incorporation. For some of the typologies, should take into account aspects of demographics within different thresholds of distance from corridor. NN did recognize that different metrics are addressed when looking at different service typologies, but please double check!

Also – medical services and trip related needs should be evaluated and incorporated.

Mr. Landfried asked about concepts of Geographic Equity and presented some examples to determine how proposed geographic equity would actually function.

Mr. Danny Johnson does not agree that provider equity should be incorporated at all. TPAC members in attendance were in agreement this Mr. Johnson's notion.

Ms. Cox highlighted that what was presented in the document as Attachment C in the Governance Framework table was not matching the same table in the presentation. Ms. Cox noted to the consultant to make sure that either the document or the presentation was accurate in the first column that leads up to the final right column.



Mr. Eric Lamb stated that he and the City of Raleigh have a desire to remain aggressive in the rollout of services. Mr. Lamb stated that this should be consistent between the Bus Plan and the MIS. Mr. Lamb stated that he feels that some of the steps that are laid out in the presented document are too gradual

Mr. Russell stated that the baseline framework should exist, which it does in the current draft, and it can be tweaked as the group begins to test run initial projects that have already hit the road.

Mr. Martin stated that the frequent network routes should not get all the money in the first 6 years, and coverage-focused routes don't get any. Mr. Martin recognizes the need to test this framework to operationalize it and see how it could work.

Ms. Krieser stated that the 10-year plan was put out and made attention to the fact the vision was to originally put out service in FY20. But, TPAC chose to accelerate the implementation by doing service projects in FY's 18 and 19. Ms. Krieser did state that the document as presented does need to be hard-coded, referencing target allocation purposes and that shifts and flexibility should be incorporated.

Mr. Will Allen stated the importance of managing public expectations when going through this prioritization process. Mr. Allen asked for a rough guideline to help inform the public when to expect rollout of different types of services.

Ms. Powell stated that this prioritization policy is to outline when the services outline in the conceptual plan of the referendum will be rolled out.

Mr. Matthews stated that he liked the overall concept of what is presented in the current draft document. Mr. Matthews stated that he does not feel the need to quantify geographic equity, as much as it should be addressed in the governance framework. He suggested the differing ¼ mile catchment concept should be discussed at a future point in the process (outside of prioritization) – with an example of park and ride lots feeding express routes – people are not walking up to park and ride lots.

Mr. Landfried asked about capital projects in relation to project prioritization. He sought clarification on how services that are not funded with Wake funds are tied to capital improvements seeking Wake funds? He recognized that corridors that already have service could still receive service enhancements with Wake Transit Funds. He pointed out that almost every route down to the stop level will receive and be impacted by Wake funds. Is there a need for a new category to capture existing services/corridors for capital investment prioritization?

Mr. Johnson stated why the newest capital category was included in the presented draft. The consultant team will reevaluate and see if it is in fact necessary through the overall evaluation framework/proves as proposed.



Ms. Cox shared a concern with the projects being presented in work plans now, and reasonableness in the balancing of short term to be 50/50. Ms. Whitaker of Nelson Nygaard asked if that is funding split to be 50/50, or physical route setup to be 50/50. The test run will help determine this balance between route setup and funding splits.

Mr. Martin iterated that this policy is meant to be a guide, and other factors like project implementation timing is a programming issue. The policy guide can be tweaked if need be.

Ms. Day asked about Figure 8 as presented in the current Draft. She sought clarification to understand the example weighting/scores and wanted to know how capital facilities are not being presented as the 'bare minimum' for now. Ms. Day also posed how are capital projects looked at in terms of timing from programmed to completion? She also asked for better clarifications as to how weightings in Figure 8 came to be. Ms. Whitaker stated the consultant team will need to develop an improved example to help illustrate the concept of capital project prioritization in Figure 8.

Ms. Cox asked about the use of public input being used to inform this prioritization policy. She asked for a report from the public input in October/November 2017. Ms. Whitaker stated that Friday, 12/15 – a report should be released from the consultant team and available for distribution. A more detailed level of analysis is being done. Project management team for the bus plan will review and the report will go out before the holidays.

Mr. Howell stated that to get this moving forward, the following timeline will need to be followed:

TPAC/CTT members to provide any final comments on the draft as presented at the 12/12 TPAC meeting by Friday, 12/15 to the TPAC Administrator.

TPAC Administrator will deliver those comments to the consultant same day

CTT will get an updated draft document from consultant/PMT on 12/18

Adam & Jenny Green will facilitate electronic voting from Bus Plan CTT members through email on 12/21.

VIII. Multi-Year Bus Service Implementation Plan: Service Standards & Performance Measures – (Information Item – Jenny Green, GoTriangle – 20 minutes)



Ms. Jenny Green provided a brief introduction to the Service Standards & Performance Measures document.

Ms. Green also introduced Ms. Whitaker to present the current status of the Service Standards & Performance Measures.

Mr. Mann asked to rename service type classification 'frequency vs coverage' as opposed to productive as the way it is written it stated that coverage is not productive. Ms. Whitaker noted that was an oversight and change will be made.

Mr. Eatman asked if the measures as presented for information during this item are what is recommended to be incorporated. Ms. Whitaker stated that if there are specific comments/concerns on such measures, then to funnel those comments to the appropriate CTT representative.

