

APPROVED MINUTES



Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)
Regular Meeting
August 29, 2017 – 9:30 AM – 11:45 AM
Capital Area MPO Administrative Offices

Voting Members/Alternates Present:

Chip Russel, Chair, Town of Wake Forest; Shannon Cox, Vice Chair, Town of Apex; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Tim Maloney, Wake County; Mark Matthews, Town of Fuquay-Varina; Erik Landfried, GoTriangle; Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO; Tim Gardiner, Wake County; Ben Howell, Town of Morrisville; Chris Lukasina, CAMPO; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Jerry Jensen, Town of Cary; Jason Brown, Town of Knightdale; Gretchen Coperine, RTP; John Tallmadge, GoTriangle; Saundra Freeman, GoTriangle; Mackenzie Day, Town of Zebulon; Darcy Downs, GoTriangle; Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Danna Widmar, Town of Cary; Danny Johnson, Town of Rolesville; David Eatman, City of Raleigh

22 Voting Members Present; Quorum was attained through attendance of 6 eligible members from CAMPO, Wake County and GoTriangle.

Other Attendees:

John Hodges Cople, TJCOG; Jenny Green, GoTriangle; Jennifer Keep, GoTriangle; Tim Bender, City of Raleigh; Anita Davis, Wake County (TRACS); Mike Charbonneau, GoTriangle; Jason Morgan, GoTriangle; Juan Erickson, GoTriangle; Ashley Hooper, GoTriangle; Phoebe Landon, McGuireswoods; Karen Rindge, WakeUp Wake County; Kory Wilmot, AECOM; Morven McClain, WSP; Linda Wire, Citizen – City of Raleigh

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

Chip Russell called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM

II. Adjustments to the Agenda

No adjustments to the Agenda

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

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

No actual individuals in attendance signed up to speak. As pointed out by Bret Martin, please be mindful of what sign in sheet is used. One is to be used for general public or agency comment, and other is used for actual attendee sign in sheet.

IV. Process Sub-Committee Work Task List – Fall 2017 – (Action Item - Shelby Powell, Process Sub-Committee Co-Chair – 10 minutes) – Attachment A

Shelby Powell presented the work items as developed by the Process Subcommittee for the remainder of the 2017 calendar year. Items include Establishing TPAC Annual Work Program Amendment Process, Review/Update Lead Agency Assignments,



Transit Customer Survey Effort – overview & coordination, Public Engagement Processes, TPAC Subcommittee Processes/Bylaws, Coordination of Schedules Calendar, and Website Development & Communications. Descriptions of these tasks can be found in the original Attachment A as presented with the agenda on 8/29/2017.

There was a desire to include Establishment of the TPAC Annual Work Program Amendment Process with the Budget & Finance Subcommittee to review (proposed by Nicole Kreiser)

Annual Template Development for Project Agreements to be incorporated with the Process Subcommittee. Whole agreement vs Exhibit A, and include this development/review with the Budget & Finance Subcommittee (proposed by John Tallmadge). A further desire for the lead agency responsible for designing a structure for agreement templates and bring such a structure/process as a recommendation to the Process Subcommittee and Budget & Finance Committee (after vetting with ILA party entities) to then have templates move forward (proposed by Tim Gardiner). At a minimum, template development of Exhibit A.

Motion made by Nicole Kreiser, Wake County with suggested additions; Second by Danny Johnson, Rolesville.

No Further Discussion

Item is approved unanimously.

V. Frequently Asked Questions and Answers – Follow-Up on FY 2018 Wake Transit Work Plan Public Comments – (Discussion/Action Item – Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle – 15 minutes) – Attachment B

Juan Carlos Erickson presented the background of how FAQ's were developed and why. Acknowledged that the version presented for this meeting that this is the 6th round of edits. Mr. Erickson is recommending that the FAQ process in the future be a process that remains in the Process Subcommittee as a role/responsibility in future development of subsequent fiscal year work plans to allow for a faster review process.

Question from Karen Rindge, WakeUp Wake County – Will the document as presented be the format that will be posted on the website?

Mr. Erickson stated that different design can be formulated for public distribution. With the volume of FAQ's, by drilling down and categorizing public feedback, the communications group will be able to better market and inform the public on general sentiments as received during public comment periods for each annual work plan.

Comment by Mark Matthews – Item #9 – as brought up in July TPAC meeting – the desire to strike the statement ‘...additional general public or human service-oriented...’ Shelby Powell confirmed that the TPAC agreed to such a strike in previous TPAC meeting.

Comment by Mark Matthews - #13 – clarification – editing the statement in the first sentence to have the word ‘for many’ inserted to allow for the first sentence to read as follows:

Gentrification is a major concern for many within our community...



