

# Wake County Transit Planning Advisory Committee

## TPAC Regular Monthly Meeting • October 23, 2025 @ 9:00am

## **MEETING MINUTES**

1. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Blazey, TPAC Chair)

Kelly welcomed attendees to the October TPAC meeting. She introduced Mark Eatman, Cary's new Sr. Planner and he provided a brief introduction. Kevin McCarthy is the new Alternate member for Wendell.

10/23/25 TPAC Attendance & Voting Record		PM= Primary Member, VA= Voting Alternate, OA= Other Alternate, MG= Meeting Guest									
Agency/Org	<u>Name</u>	<u>PM</u>	<u>VA</u>	<u>0A</u>	MG	Agency/Org	<u>Name</u>	<u>PM</u>	<u>VA</u>	<u>0A</u>	MG
Chair/Cary	Kelly Blazey	1				Wake County	Tim Gardiner	1			
Vice Chair/Apex	Katie Schwing	1				Wake County	Michael James	1			
CAMPO	Shelby Powell	1				Wake Forest	Emma Linn	1	_	_	-
CAMPO	Ben Howell	1				Wendell	Kevin McCarthy		1		
CAMPO	Stephanie Plancich				1	Zebulon	Matt Lower	1			
CAMPO	Steven Mott				1						
CAMPO	Suvir Venkatesh				1						
Cary	Mark MacDougal		1			Online Guests					
Cary	Mark Eatman			1		GoTriangle	Kim Johnson				
Fuquay-Varina	Allison Wylie		1			GoTriangle	Meg Scully				
Garner	Julien Griffee		1			CAMPO	Crystal Odom				
GoTriangle	Paul Black	1				Cary	Christine Sondej				
GoTriangle	Jason Hardin	1				Raleigh	Andrea Epstein				
GoTriangle	Kelly Smith				1	Raleigh	Reese Berman				
GoTriangle/TDA	Steve Schlossberg				1	Raleigh	Tierra Hobley				
GoTriangle/TDA	Paul Kingman				1	Raleigh	Mason Chamblee				
Holly Springs	Chris Garcia	1				Raleigh	Dana Smith				
Knightdale						Wake County	Akul Nishawala				
Morrisville	Bret Martin	1				Raleigh	Dawn Souza				
NC State Univ.	Andrea Neri	1				Wake County	Akul Nishawala				
Raleigh	David Walker	1				Wake County	Anita Davis				
Raliegh	Het Patel	1									

- 2. Adjustments to the Agenda (Kelly Blazey, TPAC Chair)
  - a. CAMPO removed the action to approve a new minutes format from item #4. It will be discussed with the cabinet later today.
  - b. Raleigh requested to move their WakeBRT progress report item up on the agenda to avoid a scheduling conflict. Item 11 moved to under Item 4.
- 3. General Public or Agency Comment (Kelly Blazey, TPAC Chair) None

#### **TPAC ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

## 4. TPAC Meeting Minutes

(Action Item: Stephanie Plancich, TPAC Administrator, 10 minutes) Attachment A & B1/B2

Many of the Wake Transit partners are exploring options to utilize AI technology to streamline materials development, communications and other parts of their processes. The TPAC Administrator is doing the same. TPAC members have confirmed that they like to receive a highly detailed agenda to understand what will be discussed at their next meeting, but we have not visited the question of Minutes format in a while. Members were provided with two versions of the September minutes for review and discussion. The standard template used for the past several years is included as Attachment B1 and a new streamlined version is included as Attachment B2.

TPAC members confirmed that a shorter, streamlined version of the minutes would be good. Ms. Plancich noted that full recording would still be available in administrative files if more detail is ever needed. Members were asked to email her examples of minutes they like or other feedback. She hopes to share the new format starting with October minutes. Mr. Martin commented that some sentences in the draft August minutes were cut off and clarified in Microtransit item #6 his concern was about matching service spans not match in general. Stephanie will edit the minutes before archiving.

