

WAKE COUNTY TRANSIT PLAN

Transit Planning Advisory Committee

Regular Meeting

March 13, 2019
CAMPO Administrative Offices, Conference Room A
9:30 AM – 11:30 AM

Meeting Minutes / Summary

Voting Members & Alternates Present

Kevin Wyrauch, Town of Cary; Ben Howell, Town of Morrisville; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Bret Martin, CAMPO; Dirk Siebenbrodt, Town of Holly Springs; Het Patel, Town of Garner; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; Erik Landfried, GoTriangle; Tim Brock, RTP; Sandra Freeman, GoTriangle; Akul Nishawala, Town of Fuquay-Varina; Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Danny Johnson, Town of Rolesville; Mila Vega, City of Raleigh; David Walker, City of Raleigh

Other Alternates Present

Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle; Bonnie Parker, CAMPO

General Attendees

Anita Davis-Haywood, Wake County; Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle; Bill Gilmore, HDR; Adam Howell, Atkins Global; Will Allen, GoTriangle; Mark Huffer, HNTB; Samone Oates-Bullock, GoTriangle; Andy Willard, GoTriangle; Tim Bender, City of Raleigh; Terry Nolan, Wake County

I. Welcome and Introductions – (Shannon Cox, TPAC Chair)

Ms. Shannon Cox welcomed all to the meeting

II. Adjustments to the Agenda – (Shannon Cox, TPAC Chair)

Item VII was removed from the agenda. This item is anticipated to come back to the TPAC in April.

III. General Public or Agency Comment – (Shannon Cox, TPAC Chair – 5 minutes)

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

None

IV. Meeting Minutes/Summary from January 22, 2019, Regular Meeting (Discussion/Action Item – Matthew Cushing, CAMPO Staff; 5 minutes) – **Attachment A**

Requested Action: Consider approving the Meeting Minutes/Summary from the January 22, 2019, Regular Meeting

Motion by Mr. Ben Howell: Approve the Meeting Minutes/Summary from January 22, 2019

Second: Mr. Bret Martin
Motion passes unanimously

V. **Update on Community Funding Area Program FYs 2019 and 2020 Project Selection**
– (Information Item – Matthew Cushing, CAMPO Staff – 20 minutes)

The Community Funding Area FYs 2019 and 2020 call for projects was announced in November of 2018 and closed in January of 2019. A total of six (6) applications were submitted by eligible applicants in response to the call. CAMPO staff will provide a status update on the selection of projects to receive funding under the program at the TPAC's March meeting.

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Mr. Matthew Cushing reviewed the highlights of the Community Funding Area Program, which provides an opportunity for eligible Wake County communities to compete for funding for planning, capital, operating, or combined capital/operating transit projects, and requires a minimum 50% funding match from the eligible community. He explained that the current program year is unique due to the timeline for approval of the Program Management Plan, leading to two application years, FY19 and FY20, being considered concurrently. Mr. Cushing explained that FY19 CFAP funding was approved in the FY19 Work Plan with CAMPO as the project sponsor, and that approved FY19 projects will move forward once agreements are signed. These agreements will include CAMPO, GoTriangle as Tax District Administrator, and the project sponsor. FY20 projects will follow a process that will be used in future years, where projects will be approved via adoption in the Work Plan with the applicant community listed as the project sponsor.

Mr. Cushing then explained the timeline for any steps that have occurred thus far in the FY19/FY20 program year. He noted that interested CFAP applicants have attended a training and pre-submittal review meeting to learn about the program and prepare applications, and then a selection committee meeting was held to review the submitted applications. One selection committee meeting has already been held, but another is scheduled for March 18th to finalize any remaining decisions.

Mr. Cushing explained that submissions for FY19 planning projects were received from the Towns of Apex and Morrisville; FY20 planning project submissions were received from the Towns of Fuquay-Varina, Garner, and Rolesville; and an FY20 operating project submission was received from the Town of Wake Forest. Other communities expressed interest at earlier stages in the program cycle but did not apply for this program year. At the first selection committee meeting, the submitted FY19 projects were recommended for approval, and the sponsors for proposed FY20 projects were asked to provide clarifications for their submissions, or the projects were flagged as needing additional discussion before making final recommendations.

