



Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)
Regular Meeting
February 14, 2018 – 9:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Capital Area MPO Administrative Offices

NOTICE: If you are not a TPAC Member/Alternate entity representative, 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.

Meeting Minutes/Summary

Voting Members/Alternates Present

Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO; Alex Rickard, CAMPO; Benjamin Howell, Town of Morrisville; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; John Tallmadge, GoTriangle; Mark Matthews, Town of Fuquay-Varina; Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Tim Gardiner, Wake County; Het Patel, Town of Garner; Jason Brown, Town of Knightdale; Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest; MacKenzie Day, Town of Zebulon; Saundra Freeman, GoTriangle; Danna Widmar, Town of Cary; David Eatman, City of Raleigh; Danny Johnson, Town of Rolesville; Tim Bender, City of Raleigh

Other Alternates Present

Bret Martin, Town of Cary; Darcy Downs, GoTriangle

General Attendees

Jennifer Green, GoTriangle; Nathan Spencer, Raleigh Transit Authority Board; Will Allen, GoTriangle Board of Trustees; Moven MacClean, WSP; Betty White, Kimley Horn & Associates; Mark Huffer, HNTB; Ashley Hooper, GoTriangle; Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle; Tyronne Williamson, City of Raleigh; Joe Milazzo, Regional Transportation Alliance

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

II. Adjustments to the Agenda

*Ms. Shannon Cox motioned that item IV be removed from the agenda until further notice.
Second made by Alex Rickard.
Motion passes unanimously*

III. Meeting Summary/Minutes from December 12, 2017 & January 22, 2018 Regular Meetings – (Action Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 5 minutes) – Attachment A & B

*Motion to approve both the Meeting Minutes from the December 12th 2017 and January 22nd 2018 regular TPAC meetings was made by Ms. Danna Widmar.
Second made by Mr. Benjamin Howell.
Motion passes unanimously*



IV. Update on State Funding Decisions for Regional Transit – (Information Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 5 minutes)

V. General Public or Agency Speaks Out – (TPAC Chair – 5 minutes)

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

Mr. Joe Milazzo presented to the Chair and all of TPAC a staff proposal for branding and communications concept for the mass transit projects as a part of Wake Transit Implementation.

This concept, GoRapid, will be distributed by the TPAC Administrator after the February 2018 TPAC Regular meeting, and will be up to the Chair as to when this will be brought back for TPAC review and discussion.

VI. FY 2018 Q2 Amendments – FTE Related Requests – (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 15 minutes) – **Attachment C**

Mr. Howell presented an overview of the Staffing Plan’s memo and analysis regarding the alignment between the FTE-related amendment requests and the Staffing Plan document.

Ms. Kreiser stated that Wake County is in support of all amendment requests after the release of the February TPAC meeting materials. The memo presented included some clarification sought by Wake County regarding the Data Analyst position FTE levels. Through further dialogue between Wake County and GoTriangle, Wake County iterated full support behind all FTE-related amendment requests as presented, despite the published memo.

Motion to approve FTE-related FY 2018 Work Plan Q2 Amendment Requests was made by Alex Rickard

Second was made by Kenneth Withrow

Motion passes unanimously

VII. Lead Agency Assignments – (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 40 minutes) – **Attachment D**

Mr. Howell presented an overview of the Lead Agency Assignment documents through the attachments – including the comments collected from agencies/stakeholders. He proposed a structured conversation, going line-by-line to reach consensus on proposed changes made by agencies/stakeholders. Mr. Howell clarified that the original intent behind the Lead Agency table/document was to strictly define the task (as identified through the Wake Transit Governance Interlocal Agreement or realized through evolving implementation processes) and one lead agency role assigned to oversee and manage that task.

Ms. Kreiser stated that Wake County wanted to help streamline processes with the addition of a new column labeled ‘Review Agencies/Parties.’ Intent behind that proposal was to help



define a more collaborative endorsement process before presenting information to the TPAC and Wake Transit Governing Boards.

Mr. Rickard stated that CAMPO is objecting to the second summary paragraph presented in the clean, TPAC Administrator Recommended Lead Agency Assignments Table. The governance ILA does not single out Wake County for additional roles through Wake Transit Implementation outside of TPAC participation.

Ms. Kreiser stated that Wake County did not specifically ask for that second summary paragraph as shown in the clean, TPAC Administrator Recommended Lead Agency Assignments Table. Mr. Howell stated it was his interpretation based on conversations with Wake County and review of the proposed comments in conjunction with the Wake Transit Governance ILA. The intent behind the summary sentence, Mr. Howell stated, was to allow for a dialogue amongst TPAC members on how to incorporate the proposed column by Wake County (its proposed 'Review Agencies/Parties' column) into the Lead Agency document.

