

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



Transit Planning Advisory Committee
(TPAC) Regular Meeting
January 22, 2018 – 9:30 AM – 12:00 PM
*(Meeting was originally scheduled for
January 17 – postponed to January 22 due
to weather)*
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 V 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 Members/Alternates Present

David Bergmark, Town of Wendell; Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest; Benjamin Howell, Town of Morrisville; Tim Gardiner, Wake County; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; Saundra Freeman, GoTriangle; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; John Tallmadge, GoTriangle; Chris Lukasina, CAMPO; Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO; David Eatman, City of Raleigh; Eric Lamb, City of Raleigh; MacKenzie Day, Town of Zebulon; Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Bret Martin, Town of Cary

Other Alternates Present

Tim Bender, City of Raleigh; Erik Landfried, GoTriangle; Darcy Downs, GoTriangle; Christine Sondej, Town of Cary

General Attendees

Jenny Green, GoTriangle; Jeff Mann, GoTriangle; Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle; John Hodges-Copple, GoTriangle; Michelle Brooks, Town of Cary; Kevin Wyrauch, Town of Cary; Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle; David Jackson, Cambridge Systematics; Richard Adams, Kimley-Horn & Associates; Will Allen; GoTriangle Board of Trustees; Andi Curtis, WakeMed; Monica Barron, STV; Anita Davis, Wake County Coordinated Human Transportation Services; Tyronne Williamson, City of Raleigh

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

Mr. Chip Russell welcomed everyone. He asked those representing their respective TPAC entities as voting primary/alternate members to recognize themselves for voting record purposes.

II. Adjustments to the Agenda

Mr. Martin of the Town of Cary made a motion to adjust the agenda. The motion requested to shift Item IX of the original agenda to be presented/discussed prior to Item VI of the original agenda. The reason for this, as discussed by Mr. Martin, is to allow for the FY 2018 Amendment Requests to be presented prior to the FY 2019 Draft Wake Transit Work Plan so as to allow the TPAC to understand potential impacts of the amendments to the

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



draft work plan.

A second of support was made by Mr. David Eatman.

Ms. Kreiser stated that the goal of presenting the work plan first would demonstrate the inclusion of amendments for financial modeling needs. The amendment discussion could in fact be presented later in the meeting.

After discussion, Mr. Russell called for a vote on the motion as presented by Mr. Martin of the Town of Cary.

21 Votes in favor

1 vote against – casted by Nicole Kreiser of Wake County

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

Mr. Martin of the Town of Cary motioned that this item be tabled until the February TPAC meeting to allow for additional edits to be incorporated by the TPAC Administration.

Second made by Mr. Tim Gardiner. Motion passes unanimously.

IV. Elections of TPAC Chair & Vice Chair – (Action Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 5 minutes)

Mr. Russell called upon Mr. Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator, to conduct elections for TPAC Chair & Vice Chair

Mr. Howell, made a call for nominations for the TPAC Chair Position.

*Mr. Bret Martin nominated Mr. Chip Russell of Wake Forest as Chair.
No other nominations were received.*

Mr. Howell called for a vote on the nomination of Mr. Russell as TPAC Chair for the 2018 calendar year.

Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Howell made a call for nominations for the TPAC Vice Chair Position

*Mr. Benjamin Howell nominated Ms. Shannon Cox of the Town of Apex as Vice Chair
No other nominations were received.*

Mr. Howell called for a vote on the nomination of Ms. Cox as TPAC Vice Chair for the 2018 calendar year.

Vote was unanimous.

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



Mr. Chip Russell will serve as TPAC Chair and Ms. Shannon Cox will serve as TPAC Vice Chair for the 2018 calendar year.

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.*

NONE

VI. FY 2018 2nd Quarter Proposed Amendments – (Discussion/Action Item – Adam, TPAC Administrator; TPAC Chair – 60 minutes) – **Attachment E**

Per Item II, this item was presented prior to Item VI. Mr. Howell presented an overview of the proposed amendments to TPAC

At the end of the discussion, Mr. Russell opened the floor for discussion.

