

WAKE COUNTY TRANSIT PLAN

Transit Planning Advisory Committee

Regular Meeting

January 22, 2019

CAMPO Administrative Offices, Conference Room A

9:30 AM – 12:00 PM

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

Meeting Minutes/Summary

Voting Members & Alternates Present

Kevin Wyrauch, Town of Cary; Dirk Siebenbrodt, Town of Holly Springs; Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle; Ben Howell, Town of Morrisville; Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest; Het Patel, Town of Garner; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Bret Martin, CAMPO; Tim Gardiner, Wake County; David Walker, City of Raleigh; David Eatman, City of Raleigh; Akul Nishawala, Town of Fuquay-Varina; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Danny Johnson, Town of Rolesville; Mary Kate Morookian, GoTriangle

Other Alternates Present

Jonathan Jacobs, Town of Wake Forest; Mila Vega, City of Raleigh

General Attendees

Tyler Bray, Atkins; Bob Boot, Atkins; Nathan Spencer, Raleigh Transit Authority; Jim Kessler, NCRR; Juan Carlos Erickson; Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle; Will Allen, GoTriangle Board of Trustees;

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

Mr. Chip Russell welcomed all to the meeting

II. **Adjustments to the Agenda** – (*Chip Russell, TPAC Chair*)

None

III. **General Public or Agency Speaks Out** – (*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.

Mr. Jim Kessler reported that NCCR provided comments on the concurrence framework (Agenda Item X) in the days preceding the TPAC meeting.

Ms. Mila Vega provided an update regarding project prioritization for the BRT project. In this fiscal year (FY19), the City of Raleigh has sufficient funds to advance one project into the federal project development process. Due to feedback from the public and Raleigh City Council stressing quick implementation, the New Bern corridor, which has alignment certainty, right of way availability, and fewer complexities than the other corridors, is recommended as the first project to enter Small Starts project development in Winter 2019. With additional FY20 funds, all remaining corridors will be entered into project development. Each remaining corridor will advance in parallel, with schedule deviations based on the complexities of each specific project. If all deadlines are met, construction will begin on the first corridor in the summer of 2021, with revenue service for the first corridor beginning in 2023. The remaining corridors are all scheduled for revenue service to begin by 2027. In the near term, Ms. Vega explained that the City of Raleigh is engaged in a procurement process for project development consulting and is reviewing RFQ submittals with a selection committee. A contract is likely to be presented to the Raleigh City Council at the end of February.

IV. Elections of TPAC Chair and Vice Chair – (Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator – 5 minutes)

Requested Action: Nominate and elect a TPAC Chair and Vice Chair to serve for the 2019 calendar year.

Mr. Adam Howell called for nominations for the TPAC Chair Position. Mr. Bret Martin nominated Ms. Shannon Cox of Apex, which was seconded by Ms. Kelly Blazey. No other nominations were received. Mr. Howell called for a vote on the nomination of Ms. Cox as TPAC Chair for the 2019 calendar year. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Howell called for nominations for the TPAC Vice Chair Position. Mr. Martin nominated Mr. Het Patel of the Town of Garner, which was seconded by Ms. Blazey. No other nominations were received. Mr. Howell called for a vote on the nomination of Mr. Patel as TPAC Vice Chair for the 2019 calendar year. The vote was unanimous.

V. Meeting Minutes/Summary from December 22, 2018 Regular Meeting (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator; 5 minutes) – Attachment A

Requested Action: Consider approving the Meeting Minutes/Summary from the November 14, 2018, Regular Meeting.

Motion by Mr. Ben Howell: Approve the Meeting Minutes/Summary from December 22nd
Second: Mr. Martin
Motion passes unanimously

VI. 2019 Calendar Year TPAC Meeting Day/Time Selection (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator; 5 minutes)

Based on survey results, TPAC will need to choose from top 3 ranked day/time combinations as the preferred day/time for remaining 2019 TPAC meetings. This does not include any special meetings that may arise for a certain purpose.

Requested Action: Confirm, as a group, remaining 2019 day/time and location for TPAC meetings.

Mr. Howell reported on scheduling preferences received from a survey sent to TPAC members prior to the meeting. Wednesday mornings from 9:30-11:30am had the highest preference, followed by Tuesday and Thursday mornings at the same time.