Question from Kelly Blazy, Town of Cary – Regarding the online public engagement tool – why won't agencies/parties be able to respond to all questions?

Response from Mr. Erickson is that due to anticipated volume, the goal was to categorize and generalize questions with common themes to help make the answering of questions from public feedback more feasible.

Follow up from Ms. Blazey – will we update annually? There should be a process to allow for continual need for answering/responding to citizen/stakeholder inquiries/comments.

Mr. Erickson stated that GoTriangle is facilitating the response effort with all project sponsors/lead agencies and will react to the needs and direction as deemed necessary by the group and volume/type of questions.

Mike Charbonneau stated that having one point person at each agency will be very helpful to allow for each agency to turn in a joint response regarding any set of FAQ's.

Ms. Blazey iterated the importance for expeditious response to questions/comments from the public.

Question from Gretchen Coperine – when will this set of FAQ's and timeline to allow future responses be available online?

Mr. Charbonneau stated that this set of FAQ's will be posted once approved by the TPAC.

Mr. Erickson asked if TPAC or Process Subcommittee should be the right body to approve.

Chair, Chip Russel, stated that it should be the TPAC for the time being, as there is not rounded representation on the Process Subcommittee as there is on the TPAC.

Mr. Russel asked if this FAQ process can be included in the Communications Committee.

Ms. Powell stated that she agreed that the Communications Group can take stronger ownership over the FAQ development, and have the right members from each TPAC party be involved (communications officer or other correct designee).

Tim Gardiner stated that a proposed structure/strategy be presented at future TPAC meeting so the group understands how FAQ's will be managed and communicated with effectively by all parties and eventually leading to publication to the public.

Mark Matthews suggests that recommendation of strategies of FAQ review process be a part of the Process Subcommittee tasks, not at the TPAC level.

Vice Chair, Shannon Cox, pointed out that #9 and #15 are repetitive. Mr. Erickson acknowledged and will strike for next iteration.

Chair, Mr. Russel, stated that direction that Process Subcommittee will incorporate the FAQ process with Communications Group.

Motion made by Mark Matthews, Fuquay-Varina, with noted edits; Second made by Danny Johnson



*No further discussion
Item passes unanimously*

**VI. Wake Transit Implementation Branding, Marketing and Online Presence Strategy
– (Discussion/Action Item – Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle – 20 minutes) –
Attachment C**

Mike Charbonneau presented this item. Described purpose of the draft plan and guidelines and how it will work through communications tied with work plans and overall communications for Wake Transit purposes.

No longer incorporating in title notion of ‘branding’. Each Transit agency will retain individual and regional brands, and Wake Transit will serve and be branded as a funding source to allow for such a service or investment to be possible.

As a part of this document, it proposes the creation of a Communications Steering Committee that will discuss ongoing communications and marketing strategies to maximize reach and amplifying shared key messages regarding any all aspects of the plan.

Mr. Charbonneau suggested an edit to the draft document to exclude ‘Wake County, Wake TRACS’ from the top line of page 2.

Tim Maloney, Wake County, clarified for Mr. Charbonneau that the desire for Wake County is not to be a part of the ‘rotation’ of leading the steering committee. First paragraph of page 2 will stay the same.

Suggested edit - Third paragraph on page 2, first sentence, to be edited as follows:

‘...of the transit partners (GoCary, GoRaleigh, & GoTriangle) will take turns in rotation leading the collaborative process for developing the next year’s Communications and Marketing Plan and leading the Communications Steering Committee for the next year.

Shelby Powell commented regarding the last sentence of paragraph 3 on page 2 of draft document that agencies do in fact have individuals solely devoted to marketing and communications aspect for Wake Transit. Mr. Charbonneau clarified that this statement is demonstrating that there is not one person at any agency that is simply able to oversee and lead/coordinate single-handedly marketing and communications of Wake Transit implementation, and it is being proposed as a shared/collaborative process.

Kelly Blazey discussed concerns over staff availability to effectively lead such a process of collaboration.



Mr. Charbonneau recognized that concern and wanted to clarify that they wanted to allow for multiple agencies to take rotating leads, and not to have the perception that GoTriangle would be leading in a Silo.

Suggested edit - Mr. Charbonneau suggested after discussion points to strike the final sentence of paragraph 3, page 2.

Chair, Mr. Russell, recognized that 'chairing' the steering committee as a part of this document is simply chairing and organizing aspects of, but the processes involved with the committee will still truly be a team effort of all involved agencies. Confirmed by Mr. Charbonneau.