**Motion** to adopt the August and September TPAC meeting minutes with requested edits made by Bret Martin. Second by David Walker, Passed unanimously.

#### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING ITEMS

# 5. Moved up from #11 - Project Update - Wake BRT: New Bern Ave Updates (Phase 2 construction and \$7.5M allocation)

(Information item: Het Patel, Raleigh, 15 minutes)

In the news recently, the City of Raleigh announced that it will be using the articulated "bendy" buses, originally purchased for use on the New Bern Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor, for other high ridership routes until the corridor is constructed and ready to start service. Raleigh staff will provide an overview of this timeline, process and purpose. In addition, Raleigh staff will follow up on their last BRT presentation which

## **NEXT STEPS**

- · Council awarded Package 2 on October 7, 2025
- · Construction Package 3 advertisement anticipated by end of the year
- Conducting one-on-one with interested vertical contractors end of September/early
   October
- · Will provide another update once Package 3 bids are received

introduced the 3-phase strategy for getting construction on the New Bern corridor underway. Phase 1 was awarded in July 2025, Phase 2 was open for bid submission in September and was awarded to a contractor on October 7<sup>th</sup>, Phase 3 bids are expected to open by the end of the year.



Mr. Patel and Mr. Walker clarified that 7 buses were ordered to support New Bern BRT operations. Instead of letting them sit for years of construction, the city has bought out the federal share on them, is rewrapping them to general GoRaleigh branding, and will run them on the Capital Blvd route. New buses will be ordered for New Bern in a later year. Raleigh

will submit a request to amend the FY26 Work Plan to remove planned bus acquisition until that later year of need. City is confident that using contingency from Western Corridor will cover all costs associated with getting New Bern corridor built and operational. Staff confirmed additional funds will likely need to be added to the Western budget later, once cost estimates have been updated. Going through New Bern process will help right-size the budgets for all future BRT corridors.

**Staff contact**: Het Patel, <a href="het-patel@raleighnc.gov">het-patel@raleighnc.gov</a> **Requested Action**: Receive as information.

## 6. FY 2026 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Requests

(Action Item: Steven Mott, CAMPO, 10 minutes) Attachment C

The FY 2026 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Wake Transit Work Plan amendment request packet was released for public review and comment from September 5 - October 5, 2025. Amendment cycles are scheduled throughout the fiscal year to allow Wake Transit partners the opportunity to update project scopes, schedules, budgets and/or request funding for new projects or project phases. Three amendment requests were submitted for consideration:

- GoTriangle, Wake Transit Tax District Administration, has requested an amendment to remove federal apportionment fund allocations from the FY 2026 Wake Transit Work Plan. Contact: Steve Schlossberg, <a href="mailto:sschlossberg@gotriangle.org">sschlossberg@gotriangle.org</a>
- 2. GoTriangle has requested an amendment for an additional \$100,000 to support planned customer satisfaction surveys throughout Wake County. Contact: Curtis Hayes, chayes@gotriangle.org
- 3. Wake County has requested an amendment for \$801,632 (updated amount) to support administrative changes made to the NE Wake SmartRide and on-demand shuttle program. These funds are needed to maintain current service levels. Contact: Anita Davis, <a href="mailto:anita.davis@wake.gov">anita.davis@wake.gov</a>

The Program Development Subcommittee reviewed the amendment requests at their September meeting and offered a unanimous favorable recommendation to TPAC for its consideration. CAMPO staff will present the amendment requests, <u>Attachment C</u> along with the engagement summary and request a recommendation for adoption to the Wake Transit governing boards.

Ben Howell asked if the removal of federal apportionment revenue will impact or fund balance. Mr. Schlossberg confirmed that the ~\$1.6M changes will be reflected in fund balance but that could be mitigated by actuals that are yet to be calculated. Mr. Howell also noted that there is desire to institute reporting requirements for transit agency who receive federal apportionments to share amounts received and how they are being used, especially to support Wake Transit investments.