Ms. Saundra Freeman asked what the purpose would be to have appointed TPAC-subcommittees if TPAC were to incorporate the Wake County proposed 'Review Agencies/Parties' column into the Lead Agency document structure. Mr. Howell stated the text refinement included in the clean version does clarify subcommittee involvement within the 'Notes' column of the Lead Agency document.

Mr. Eatman asked for clarification to the Wake County proposed 'Review Agencies/Parties' column as to if it were to be a formal appointment to subcommittees, or just a process-flow change to plan implementation components.

Ms. Kreiser stated that the Wake County proposed 'Review Agencies/Parties' column was to be incorporated through the TPAC-appointed subcommittee structures – not to have Wake County as an additional lead agency role on multiple tasks through plan implementation.

Ms. Widmar suggested to strike the first sentence of second summary paragraph on the first row of the clean version Lead Agency Assignments table. She then recommended keeping the remaining text beyond the first sentence of the second summary paragraph on the first row of the clean version Lead Agency Assignments table.

Mr. Tallmadge stated that he did not feel comfortable sending to governing boards editorial changes to notes sections of the Lead Agency Assignment table. He stated that the notes were not originally a part of the packet for approval through the Lead Agency adoption. Mr. Martin clarified that the Notes were presented to the CAMPO Executive Board as a Wake Transit Governing Board for approval.

Mr. Will Allen asked if legal counsel reviewed the current drafts of Lead Agency assignments as presented through this meeting. Mr. Howell stated that counsel was not sought out directly for review.

Mr. Eatman asked if there were any actual process changes, or are there just notes changes presented to the TPAC. Mr. Howell stated that information presented in the clean



Lead Agency Assignment table includes text refinement in the Notes column, as well as a change to a Lead Agency role, as well as some newly recognized tasks and associated Lead Agency assignments.

Mr. Rickard stated that the way the clean version Lead Agency Assignment as presented reads that Wake County may be seeking additional roles through plan implementation. Ms. Kreiser stated that was not the case and reiterated that the Wake County proposed 'Review Agencies/Parties' column was to be incorporated through the TPAC-appointed subcommittee structures – not to have Wake County as an additional lead agency role on multiple tasks through plan implementation.

Ms. Freeman stated that subcommittees exist for a reason and should serve as the bodies for review/partner entities rather than formally recognized TPAC members to be listed as additional review on work plan implementation components. Mr. Howell stated that the information being presented in the clean version Lead Agency Assignments document, incorporates mostly text refinement changes/updates to processes amongst and between subcommittees, and also includes concepts of the proposed 'Review Agencies/Parties' concepts in the Notes.

Ms. Kreiser helped to clarify further text refinements proposed by Wake County by referencing other plan implementation components outside of the work plan development components.

Mr. Russell stated that the Lead Agency Assignments are designed to inform the Governing Boards that the TPAC is to assign a task with a lead agency. Text and process refinement should be held internally for administrative processes. The goal should be to recommend the first two columns to the governing boards to keep it clean and clear.

Ms. Freeman asked that the process changes being proposed be taken back to the Process Subcommittee. Mr. Howell stated that this was originally in the hands of the Process Subcommittee, but then when presented to TPAC with preliminary updates, it was asked to remain at the TPAC level for review once agencies/stakeholders provided comments.

Mr. Howell clarified which lead agency assignments were changed as presented in the clean version Lead Agency Assignments.

Mr. Mann asked why there was a change made to lead agency on the Multi-Year Operating Program from both CAMPO and GoTriangle to just CAMPO. As that being a Town of Cary recommended change, Mr. Martin clarified that CAMPO, with its involvement in the Multi-Year Capital Improvement Program, should also work to maintain the scopes involved in the Multi-Year Operating Program. He stated that when two lead agencies are listed for one task, there can be confusion as to who the actual lead agency is for a specific task. Mr. Martin stated that if the proposed change is not acceptable, then a dialogue should occur as to how to define the appropriate levels of involvement from one or more agencies to be a lead in the Lead Agency Assignment Table.

Mr. Tallmadge motioned for a separation of information as presented into two documents. One to simply list a required/recognized task for plan implementation and its



associated/recommended lead agency (single point – no multiple leads), and then a separate document to clarify and define adequate involvement of additional TPAC-entity collaboration on process and work flow, allowing products from individual tasks to move from subcommittee, to the TPAC, and then to governing boards as deemed necessary.

Ms. Kreiser made a second to support the motion.

Mr. Matthews asked for clarification as to expectations between the two documents.

Ms. Freeman asked for better collaboration between subcommittees on further definitions/clarifications in the notes portion of the lead agency assignment document.