Suggested edit of first sentence of paragraph 3, page 2, to be '...leading the collaborative effort...' (replacing process with effort).

Question by Ms. Blazey about the use of the technical document created by Quest Corporation of America that the TPAC had so many problems with. Ms. Powell responded that the Process Subcommittee made the decision that there was plenty of good technical information that will serve as a reference tool.

GoTriangle has control now over the Wake Transit domain/website. There will be shared access allowance to agencies that have items to share. GoTriangle acknowledges that they will do the 'heavy lifting' for documentation/publication creation, but recognize the need for shared usage and authorities.

*Motion to approve document with suggested edits – John Tallmadge, GoTriangle;
Second made by Sandra Freeman.*

Additional Discussion:

Karen Rindge asked Mr. Charbonneau if all communications aspect meetings will be open to the public.

Mr. Gardiner stated that the meetings will be public, but will not necessarily be advertised.

Mark Matthews – point of order – asking if same agency can make motion and have a second? Mark Matthews documented as a second for this purpose.

Bylaws do not specifically address differing agencies must be separate from original motion and second.

Passes unanimously



VII. Multi-Year Bus Service Implementation Plan – Draft Plan-Level Decision Making

Structure – (Information/Discussion Item – Jenny Green, GoTriangle/Bret Martin, CAMPO – 15 minutes) – **Attachment D**

Jenny Green, GoTriangle, presented attachment and prefaced presentation that final draft of such item will come to TPAC for approval at a future date (potentially September, 2017).

Question by David Eatman – what was meant by ‘Passenger facility conceptual design’. Ms. Green responded as conceptual design scoped up to two passenger facing facilities, such as a transfer center.

Question by John Tallmadge – what action will be necessary through the document with regards to the CFA market analysis. What will be informed by this task? Ms. Green confirmed Mr. Tallmadge’s questions regarding concepts presented.

Question by Ms. Blazey – need to change GoCary to Town of Cary. Acknowledged by Ms. Green

Ms. Green called upon Bret Martin, CAMPO to discuss and expand upon more regarding Task 5, Locally Coordinated Human Services Transportation Update and clarify information/action items in the matrix. There is a requirement to coordinate with recipients of federal funding.

Dispute resolution and simultaneous review on deliverables – all must be coordinated and within compliance, but disputes can arise. Use of the CTT as the space to have the formal conversations initially to attempt to resolve issues first hand. There will be identification between minor or major disputes. Minor disputes, impacting one deliverable, can be handled simply through the CTT. If major, impacting more than one deliverable, the CTT will attempt to resolve first; if unable at CTT, the dispute will go to the formed Executive Committee as a part of the Multi-Year Bus Service Implementation Plan. If dispute remains, then the issue comes to the TPAC seeking final resolution.

Mr. Mark Matthews asked about formal design of how a party can invoke the formal dispute process. Is there a formal action that one needs to take?

Ms. Green and Mr. Gardiner acknowledged that the dispute from any TPAC member should go through proper channels. They should discuss the issue with their CTT representative, and then the dispute will rise to necessary levels as described initially by Ms. Green.

One item that still required discussion. The concurrency checkpoint aspects. Mr. Martin clarified the main question – does the TPAC need to approve concurrency checkpoints, or do they need to recommend these aspects to the governing boards? There was ambiguity within the CTT as to the issues at hand for who needs to approve.

Mr. Tallmadge posed a scenario – with differing ideas regarding individual projects, offering perspective to assist with decision making regarding the concurrence



checkpoint. Recommends that concurrence checkpoints should be that TPAC make recommendations at a policy level to then be approved by the two governing boards.

Mr. Martin stated that CAMPO perspective is that due to interagency complexities with processes around project concurrence, he agrees with Mr. Tallmadge's recommendation.

Ms. Green responded to Mr. Gardiner's inquiry regarding what specific needs are to be changed. The last column would be edited to state that governing boards are required to review and approve concurrence checkpoints when action is necessary.

Ms. Cox asked sought clarification on title between plan level and project level decision making structures. Nicole furthered the point of clarification wanting to understanding the definition between plan vs. project decision making structures and ensure that each document outlining such needs are clear.

Ms. Green recognized the differences needed to be made and clarified on site. Plan-level decision making on plan would be packages of projects and concepts over a horizon year timeframe. Individual projects are reviewed through the project level decision making structure.

Mr. Martin explained the processes and concurrence checkpoint needs could and should be a separate document to allow for schedule and timing for bringing forth such issues.

Mr. Gardiner – recommends Task 2.2 be broken out as a separate task. Mr. Russell reminds that as an information item – to pass on comments to Ms. Green to ensure that document can be made final.