TPAC members agree that 5307 funds should be tracked and reported out to TPAC. Some method of reporting will be developed for FY26. In FY27, CAMPO and TDA will work with partners to include language in the operating agreements to include reporting of federal allocation funds.

Mr. Martin reminded TPAC that FTA requires that UZA allocated funds be used in the UZA or "touch" the UZA it was given to. There are a couple of examples of exceptions for regional services providers, but this is the general rule.

There is no impact to the CFAP balance. It was determined that this funding adjustment amendment request applies to only one year and will be evaluated again with the FY27 call for projects.

In regard to Wake County's amendment request, members asked for clarification on how funds will be allocated and reported between Big Wake and CFA Program funds since they are both supporting the CFA Program supported NE SmartRide service. Mr. Gardiner responded that they will keep the funds separate and Wake County and Wendell will submit reimbursement requests to their individual project ID's.

GoTriangle-TDA has not completed the update to the financial policies yet. The TPAC motion to not allow operating carry over that was discussed and approved for implementation back in the summer is not yet approved by the Boards.

The topic of operating carryover was brought up. Ms. Plancich asked for clarification from TDA. She noted that the TPAC had already considered and voted to not allow carry over, per TDA recommendation, several months earlier. Mr. Schlossberg stated that TDA staff have not followed up and gotten the policy update approved by the governing boards so it is not yet in effect. Mr. Gardiner stated that we will act as though it is. We will remove carryover in FY26 and FY27 and will get the policy update adopted this year to support that path forward and to clarify what will be included in the financial model in future years. TPAC wants to keep an eye on how the funds are used since they are attributable to Wake Transit investment.

Shelby Powell asked if supplantation is a concern since we are removing a federal funding source and now being asked to pay for it with Wake Transit funds. If we are paying for something that was previously funded by Federal 5307 funds, what is 5307 being spent on. If we are now using Wake Transit fund balance to cover what should have been/has been covered by another source, that seems to be the definition of supplantation. Some further discussion is needed to discuss supplantation questions that are different from pre-Wake supplantation regulations. It was reiterated again that TPAC needs to be kept aware of how 5307 funds are being spent if they are no longer going through the Wake Transit planning process.

Some questions these requests have sparked are big asks for an amendment cycle. The way CAMPO is handling it right now is appropriate but there is still larger questions and lack of understanding about how different funding sources work, can be applied, must be reported on, etc. There is a level of education needed for TPAC to make educated decisions for future years.

Staff contact: Steven Mott, <a href="mailto:steven.mott@campo-nc.us">steven.mott@campo-nc.us</a>

Motion to recommend adoption of the FY2026/Q2 Wake Transit Work Plan amendment requests to the Wake Transit governing boards made by Paul Black. Second by Bret Martin. Note that additional discussion on supplantation and some training on federal apportionments in relation to Wake Transit financial planning is needed. Passed unanimously.

## 7. FY 2026 Period of Performance Extension Requests

(Action Item: Steven Mott, CAMPO, 10 minutes) Attachment D

In conjunction with the FY26/Q2 amendment cycle, project sponsors were asked to review their December 2025 expiring agreements to determine which may need a period of performance (POP) extension. All Wake Transit project agreements are tracked by GoTriangle staff and a list of those set to expire in the coming year were provided for partner review. In FY26, 11 requests for extension have been submitted. The POP extension requests will be reviewed by the TPAC at their October meeting where they will consider a recommendation to the Wake Transit governing boards.

Ms. Powell asked if the City of Raleigh is working with developers to identify land and working with them to purchase parcels as needed. She is concerned that without cooperation, we may still not meet the extended timelines. Mr. Patel spoke to the Triangle Town Center and Mid-Town project, noting that one of the biggest

challenges is that multiple property owners are involved and not all are interested in redeveloping right now. Nor is there a good area where Real Estate division thinks we can purchase the property needed for the price currently budgeted for the project. Mr. Walker added, for Mid-Town that GoRaleigh was able to include transit supportive conditions in the developer's re-zoning request, but that originally zoning request was pulled and discussions are occurring again to re-evaluate the request for submission. Staff are working with the developer and hope they include the transit conditions again.