Mr. Cushing then provided a summary of each submitted application, starting with the FY19 projects. He described that the Town of Apex submitted a planning project for an Apex Circulator and will hire GoCary to complete service level planning and prepare any items needed for a later service agreement and CFA application. The application for the Town of Morrisville describes hiring a consultant to consider local transportation needs, including both traditional and non-traditional service modes, with a goal of providing 1-2 service alternatives with planning-level details, and preparation for a future CFAP application. Mr. Cushing then explained that there is \$100,000 available for planning projects in FY19, and that around \$75,000 was being requested, leaving \$25,000 of the designated FY19 funding, if all FY19 projects move forward. Mr. Cushing then detailed the next steps for FY19 planning projects, explaining that agreements are currently being drafted and reviewed, and that project sponsors will attend a kickoff meeting upon agreement execution, and then a mid-year review.

Mr. Cushing then described the FY20 project submissions but explained that there is less information available for these projects currently, as clarifying detail is still being sought for most of these projects. However, he described a goal of providing a high-level overview for these projects, as they will not be discussed again at TPAC before inclusion in the Recommended Work Plan. The Town of Fuquay-Varina intends to complete a Microtransit Feasibility Study considering improvements to existing dial-a-ride service. The Town of Garner intends to study the potential for a circulator loop connecting future and existing transit options and targeted origins/destinations within the community. The Town of Rolesville intends to study its transit options generally, and will include ride-hailing, demand-response, flex-route, and circulator service as potential service modes. The Town of Wake Forest submitted the only application for an operating project and intends to run a reverse route of its existing, uni-directional circulator service to improve headways and connectivity. Mr. Cushing explained that the Town of Wake Forest is only requesting funding for a partial year in its FY20 application, but that the annualized cost is higher than the requested amount shown.

Mr. Steven Schlossberg asked whether approval of the Wake Forest project guarantees full funding in the next program year. Mr. Cushing explained that, once approved, project costs would be annualized in future years. He added that there are reporting deliverables and service metrics for approved operating projects that are reviewed every year, which means that a project can lose CFAP funding, but that the general rule is that an approved operating project will continue in perpetuity. Mr. Cushing noted that the Wake Forest project is somewhat unique, in that the City of Raleigh pays some of the cost for the existing circulator, which will have impacts on the funding structure for the project, and the match for future years, but that the discussed annualized cost is the total cost for the project, including the City of Raleigh contribution.

Mr. Cushing then explained the funding available for FY20 projects. He noted that \$150,000 of planning funding is programmed in the Work Plan, but only around half of this amount was requested. \$160,000 is programmed for operating and capital projects, but the Town of Wake Forest comes in at around \$195,000. Mr. Cushing then explained that this higher request is one of the items flagged for further discussion by the selection committee and explained that the CFA Program Management Plan does allow unused planning/technical assistance funds to be rolled over to the capital/operating budget. If the remaining planning funds are rolled over, full funding for Wake Forest's request would be available, and there would still be additional funds left in the fund balance to roll to future funding years.

Mr. Cushing then explained the next steps for the FY20 projects. He explained that project sponsors are currently completing responses to the selection committee, which will meet on Monday, March 18th, to make final recommendations. Additionally, an update will be presented to the TCC in April and then to the CAMPO Executive Board. Any projects which are recommended for approval will be included in the recommended FY20 Work Plan.