Mr. Gardiner asked the Chair about timeframe expectations from the TPAC for this to return for review and approval – regarding the internal administrative language to be revisited in the separate document, clarifying and defining adequate involvement of additional TPAC-entity collaboration on process and work flow, allowing products from individual tasks to move from subcommittee, to the TPAC, and then to governing boards as deemed necessary. Mr. Russell stated that the simple document of just tasks and lead agency roles can be presented at the next TPAC meeting for final review and recommendation; the separate document refining/defining processes around the individual tasks will be revisited by the Process Subcommittee and brought back to TPAC at a later date.

Mr. Russell recognized the original motion made by Mr. Tallmadge, and second of support by Ms. Kreiser. Motion passes unanimously.

VIII. Wake Bus Plan – Request for New Working Group as a Part of Bus Plan CTT for CHST-Related Tasks (Discussion/Action Item – Jennifer Green, GoTriangle – 10 minutes) - Attachment E

Ms. Green presented a request to the TPAC to stand up a sub-CTT to the Bus Plan CTT to allow for the Locally Coordinated Human Services Transportation (CHST) Plan task as a part of the Bus Plan to be given increased attention with appropriate staff and consultant support. This would be in parallel with the Bus Plan study.

Mr. Tallmadge asked how information would flow from this new group. Ms. Green stated that flow would be defined through the kick-off meeting and expectations between this new group and the Bus Plan CTT – and how that information gets presented to the TPAC.

Mr. Matthews & Ms. Kreiser both asked for adequate coordination between the CHST and the Bus Plan to ensure efficient mobility options are studied for the citizens of the County.

*Motion to approve this new working group (sub-CTT) to focus on the CHST component of the Bus Plan made by David Eatman
Second was made by Benjamin Howell
Motion passes unanimously.*



Ms. Green sought representation from Community Funding Area entities to serve on this new Bus Plan CTT for CHST-Related Tasks. Ms. MacKenzie Day of Zebulon and Mark Matthews of Fuquay-Varina will serve on this task.

IX. Wake Bus Plan – Service Measures & Performance Guidelines Update –
(Information/Discussion Item – Jennifer Green, GoTriangle – 15 minutes)

Ms. Green presented an update on the Service Measures & Performance Guidelines as a deliverable of the Bus Plan.

X. Major Investment Study – Progress Update – *(Information/Discussion Item – Darcy Downs, GoTriangle – 15 minutes)*

Ms. Downs presented an update on the progress of the Major Investment Study.

XI. Interim Work Task Lists for Subcommittees – *(Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 5 minutes)*

Mr. Howell presented interim work task lists for subcommittees during the timeframe of mid-February and mid-March. These are interim to allow for flexibility in how work tasks get presented based on conversations to occur between subcommittee co-chairs in the following week of this TPAC regular meeting.

Ms. Kreiser asked to have Budget & Finance interim task list to include FY 2019 Work Plan & Ordinance development/review.

*Motion to approve interim work task lists for subcommittees made by Danny Johnson.
Second of support made by David Eatman.
Motion passes unanimously.*

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

a. 2018 TPAC Meeting Schedule

Mr. Howell presented the finalized CY 2018 TPAC regular meeting schedule.

b. 2018 TPAC Subcommittee Meeting Schedules

Mr. Howell presented the finalized meeting schedule cycles for each TPAC subcommittee (Process, Planning & Prioritization, and Budget & Finance)

c. FY 2019 Draft Work Plan – Current Summary of Public Comments

Mr. Howell presented a summary of comments collected up the point of this TPAC regular meeting on the DRAFT FY 2019 Work Plan.



- d. TPAC Chair/Vice Chair & Subcommittee Co-Chairs Meeting on February 19th

Mr. Howell provided notice to TPAC member entities and stakeholders that the TPAC Chair has called for a special meeting between all Co-Chairs of TPAC subcommittees. Intent behind this special meeting is to conduct a special review of the proposed TPAC Standing Rule I – Subcommittee Structures & Guidelines – a product of the Process Subcommittee

- e. Master Schedule Reminder - TeamUp

Mr. Howell reminded TPAC entities and stakeholders to utilize the Teamup Calendar. Mr. Howell stated he is working on embedding the calendar into the CAMPO-TPAC website for ease of use and reference.

XIII. Sub-Committee Chair Reports – (Information Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 5 minutes)

- a. Budget and Finance

Next meeting – 2/15

- b. Planning and Prioritization

Next meeting – 2/27

- c. Process

Next meeting – 2/23

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

- a. New Business

None

- b. TPAC Member Discussion

None

- c. Next Steps

None



XV. 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 F**

- 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)*

XVI. Adjourn