

GO FORWARD

A COMMUNITY INVESTMENT IN TRANSIT
WAKE COUNTY

Wake Transit Plan

Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)
Special Meeting
May 22, 2018 – 9:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Capital Area MPO Administrative Offices

NOTICE: If you are not a TPAC Member/Alternate entity representative, please use seating along the walls behind the table. If you are seeking to speak on anything not a part of the agenda, you may do so during Item III on the agenda and MUST sign in on the Public/Agency Speaks Out Sign-In Sheet outside the board room. If you are seeking to speak on anything on the current agenda, you must be recognized by the TPAC Chair, or an official TPAC Member/Alternate entity representative.

Meeting Minutes/Summary

Voting Members/Alternates Present

Bret Martin, Town of Cary; Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Het Patel, Town of Garner; Benjamin Howell, Town of Morrisville; David Walker, City of Raleigh; John Tallmadge, GoTriangle; Saura Freeman, GoTriangle; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Danny Johnson, Town of Rolesville; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Chris Lukasina, CAMPO; Mark Matthews, Town of Fuquay-Varina

Other Alternates Present

Christine Sondej, Town of Cary; Erik Landfried, GoTriangle; Eric Lamb, City of Raleigh; John Hodges, Town of Garner

General Attendees

Terry Nolan, Wake County; Toy Beeninga, City of Raleigh; Will Allen, GoTriangle Board of Trustees; Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle; Morven Maclean, WSP; Shelley Blake, GoTriangle; Mary Kate Morookian, GoTriangle

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

Shannon Cox, Vice Chair, welcomed all to the meeting. She informed those in attendance that Chip Russell was unable to be present for this meeting. She will be chairing the meeting.

II. Adjustments to the Agenda

None

GO FORWARD

A COMMUNITY INVESTMENT IN TRANSIT WAKE COUNTY

III. **General Public or Agency Speaks Out** – (Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 5 minutes)

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

None

IV. **FY2019 Wake Transit Work Plan: Operating & Capital Agreements & Exhibits** – (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator, 30 minutes) – **Attachment A**

Mr. Howell presented an updated overview of the proposed FY 2019 Operating & Capital Agreements & Exhibits Packet.

Consensus was declared by those in attendance that the project groupings for agreement purposes was acceptable.

Mr. Howell presented the projects to which CAMPO will need to be a party. Ms. Powell stated that CAMPO will need to be on all projects as highlighted in the presentation, as well as all bus operating projects. Justification behind this is the potential future need for conducting TIP action as necessary.

Mr. Tallmadge asked about the Wendell & Zebulon projects in FY19 as sponsored by each municipality – as to whether or not GoTriangle would assume responsibility of those projects. TPAC members responded that this is the case for Knightdale on the Knightdale Raleigh Express (KRX), but both Wendell and Zebulon have chosen to remain as project sponsors in relation to the stops served by the Zebulon-Wendell Express (ZWX) route. Mr. Tallmadge asked that the TPAC address the issue as to whether or not GoTriangle should, in the future, absorb these minor costs.

Mr. Martin asked about the agreement structure in regard to the proposed Youth GoPass project. Tax District Counsel confirmed that all three transit operating agencies would be parties to one single agreement. Mr. Martin then asked if Wake County would have any role or need to be a party to the Youth GoPass Agreement. Ms. Kreiser stated that Wake County does not have a reporting role, but is playing a role in assisting with pass distribution at County-managed facilities. The County will have to think about the need for being a party to this specific agreement and let the Tax District know.

Mr. Howell summarized the projects, in addition to the ones presented, to which CAMPO will be a party. Tax District counsel will also be including a statement in agreements to which CAMPO is a party regarding TIP action as necessary. Consensus was declared by those in attendance that the projects that will include CAMPO as a signatory, as well as the added statement in the agreements of CAMPO's role as suggested by Tax District counsel, was acceptable.

GO FORWARD

A COMMUNITY INVESTMENT IN TRANSIT

WAKE COUNTY

Mr. Howell presented an overview of highlighted changes in the FY19 agreements, both capital and operating. He called upon Ms. Shelley Blake, Tax District counsel, to expand on the timeframe as written. She explained that there was discrepancy between timeframes for invoice submittal and timeframe of the life of the project agreement. Ms. Kreiser asked if this was related to both operating and capital. Ms. Blake confirmed. Ms. Kreiser clarified that the fiscal amount listed for capital projects are total amounts for the entire phase of the project as submitted. This means it should be a multi-year agreement, and language should be incorporated. Ms. Blake stated that language will need to be amended to address this need, as current agreements as presented only allow for a year of spending against each project.