Ms. Kelly Blazey asked Mr. Howell for clarification on the Multi-Year Bus Service Implementation Plan (MYBSIP) line item and the Reserve line item as presented in the amendment packet. Mr. Howell explained that the MYBSIP was a project recognized by the sponsoring party to be funded by non-Wake Transit funding sources. Therefore, it was being pulled from the amendment list. Ms. Kreiser noted that the MYBSIP line item will remain as budgeted, but the proposed decrease amount will fall to fund balance.

Mr. Martin stated that while he is comfortable with the financial impacts defined through the amendment packet as presented, he continued to state that there is still the need for scope evaluation to meet the criteria of a major or minor amendment as defined in the Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Policy and to determine appropriateness of scope changes. He stated this as he pointed out that the MYBSIP was originally included in the FY 2018 Adopted Wake Transit Work Plan – if it is being requested for removal from the work plan, then it is an amendment, as defined in the amendment policy.

Ms. Kreiser stated that the MYBSIP should not be on the amendment list, as it should not have been in the work plan in the first place. Ms. Sandra Freeman of GoTriangle confirmed.

Mr. Martin stated again that the removal of a project from a work plan is in fact an amendment.

Ms. Freeman stated that it is not being removed from the work plan at this time. Mr. Martin stated that it was proposed to be removed from the work plan through an amendment request form.

Ms. Kreiser stated that that amendment request form has now been retracted. Ms. Blazey sought confirmation that the amendment request regarding the MYBSIP has been retracted. Ms. Freeman confirmed.

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



Mr. Martin stated that if the intent is for a project not to impact by Wake Transit funding, but still listed in a work plan and allowing the fiscal impact of the project to roll over to fund balance, that is disingenuous to the public. The fiscal impact should be removed from the funding expectations of the Wake Transit plan financial model and work plan.

Mr. Martin explained that during the public outreach of the FY 2018 work plan, comments were received from the public questioning why so much money was being spent on continued planning for Wake Transit.

Mr. Gardiner suggested a reporting concept to demonstrate progress of the MYBSIP.

Mr. Martin also stated that the Community Funding Area Program Management Plan as originally included in the FY 2018 Adopted Wake Transit Work Plan should also be removed from the work plan through an amendment just as he suggested with the MYBSIP. This would be to ensure transparency to the public with the fiscal impacts in the Wake Transit financial model and work plan.

Mr. Martin also asked for clarification regarding the differentiation of fiscal impacts by the Creative Design Consultant – varying costs were presented in the amendment packet.

Mr. Gardiner stated that he wanted more vetting completed, especially on the staffing positions presented. He asked the group to provide more time to allow vetting to occur. He asked that the Wake Transit Staffing Model & Expectations Plan (Staffing Plan) Core Technical Team (CTT) review the Full-Time-Equivalent (FTE)-related amendments and how they align with the latest draft of the staffing plan document.

Mr. Russell stated that the Staffing Plan CTT could serve as that vetting venue. He did ask, though, if initial vetting had occurred prior to the presentation of the amendment packet. Ms. Kreiser stated that per the policy, Budget & Finance Subcommittee was only tasked with analyzing the fiscal impacts to the financial model based on the amendments as submitted. Those scope/content discussions were to happen at TPAC meetings. The comments submitted by the public/agencies were to help inform the TPAC discussion on the proposed amendments.

Ms. Blazey asked whether the dollar amounts as submitted for the amendments based on FY 2018 are annualized in the FY2019 work plan modeling efforts. Ms. Blazey also sought clarification that the major/minor thresholds were correct based on the annualization of fiscal impacts. Ms. Kreiser stated that when the Budget & Finance Subcommittee received the amendment list regarding FTEs from the TPAC Administrator, they were all major, except for the BRT Engineer, the Bus replacement scope change and the Creative Design Consultant funds.

Ms. Blazey asked why the BRT Engineer was presented as a minor and not a major. Ms. Freeman stated that it was not Budget & Finance Subcommittee's role to determine major or minor status for amendments. She also stated that there was a lot of conversation regarding the scope issue with the BRT Engineer, but recognized that it was not the subcommittee's role. Mr. Howell stated that the BRT Engineer amendment request and its status as minor was discussed internally with GoTriangle staff. It was recognized that it was

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



an FY 2017 project originally, which was then rolled over into FY 2018. The project amendment request was ultimately recognized as minor due to the adjustment in funding – of which the threshold of funding adjustments fell within the minor category.