Mr. Matthews asked if it is anticipated that over/under criteria will be considered to be different as treated with community funding area types of services.

IX. FY19 Work Plan – Draft Project Requests Overview – (Information/Discussion Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator; Erik Landfried & Kelly Blazey, Co-Chairs of Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee; Nicole Kreiser & Sandra Freeman, Co-Chairs of Budget Finance Subcommittee – 15 minutes)

Mr. Howell spoke initially about the FY19 Work Plan Development Process and its status as of the 12/12/2017 TPAC meeting.

Mr. Matthews asked about the relation between the FY19 work plan development and FY18 amendments. He asked if there is a process to conduct a parallel evaluation between the draft work plan and proposed amendments.

Ms. Kreiser noted that the amendment financials were incorporated/considered through modeling purposes for the FY 2019 work plan project vetting process, not scope/project content. Goal was to work to incorporate the amendments into the model to inform FY19.

X. FY18 First Quarter Report – (Information/Discussion Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator; Jennifer Keep, GoTriangle – 10 minutes) – Attachment D

Mr. Howell presented the first quarterly report from work plan initiatives as required by governance documents. He highlighted that the report development is iterative, and those involved with creating the report are seeking feedback for areas of improvement.

The quarterly reports will be made available online through the CAMPO TPAC website, and the TPAC Administrator will coordinate with webmaster over the WakeTransit.com site.



Ms. Blazey asked about the revenues received as reported. Ms. Kreiser stated that the sales tax dollars collected are on a lag, and future reports will show a more accurate depiction of tax dollars collected.

Ms. Blazey asked if the inclusion of agency expenditure to date on reports is going to be worked on for next set of reports.

Ms. Freeman responded that this concept needs to be reviewed and discussed within the Budget & Finance Subcommittee.

Ms. Blazey stated that there could be a YTD for agency expenditure, as well as an agency YTD reimbursements made from the Tax District to the responsible agency.

XI. TPAC Administrator Updates – (Information Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator, CAMPO - 10 minutes)

FY18 Amendments for quarter 2 were released for public comments on Monday, 12/11. Mr. Howell noted that the TPAC-recommended Work Plan Amendment Policy was brought to CAMPO's TCC on 12/7. The TCC took action to recommend the proposed policy to the CAMPO Executive Board, with the notion that the policy as written be used for FY18 purposes only, and the policy be revisited to incorporate changes realized through initial amendment outcomes in FY18. The TCC asked that the policy be revised and brought back to the TPAC and governing boards, if necessary, for use in FY19 and beyond.

Due dates for comments are as follows:

Minor Amendments – December 25th

Major Amendments – January 11th

a. TPAC Organization – Roster Update

Mr. Howell recognized Mr. Het Patel of Town of Garner as a new primary TPAC member. He also recognized Mr. Bret Martin of Town of Cary as a new alternate TPAC member.

b. TPAC Meetings Scheduled

Next schedule meeting – 1/17/18. Ms. Blazey asked if we would be discussing scheduling of meetings in 2018. Mr. Russell asked if a survey should be distributed to take preferences of desired meeting day and times. Mr. Howell said that he would revamp the survey and poll the current TPAC roster with a new survey. Ms. Blazey has also asked for a list of recurring TPAC-related meetings and how to coordinate meetings on the same day to allow for ease of involvement. Mr. Howell noted that he could highlight with distribution of the survey the current recurring meetings. Mr. Matthews suggested that TPAC scheduling should take priority, and the subsequent recurring meetings will have to coordinate after TPAC schedule is determined.



- c. Chair/Vice Chair Elections

Elections will be held on 1/17. Speak with TPAC Administrator/current chair/vice chair if interested

- d. Master Schedule Reminder - TeamUp
- e. FY19 Work Plan Development Schedule

XII. Sub-Committee Chair Reports – (*Information Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 10 minutes*)

- a. Budget and Finance – *FY19 Work Plan Development*
- b. Planning and Prioritization – *FY19 Work Plan Development*
- c. Process – *meeting on 12/15 – discussion of standardization of guidelines for subcommittee structures and processes.*

XIII. Other Business – (*Information Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair - 5 minutes*)

- a. New Business

Mr. Russell discussed through the development of a new Wake Transit website, he suggested that there should be the development of a tag line to help define what Wake Transit actually is in a short tag line. He initially challenged the Communications working group first to create, but allow them to open that development by soliciting suggestions from TPAC members.

- b. TPAC Member Discussion

Mr. Eatman introduced Mila Vega as Raleigh's newest Senior Planner with GoRaleigh.

- c. Next Steps

XIV. On-Call Transit Planning Services Task Status Updates – (*These items are presented in attachment form so as to provide TPAC Member Partners with updates on project progress.*)



*If there is any point with which you want to discuss, please bring to attention during 'Other Business – TPAC Member Discussion') – **Attachment E***

- a. Public Engagement Policy – (CAMPO Staff)
- b. Staffing Model and Expectations Plan – (CAMPO Staff)
- c. Community Funding Area Program Management Plan – (CAMPO Staff)
- d. Multi-Year Bus Service Implementation Plan – (Jenny Green, GoTriangle/CAMPO Staff)
- e. Transit Corridors Major Investment Study – (CAMPO Staff/Darcy Downs, GoTriangle)
- f. Transit Customer Surveys – (Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle)

XV. Adjourn