Mr. Martin suggested the addition of a statement referencing a period of performance, in addition to the term of the contract – specifically to operating. He stated the Town would like to see a period of performance statement that would allow for a project sponsor to accrue expenses against each individual project during the fiscal year. Ms. Freeman asked for Mr. Martin to clarify the difference between agency accrual and tax district actions. Mr. Martin stated that the project sponsor will accrue expenses through the allowance as defined by the period of performance. Then, the term allows for the project sponsor to submit invoices beyond the period of performance and allow for the accounting functions to take place. Mr. Martin continued, on the capital side of projects in work plans, the Town does not have much issue with the defined term as presented to the TPAC during this meeting. He did suggest, though, to extend one more additional year beyond the original draft presented. Mr. Howell did clarify that the most recent draft defines a term for capital projects through the end of calendar year 2021. The capital agreements currently read to allow for expenses to be accrued against each project through December, 2021. What is being proposed for period of performance is to allow for invoices to be submitted by August 10 of the following fiscal year. Ms. Kreiser suggested and clarified that a capital project's period of performance should be 3 years; terms of projects should follow the fiscal year calendar. Exhibit A's as a part of each agreement will contain full budgeted amounts as appropriated by the work plan, as well as deliverables. The full budgeted amount will be the full cost of the project; the deliverables could change and evolve on an annual basis. Mr. Tallmadge asked that projects with open and continuing phases/budgets be reviewed at the end of each fiscal year to evaluate progress and terms as defined in the agreements and Exhibit A's. Ms. Cox asked Ms. Blake to summarize this discussion into draft language and present it at the conclusion of this agenda item prior to action.

**** Ms. Blake did come back to the TPAC to state new proposed draft language*

“Any reimbursable cost associated with a project must be completed by June 30th of that fiscal year and should be submitted for reimbursement by Aug 10th to apply to the fiscal year of submission.”

****This language will be included under the Terms section of both operating and capital agreements.*

GO FORWARD

A COMMUNITY INVESTMENT IN TRANSIT

WAKE COUNTY

Mr. Howell continued the discussion by reviewing draft proposed language from Tax District Counsel regarding a special provision with special agreements.

Mr. Martin stated that the proposed language is fine, but additional language should be incorporated to reference the concurrence/endorsement policy (and other policies still in development for Wake Transit) when fully adopted by both Wake Transit Governing boards. Ms. Kreiser clarified that Wake County's desire for additional language for special agreements was to require inclusion of appropriate parties to be involved in project development coordination through project completion. Wake County stated it wanted the agreement language to help TPAC to understand the need for project coordination through this desired added language. Mr. Martin stated that the concept of concurrence has not yet been institutionalized as a policy, and cannot be fully referenced at this time for FY19 agreements.

TPAC partners are comfortable with the 'Funding' statement as proposed, but striking '...in an agreement.' at the end of the sentence after the word 'documented.' The new sentence would read:

Funding. In the event that there will be funding for the Project from multiple sources, all parties with a financial contribution agree that the cost allocation must be specifically documented.'

Ms. Blake stated this would be placed under the responsibilities section of each agreement when appropriate. Ms. Blake also suggested that the main parties to the Master Participation Agreement be listed in the proposed concurrence statement (and encouraging project sponsors to coordinate with appropriate parties as necessary). The goal will be to incorporate a formalized reference to the eventually adopted concurrence policy (to occur during FY19) in the creation of the FY20 agreements. The group stated consensus on Ms. Blake's suggestion.

Mr. Howell summarized the format of the Exhibit A, and that no formatting has changed between FY18 and FY19.

Mr. Howell summarized the proposed Scope Reference Statement:

The project description included in the FY2019 Adopted Wake Transit Work Plan, and as amended, is incorporated herein by reference.

This statement would be listed on the Exhibit A under 'Scope.'