Mr. Martin posed a question to TPAC. He explained that the Program Management Plan was not clear on the actions required to institutionalize FY19 projects as approved projects, but that money was set aside in the FY19 Work Plan for CAMPO for Community Funding Area Program technical assistance. Mr. Martin asked whether the TPAC felt that the FY19 projects need to be formally endorsed. There was a discussion as to whether the FY19 work plan needed to be amended, and a clarification that the project is already in the FY19 work plan with CAMPO as project sponsor, with the conclusion that an amendment would not be needed for CAMPO to pass money through to approved project sponsors. It was explained that CAMPO decided to make the FY19 money subject to the Program Management Plan, but that future years will require formal approval via the work plan by default. Ms. Nicole Kreiser commented that seeking TPAC endorsement for the projects is the best parallel to future year project approvals, even if such an endorsement is not required.

Ms. Cox commented that TPAC action is normally taken a month after receiving an item as information and asked if there was any concern with such a motion to endorse. Ms. Shelby Powell noted a concern that delaying the motion would slow FY19 projects, with FY19 quickly closing.

Motion by Mr. Danny Johnson: Endorse the recommended FY19 Community Funding Area projects
Second: Ms. Kreiser
Motion passes unanimously

VI. Update on FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan Development and Public Outreach Summary - (Information/Discussion Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff and Samone Oates, GoTriangle Staff; 25 minutes) – Attachment B

The Draft FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan was released by GoTriangle for a 30-day public comment period running from February 1st through March 3rd. GoTriangle staff and staff from TPAC member organizations also participated in a number of events throughout the county to drive public review of and solicit input on the draft work plan. GoTriangle staff will provide a summary of the outreach conducted and comments received in response to the draft work plan at the TPAC's March meeting. A written public outreach summary is provided as **Attachment B**. CAMPO staff will also provide an update on next steps for the development and consideration of adoption of the FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan.

Requested Action: Receive as information and discuss, as necessary

Mr. Martin discussed the planned schedule for completing the recommended FY20 Work Plan. He explained that the public comment period for the draft Work Plan closed on March 3rd. GoTriangle collected comments throughout the period and sent them to project sponsors on a weekly basis. March 8th was the due date for sponsors to submit modifications to Work Plan requests. Mr. Martin explained that modifications have been received, and that most have been financial in nature rather than scope-related, but that some additional modifications are still being received. There will be a joint meeting of the Planning & Prioritization and Budget & Finance subcommittees on March 14th to review these submissions, update revenue assumptions as appropriate, consider the financial impacts associated with the submitted modifications, and prepare to model the projects for FY20 and later years. On March 26th, there will be another joint subcommittee meeting to finalize these modifications and, if needed, the subcommittees will hold a vote on which projects will be included in the Recommended Work Plan.

Mr. Martin also explained that the subcommittees have been working on the agreement grouping structure for adopted Work Plan projects. Typically, in prior years, the Work Plan has come to the TPAC in April for consideration of recommendation, and the proposed agreement structure came to the TPAC in May. This year, these items are intended to proceed at the same time. Additionally, language is being added to the agreements to account for items such as debt funding of projects and for newer policy adoptions, such as the concurrence framework. The Planning & Prioritization subcommittee is working to standardize reporting deliverables, with a goal of ensuring that each agency is reporting the same type of information for each type of project.

On April 23rd the TPAC will consider recommending the Work Plan to the governing boards. A work plan draft will be sent out on April 9th, allowing two weeks for TPAC review. Mr. Martin noted that, in prior years, only one week was provided for review, but with a larger version of the Work Plan document in FY20, two weeks is more appropriate. He also explained that the agreement structure and reporting deliverables will be received for TPAC review one week in advance of the meeting on the 23rd.

Mr. Juan Carlos Erickson asked about the timeline for consideration by the boards. Mr. Martin explained that board consideration could occur either in May or June. However, he explained, CAMPO will hold a 30-day public comment period and a public hearing for the Work Plan, which

means that the Recommended Work Plan likely won't be discussed by the CAMPO Executive Board in May, as this would mean considering the Work Plan before the comment period ends. Mr. Erickson asked whether GoTriangle should plan to do another communications push around this time. Mr. Martin explained that the governing boards should consider the recommended Work Plan without significant changes, otherwise the Work Plan will need to go back to TPAC. Ms. Shelby Powell explained that the TPAC public engagement push occurs in coordination with the draft Work Plan, after which the document should go through any internal processes related to the policies of each respective board.