Mr. Martin suggested that we update the amendment request and POP extension request tables to include what work has already been done and funds expended to date, amount remaining in the project budget and what is being requested. Steven noted that this information is compiled and shared in the larger packet, but he can look at options for adding it to the reference table.

Mr. Gardiner commented that extending projects for multiple years may be appropriate for some projects but not all. The goal is for sponsors to get their projects done as soon as possible. He wants staff to make sure that the extensions are appropriate to each project's situation. Steven noted that he did hold one on one meetings with each requesting agency prior to finalizing the requests presented today.

Staff contact: Steven Mott, <a href="mailto:steven.mott@campo-nc.us">steven.mott@campo-nc.us</a>

**Motion** to recommend governing board adoption of the FY2026 period of performance extension requests made by Tim Gardiner. Second by Het Patel. Passed unanimously.

## 8. Adoption of the Operations Security Funding Policy

(Action Item: Steven Mott, CAMPO, 10 minutes) Attachment E

A Safety & Security Workgroup was convened in January 2024 to create a policy to guide the funding of safety and security projects with Wake Transit funds. Staff will provide a short overview of the Operations Security Funding Policy, including the funding and match mechanism outlined and what funding is allowed within the policy. The policy was reviewed by the PD Subcommittee, and a unanimous, favorable recommendation was offered for consideration by TPAC. Approval of this policy will provide funding for subject operations security projects approved in the FY 2027 Wake Transit Work Plan.

This new policy can be used to inform updated funding requests submitted for the FY27 Work Plan. Those requests are due in March for release to the public in April. Difference between Security and ADA Funding Policies is the way it is allocated in the Work Plan/MYOP. The ADA has a 15% match that is automatically allocated in the MYOP. For safety and security, a project request must be submitted to pull down funds. This is most similar to the Art Funding Policy.

There is some confusion on how safety & security (S/S) money will be set aside in the MYOP. Some members prefer that an "up to" amount, similar to how ADA reimbursements are handled, be included in the MYOP. Here is an example of how this new policy would be applied.

- City is eligible for up to \$900,000 of 100% reimbursed S/S funding.
- They currently have a project to hire a safety supervisor for \$600,000.
- In the FY27 Work Plan this project will now be identified as a S/S project and that \$600,000 will count against their \$900,000 total eligible amount.
- If in FY27 or some future year, the City wishes to hire additional staff they can 1) request a separate project with a new project ID, or 2) they can update the scope of their current project to account for the additional staff and a combined total will be calculated.
- Funds over the 3% will be calculated in accordance with the policy.

Staff note that this process is similar to the Art Funding Policy in that the eligible amount is tied to a portion of the budget and is requested as a unique project to draw down the funds. There must be a project to draw

down S/S funds, but once it is adopted in the Work Plan it will be added to the MYOP with regular 2/5% growth rate per year.

Projects will be categorized as security projects when requested. One sponsor can have multiple projects like Raleigh has a supervisor project, and a support staff project. Combined they are limited to the 3% cap for 100% reimbursement.

This policy covers staff. Facilities are expected to be covered by project budgets for now. Additional discussion is needed for how multimodal hubs will be funded, how BRT corridors will fall under the policy cap and how CFA programs and facilities will receive ongoing security support. TPAC will continue to review and update the policy as these types of new situations arise.

Mr. Mott will remove reference to 7% on page 2 because members are confused by it.

Members also asked that some sort of reporting on the impact of the investment be included in the quarterly report process. It was noted that PD discussed this in detail and determined that setting specific metrics was not realistic at this time but an open-ended question on the quarterly report form could be included for sponsors to share impact/progress statements. This is supported since things like rider sense of security cannot be measured. If specific reporting requirements are desired in the future they can be included in a policy review and update process.

Staff contact: Steven Mott, steven.mott@campo-nc.us

**Motion** to adopt the Operations Security Funding Policy made by Bret Martin. Second by Paul Black. Passed unanimously.