Ms. Nicole Kreiser clarified whether this agenda item also included a consideration for which week of the month to hold TPAC meetings, and proposed the 2nd Wednesday of the month, with other Tuesdays being scheduled as issues arise.

Mr. Martin expressed agreement with the proposal but requested the April meeting be held on April 23rd to accommodate the current schedule for the Wake Transit Work Plan.

Motion by Ms. Kreiser: TPAC will continue to meet on the 2nd Wednesday of each month from 9:30-11:30am, with an exception in April to meet on 4/23/19.

Second: Mr. Martin

Motion passes unanimously

VII. Subcommittee Leadership & Work Task Lists – (Discussion/Action Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator; 10 minutes) – Attachment B

Each subcommittee has held individual elections for each respective leadership position (Chair and Vice Chair). Each subcommittee has also developed draft work task lists that outline proposed work to be completed between February and July of 2019. The TPAC is charged with confirming both the elected leadership personnel and work task lists of each subcommittee.

Requested Action: Consider approving the new Subcommittee Leadership and February-July 2019 Work Task Lists.

Mr. Howell explained that subcommittees elect new annual leadership at the first subcommittee meeting of the calendar year, as well as create work task lists for the upcoming 6 months. He described that the only changes to subcommittee leadership from the prior year as a result of these proceedings is that Mary Kate Moorokian of GoTriangle was elected as Vice Chair for the Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee, and the Public Engagement & Communications Subcommittee has modified its co-chair structure to a chair/vice chair structure with Bonnie Parker as Chair and Mike Charbonneau as Vice Chair. Mr. Howell explained the work task lists are included in the agenda packet and opened the floor for any questions regarding the Work Task List document.

Mr. Martin asked that a TPAC cabinet meeting be held soon to better coordinate the numerous joint committee efforts being held through July.

Motion by Ms. Kreiser: Approve the new Subcommittee Leadership and February-July 2019 Work Task Lists

Second: Mr. Kevin Wyrach

Motion passes unanimously

VIII. FY 2019 Work Plan 3rd Quarter Amendments – (Discussion/Action Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff, 15 minutes) – Attachment C

Four (4) FY 2019 Wake Transit Work Plan amendment requests were submitted for the 3rd quarter of the fiscal year. Per the Wake Transit Work Plan Amendment Policy, the TPAC

Budget & Finance and Planning & Prioritization Subcommittees are tasked with jointly reviewing the quarterly Work Plan draft amendment list and amendment request forms when a Major Amendment request is submitted. The subcommittees consider appropriateness of changes in scope and, if applicable, financial choices and trade-offs associated with proposed amendments, creating a disposition for TPAC consideration. The list of amendment requests, along with the joint subcommittee disposition and voting records are found in Attachment C.

Four (4) amendment requests were submitted:

- Major Amendments:
 - FTE for Commuter Rail Environmental Planner (NEW Project)
 - FTE for Manager of Commuter Rail Design (NEW Project)
 - Multi-Year Bus Service Implementation Plan (TO002-G) and Community Funding Area Program Management Plan (TO002-K)
- Minor Amendments:
 - Sunday Service all Routes, Expanded Paratransit & Holiday Hours for GoCary (TO004-A)

Requested Action: Consider recommending approval of the FY 2019 Wake Transit Work Plan 3rd Quarter Amendments to the Wake Transit governing boards.

Mr. Martin explained that four amendment requests were received, with three classified as major, and one as minor. The major amendment regarding projects TO002-G and TO002-K makes a modification to items from the FY18 workplan, collapsing two lines in the operating budget related to the Bus Plan and the Community Funding Area Program Management Plan. This amendment also expands the scope of these projects to include work related to the staffing plan and public engagement policy. Finally, this request adds \$202,000 to the amount encumbered from FY18 to FY19. Mr. Martin clarified that the total budget for the project was originally around \$1.4 million, but that less than was needed to complete the projects was encumbered from FY18 to FY19 (\$500,000). Mr. Martin further clarified that the amendment request does not exceed the original budgeted amount.