Ms. Samone Oates–Bullock provided an update on outreach efforts related to the draft Work Plan. She explained that the Public Engagement team had 3 main goals: 1.) promote awareness of the workplan, 2.) educate the public on upcoming improvements and capital investments, and 3.) engage the community in the public input and decision-making process. She described that the team used a mixed method approach, which included presentations, pop-ups, media posts, e-mail blasts, website updates, and which involved collaboration with TPAC representatives to allow the proper level of involvement based on the level of expected changes coming to each community.

Ms. Oates-Bullock reported that the team conducted 14 communications pushes, 14 pop ups, 11 presentations and collected 74 comments, engaged roughly 2,400 people, and made around 7,500 impressions. She clarified that impressions refers to the number of people reached, and engagement refers to the number of people who clicked, retweeted, or shared. Ms. Oates-Bullock then described that the draft Work Plan was sent to stakeholder groups on the first day of the public comment period and was also uploaded to the GoForward website at this time. Additionally, social media posts about specific events occurred throughout the comment period. 276 people were reached at pop-up events, and there were 11 presentations held, which reached around 180 people. As of March 8th, most comments that have been received were received via the online portal (65%). The majority of comments mentioned GoRaleigh. Ms. Oates-Bullock reported some of the themes expressed in these comments. She described a general support for transit investments, mobile ticketing, fare capping, and expansion of service. There were also comments that improvements are taking too long. Additionally, some comments focused on concerns about route connections and timing of service to better allow transfers. There were also some criticisms about buses being inconsistent (early or late), a desire for buses to run later, and a report of a need for improvements in the Glenwood Avenue corridor. Additionally, a desire was expressed for more information on route-level detail to be included in the Work Plan. Finally, Ms. Oates-Bullock reported that there were a few comments about investment in transit being a waste of money.

Ms. Kreiser commented that final Work Plans always include a section which describes how the plan is responsive to public comment but noted that many of the received comments are project specific. She asked whether there is a process for incorporating this kind of information directly onto project sheets. Mr. Martin replied that the Work Plan is at a programmatic level and that, generally, short-range information isn't available yet, as the service provider will be developing this at a later date. However, he commented that it would be possible to add a sentence mentioning that service-level planning will be undertaken by the project sponsor, with each provider having their own internal processes for public engagement. Ms. Cox asked whether this kind of concern has been addressed in the past via inclusion of a clarification in the FAQ's. Mr. Martin replied that this is the case, but it would also be possible to provide basic timeline information on project sheets. Ms. Kreiser commented that, as projects are on different timelines, the FAQ's cannot give the desired level of detail, and she expressed that users may only look at a project sheet for the route they're interested in and may not look at the FAQ's. Ms. Cox asked if there was an intent to create a new FAQ sheet this year. Mr. Erickson replied that a FAQ sheet would be created.

VII. Fixed Guideways Major Investment Study – Commuter Rail (CRT) System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework

This item was removed from the agenda, and is anticipated to come back to the TPAC in April

VIII. **Raleigh Urbanized Area/Wake County Locally Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan** – (Information/Discussion Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff, 20 minutes) – **Attachment D**

The Raleigh Urbanized Area and Wake County Locally Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan (LCHSTP) is a federally-required plan that sets regional priorities for transportation investments and initiatives that support public transportation coordination for human services. The plan intends to guide funding and service development for transportation projects supporting older adults, persons with disabilities and individuals with low incomes, with a focus on identifying strategies to address service gaps. The scope of the plan covers Wake County and the entirety of the Raleigh Urbanized Area, which includes a sizable portion of Johnston County and small portions of Harnett, Franklin and Granville Counties. The plan update serves as a federally required update to the 2013 LCHSTP and will serve as the official plan that informs the distribution of federal Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) funding throughout the Raleigh Urbanized Area. The plan will be used to inform funding recommendations for the applications received in response to the 2019 Raleigh Urbanized Area Section 5310 call for projects. The plan was completed in concert with the Wake Bus Plan and will also be used to direct Wake Transit funding to human service transportation needs within Wake County.