Mr. Martin stated that the amendment policy should be revisited based on the grey areas realized through this first process, as well as need for more review of scope/content of amendments as submitted.

Mr. Howell stated that when the amendment policy was reviewed and adopted by the Wake Transit governing boards, the CAMPO Executive Board asked that staff come back to the boards in June of 2018 with a status update on the originally adopted amendment policy.

Mr. Gardiner stated that he believes additional vetting is required on the amendments as presented.

Mr. Russell asked who should do the additional vetting on the amendments.

Mr. Gardiner stated that the CTT as a part of the Staffing Plan could serve that role.

Ms. Freeman sought clarification as to what the additional vetting would do. Mr. Russell responded that more attention to the scope detail with the amendment requests would be better reviewed by an additional body of people.

Mr. David Eatman motioned to send back the amendments to CTT of the Wake Transit Staffing Model and Expectations Plan, further review the amendments and bring back to TPAC in the next meeting.

Mr. Chris Lukasina made a second to the motion on the floor.

Mr. Tallmadge commented that there are two non-FTE related amendments that could be approved now.

Mr. Eatman revised his motion to approve the two non-FTE related amendments and send back to the Wake Transit Staffing Model and Expectations Plan CTT the FTE-related amendments, allow for its further review, and bring back a disposition to the TPAC at the following TPAC meeting in February.

Mr. Lukasina made a second to the revised motion on the floor.

Ms. Freeman asked for clarification as to when the staffing plan report would be completed. In the project status reports as a part of Attachment G, it is expected that the Staffing plan report would be complete by February, 2018.

Mr. Lukasina reminded the group that the staffing plan is a 'yard stick'/guideline document and not an edict.

Ms. Cox recognized analysis conducted by the TPAC Administrator to compare the amendments with the staffing plan draft.

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



Mr. Martin stated that the staffing plan CTT is an acceptable venue for amendment review related to the staffing requests but came to the meeting willing to recommend them for approval to the governing boards. He further stated that all of the amendment requests related to staffing have been included as recommendations in multiple drafts of the staffing plan. Mr. Martin also stated that the BRT Engineer FTE request submitted through the amendment process should be a general project engineer as originally authorized in previous work plans. He justified this statement with the fact that lead agency assignments have not been made as of yet on any level of service implementation. Therefore, GoTriangle should not be requesting an engineer with the focused intent on BRT projects.

Ms. Freeman stated that agencies are in need of producing work products for Wake Transit. Amendments with FTE requests should not be delayed any longer than what the motion on the floor suggests.

Mr. Russell noted that a motion and second on the floor exists. He notes that this is a brand new process and will be iterative and reviewed as we move forward.

Mr. Benjamin Howell sought clarification that the FTE-related amendments will in fact be reviewed by the staffing plan CTT, so the CTT is clear they will have to meet prior to the February TPAC meeting.

Mr. Russell called for a vote on the original motion – tabling the vote on the FTE-related amendment requests and send back to the Staffing Plan CTT for further review through the Staffing Plan report and bring back findings to the TPAC in February.

Original motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Russell stated that a second motion was required to further approve the two non-FTE related amendments.

Mr. Tallmadge made a motion to approve the two non-FTE related amendments (the Creative Design Consultant and the Acquisition of Buses).

A second was made by Ms. Blazey. Second motion passes unanimously

VII. FY 2019 Draft Wake Transit Work Plan – (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator, Nicole Kreiser, Co-Chair of Budget & Finance Subcommittee/Wake County, Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle – 20 minutes) – **Attachment B**

Mr. Howell introduced Ms. Kreiser and Mr. Schlossberg. He kicked off the FY 2019 Draft Wake Transit Work Plan presentation.

Ms. Kreiser presented the details related to the draft work plan development and the fiscal impacts the projects present to the financial model. The group also presented to TPAC some of the highlights of new service implementation and new initiatives related to transit plan implementation.

Ms. Blazey asked if the reserve line item has any other contingencies set aside for future needs in FY 2019 not related to the amendments. Ms. Kreiser stated that \$37,500 is a part of

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



the reserve line item that is not a part of the amendments to serve for the final quarter hiring of a BRT Engineer position.