The other two major amendments correspond to GoTriangle positions needed to implement pre-project development work for the commuter rail project, and any subsequent project development steps. These positions are supported by the staffing plan. Mr. Martin noted that the request originally came in with a \$75,000 FY19 impact, however GoTriangle has since modified the request to cost allocate with Durham County, as it is a cross-county project. The updated FY19 Wake Transit impact is \$50,025, annualized at \$100,050, which would escalate 2.5% annually while the positions are needed. Mr. Martin also noted that approval of the amendment does not pre-suppose later stages or approvals for the commuter rail project.

Mr. Martin explained that the minor amendment is related to a project that expanded service for Town of Cary routes, including adding Sunday service, and paratransit and holiday hours. Due to upcoming service changes, a scope change is needed to reflect the modified routes that would be covered by the project. Mr. Martin further clarified that this amendment would not become effective until Cary implements the service changes, pending Town Council approval.

Mr. Martin noted that financial and scope dispositions from the Budget & Finance and Planning & Prioritization subcommittees are included in agenda materials.

Ms. Shelby Powell noted that meeting materials describe that no public comments had been received in the comment period and asked if any had been received since the materials were created. Mr. Martin and Mr. Matthew Cushing replied that no comments have been received.

Motion by Ms. Powell: Recommend approval of the FY 2019 Wake Transit Work Plan 3rd Quarter Amendments to the Wake Transit governing boards.

Second: Ms. Blazey
Motion Passes unanimously.

IX. FY 2020 Draft Wake Transit Annual Work Plan – (Discussion/Action Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff; Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle Staff, 20 minutes) – Attachment D

The TPAC and its assigned lead agencies are responsible for the development of all components of annual Wake Transit Work Plans. It includes:

- Annual Operating Budget;
- Multi-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP);
- Annual Capital Budget;
- Multi-Year Operating Program;
- Update of the Wake Transit Financial Plan and financial model assumptions;
- Capital Funding Agreements; and
- Operating Agreements

The TPAC is asked to review the work plan document in draft form and consider allowing staff to publish for public review and comment. Staff will then review any public comments and make potential changes to the draft work plan and present a recommended work plan to the TPAC in the spring of 2019.

Requested Action: Consider releasing the Draft FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan for public review and comment.

Mr. Martin discussed the work plan development schedule, commenting that this schedule was shown previously in September. Since then, he added, there have been several subcommittee meetings related to work plan development, the call for projects has occurred, and the Budget & Finance and Planning & Prioritization Subcommittees have reviewed submitted projects, checking, among other considerations, for alignment with the Bus Plan. As part of the financial analysis, revenue assumptions were revisited, and project sponsors were asked to look for savings and modify budgets where possible to account for lowered revenue projections. If the Draft Work Plan is recommended for release today, Mr. Martin explained, release for public comment is suggested on 1/28 with comments being accepted through 2/28. As this year's Work Plan is a larger document than in previous years, including significantly more detail on future year projects, there is additional time included in the timeline to allow for thorough review. Project sponsors will update project requests based on public feedback and further refinements of revenue and cost estimates by March 8th. On April 9th, TPAC will receive a draft of the recommended work plan, which will have gone through a further vetting process with subcommittees. The recommended work plan will come before TPAC to consider recommendation of approval to the governing boards on 4/23. By June 30th, the Wake Transit Governing Boards will consider approval of the recommended work plan.

Mr. Martin introduced Mr. Steven Schlossberg to discuss the budget considerations included in the draft work plan. Mr. Schlossberg described that growth assumptions were lowered from 4% to 3% based on the sales tax revenues coming in this year thus far. Mr. Schlossberg further commented that, compared to the FY19 plan, revenues are still slightly up, due to FY18 actuals exceeding expectations. Mr. Schlossberg also explained that this year's work plan is the first that includes debt proceeds, which are less than originally anticipated due to lower than expected capital expenditures. Operating expenses include \$7 million of new operating costs, with a substantial portion of this amount comprised of bus operations, including an express route to Rolesville, an express route to Holly Springs, and the new Route 310. Mr. Schlossberg explained that continued operations are another large element of the costs as well, at \$16 million. In the capital projects category, there is around \$40 million for bus infrastructure, such as Cary BOMF and Park-and-Ride facilities, \$11 million for vehicle acquisition, \$21 million for BRT, and \$42 million for commuter rail.