The draft Raleigh Urbanized Area/Wake County LCHSTP was posted for a 30-day public comment period running from February 18th through March 19th. A couple of comments have been provided to date in response to the draft plan and will be shared with the TPAC at its March 13th meeting. Staff will provide a brief presentation on the draft LCHSTP at the March 13th TPAC meeting and will explain how the plan's recommendations are anticipated to dovetail with Wake Transit Plan implementation. A public hearing for the draft plan is scheduled to occur on March 20th before the CAMPO Executive Board, and the Executive Board will be asked to consider approval of the draft plan at its March 20th regular meeting following the public hearing. The draft plan is provided as **Attachment D**.

Requested Action: Receive as information and discuss, as necessary

Mr. Martin introduced the Locally Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan (LCHSTP). He explained that, due to the substantial increase in service associated with the Bus Plan, it was recognized that there would be a need to update the LCHSTP, as gaps in human service transportation would be changing from those identified in the existing 2013 LCHSTP. He described that there are numerous programs that offer human services transportation, but they are often siloed. As such, a major goal of the LCHSTP is to better coordinate these services to realize efficiencies, and to identify and serve any new gaps as the transit system changes.

Mr. Martin then explained that the LCHSTP is federally required for access to Section 5310 funds for the Raleigh Urbanized Area (UZA), further explaining that Section 5310 funds focus on enhanced mobility of seniors and individuals with disabilities, but also noting that human services transportation goes beyond these target groups to include low-income persons, veterans, etc. Mr. Martin explained that the Raleigh UZA has access to \$550,000-\$600,000 each year through the Section 5310 program, all of which is subject to direction by the plan. He specified that the plan is for the entire Raleigh UZA, which includes most of Wake County, but also portions of Johnston County, including the Town of Clayton, and small portions in Granville, Franklin, Harnett, and Durham Counties. However, while the UZA does not include all of Wake County, the plan does include all of Wake County, as it will direct funding for both the Section 5310 program, and any Wake Transit funding targeting human service needs.

Mr. Martin described that the plan was completed in concert with the Wake Bus Plan. He also described that, as a human services plan, the plan focuses mostly on demand-response services, but also encourages the use of fixed-route service when possible for increased efficiencies. The working group for the plan involved regional stakeholders, including input from multiple TPAC member agencies, a representative from the Johnston County Area Transportation System, and invitations to participants from KARTS (focusing on Granville and Franklin Counties) and HARTS (Harnett County). There was also outreach to community stakeholders, specifically targeting human service agencies. Additionally, drop-ins were scheduled throughout Wake County and in the Town of Clayton to review the draft plan. Mr. Martin explained that the LCHSTP has already gone to the TCC, and that the Executive Board will hold a public hearing and consider the LCHSTP on March 20th. CAMPO has opened a public comment period for the plan, which closes on March 19th. Mr. Martin then explained that the FY19 Call for Projects for Section 5310 projects is open through March 29th, and that it is the first call for projects for which the updated LCHSTP will inform funding distribution.

Mr. Martin then moved on to describing the need and gaps identified in the plan. He described that more services are needed generally, especially in rural areas. He also described that the plan highlights a need to account for changes to the Medicaid program, which currently uses a fee for service model, but which will transition to a managed care model on July 1. Additionally, he described a need for human services transportation to cross borders more effectively, as programs are often geographically siloed, making it difficult to schedule trips from one area to another. Also, there is a need to improve the processes to reserve and schedule trips, noting that multiple providers reserve and schedule trips currently, but that they use different methodologies for doing so.

