



Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)
Regular Meeting
November 14, 2017 – 9:30 AM – 11:45 AM
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.

TPAC Members & Alternates in attendance:

Chip Russell, Chair, Town of Wake Forest; Christine Sondej, Town of Cary; Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Chris Lukasina, CAMPO; Benjamin Howell, Town of Morrisville; Leah Henderson, City of Raleigh; Erik Landfried, GoTriangle; John Tallmadge, GoTriangle; Darcy Downs, GoTriangle; Tim Gardiner, Wake County; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Sandra Freeman, GoTriangle; Eric Lamb, City of Raleigh; Danny Johnson, Town of Rolesville; Gretchen Coperine, RTP

General Attendees:

Bret Martin, Town of Cary; Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle; Jenny Green, GoTriangle; Will Allen, GoTriangle Board of Trustees; Bill Martin, VHB; Morven Maclean, WSP; Tim Bender, City of Raleigh; Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle; Ray Boylston, RLS Associates

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

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**

Motion to approve – Ben Howell, Town of Morrisville; Second – Nicole Kreiser, Wake County. Passes Unanimously. Minutes Approved.

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. Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator, presented a plan implementation spotlight as provided by GoCary and Ana Orlowsky.

VI. **Proposed Budget Amendment Process** – (Discussion/Action Item - Tim Gardiner, Co-Chair of Process Subcommittee – 25 minutes) – **Attachment B**

Mr. Tim Gardiner presented the Proposed Budget Amendment Process Document as prepared by the Process Subcommittee. A Revised Attachment B1 was provided in print for the meeting to take place of the original Attachment B1 that was provided with the announcement of the TPAC agenda.

Mr. Russell asked for a brief description and explanation of what a ‘cardinal change’ is as stated in the proposed policy.

Mr. Lukasina asked for clarification on what scope means where in policy it states ‘cardinal change in scope’. Concern that the proposed document is written from a budget standpoint, versus what an entity may actually be doing with respect to a specific project. Mr. Lukasina stated that the cardinal change concept from the FTA is written regarding contractual terms, not from a work program standpoint. Concern is to be flexible but ensure that what is programmed to happen happens.

Ms. Kreiser commented to help ensure Mr. Lukasina’s concerns are addressed in the policy, using the examples in the presentation for support.

Mr. Lukasina asked how the involvement of Planning & Prioritization is documented in the proposed policy document. Mr. Lukasina asked why concurrent processes between Budget & Finance (budget amendment review) & Planning & Prioritization (scope amendment review) happen.

Mr. Ben Howell commented to the TPAC the iterative conversation that occurred in the Process Subcommittee regarding this process and how it relates to calendars, timelines and schedules – so as to keep proposed policy document to be efficient and still meet all levels of approval needs when amendments are submitted.

Ms. Freeman sought clarification to understand TPAC Administrator’s role at the initial stages of budget amendment submittal reviews – that the TPAC Administrator will initially vet the amendment forms as submitted, review and pose questions for supporting documentation/information from requesters before getting to Budget & Finance Subcommittee.



Ms. Freeman also brought up concern of prioritization in the amendment process. How can or should amendments be prioritized? Mr. Lukasina responded by stating that this is how Planning & Prioritization can be involved.

Ms. Kreiser mentioned that previous versions included a joint committee review/meeting between Planning & Prioritization and Budget & Finance to review and potentially prioritize/approve/deny amendments.

Mr. Russell commented that amendments, based on the calendar cycle, that most amendments will potentially come forward in the winter to potentially be approved in the spring. In reality, the amendments will most likely be minor, and major will be few/far between.

Ms. Freeman asked for presentation to be distributed to TPAC members/stakeholders.

Ms. Blazey pointed out discrepancies between language iterations between attachment's B1 Revised and B2. Has asked for intent between budget ordinance appropriation and project level/plan appropriation ordinance and how it relates to amendments and financial/scope changes.