# 9. Recommend Adoption of the Community Funding Area Program Management Plan (Action item: Suvir Venkatesh, CAMPO, 10 minutes) Attachment F

The Wake Transit Community Funding Area Program Management Plan (CFA PMP) was updated as part of the 2035 Wake Transit Plan development process. The CFA PMP outlines how the Community Funding Area (CFA) Program is structured, the application process, and performance metrics and defines reviews for CFA projects. Major updates to the PMP include more funding available and a lower local match requirement.

The CFA PMP was included in the May 2025 Phase 3 Community Engagement period for the Transit Plan and has also been reviewed by the Transit Plan Core Technical Committee and TPAC. While there were no substantive comments on the Guidelines during the Community Engagement period, CTT and TPAC members submitted comments that resulted in some minor revisions/clarifications to the CFA PMP. Changes include clarifying partners that are eligible to apply for projects and the scoring criteria for operating and capital projects. As a result, a second public review was conducted from September 22 – October 21, 2025.

An engagement summary was presented. 154 page views for the project, 3 comments; none of which were related to the draft CFA PMP. The Plan will be considered for adoption by the Wake Transit governing boards on November 19<sup>th</sup>.

Staff contact: Suvir Venkatech, <a href="mailto:suvir.venkatesh@campo-nc.us">suvir.venkatesh@campo-nc.us</a>

**Motion** to recommend governing board adoption of the updated Community Funding Area Program Management Plan made by Andrea Neri. Second by Paul Black, Pass unanimously.

### 10. Recommend Adoption of the 2035 Wake Transit Plan

(Action item: Ben Howell, CAMPO, 20 minutes) Attachments G & H

TPAC received a comprehensive overview presentation of the draft 2035 Wake Transit Plan in August and held a work session to discuss the draft Plan in more detail in September. During the work session discussion

members of the TPAC requested revisions to the document to clarify the investments in the Plan, provide more background on the planning process and implementation, and ensure the Plan is written for the correct audience.

Staff have revised the Plan document based on the discussion at the work session and the recommended 2035 Wake Transit Plan is included as Attachment G. Staff will also provide an overview of the feedback received during the most recent engagement period that ended on October 5<sup>th</sup> at the meeting. Staff are requesting that TPAC vote to recommend adoption of the recommended 2035 Wake Transit Plan to the governing boards at this meeting. It is anticipated that adoption will occur at the board meetings scheduled for November 19<sup>th</sup>.

Included with the Plan are several appendices. The appendices have been provided as Attachment H, as they are not formally adopted with the Plan. The Engagement Summary appendix only includes a summary of engagement through Phase 3 (May 2025), and the Community Funding Area Program Management Plan (CFA PMP) appendix includes the version of the CFA PMP that is being considered for adoption at the October meeting. The Microtransit Guidelines are the Microtransit Guidelines approved by TPAC, and the Prioritization Guidance will be provided once it has been approved by TPAC.

GoTriangle staff has suggested that we add to the existing language regarding VRT revenue to help it to pass board approval process. Suggestion is to add the portion in red to the current statement. "The portion of the Regional Vehicle Rental Car Tax Revenue attributable to Wake Transit continues to be under discussion by the Wake Transit Conference Committee formed in the Spring of 2024 and is subject to annual allocation decisions by the GoTriangle Board of Trustees."

Members thanked CAMPO staff for working with the partners to address all of the comments.

The language requested by GoTriangle is accurate but goes against the purpose of the TPAC, it is anti-partnership. This is technically true, but it is true for all partners. One partner holding out it makes it hard to plan and hard to act in partnership for future years. This goes against the spirit of Wake Transit.

Do we know when a decision of the conference committee will be made? TPAC and CAMPO have agreed and put forth recommended plans and one partner has held up progress. There is talk of reconvening the Conference Committee in January to get guidance for the FY27 Work Plan and future years.