Mr. Martin then discussed the challenges and opportunities identified in the plan. He again mentioned pending changes to Medicaid as a potential challenge, and noted challenges associated with sprawl/suburbanization, as the spreading of the population makes it difficult to achieve efficiencies. Regarding opportunities, he noted that an increase in transit service provides additional opportunities for efficiencies, and that technology improvements, such as those associated with TNCs, also provide opportunities. Finally, Mr. Martin showed maps from the plan to illustrate the distribution of relevant populations, such as disabled populations and senior populations, and also to illustrate identified transit deserts.

Mr. Martin explained that the plan makes short-range, mid-range, and long-range recommendations, and then moved to list some of these recommendations. First, the plan recommends creating a mobility coordination committee responsible for guiding plan implementation. As there are dual funding sources relevant to the plan, this committee would report to both the CAMPO TCC and the TPAC and can also serve as the project selection committee for the Section 5310 program moving forward. The structure of the committee is still being decided. The second recommendation is to develop consistent ADA policies across agencies, including the standardization of application processes, eligibility determinations, reservations processes, fares, and the rider's guide. Third, the plan recommends creating a centralized call center/passenger training program, as well as implementing shared scheduling software. Fourth, the plan recommends a mobility management approach, focusing on creating a centralized point of contact to help people navigate through their eligibility and transportation options. Finally, the plan recommends considering ways to make use of the services of emerging mobility providers.

There was a short conversation involving the ways that eligible Community Funding Area Program communities may consider using CFA funds to implement services like those described above in their own communities. Additionally, there was a discussion as to whether there are any redundancies or opportunities for engagement with the statewide NC Care 360 initiative.

Mr. Martin explained that he is bringing the LCHSTP to the TPAC as information, with a note to discuss as necessary, as the Wake Bus Plan interim deliverables decision plan, which was

endorsed by TPAC, does not specify this plan as needing TPAC approval. As such, the intended protocol is for the LCHSTP to go CAMPO Executive Board via the TCC, and to the Raleigh Transit Authority. However, Mr. Martin explained, as this plan will have an impact on TPAC programming and recommendations moving forward, he would welcome any comments or endorsement of the plan as the TPAC deems appropriate.

Questions were received about comments from the Wake County Board of Commissioners, and as to which organization would be taking the lead on plan implementation. Mr. Martin explained that the Board of Commissioners submitted comments, focusing mostly on the Work Plan, but that these comments also addressed the LCHSTP, expressing high-level support, alongside a desire to see a clearer timeline for the recommendations. Mr. Martin explained that the LCHSTP is intended to be a relatively broad, programmatic document, but that these comments provide further motivation to get the coordination committee set up quickly. As for responsibility for plan implementation, Mr. Martin expressed that CAMPO would take the lead on staffing the committee but explained that implementing recommendations of the committee is not something a single agency can handle.

Ms. Cox asked a question about the Section 5310 program. She noted that this program requires applicants to identify how their requests are supported by the LCHSTP but commented that the LCHSTP is at the policy level rather than a listing of specifically needed projects. She asked how a Section 5310 applicant with a more specific goal could best reference the plan. Mr. Martin responded that the intent should be to show that a proposed project furthers some aim discussed in the recommendations or helps address a need identified by plan. Ms. Cox also asked how often the plan is updated. Mr. Martin replied that there is not a federally required timeline for updates, rather the plan should be updated with any significant change in gaps and needs, but that an update every 4-5 years is typical.

Ms. Kelly Blazey asked a question about whether any potential endorsement of the LCHSTP should occur at the next TPAC meeting, to preserve the normal process of presenting action items as information the month preceding said action. It was clarified that the Executive Board will be reviewing the LCHSTP before the next TPAC meeting so, if an endorsement is to be provided, it would need to occur at this meeting to be timely.

Mr. Johnson communicated a willingness to endorse the plan, so long as it expresses a need to fill in gaps for people that don't fit into Section 5310 program requirements. Ms. Kreiser commented that Wake Transit funding is modeled to cover some of those gaps. Mr. Martin commented that the LCHSTP helps to identify such needs.