Ms. Kreiser stated that the ordinance allows transfers to occur within appropriations. Amendment thresholds only apply when there is a desire to move appropriations to a different appropriation.

Mr. Tallmadge – if it a project scope – then it matters – per the language discrepancy.

Ms. Henderson made statements that flexibility exists within 'buckets' of appropriations, unless there is a scope change.

Ms. Blazey has asked that thresholds include greater than or equal to – similar language for both major and minor should be included.

Ms. Blazey stated concern that the adoption of something so general will allow for wide variation on how agencies submit and/or define amendments as well as how fiscal appropriations are managed. There could be a transparency issue, which is also recognized by the Chair, Mr. Russell.

Ms. Blazey reiterated the need for financial status on the quarterly reports and make edits to the reporting template for future reporting, which Mr. Tallmadge also confirmed the need for. Mr. Lukasina agrees with the need.



After some deliberation, Ms. Blazey also stated concern that her issues are more with operating projects vs. capital. How are agreements on projects adhered to and/or incorporated into the amendment process?

Mr. Tallmadge stated he is appreciative of the work done by the Process Subcommittee on this policy draft thus far, and with the language changes related to amendment types on budget appropriations and project appropriations – he motions to approve document.

Ms. Powell seconds the motion made by Mr. Tallmadge.

Ms. Freeman added discussion that the Planning & Prioritization should be involved in some formalized way. Mr. Russell stated that the TPAC Administrator could determine the level of involvement from subcommittees to assist with amendment actions.

Ms. Blazey has asked for the statement 'disposition' that is supposed to be provided by Budget & Finance Subcommittee stated in Attachment B1 Revised.

Mr. Gardiner responded to clarify the purpose and need of the disposition. Ms. Kreiser continued to state that prepares information to TPAC choices trade-offs that are required to accommodate the work plan amendment.

Ms. Blazey asked for that statement to be included, and Mr. Tallmadge stated he was amenable to adding this to his motion.

Ms. Powell stated that it was not the intent of the 'disposition' for the Budget & Finance and/or Planning & Prioritization to state a 'thumbs up/thumbs down' to individual amendments, but more of a memo or brief explaining how amendments will be accommodated within the current budget and plan structures.

Mr. Lukasina stated his recognition that this will be an iterative and learning process. Ms. Kreiser supported this notion.

Mr. Johnson from Rolesville called for a vote.

Voting took place – all but one entity voted in support of the motion.

Dissenting vote was cast by the Town of Cary TPAC members.

Mr. Tim Gardiner presented a Proposed Budget Amendment Process Document based on discussions in the the Process Subcommittee. A Revised Attachment B1 was provided in print for the meeting to take place of the original Attachment B1 that was provided with the announcement of the TPAC agenda.



Mr. Russell asked for a brief description and explanation of what a 'cardinal change' is as stated in the proposed policy.

Mr. Lukasina asked for clarification on what scope means where in the presented proposed policy it states 'cardinal change in scope'. Mr. Lukasina shared concern that the proposed document is written from a budget standpoint, versus what an entity may actually be doing with respect to a specific project. Mr. Lukasina stated that the cardinal change concept from the FTA is written regarding contractual terms, not from a work program standpoint. Mr. Lukasina stated that the policy should be flexible but ensure that what is programmed to happen will happen.

Ms. Kreiser commented to help ensure Mr. Lukasina's concerns are addressed in the policy, using the examples in the presentation for support.

Mr. Lukasina asked how the involvement of Planning & Prioritization is documented in the presented policy document. Mr. Lukasina asked why concurrent processes between the Budget & Finance Subcommittee (budget amendment review) & Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee (scope amendment review) happen.

Mr. Ben Howell commented to the TPAC the iterative conversation that occurred in the Process Subcommittee regarding this process and how it relates to calendars, timelines and schedules – so as to keep the proposed policy document efficient and still meet all levels of approval needs when amendments are submitted.