Members comment that adding the language in read is giving weight and some form of special approval authority to GoTriangle. It sets it up that they'll be treated differently than the other Wake Transit partners.

GoTriangle reps noted that the current language will likely not pass their Board approval process. That for GoTriangle this is a main source of income for the agency and they need it. The inclusion of the red language is hoped to help the GoTriangle board pass the 2035 Plan.

It was confirmed that Conference Committee decisions are binding only on the TPAC. The spirit of the conference committee process is that the representatives of the three ILA partners will come to an agreement that their governing boards will abide by, but it is not required at this time.

Concern is that TPAC is not in position to make decisions regarding this issue. It has been put in the hands of the Conference Committee, and their decision will be binding on the TPAC and language provided from the committee would automatically amend the TPAC's recommendation. No action today will change that.

On November 19th, GoTriangle board meets at noon, and CAMPO at 3:00pm. If adoption of the plan does not occur, the potential impact could include delays to Bus Plan technical work until an investment strategy and financial model are approved, VRT is included in the plan at ~\$58M. Removal of VRT revenue will require removal of projects from the plan. Delay will also impact new service requests in FY28 since current short-

range plans only go through FY27. CAMPO will not enter into a contract to implement a plan that doesn't exist.

Is the geographic representation of GoTriangle in this process affecting their position. It was noted that their board is nearly 50/50 Wake and other County reps. GoTriangle concerns are about future revenue streams for the agency. It was also noted that although Conference Committee and agency leadership has had meetings there has not been a long-term decision on VRT inclusion.

Although VRT contribution was removed from Orange and Durham ILAs, Wake has never approved that change. We have a significantly larger portion of the tax since we are a larger area, and the airport boosts our numbers. It is a significant amount of funds that is being requested being requested to be removed from the Wake Transit financial model.

Staff contact: Ben Howell, ben.howell@campo-nc.us

**Motion** to recommend governing board adoption of the 2035 Wake Transit Plan with current VRT related language and minor edits discussed was made by Tim Gardiner, Second by Bret Martin. Passed unanimously.

**Note to Governing Boards**: TPAC does not feel comfortable adding the proposed language to the VRT statement for a variety of reasons, the most prominent being that the TPAC has approved general language addressing the fact that VRT inclusion in the Plan has been referred to and is being discussed by the Wake Transit Conference Committee and their decision will be binding on the TPAC. A recommendation to adopt the 2035 Wake Transit Plan today will be automatically amended to reflect the findings of the committee. Members were not comfortable in preempting the committee's decision to add language specific to one of seventeen partners. They prefer to remain neutral and wait for guidance. The

# 11. Annual Bus Service Performance and Project Progress & Expenditure Reviews (Information Item: Steven Mott, CAMPO, 20 minutes) Attachment I & J

The Bus Service Performance Review is conducted annually to provide insights into the performance of individual Wake Transit funded routes operated by GoCary, GoTriangle, and GoRaleigh.

- 8 GoCary routes were assessed 2 are in the 18 month development phase, none were over or under performing, system is stable with localized ridership fluctuations
- 21 GoRaleigh routes were assessed none are in development, 2 are overperforming and 3 are underperforming
- 6 GoTriangle routes were assessed 5 are in development phase, the remining route is neither over or under performing

The data report included in <u>Attachment I</u> details the performance of all assessed routes over the course of six quarters (FY24Q2-FY25Q3) along with a memo detailing key takeaways and insights gained from the data analysis and conversations with partner staff.

CAMPO staff have worked with Wake Transit partners over the past several months to also conduct the annual Project Progress and Expenditures (PP&E) Review. The PP&E Review provides analysis and discussion surrounding the expenditure and progress of Wake Transit projects sponsored by CAMPO, GoCary, GoRaleigh, GoTriangle, the Tax District Administration, and Wake County. The review is meant to understand the health of the Wake Transit Plan at large and provide for insight leading into the development of the FY 2027 Wake Transit Work Plan. The PP&E Review packet can be viewed in <a href="Attachment J">Attachment J</a> and includes a memorandum summarizing the reviews, the agency expenditure reports, and the written question-answer portion of the review.