Motion by Mr. Erik Landfried: Endorse the Locally Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan

Second: Mr. Chip Russell

Motion Passes Unanimously

IX. Proposed Approach for Scoping and Preparation of the Wake Transit Vision Plan Update – (Information/Discussion Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff - 20 minutes)

As discussed in the TPAC Planning and Prioritization Subcommittee in the summer of 2018, an update or extension of the horizon of the Wake Transit Plan is slated to occur in FY 2020. The Planning and Prioritization Subcommittee identified a few very basic desired outcomes for the Wake Transit Vision Plan update to achieve, including:

- 1) Updating the plan to coincide with the schedule for the CAMPO 2050 MTP update and a subsequent update to the Wake Bus Plan such that a vision plan update can adequately inform the others;

- 2) A component of the vision plan that identifies viable projects or transit network expansion that goes beyond the fiscal constraint tied to the horizon year of the vision plan update, similar to the concept of the CAMPO Comprehensive Transportation Plan;
- 3) Evaluation of customer and community attitudinal surveys associated with the expanded network to date to inform upcoming and post-2027 investments; and
- 4) Identification of unserved or underserved markets not receiving investment in the 2018-2027 Wake Transit Plan.

To prepare for an upcoming update to the Wake Transit Vision Plan, CAMPO staff will present a proposed approach to the TPAC at its March 13th meeting that details CAMPO's recommended structure and process for scoping and executing the plan update.

Requested Action: Receive as information and discuss, as necessary.

Mr. Martin explained that CAMPO, as lead agency, will be starting on the Wake Transit Vision Plan Update soon, and is presenting the proposed schedule and plans for involvement here today. He explained that the Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee has already had some conversation about this update in meetings over the past summer, with a central discussion about how long to extend the planning horizon. Mr. Martin explained that a primary intent is to match the Vision Plan Update with the schedule for updates to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). He also described that the schedule for work on the update, as discussed at these meetings, is to start around the current time of year, with initial work focusing on developing the project scope, and identifying whether there is a need to use consultant resources. If such resources are needed, an RFP or RFQ would be released by early this summer. This schedule builds in around 18 months for completion of the project, with significant work starting at the beginning of FY2020.

Mr. Martin explained that the Vision Plan Update would include a deficiencies and needs analysis, along with financial forecasting. The update is targeted to be considered by the CAMPO and GoTriangle boards by mid-FY21. This schedule would allow the Vision Plan Update to inform the deficiencies and needs analysis, alternatives analysis, preferred alternatives, financial constraint, etc. for the MTP. Mr. Martin noted that additional steps related to the MTP would continue into FY22. Additionally, Mr. Martin noted that this schedule should help to align the Vision Plan Update with updates to the Wake Bus Plan, including Short-Range Transit Plans, as well as the next range of years included in the multi-year operating program.

Mr. Martin explained that the update would continue to use a 10-year planning horizon – specifically 2020-2030 for this update - which aligns with horizon decades in the MTP. However, there is also a goal of identifying projects, and especially fixed guideway projects or network expansions, that go beyond the Vision Plan's horizon year, and beyond the fiscal constraints associated with this horizon year. This would allow local governments to complete longer term planning initiatives.

Mr. Martin described that a goal of the update will be to identify underserved markets not currently receiving Wake Transit investment, especially noting the fast growth of the county in recent years, as the first work on the Wake Transit Plan occurred in 2015 and was based on 2013 data. He also noted that customer/attitudinal surveys will be completed this fall and will allow the updated plan to be informed by community input.

Mr. Russell confirmed that only three years are being added to the plan horizon. Mr. Martin replied that the fiscally constrained portion of the plan will be extended by three years. Ms. Kreiser stressed the importance of messaging – noting that no portion of the existing plan is being thrown out, rather the plan is being expanded by three years.

