Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)
Meeting Summary/Minutes
July 6, 2016 – 9:00 AM – 10:05 AM
Capital Area MPO Administrative Offices

Voting Members/Alternates Present:
Chris Lukasina, Co-Chair, CAMPO; Saundra Freeman, Co-Chair, GoTriangle; Alex Rickard, CAMPO; John Tallmadge, GoTriangle; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Tim Gardiner, Wake County; Ben Howell, Town of Morrisville; Kevin Lewis, Town of Rolesville; Matt Watterson, Town of Zebulon; Ray Boylston, Town of Cary; Tim Bailey, Town of Cary; Jason Brown, Town of Knightdale; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; Tansy Hayward, City of Raleigh; David Eatman, City of Raleigh; Mike Kennon, North Carolina State University; David Bergmark, Town of Wendell; Brad Bass, Town of Garner; Corey Liles, RTP; Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest; Mark Matthews, Town of Fuquay-Varina

21 voting members/alternates present

Other Attendees:
Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO; Darcy Downs, GoTriangle; Joey Hopkins, NCDOT – Division 5; Bret Martin, CAMPO (TPAC staff); Michelle Boudreau, City of Raleigh; Eric Lamb, City of Raleigh; Erik Landfried, GoTriangle; Tim Maloney, Wake County; Jerry Jensen, Town of Cary

I. **Welcome and Introductions** – (*TPAC Co-Chairs – 5 minutes*)

   Saundra Freeman opened the meeting and invited attendees to introduce themselves around the room.

II. **Adjustments to the Agenda**

   Saundra Freeman asked TPAC members if there were any proposed adjustments to the agenda. There were no proposed adjustments to the agenda.

III. **Weighted Voting -** (*Discussion Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO – 15 minutes*)

   A. Weighted Voting Proposal from June 29th Meeting (Attachment A)
   B. Discussion and Next steps

   Saundra Freeman opened the item and turned it over to Bret Martin to present a weighted voting structure discussed at the June 29th meeting that was carried over as a tabled motion. The weighted voting structure was based on jurisdictional population (1 vote per 50,000 population), with transit governance ILA parties having equal weight with Wake County based on its population, and an additional nominally assigned single weighted vote based on whether an agency currently reports fixed-route transit service to the National Transit Database (NTD). Mr. Martin then turned the item back over to the co-chairs and the TPAC members for discussion.

   Chip Russell expressed concern over the use of NTD reporting to determine whether agencies provide transit service and suggested consideration of agencies that pay for fixed-route transit service but may not be a reporter. Tim Gardiner echoed the concern. Mr. Russell further raised a concern over the use of agencies providing existing service driving weighted voting when the funding to be directed by the Wake Transit Plan is for new services.

Jason Brown made a substitute motion to approve a weighted voting structure using population only, with the ILA parties having equal weight based on Wake County's population. The motion was seconded by Mark Matthews.

During discussion on the motion, Tansy Hayward, City of Raleigh, explained that existing transit providers and the City of Raleigh's level of existing and future commitment to transit plan implementation is not adequately represented in the proposed weighted voting structure based on population alone. Tim Bailey, Town of Cary, expressed the same level of discomfort with the proposed weighted voting structure for similar reasons on behalf of the Town of Cary. David Eatman expressed a concern with the proposed structure, presenting the case that the existing transit providers are taking on the existing onerous administrative and management requirements of transit service implementation, including the burden of taking on federal compliance requirements, which will grow as implementation occurs. Tim Gardiner mentioned that weighted voting is not something the TPAC should be using on a regular basis to make decisions or recommendations. Nicole Kreiser mentioned that the difference in the two weighted voting structures moved forward under discussion only represent a difference of four weighted votes, which may be inconsequential when weighted voting is not something that should be looked at for frequent use.

Saundra Freeman administered a vote on the motion. The motion passed with 16 voting members in favor of the motion, and five voting members opposed. Voting members opposed to the motion included both representatives each from the Town of Cary and the City Raleigh and one from GoTriangle.

IV.   **TPAC Bylaws**– (*Discussion/Possible Action Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO – 10 minutes*)

   A. Draft from TPAC Feedback (Attachment B)
   B. Next Steps

Bret Martin presented changes to the draft bylaws based on TPAC member discussion at the June 29th meeting. TPAC members discussed how the section on weighted voting should be handled within the draft bylaws and determined that only the formula dictating weighted voting should be included, with the actual weighted voting result being referred to as an exhibit within the bylaws to be maintained by the clerk and reviewed by the TPAC annually.