Ms. Freeman sought clarification to understand the TPAC Administrator's role at the initial stages of budget amendment submittal reviews – that the TPAC Administrator will initially vet the amendment forms as submitted and review and pose questions for supporting documentation/information from requesters before getting to Budget & Finance Subcommittee.

Ms. Freeman also brought up concern of prioritization in the amendment process. How can or should amendments be prioritized? Mr. Lukasina responded by stating that this is how the Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee can be involved.

Ms. Kreiser mentioned that previous versions included a joint committee review meeting between the Planning & Prioritization and Budget & Finance Subcommittees to review and potentially recommend prioritization/approval/denial of amendments.

Mr. Russell commented that, based on the calendar cycle, most amendments will potentially come forward in the winter to be considered for approval in the spring. In reality, the amendments will most likely be classified as minor, and major amendments will be few/far between.

Ms. Freeman asked for the presentation to be distributed to TPAC members/stakeholders.

Ms. Blazey pointed out discrepancies between language iterations associated with attachment's B1 Revised and B2. She asked for clarification on the difference between



budget ordinance appropriation and project appropriation and how it relates to amendments and financial/scope changes.

Ms. Kreiser stated that the ordinance allows transfers to occur within budget ordinance appropriations, not project appropriations. Amendment thresholds only apply when there is a desire to move appropriations to a different appropriation.

Mr. Tallmadge stated that if it is a project scope change – then it matters – per the language discrepancy.

Ms. Henderson made statements that flexibility exists within ‘buckets’ of appropriations, unless there is a scope change.

Ms. Blazey has asked that thresholds include greater than or equal to language – similar language for both major and minor should be included.

Ms. Blazey stated concern that the adoption of something so general will allow for wide variation on how agencies submit and/or define amendments as well as how fiscal appropriations are managed. There could be a transparency issue, which is also recognized by the Chair, Mr. Russell.

Ms. Blazey reiterated the need for financial status on the quarterly reports and making edits to the reporting template for future reporting, which Mr. Tallmadge also confirmed the need for. Mr. Lukasina agrees with the need.

After some deliberation, Ms. Blazey also stated concern that her issues are more with operating projects vs. capital. How are agreements on projects adhered to and/or incorporated into the amendment process?

Mr. Tallmadge stated he is appreciative of the work done by the Process Subcommittee on this policy draft thus far, and with the language changes related to amendment types being based on budget appropriations versus project appropriations – he motions to approve document.

Ms. Powell seconds the motion made by Mr. Tallmadge.

Ms. Freeman added discussion that the Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee should be involved in some formalized way. Mr. Russell stated that the TPAC Administrator could determine the level of involvement from subcommittees to assist with amendment actions.

Ms. Blazey asked for language to be added clarifying the meaning of ‘disposition’ to be provided by the Budget & Finance Subcommittee stated in Attachment B1 Revised.

Mr. Gardiner responded to clarify the purpose and need of the disposition. Ms. Kreiser continued to state that it is meant to prepare information to TPAC on choices and trade-offs that are required to accommodate proposed work plan amendments.



Ms. Blazey asked for that statement to be included, and Mr. Tallmadge stated he was amenable to adding this to his motion.

Ms. Powell stated that it was not the intent of the 'disposition' for the Budget & Finance and/or Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee to state a 'thumbs up/thumbs down' to individual amendments, but more of a memo or brief explaining how amendments will be accommodated within the current budget and plan structures.

Mr. Lukasina stated his recognition that this will be an iterative learning process. Ms. Kreiser supported this notion.

Mr. Johnson from Rolesville requested the Chair call for a vote.

Voting took place – all but one entity voted in support of the motion. The voting record is 20-2

Dissenting vote was cast by the Town of Cary TPAC members (The Town of Cary has 2 voting members as a part of the TPAC).