Mr. Martin then explained the proposed next steps for plan development. He described that the intended approach is to set up a scoping committee which, if consultant assistance is needed, would then transition into a consultant selection team. Later in the process, this team would transition into the Core Technical Team. This team would be composed of a representative from:

1.) GoTriangle (both financial and planning staff), 2.) Wake County, 3.) City of Raleigh, 4.) Town of Cary, 5.) NCDOT, 6.) NCSU, and 7.) Two representatives from other Wake County communities or RTP. Mr. Martin noted that availability and ability to represent municipal interests at a level other than that of Cary or Raleigh will be the main considerations for selection of the representatives from the two additional Wake County communities described in item #7. It was also clarified that the representatives from each listed organization do not need to be the appointed TPAC voting member.

Mr. Martin then explained the schedule for the update. He explained that preliminary work is beginning now, with late March or early April targeted for the scoping committee meeting, with an intent to discuss outcomes and scope elements, schedule, consultant need, steering structure, and plans for public engagement. Following this, in mid to late April, the committee will receive a draft RPQ/RFP to review, or, if consultants are not needed, a scope description. By mid-May, CAMPO would receive comments on this proposed approach. Finally, by late May, CAMPO would prepare to post the RFP/FRQ or begin work on the scope.

Mr. Landfried commented that the proposed schedule is somewhat awkward when considering development of the annual work plan, as the update would provide little opportunity to inform the FY22 Work Plan. Mr. Martin replied that the described 18-month time frame is intended to be conservative, however, as the Short-Range Transit Plan isn't intended to be revisited until FY24, there shouldn't be significant impacts to the FY22 Work Plan. Mr. Landfried noted that, as some Wake Transit service will have been online for over 18 months at this point, it may be worth reviewing these services earlier.

X. Subcommittee Chair Reports – (Information Item, TPAC Chair – 10 minutes)

a. Budget and Finance

Ms. Kreiser reported that the Budget & Finance Subcommittee is working on items on the work task list, and will be participating in next two joint meetings with the Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee to work on the recommended Work Plan

b. Planning and Prioritization

Mr. Martin reports that the Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee is also currently focusing on preparation of the recommended Work Plan.

c. Process

Mr. Howell reported that the subcommittee met in late February to continue discussions about agreement structure. He also reported that the subcommittee worked on additional language for this year's agreements, with an aim of encouraging transit providers to work with outlying municipalities as service is expanded to these areas. He described that, moving forward, the subcommittee will be looking into whether another layer of agreement is needed to further this aim.

d. Public Engagement and Communications

Ms. Bonnie Parker reported that the Public Engagement & Communications Subcommittee meeting scheduled for March 28th has been canceled. She explained that an update has been sent by e-mail to the subcommittee, and she asked TPAC members to check in with their PE&C representatives if they are not on the e-mail list. She also provided an update that the Community Attitudinal Survey, led by GoTriangle, is being pushed to the fall, with survey questions developed over the summer.

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

a. New Business

Mr. Martin described that CAMPO is currently in the process of recruiting a new TPAC Administrator, clarifying that interviews have begun, and there is a goal of identifying a candidate in the next few weeks. Ideally, the selected candidate will be onboarded in the next month to a month and a half. In the short run, any TPAC Administration needs should continue to be addressed to Mr. Martin, or to Mr. Cushing.

b. TPAC Member Discussion

None

c. Next Steps

Ms. Cox reminded the group that the removed agenda item (VII), the System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework for the Fixed Guideways Major Investment Study – Commuter Rail (CRT), is anticipated to return to the TPAC agenda in April

XII. Adjourn

Upcoming Items to Note at February Regular TPAC Meeting (April 23rd)*

- FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan Recommendation to Governing Boards (Action)
- Endorsement of FY 2020 Community Funding Area Project Selection Recommendations
- FY 2019 Wake Transit Work Plan Quarter 4 Amendments

**Please be advised this list may or may not include all items for information/discussion/action.*