VIII. Kickoff of FY 2019 Wake Transit Work Plan Development – (Information Item – Nicole Kreiser, Budget and Finance Sub-Committee Co-Chair – 25 minutes)

Ms. Nicole Kreiser presented to the TPAC an overview on FY19 Work Plan Development processes and schedules, leading to overall board and budget adoptions for an FY19 implementation. Presentation is provided electronically on the TPAC section of the CAMPO website for future reference.

IX. TPAC Staff Updates – (Information Item – Bret Martin, TPAC Staff - 5 minutes)

- A. TPAC recommendation to include MPA parties as third party beneficiaries to Governance ILA

Mr. Martin brought to TPAC Member's attentions that TPAC did recommend to include MPA parties as third party beneficiaries to the Governance ILA for Wake Transit.

- B. New TPAC Administrator



Mr. Martin introduced Adam Howell as the new TPAC Administrator. He will be leading and coordinating all efforts related to TPAC activities, affairs and direction. He will also be providing technical assistance throughout the plan implementation to all Wake Transit/TPAC participating parties.

Chris Lukasina recognized Mr. Martin's efforts for jump starting the TPAC process.

Mr. Martin emphasized that Mr. Howell will be setting up a meeting between TPAC leadership and project managers to allow for the management for the TPAC master schedule and continue to keep the plan implementation moving forward.

TPAC members are encouraged to rely on their CTT members/representatives to help relay and receive communication regarding specific projects.



X. On-Call Transit Planning Services Task Status Updates – (Information Item – 20 minutes)

A. Public Engagement Strategy – (Bret Martin, CAMPO)

Mr. Martin presented brief overview of the public engagement strategy. Brand development component has been dropped. Alternative approach was taken action upon during this meeting and moving forward. Background on the strategy has been developed to understand generalities regarding how public engagement will within the entire plan implementation. Finalization is expected to come to TPAC in October, 2017. Next CTT Meeting is on September 25, 2017.

B. Staffing Model and Expectations Plan – (Bret Martin, CAMPO)

Nearing the finish line. Internal CTT meeting has been formulated to further inform the study and take it towards completion. Draft memo of staffing allocation has been received and will be reviewed internally by the CTT as we work towards finalization. Staffing responsibilities has been made agnostic to sponsoring agencies, but has been placed into buckets recognizing parties to Tax District Administration, Plan Implementation Administration and Wake Transit general administration.

C. Community Funding Area Program Management Plan – (Bret Martin, CAMPO)

Peer Review is under way. Municipal meeting to allow for all municipalities has been setup for September 18, 2017 is scheduled to allow for all CFA entities to provide feedback on what the program should look like.

D. Multi-Year Bus Service Implementation Plan – (Jenny Green, GoTriangle/Bret Martin, CAMPO)

Stakeholder workshop was held and conducted with multiple entities directing how public engagement centered around the MYBSIP and MIS should be designed. Should be outlined for September TPAC meeting review and discussion. First round of public engagement has been targeted for September, 2017 – looking at project prioritization beyond FY19 planning efforts.

CTT is working on the specifics on the project prioritization polices. Coordinating closely with MIS CTT.

Project level decision making structures will most likely be presented at the September TPAC meeting.

E. Transit Corridors Major Investment Study – (Bret Martin, CAMPO/Jason Morgan and Darcy Downs, Go Triangle)

Contract in process of being finalized.



First CTT meeting to be held in September (the 13th) prior to contract being placed – to allow for project to begin and move forward.

Kickoff meeting was conducted and successful, as lead by the consultants and the project management team.

F. Transit Customer Surveys – (Erik Landfried, GoTriangle)

This project has been passed off to Communications team of GoTriangle (Juan Carlos Erickson). Expect further updates at next TPAC meetings.

Mr. Charbonneau recognizes the need for a baseline survey to be implemented in the next year to help capture attitudinal and behavioral responses for expectations of aspects of Wake Transit. To help guide further survey development.

XI. **Sub-Committee Chair Reports** – (Information Item – Chip Russell, TPAC Chair – 15 minutes)

A. Budget and Finance

Ms. Kreiser – B&F Subcommittee is meeting on 8/31 at 10 AM; Fare working group has also started.

B. Planning and Prioritization

Mr. Landfried – P&P is meeting on 9/5 at 9:30 AM – attachments to follow with agenda; Co-Chair solicitation is desired!

C. Process

Next Process Subcommittee is meeting 9/8 and list from work tasks will be discussed to be prioritized.

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

A. New Business

None

B. TPAC Member Discussion

None

C. Next Steps

None



XIII. Adjourn

Adjourn at 11:58 AM.