VII. Multi-Year Bus Services Implementation Plan: Project Prioritization – (Information Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 15 minutes)

Mr. Howell called upon Bret Martin as former project manager over this task during his tenure with CAMPO. Mr. Martin came forward to present the concepts of the Project Prioritization Framework policy currently under development with the CTT of the MYBSIP and the consultant.

Mr. Lukasina asked if examples and concepts being presented by Mr. Martin are final or illustrative and in progress/discussion with the CTT. Mr. Martin indicated that these are solely ideas being discussed.

Mr. Tallmadge asked that CTT be mindful of how to include capital bus stop construction projects on distinct services – there may not necessarily be a new level of service prioritized, but may still be a need for bus stop infrastructure.

Mr. Russell asked for presentation to be provided online. All comments and questions to be provided to Adam Howell as project manager over this task as a part of the MYBSIP.

VIII. Preliminary Findings – Public Engagement – (Information Item – Jenny Green, GoTriangle – 20 minutes)

Mr. Erickson of GoTriangle stepped up to present initially on current status of public outreach efforts and planning of such efforts.



Ms. Hooper stepped up to present methodology and efforts included with the first phase of outreach to help get first set of findings based on outreach and survey implementation.

Ms. Green and Ms. Downs presented preliminary findings from the public outreach phase 1 efforts/survey. It was iterated that the findings presented are preliminary, as the Cary open houses had yet to be hosted in Cary, as well as the survey is to remain open through November 30, 2017.

Ms. Kreiser asked for further analysis of data to look at data separated from those that use transit vs those that do not and see how priorities may differ.

IX. Multi-Year Bus Services Implementation Plan: 10-Year Service and Capital Plan – (Information Item – Jenny Green, GoTriangle – 15 minutes)

Ms. Green called upon Ms. Bethany Whitaker of Nelson Nygaard to present this item.

Ms. Whitaker presented general concepts to help illustrate how the consultant and CTT will communicate progress of the MYBSIP with the TPAC.

Mr. Tallmadge asked if the consultant/CTT is working to avoid some conflicts that planning for the FY19 work plan development will not contradict with this planning effort.

X. FY19 Work Plan Development – DRAFT Project Request List - (Erik Landfried, GoTriangle & Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary, Co Chairs of Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee – 10 minutes)

Mr. Landfried stepped up to present this overview.

Mr. Tallmadge asked of Mr. Howell if public comment periods are being aligned between major studies and work plan development. Mr. Howell confirmed that is occurring

XI. TPAC Administrator Updates – (Information Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator, CAMPO - 20 minutes)

a. TPAC Organization

Mr. Howell clarified that TPAC Subcommittees have open rostering and are public meetings. CTT's are also public meetings, but have specific, appointed rosters. It is up to the project manager to determine communication/facilitation protocols.

b. TPAC Meetings Scheduled

Reminder of January 17, 2018 meeting as well as opportunity for nominations and Chair/Vice Chair Elections



Ms. Kreiser reminder the TPAC of the amendment process proposed and if any amendments brought forward tied to the TIP may change the timing of the January TPAC meeting and shift to January 10.

- c. Master Schedule Reminder - TeamUp

Simple reminder to use the TeamUp calendar tool for Wake Transit

- d. FY19 Work Plan Development Schedule

Reminder of the published Work Plan Development Schedule

XII. Sub-Committee Chair Reports – (*Information Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 15 minutes*)

- a. Budget and Finance

*Active in getting budget amendment process
Meeting scheduled on Nov. 21 – working to refine assumptions in the financial model.*

- b. Planning and Prioritization

FY19 Work Plan Development in process

- c. Process

*11/17 Process Subcommittee meeting is cancelled
Transit customer and attitudinal surveys will be discussed at next meeting on 12/1.
Process will also discuss Wake Transit website content and structure at a high level.*

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

- a. New Business

None

- b. TPAC Member Discussion

None

- c. Next Steps

Next TPAC meeting December 12, 2017.



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 C**

- 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