Mr. Martin stated that the Town was comfortable with the presentation of the fiscal impact of the amendments through the reserve line item in the draft work plan. He continued to state that the Town of Cary would prefer the draft work plan be restructured to include FY2018 project sheet scope details into the FY 2019 work plan – and that this should be done before the TPAC recommends the FY 2019 Wake Transit Work Plan to the governing boards. Mr. Martin noted that not including these details demonstrates a lack of transparency.

Mr. Schlossberg and Ms. Kreiser respond by how the group presenting the draft work plan worked to develop the document and that lack of transparency is not an issue.

Mr. Martin stated that financials are shown and transparent in the draft work plan as presented. He continued to state that not including scope details is not transparent. Mr. Martin also stated that the format of the draft work plan is not in compliance with the direction given by the Planning and Prioritization Sub-Committee or the TPAC from when the TPAC previously determined what the format of work plan components will be.

Mr. Tallmadge commented that the group should revisit this conversation on work plan structure and elements to be included at the point of FY 2020 work plan development.

Ms. Blazey asked for clarification on the updated and changed project ID numbers. Mr. Howell explained the desire to showcase bus services first in the work plan, and combine regional/express with local bus service (which were separated in the FY 2018 work plan).

Mr. Russell called for a motion to release the FY 2019 Draft Wake Transit Work Plan as presented to the TPAC to be released for public comment.

Mr. Eatman motioned that the FY 2019 Draft Wake Transit Work Plan as presented to the TPAC be released for public comment. Second made by John Tallmadge.

Mr. Eatman brought forward an additional discussion point – the City of Raleigh will have to follow its public meeting requirements as necessary with the work plan.

Motion passes unanimously.

VIII. Multi-Year Bus Services Implementation Plan: Project Prioritization Framework Policy – (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 15 minutes) – Attachment C

Mr. Howell presented the final draft highlights of the Multi-Year Bus Services Implementation Plan's (AKA Wake Bus Plan) Project Prioritization Framework Policy.

Mr. Martin commented that this policy is a great policy for the plan implementation to use. There is a minor typographical error caught. Will be taken care of for document to go to governing boards.

Mr. Tallmadge commented that on page 2-5 of the document presented, Figure 4, under

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



'Enhance' – the 30-minute reference should be changed to 45-minute services per the need with regional services. Per the comment disposition, the consultant stated it was changed, but the text as pointed out was not. Mr. Howell to work with the consultant to make that change.

Mr. Gardiner stated that this policy is a great guide to allow for us to prioritize the initial network over the 10-year horizon of the plan. If there are some prioritizations that are produced and the group does not agree, certain criteria or thresholds can be changed for further or continued use of the policy.

Ms. Cox asked that the statement/definition of 'unserved areas of Wake County' be better defined. She asked that it state 'Transit service to an area of Wake County currently unserved by all-day transit.' This is what was defined in email communication after the release of this document to TPAC. Mr. Howell stated that change would be made.

Mr. Lukasina referenced Figure 4 on page 2-5 regarding the census geographies as defined. He wanted clarification on data sources required for geographical analysis with transit system planning. Mr. Lukasina suggested to firm up the definitions in the note below the figure with the and mirror the same text directly in the figure. Mr. Martin stated that the intent was to use the most localized scale of census geographies available for the given measure..

Ms. Cox how projects already implemented are factored in to this prioritization process. Ms Jenny Green stated that through CTT discussions the base year for prioritization would be FY 2020. Mr. Martin stated that there is some assumed vesting, in regards to projects implemented prior to prioritization of projects in the Wake Transit Plan. Ms. Cox asked if the intent of the governance framework is to acknowledge investments made prior to the FY 2020 base year for prioritization. Ms. Green stated that Ms. Cox is correct about the intent of the governance framework acknowledging investments made prior to the FY 2020 base year

Ms. Cox also asked about the summary from the public engagement and when that would be released to the TPAC. She continued to ask for the CTT of the Bus Plan to consider the feedback loops regarding public engagement efforts and how transit operating agencies & other TPAC representatives should respond to the public.

Mr. Martin stated that the investment split of the 70% ridership, 30% coverage of bus services includes BRT services in the 70% ridership investment target as well. He stated that the intent should not be to get to the 70/30 split as quickly as possible, but to follow the tiered investment splits over time as defined in Figure 9 of the policy as presented.