Mr. Howell continued to summarize updated language regarding deliverables on Exhibit A's that have been standardized (i.e. bus acquisition projects), as well as updated language requested by the Town of Cary on its projects. Mr. Tallmadge asked if the TPAC Planning & Prioritization (P&P) Subcommittee will add to its work task list the review and development of potential standards for project reporting deliverables – especially as TPAC moves towards FY20 work plan development. Mr. Howell and the co-chairs of the P&P Subcommittee confirmed this would occur.

GO FORWARD

A COMMUNITY INVESTMENT IN TRANSIT WAKE COUNTY

Motion: Approve (with any discussed clarifications & edits during the Special 5/22/2018 TPAC Meeting) the FY2019 Wake Transit Plan: Operating & Capital Agreements & Exhibits and Recommend to the Wake Transit Governing Boards.

Motion made by: Nicole Kreiser

Second: Sandra Freeman

Motion passes unanimously.

V. **MIS – Bus Rapid Transit: Definition of Corridor Transportation Problems – Problem Statements** – (Discussion/Action Item – Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle, 30 minutes) – **Attachment B**

Mr. Patrick McDonough presented the MIS – Bus Rapid Transit: Definition of Corridor Transportation Problems – Problem Statements to TPAC

Mr. Tallmadge asked if the CTT reviewed not only conditions with system operation, but also access to and physical conditions of said access to proposed BRT services. Mr. Tallmadge continued to clarify his question by asking if the document highlights issues/problems as related to the customer experience, or does it only touch on the three major ‘headlines’ as presented by Mr. McDonough. Ms. Shelby Powell clarified that the need for the problem statement is to describe, at a high level, a comprehensive description of the problem the region is working to solve.

Mr. Eric Lamb asked for ‘roadway capacities’ to be removed from the document, but rather use ‘existing & projected growth and travel demand issues.’ Mr. McDonough also summarized the previous point to include customer experience with the phrase ‘improve transit service’, as well as the point made by Mr. Lamb. These text edits will be incorporated into the individual corridor sections as well.

Motion: Approve the MIS – Bus Rapid Transit: Definition of Corridor Transportation Problems – Problem Statements.

Motion made by: Benjamin Howell, with the edits as discussed.

Second: Shelby Powell

Motion passes unanimously.

VI. **MIS – Bus Rapid Transit: System Performance Standards Memo** – (Discussion/Action Item – Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle – 30 minutes) – **Attachment C**

Mr. McDonough presented the MIS – Bus Rapid Transit: System Performance Standards Memo to TPAC.

Mr. Tallmadge asked about the stated on-time performance standard for BRT as presented in the document – he recognized it is the same standard as the region’s bus service on-time performance.

GO FORWARD

A COMMUNITY INVESTMENT IN TRANSIT WAKE COUNTY

Mr. Will Allen asked about the presented average speed of 16 mph for the proposed BRT system. Mr. McDonough stated that the CTT and consultant team reviewed peer BRT systems to understand average travel speeds of individual systems – 16 mph would exceed travel speeds of many systems in the USA. Mr. Martin cautioned the group as to how to publish travel speed information with the public in mind – as the general citizen does not think about average travel speed, but maximum travel speeds allowed on a trip/corridor in their personal vehicles. The same concept could be considered for discussion around BRT/bus travel publications. Mr. Landfried cautioned the TPAC that setting the BRT on-time performance standard at the same level as for bus service would be a mistake.

Motion: Approve the MIS – Bus Rapid Transit: System Performance Standards memo and Recommend to the Wake Transit Governing Boards

Motion made by: Chris Lukasina

Second: David Walker

Mr. Bret Martin asked for an amendment to the motion – with Figure 16 in the header – to strike ‘and headway adherence.’

Mr. Tallmadge referenced Figure 3 and Figure 11 inconsistencies between frequencies as presented in the document. Mr. McDonough clarified that the project manager will confer with the consultants as to why there is a variation. Mr. Tallmadge requested the frequencies in Figure 3 be the same as in Figure 11 to be 10 minutes (not 15 minutes). Mr. Tallmadge also asked that a description of tradeoffs between different standards, like the on-time performance standard, be presented to the GoTriangle Board of Trustees when also presenting the system performance standards memo for approval.

Ms. Cox asked Mr. Lukasina if he is accepting of these two minor amendments to his original motion. Mr. Lukasina confirmed.

Motion passes unanimously.

VII. Other Business – (Information Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair - 5 minutes)

a. New Business

None

b. TPAC Member Discussion

None

c. Next Steps

None

VIII. Adjourn