Tim Bailey raised the issue about the possibility of population in jurisdictions being double counted. Bret Martin explained that the methodology of the State Demographer does not double count populations, as population is either located within a jurisdiction or it is not, and incorporated jurisdictional boundaries that are being assigned population do not geographically overlap. Mr. Martin also explained that there will be a lag from the most recent population estimates to the State Demographer's estimates that are two years behind, so they may not be up to date, but population figures have to come from a credible or certified source with temporally consistent methodology.

Under the weighted voting section of the bylaws, Ben Howell asked if the group would like to add the requirement that member agencies with two members must vote as a single block when weighted voting is invoked. The group discussed the advantages and disadvantages of such a requirement. David Eatman moved that the issue be referred to the Process Sub-Committee and for the sub-committee to return to the TPAC with a recommendation for the next regular TPAC meeting. The motion was seconded by Mark Matthews. Saundra Freeman administered a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Tansy Hayward asked that the TPAC consider allowing a weighted vote to occur when amendments are made to the section addressing weighted voting and its structure in the bylaws.

Tim Gardiner raised the issue again that weighted voting should always be approached with caution. Tansy Hayward suggested that the question be referred to the Process Sub-Committee.

In the absence of any further discussion, the TPAC directed staff to return to the TPAC at its next meeting with the Process Sub-Committee's recommendations and any other comments to discuss on the bylaws at the TPAC's next meeting.

V.   **Transitional Analysis Process/Steps** - (*Information/Discussion Item – Darcy Downs, GoTriangle – 10 minutes*)

Darcy Downs distributed and presented a draft outline for a transitional analysis to move the transit systems' major capital projects implementation forward. Darcy asked the group to provide feedback on the draft outline. Eric Lamb asked which projects the transitional analysis would cover. Darcy responded that it would be inclusive of all BRT projects and the planned CRT project. Eric mentioned that prior planning work on subject projects should be added to the outline. Group discussion suggested that further consideration and development of the transitional analysis components should be worked out in the Planning and Prioritization Sub-committee. Joey Hopkins stated that any prioritization of capital projects, assuming State funding may be involved, should consider the SPOT process.

VI.   **Financial Model/Plan Budget Assumptions**– (*Information Item – Nicole Kreiser, Wake County – 15 minutes*)

Chris Lukasina opened the item and turned it over to Nicole Kreiser. Nicole provided a presentation on the Wake Transit financial model and its assumptions. Chris Lukasina emphasized the point to others that existing levels of funding were assumed in the financial model that is being comingled with anticipated Wake transit tax revenues to support plan expenditures. The group also had an expanded discussion on how the model handles replacement of vehicles associated with current fleets versus an expansion fleet and whether everything needed by the transit agencies is completely accounted for in the model. There was some concern expressed by Ray Boylston that the model assumed no additional spending on operations until FY 2019. Nicole responded by indicating that the financial model/plan is the starting point and that changes could be made but any changes will involve tradeoffs that must stay within defined parameters.

At the conclusion of the presentation, additional comments were made. In the context of ensuring compliance with State law regarding the use of sales tax revenue for supplementation rather than supplantation of existing financial resources, David Eatman wanted to make sure that the annual cost escalation in the model for transit operations would be enough to cover the increased cost of existing services. Tansy Hayward mentioned that the City of Raleigh wanted to have the flexibility to make its own internal financial decisions in the face of any possible financial challenges in the future and not be subject to a set allocation bound by the model and the plan to support its existing services. Tim Gardiner explained that the model just assumes that the existing level of service provided continues and inflates at a rate consistent with every other component of the model and that something has to be assumed. He further mentioned that this discussion will play further into a later discussion on how to define supplementation and supplantation. David Eatman also mentioned that while it is prudent that the model does not assume State funding for capital projects, it may not be setting a good precedent moving forward for being able to make a case to the State to receive it in the future.

VII.   **Other Business** – (*Information Item – TPAC Co-Chairs - 10 minutes*)

    A.   TPAC Action Deadlines (Attachment C)
    B.   New Business

C. TPAC Member Discussion
D. Next Steps

Chris Lukasina opened the item and referenced Attachment C. Chris turned it over to Bret Martin to follow up on a previous request from TPAC members to put together a critical path schedule of deadlines for TPAC work products. Mr. Martin explained that CAMPO staff previously put something similar to that together and would turn it over to the Process Sub-Committee to further develop. No other new business was brought to the TPAC's attention.

VIII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:50 am.