

WAKE COUNTY TRANSIT PLAN

Transit Planning Advisory Committee

Process Subcommittee

February 29th, 2019

Meeting Notes – Compiled by Morgan Simmons/GoRaleigh

Topics of Discussion

Process Subcommittee Membership and Participation

- ❖ All municipalities will need to confirm who should be included on the email listserv for process subcommittee emails. All information will still be available for anyone to access, however specific subcommittee meeting information will be sent directly to those identified persons:

<u>CAMPO</u>	<u>GoTriangle</u>	<u>City of Raleigh</u>	<u>Town of Cary</u>	<u>Wake County</u>	<u>Wake Forest</u>
Chris Lukasina	Asley Hooper	Brandon Watson	Ana Orłowsky	Nicole Kreiser	Chip Russell
Bonnie Parker	Burgetta Wheeler	David Eatman	Kelly Blazey	Tim Gardiner	
Shelby Powell	John Tallmadge	Tansy Hayward	Lan Hygh		<u>Knightdale</u>
Bret Martin	Mike Charbonneau	Mila Vega	Kevin Wyrauch		Jason Brown
Matthew Cushing	Steven Schlossberg	Rob Murray			<u>Apex</u>
	Juan Carlos Erickson	Sharon Felton			Shannon Cox
	Suzanne Clyburn	Kelly Wright			<u>Morrisville</u>
		Michael Moore			Ben Howell
		Morgan Simmons			

Continued Discussion on Timing and Expectations for the Multi-Year Implementation Agreements

- ❖ The committee discussed the use of multi-year agreements, starting in FY 21. For FY 20, the annual agreements will continue to be in use. The committee is currently underway with including language regarding coordination responsibilities between the service providers/project sponsors and the municipalities they will serve.

Proposed Language

The project sponsor shall be responsible for leading coordination of planning efforts as it relates to the transit service, serving the local municipality. These coordination efforts should be amicable for all parties, occurring prior to the execution of the transit services. These coordination efforts should resolve any issues as it relates to, but not limited to, route planning and development, schedule development, passenger amenities, maintenance and upkeep of passenger amenities, public engagement and advertisement in relation to the new services, etc.

- ❖ Currently, project sponsors have separate agreements with the tax district and as well as with the municipality that is getting the service (if the service is entering a municipality). With this in mind, the committee must consider:
 - Does the multi-year agreement impact the need for the two aforementioned agreements? If so, what is the impact?
 - Is there a possibility of combining the 2 aforementioned agreements? If so, what are the pros and cons?
 - Are there benefits of the current 2-agreement structure that the committee is not considering?
 - Who are the current parties that are currently involved with each agreement? Who would need to continue to be involved? Who would need to be added for involvement?
- ❖ The committee discussed the currently approved expectations of service providers within the Bus Plan, Service Guidelines and 10-year capital and operating plan and the role these should play in the agreements (Is their inclusion just a reference to the documents or actual, specific context?)
- ❖ After lengthy discussion, the following are important components that should be included in the agreements (...it's still to be determined if in an annual agreement or multi-year agreement)
 - Inclusion of coordination efforts and responsibilities between the service provider and the municipality, prior to the execution of service.
 - This can include a checklist of necessary tasks and steps to ensure amicable participation.
 - Inclusion of standards and expectations of all parties (to include metrics to gauge success)
 - Creation of recourse in case a system chooses to not run the services, as identified in the 10-year or Short Range Bus Plan

- Developing an agreement structure, whether it be multiple agreements or just one agreement, that provides equitable participation by all parties (to include service providers, municipalities, county, etc)
- Developing an agreement structure that is streamlined, clear, and is only inclusive of the necessary parties.

Tasks Prior to the Next Meeting:

At the next meeting, the committee will discuss the 4 major components of the multi-year agreements:

- ❖ 5-year identified general expectations for all
- ❖ 5 year identified expectations of the service providers
- ❖ 5 year identified expectations of municipalities
- ❖ A list of all parties that need to be involved

In addition, based on the needs of each different party (service provider, city/town, county, etc.), all parties are tasked to develop a pros and cons list for using the multi-year agreement as well as an annual year agreement.

Multi-Year Agreement		Annual Agreement	
<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>