Staff are making several recommendations to improve this review process. Steven will work with the partners to make needed adjustments before the next review and conducted.

## **PP&E Review: Recommendations**

- · Align review timing with fiscal year-end for complete financial data.
- · Refine contingency expectations by project type to improve comparability.
- · Establish clearer variance metrics for more actionable insights.
- Evaluate the development of benchmarks/milestones at the prefunding/allocation stage for large capital projects with future year funding for Work Plan development consideration.
- Continue leveraging successful practices like RUS Bus project management and GoRaleigh BRT phasing for current and future capital project implementation.

It was noted that getting accurate financials for specific projects is difficult and much of the information was not available for this review. TDA responded that they have every reimbursement tracked by quarter. Mr. Mott and Ms. Blazey both noted that what is being reimbursed is not specific enough. Tracking reimbursements by Work Plan implementation element by year and by

quarter is needed and necessary. Ms. Blazey noted that a couple years earlier some effort was put into developing a grant tracking workbook to help sponsors track expenditures by project. She suggests that we need to pick up that project again and get it in place to avoid issues that have been found like reimbursements not being carried out in sequence. For example, TDA may be reimbursing funds for a recent bus stop project from a much older scope. The tracking of funds is not being tied to approved Work Plan scopes which causes discrepancies in local financial tracking and hinders the reporting process.

Resolving this issue was recommended in previous ears, but it has not been acted upon yet. CAMPO staff will be able to provide a more detailed "financial health report" once the data is able to be compiled and analyzed. Mr. Schlossberg noted that he has worked with GoCary to resolve earlier issues related to budget transfers. He believes that providing this layer of review is not a big lift. Typically, TDA focuses on a 50,000 foot view but CAMPO needs project level details to conduct these reviews. TDA and CAMPO will work together to establish a tracking/reporting process that will resolve this issue for next year's review. Ms. Blazey suggests that a change to the reimbursement forms may be the place to start since their funding gets clumped together instead of staying separated out by annual project allocation and scope. It is hard to track project details when the sums shown are combined with multiple years of projects.

Members support the recommendation that the timing of the report be timed to be incorporated into next year's Work Plan. If the process gets smoother, it can be done for the annual call for projects, but if not, it should be planned to inform the recommended Work Plan development process.

Staff Contact: Steven Mott, <a href="mailto:steven.mott@campo-nc.us">steven.mott@campo-nc.us</a>

Requested Action: Receive as information.

## 12. FY 2025 Art Funding and Real Property Report

(Information item: Paul Kingman, TDA, 15 minutes)

Wake Transit Tax District Administration tracks activities associated with the 'Wake Transit Art Funding Eligibility Policy' and the 'Policy Framework for Use of Wake Transit Funds to Acquire Real Property' throughout the year. Both policies are posted in the TPAC <u>Document Library</u>. TDA staff will provide a report on FY2025 activities at the October TPAC meeting.

The report will include information on the purchase and disposal of land as well as art funding allocations and expenditures. As a reminder, projects eligible for art funding may receive up to \$30,000 for Artist Retention; reimbursable prior to the completion of 60% project design phase. In FY 2025, 2 projects were approved for Artist Retention Fees. Other Art Funding allocations are calculated based on total estimated construction cost.

## Artist Retention: Through the end of FY25:

• City of Raleigh was reimbursed \$15,000 for Artist Retention

## Art Funding: Through the end of FY25:

The City of Raleigh was reimbursed \$355,750 for Art Funding

GoTriangle was reimbursed \$87,500 for Art Funding

## Real Property: Through the end of FY25:

- The Town of Cary was reimbursed \$20.7M for Land Acquisition
- The City of Raleigh was reimbursed \$14.7M for Land Acquisition
- GoTriangle was reimbursed \$952K in FY21 for 5 parcels, however, in FY24 GoTriangle sold two parcels and refunded \$612K to the Wake Transit Fund; the Wake Transit Plan share of the 3 remaining parcels is \$383K.