Mr. Russell called for a motion to approve the Bus Plan Project Prioritization Framework Policy with all comments/edits.

Mr. Martin made the motion to approve the Bus Plan Project Prioritization Framework Policy with all comments/edits.

Second was made by Kenneth Withrow. Motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Martin revisited the motion as originally made – it was pointed out that the Project

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



Prioritization Policy should be recommended to Wake Transit Governing Boards – not just approved by the TPAC.

Mr. Tim Gardiner made a motion, that per the previously adopted Bus Plan Interim Deliverables Action Matrix, that this Project Prioritization Framework Policy be recommended to the Wake Transit Governing Boards to be considered for approval.

Second was made by Mr. Martin. Motion passes unanimously.

IX. Major Investment Study: Interim Deliverables Action Matrix (Discussion/Action Item – Darcy Downs, GoTriangle, Bret Martin, Town of Cary – 15 minutes) – Attachment D

Ms. Darcy Downs presented the Interim Deliverables Action Matrix as it applies to both aspects of the MIS – Bus Rapid Transit and Commuter Rail initiatives.

Ms. Downs stated that she would be seeking a call for a motion to approve the Interim Deliverables Action Matrix.

Mr. Martin asked if the Durham Staff Working Group (SWG) had reviewed, considered or approved the interim deliverables decision plan. Ms. Downs responded that she would be communicating the same information to their SWG in subsequent weeks. Mr. Martin also noted that a typographical error should be addressed, as well as the removal of the consultant name in the header/footer of the document.

Mr. Russell called for a motion to approve the Interim Deliverables Action Matrix.

Mr. Benjamin Howell motioned to approve the Interim Deliverables Action Matrix.

Second was made by Mr. Tallmadge. Motion passes unanimously.

X. Annual Update to Weighted Voting Data – (Information Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator; – 5 minutes) – Attachment F

Mr. Howell presented an updated weighted voting table. This table is to set weighted voting for the TPAC based on population counts per each municipality/jurisdiction that is a voting party of the TPAC, as well as Wake County..

XI. February 2018 Meeting Date – (Information/Discussion Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 10 minutes)

Mr. Howell discussed that due to the full agenda in January, the TPAC Chair/Vice Chair would direct TPAC to determine a February meeting date. At the February meeting, the remaining annual schedule will be determined.

Preliminary results from a survey sent out to TPAC showed that Tuesdays or Wednesdays are most preferred. Through further discussion of TPAC members, the second full week of

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



each month is also preferred by most members.

The February TPAC meeting was determined to take place on February 14th. Mr. Howell will follow up with a quick mini survey to TPAC to best determine which day is best between Tuesdays and Wednesdays.

XII. TPAC Administrator Updates – (Information Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator, CAMPO - 5 minutes)

a. TPAC Organization – Roster Update

Mr. Howell noted that the Town of Morrisville has added Dylan Bruchhaus as its new alternate TPAC member representative

b. Lead Agency Assignments – Comment Submission Extension

Mr. Howell noted that the Lead Agency Assignments document is still up for review and submission of comments through January 31st. Comments due to the TPAC Administrator.

Mr. Gardiner asked how the comments would be presented, and if there should be an additional group to review the comments and vet the development of the Lead Agency document. Mr. Howell commented on the fact that at the previous TPAC meeting, the Lead Agency Assignment discussion is now in the hands of the TPAC, and it is up to the TPAC as to who should vet the next version of the document.

c. Master Schedule Reminder - TeamUp

Mr. Howell reminded TPAC to reference TeamUp schedules related to Transit Plan Implementation.

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

a. Budget and Finance

Subcommittee meetings to be scheduled through polling of the group.

b. Planning and Prioritization

Subcommittee meeting to occur this Friday, January 26th at 9:30 am at CAMPO. Follow up on the Draft Work Plan, Quarterly Reporting and possible adjustments, subcommittee task list development, and monthly meeting schedule for the year.

c. Process

REVISED ATTACHMENT B



Subcommittee meeting to occur this Friday, January 26th at noon at CAMPO. Will review proposed rules for subcommittee structures.

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 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 G*)

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