



Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)
Regular Meeting
March 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

Benjamin Howell, Town of Morrisville; Bret Martin, Town of Cary; Het Patel, Town of Garner; David Walker, City of Raleigh; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Chris Lukasina, CAMPO; Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Tim Maloney, Wake County; Erik Landfried, GoTriangle; Sandra Freeman, GoTriangle; Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest; MacKenzie Day, Town of Zebulon; David Eatman, City of Raleigh; Mark Matthews, Town of Fuquay-Varina; Gretchen Coperine, RTP; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex

Other Alternates Present

Tim Bender, City of Raleigh; Tim Gardiner, Wake County

General Attendees

Will Allen, Member – CAMPO Executive Board & GoTriangle Board of Trustees; Nathan Spencer, Member – Raleigh Transit Authority; Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle; Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle; Terry Nolan, Wake County; Mark Huffer, HNTB; Robert Bush, IBI; Karen Rindge, WakeUp Wake County; Thomas Whitman, Nelson Nygaard

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

Mr. Russell welcomed all to the meeting.

II. Adjustments to the Agenda

None

III. Meeting Summary/Minutes from February 14, 2018 Regular Meeting – (Action Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 5 minutes) – **Attachment A**

Mr. Russell called for a motion to approve the Meeting Summary/Minutes from February 14, 2018 Regular Meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Bret Martin with suggested edits (add Jeff Mann and Christine Sondej to the Meeting Summary/Minutes).



*Second made by Mr. Benjamin Howell.
Motion passes unanimously.*

IV. 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. Nathan Spencer, Member of the Raleigh Transit Authority, signed up to speak. He touched on the outreach and public engagement efforts, and asked that the communications group and outreach/public engagement staff consider utilizing live streaming technology of formal public meetings in the future when and where appropriate.

V. Lead Agency Assignments – (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 15 minutes) – **Attachment B**

Mr. Howell introduced the Lead Agency Assignments as finalized by the Process Subcommittee.

*Motion to approve the Lead Agency Assignments and recommend to the Wake Transit Governing Boards made by Mr. Martin
Second made by Ms. Powell
Motion passes unanimously*

VI. Subcommittee Work Task Lists – (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 10 minutes) – **Attachment C**

Mr. Howell presented the Subcommittee Work Task Lists to the TPAC

Mr. Martin commented, regarding the Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee Work Task List, that the Western Boulevard Area Plan (as listed) was originally presented as a Land Use Plan. Mr. Martin suggested that it should be referenced as a Corridor Study with a Land Use Study component. He also suggested the subcommittee broaden the work task list item to evaluate and suggest for future projects exactly what plans and studies should be supported with Wake Transit funding and in line with Wake Transit Implementation.

Mr. David Eatman agreed with Mr. Martin, that the Western Boulevard Area Plan as originally presented should actually be a Corridor Study with a Land Use Plan component.

Mr. Will Allen asked how coordination on such plans/studies could or should be coordinated with local planning organizations and jurisdictions. The Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee will need to incorporate this question in their evaluation of what studies/plans are supportive of Wake Transit Implementation efforts.



Mr. Erik Landfried stated that the Planning & Prioritization subcommittee will focus on guideline development as to how Wake Transit projects should incorporate concurrence roles with appropriate jurisdictions and stakeholders, especially when corridor studies crossing jurisdictional boundaries take place.

Mr. Martin also asked, regarding Work Task List Item #3 on the Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee work task list –revisiting the cycle and schedule for updating the vision for the Wake Transit Plan. Mr. Martin asked if there should be a reevaluation of the Wake Transit Plan bus network before the horizon year (2027) of the original Wake Transit Plan because markets can change very rapidly in rapidly growing areas. Mr. Martin suggested that the technical evaluation used for the market analysis (data available in 2015, which acts as the basis of the current Wake Transit Plan), should also be reevaluated prior to the revisiting of the Wake Transit Vision Plan to ensure the right markets are being served by public transportation services. Mr. Martin asked that language be clarified in Planning & Prioritization’s work task list item (#3) so it captures his suggestion. The Chair and Subcommittee CoChairs recognized this clarification to be added.