Staff contact: Paul Kingman, pkingman@gotriangle.org

**Action:** Receive as information.

## 13. TPAC Subcommittee Update

Subcommittee meeting agendas and materials are posted online at least 3 days before each meeting at <a href="https://www.campo-nc.us/about-us/committees/wake-county-transit-planning-advisory-committee-tpac/subcommittee.">https://www.campo-nc.us/about-us/committees/wake-county-transit-planning-advisory-committee-tpac/subcommittee.</a>

Subcommittee	Program Development	Community Engagement			
Chair	Emma Linn,	Tim Gardiner,			
	Wake Forest	Wake County			
Vice Chair	Tracy Chandler,	Andrew Miller,			
	City of Raleigh	City of Raleigh			
Next Meeting	* Work Plan Session 10/28	* Thurs. 12/11			
	1:00-5:00pm	1;30-3:00pm			

<sup>\* =</sup> Alternative Meeting Schedule

- Emma Linn reminded PD that the next meeting is a Work Session and encouraged members to review materials and come prepared.
- CE Subcommittee will meet on December 11<sup>th</sup> to review FY26/27 task priorities and members will be asked to support several planning efforts through end of FY26 and into FY27.

## 14. Workgroup Updates

- Technology Workgroup (<u>astanion@gotriangle.org</u>) Bi-Weekly on Thursdays
- Fare Workgroup (<u>sschlossberg@gotriangle.org</u>) November 10<sup>th</sup> Fare attributable to the plan, and TAP program update/actuals from 1<sup>st</sup> year
- Financial Policies Workgroup (pkingman@gotriangle.org) TBD
- Baseline Funding Workgroup (<u>ben.howell@campo-nc.us</u>) Moving to PD review process

### 15. CAMPO Lead Agency Updates

- a. WakeTransit.org is live and is being built out. Stephanie may be contacting project sponsors to assist over the next few months.
- b. Bus Plan scoping is underway. Expect final version in mid-November and project kickoff in January.
- c. Staffing Plan is underway. The first Steering Committee has been held, and the consultants are working to finalize the interview questions and interview participants from each agency. The consultants are also reviewing background data and finalizing peer agencies for review.
- d. BRT Extensions Concept of operations study is underway. Three CTT meetings have been held to date, and the consultants are working to begin finalizing the BRT Design Guidelines, stop locations and analysis scenarios for the two corridors.
- e. Wake Transit engagement planning/prioritization is underway. CE members will review task list and be asked to volunteer for project support on December 11<sup>th</sup>.

## 16. GoTriangle/TDA Lead Agency Updates

a. All FY26 project agreements are signed except for Wake County

- b. GoTriangle legal team met to review Period of Performance (POP) questions posed by the TPAC and will share some of their recommendations.
  - i. Question 1: Can we extend the POP for large capital projects beyond 3 years when initially executed?
  - ii. Question 2: When an extension request is needed, can we request more than 1-3 years? Is there a limit?
- c. Reminder: Quarterly reports and reimbursement requests are due October 31, 2025.
- d. Government shit down is impacting local partners. TDA is monitoring and will bring updates as needed.
- e. ETRE at NC State completed detailed revenue assessment/generated some revenue assumptions. Findings are being reviewed and will be finalized in near future. One point if interest is in growth rate assumed year over year. We assume 3% they project 1.5%.

### 17. Other Business

- Included on the slides are links to view:
  - Apex comp plan info and public survey
  - GoRaleigh proposed route changes
  - GoTriangle proposed route changes
- Reminder that comments on the draft Regional Technology Plan are due tomorrow.
- GoTriangle approved the contract for the Regional Bus Blueprint, project is moving forward.
- Any partner news or business to share?

## 18. Adjourn

## **Next Meeting:**

Thursday, November 20, 2025, 9:00am Thursday, December 18, 2025, 9:00am