Mr. Chris Lukasina stated that ‘big’ updates to the Wake Transit Plan were preliminarily discussed to be aligned with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) development timeframe (every 4 years). These ‘big’ updates that align with the MTP development, Mr. Lukasina stated, could be the more technical analysis reevaluation, and then the Planning & Prioritization subcommittee could discuss the vision plan being revisited every 12-15 years. He strongly encouraged the subcommittee to sync up the Wake Transit Plan reevaluation with the MTP development process.

Ms. Shelby Powell stated that we will be better informed with the finalization of the Bus Plan and the Major Investment Study (MIS – which includes Commuter Rail [CRT] and Bus Rapid Transit [BRT] components) so those involved with Wake Transit Implementation efforts can better understand how such a reevaluation of the Wake Transit Plan (both market analysis and vision plan) should occur.

Mr. Martin also asked for clarification on the Budget & Finance Work Task List – Item #4. Mr. Martin asked that the text state that the Budget & Finance Subcommittee is working on the “financial components” of the Multi-Year Operating Program and Capital Improvement Program in coordination with the Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee. Ms. Sandra Freeman confirmed that was an acceptable clarification for the subcommittee work task list item.

*Motion made by Mr. Martin with suggested edits
Second made by Mr. Mark Matthews
Motion passes unanimously*

VII. MIS: BRT Evaluation Framework (Discussion/Action Item – Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle – 20 minutes) - Attachment D

Mr. McDonough presented an overview of the MIS – CTT recommended BRT Evaluation Framework.



Ms. Powell asked, from a process perspective, how the CTT will be involved with the analysis of BRT evaluation. Mr. McDonough stated that the CTT will be evaluating outputs, but if there is anyone from the CTT interested in reviewing the inputs – that collaboration is welcome.

Mr. Lukasina stated that some of the project management team should meet with technical staff with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to understand what datasets are already available (from the 2045 MTP) and incorporate into the BRT evaluation framework/process.

Mr. McDonough suggested to have a 'Data Confirmation Workshop' setup quickly to confirm and ensure that all data inputs are incorporated with the MIS BRT components.

Mr. Mark Matthews asked about a statement made on page 2 of the document as presented - second to last sentence. He voiced his concern about the word as 'cumulative' across all metrics. He stated that it appears that would/could 'trap' us in a process with the number of entries for analysis with the proposed evaluation processes for BRT corridors. Mr. McDonough wants to ensure that the process will capture and evaluate all metrics as proposed in the framework. Ms. Shannon Cox agreed with the concern from Mr. Matthews, but also wanted to understand if weighting of metrics would be involved.

Mr. Martin also questioned if there is a missing piece in the BRT Evaluation Framework, which he defined to be a prioritization component as an extension of the BRT Evaluation Framework policy since the MIS scope suggests that a prioritization component would be a deliverable.

Mr. Lukasina stated that questions have come up regarding what BRT will look like at '[BRT line] opening day,' but the data for analysis is based on 2045 and the horizon year of BRT implementation (at least initially) is 2027. Mr. McDonough stated that 2045 should still be used during the current phase of the MIS. Then, in phase 2 of the MIS, BRT corridor studies can refine data and ridership expectations in different years of analysis. This would help to better demonstrate travel times and ridership. Mr. Lukasina stated that confusion may still arise and questions may come up regarding the difference between 2045 and 2027 data inputs. Mr. McDonough stated that he will check with consultants to ensure the right inputs are to be used in the second phase of the MIS.

Ms. Cox asked for clarification about prioritization of corridors – the text as presented does mention a prioritization process, but is not defined further in the BRT Evaluation Framework. Mr. Martin reiterated same concern as Ms. Cox.

Mr. McDonough turned to Mr. Adam Howell regarding scoping and process related needs with this deliverable and prioritization needs. Mr. Howell clarified that the scope does include a prioritization policy memo as a part of the task which includes a BRT Evaluation Framework.



Mr. Martin stated there may not necessarily be a need for a separate project prioritization policy, but there should be an additional step beyond the BRT Evaluation Framework to address prioritization and programming of BRT corridor projects. Ms. Powell agreed with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Thomas Whittman, via conference call, clarified the intent behind the BRT Evaluation Framework text/language – that it is an informative piece, not necessarily a deciding piece. He also touched on the 2027 vs 2045 ridership data inputs. He clarified the MIS is not a project development process. The 2045 ridership data is valuable for the current MIS phase, and then in future phases of the MIS, Wake Transit horizon year data will be used to best inform project development needs.

Mr. Landfried asked how the degradation of current/planned bus services in future years (i.e. decreasing travel speeds/increase travel time) of Wake Transit Implementation may be considered as the area grows over time. Mr. Whittman stated that assumptions will need to be made over time to consider such potential degradation of route performance. Mr. Lukasina stated to look at future travel times without infrastructure investments – regardless of what timeframe is being evaluated. Then, compare travel times once infrastructure investments are made and how travel times are modeled.

Mr. McDonough asked that the conversation related to travel time savings and data inputs to be a piece of the data confirmation workshop. He also asked, regarding the text on page 2 of the BRT Evaluation Framework, to remove ‘technical rating’ in the last sentence on page 2 and replace it with ‘evaluation framework,’ while also removing the second to last sentence of the last paragraph on page 2. Mr. Matthews asked that as a part of the data confirmation workshop that the group discuss how land use plans and visions from local jurisdictions (especially transit supportive land use definitions) are captured in the BRT Evaluation Framework.

Motion made to make the edits to the BRT Evaluation Framework as mentioned, as well as incorporate Mr. Matthews suggestion into the data confirmation workshop by Patrick McDonough.

Second made by Mr. Martin.

Motion passes unanimously.

VIII. Public Outreach for April – Bus Plan & MIS – (Information/Discussion Item – Jennifer Green, Patrick McDonough & Ashley Hooper, GoTriangle – 20 minutes) - Attachment E

Ms. Ashley Hooper presented a high level overview of the outreach processes planned for Spring public engagement centered around Wake Transit implementation.

Ms. Jenny Green presented information regarding Bus Plan components that will be included in the Spring 2018 public engagement efforts.

Mr. McDonough presented information regarding MIS components that will be included in the Spring 2018 public engagement efforts. Mr. Ben Howell reminded



those in the room that it is important to have boards of CRT information with public engagement in jurisdictions that are not directly impacted by the CRT project.

Ms. Powell suggested that engagement touches every single jurisdiction in the County. She also suggested that a 'train the trainer' event occur so that all those who want to assist and be a part of the engagement process can learn about the details involved with engagement and all can be on the same page with common language/scripts.

Ms. Karen Rindge asked that we address the MIS by the components it represents – BRT and CRT studies. She also asked that this spring engagement process implement an online survey as well.

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

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

Mr. Howell presented a brief summary of public comments, as well as indicated the FAQ will begin draft development by the Communications group.

- b. FY 2018 Work Plan Q4 Amendments Timeline

Mr. Howell reminded staff of the timeline for FY18 Q4 Amendments, from submission to potential approval by the Wake Transit Governing Boards

- c. Master Schedule Reminder - TeamUp – New Feature!

Mr. Howell informed TPAC members that the online master schedule, with TeamUp, allows for file uploads. When applicable and time permits, all associated files for review of staff and available to the public

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

- a. Budget and Finance

Next meeting to be held on 3/22/2018 – a special meeting setup to review financial impacts of the revised/new project requests for the draft Recommended FY2019 Wake Transit Work Plan.

- b. Planning and Prioritization

Next meeting to be held on 3/27/2018 – meeting will focus on revised/new project requests for the draft Recommended FY2019 Wake Transit Work Plan – and will be voting on approval of all individual projects.



- c. Process

Next meeting to be held 3/23/2018.

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

- a. New Business

None.

- b. TPAC Member Discussion

None.

- c. Next Steps

None

XII. 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 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/Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle*)
- f. Transit Customer Surveys – (*Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle*)

XIII. Adjourn