There is also a \$20 million allocation to capital reserves, which is designed to help support reserve requirements for larger capital projects.

Mr. Tim Gardiner asked Mr. Schlossberg to further clarify the modifications to revenue assumptions. Mr. Schlossberg replied that the discussed modifications are in line with modifications being made to budgets across the region based on incoming revenues. He further commented that the modeling rates are conservative and could potentially be updated for the recommended work plan in April, if reported revenues are trending higher at that time. Ms. Kreiser commented that in the two years prior, collections were higher than anticipated by the original 2016 plan, which means revenues are still higher than original estimates, but are lower than were anticipated for the upcoming fiscal year. Ms. Krieser also commented on the amount being placed in reserves and echoed that these funds are needed for larger projects in later years, and thought it was important to note for the public that these funds aren't being placed in reserve at the expense of other projects.

Mr. Jeff Mann made a clarifying comment regarding a notation shown for the commuter rail project, which described that 50% of commuter rail costs are eligible for federal reimbursement. Mr. Mann commented that any pre-project development costs are not eligible for such reimbursement.

Mr. Martin then presented on the components included in the draft work plan. He noted that the main body of the document includes the operating and capital budgets, the supporting narratives, and summary sheets laying out new projects to be implemented in FY20, along with projects initiated in prior years that carry over into FY20. He further clarified that the main body only includes detailed project sheets for new FY 2020 projects, which is designed to help the public more quickly identify proposed new projects for the subject fiscal year in the larger document. The appendix has additional details, including the Multi-year Operating Program and Capital Improvement Plan, which includes summary sheets for all projects, highlighting new, continuing, and future year projects. Detailed project sheets for continuing projects and future year projects through 2024 are included in the appendix as well. Mr. Martin noted that the bus plan does not include project sheets past 2024, so projects to be implemented between 2024 and 2027 do not have detailed project sheets in the work plan draft. Mr. Martin also commented that this year's work plan draft is a more complex document than in previous years but noted that the structure of this year's draft is as built out as should be expected in upcoming years, and, while specific projects may be added or removed from year to year, the general format should be similar moving forward.

Ms. Kreiser made a comment about the terms "programmed" versus "budgeted," clarifying that programming may change, and that projects are budgeted based on work plan approval and supporting agreements. Mr. Martin responded with a description that programming means that funds are identified in the model, which allows for longer term planning, but that fluctuations can occur in revenues, which can change what can be implemented each year. Mr. Martin further commented that multi-year programming allows the work plan to coordinate with CAMPO's Transportation Improvement Program.

Mr. Schlossberg noted that the "prior year" category in the Capital Improvement Plan only includes projects that have costs in either FY20 or future years. This means that FY18 or FY19 projects that had money allocated but that do not have anticipated new or upcoming costs are not shown.

Mr. Martin then described a note in the draft work plan which is related to the reduced revenue assumptions previously discussed. The note clarifies that the financial plan for proposed projects identifies a need for funding additional to that which is currently identified, and this means that the amounts shown in the Capital Improvement Plan exceed what is modeled.

Mr. Martin also explained that the Multi-Year Operating Program was mostly populated using details from the bus plan and noted that all FY20 projects are aligned with the proposed projects for the program year shown in the bus plan. Similar to the structure of the Capital Improvement Plan, project sheet details in the Multi-Year Operating Program are pulled from Nelson\Nygaard bus plan sheets. Similarly, project sheets are only included through 2024, while the summary sheet

goes through 2027. Mr. Martin made a comment that some of the projects shown in the operating program were difficult to notate based on accounting complexities, including cost redundancies related to efficiencies created by new bus services or by new services that replace existing bus service, as it was found that the bus plan did not always account for these redundancies. Also, Mr. Martin noted that the Multi-Year Operating Program doesn't currently account for replacements of service related to BRT or CRT operations, as these specific changes are not yet programmed. The current draft does account for efficiencies created within the services of a single provider but does not account for cross provider efficiencies. A clarifying line was added to the Multi-Year Operating Program that explains this. Also, much like the note within the Capital Improvement Plan, a note regarding a need for funding from unidentified sources is included. Mr. Martin distributed a document with a proposal for modified language for this note to be included in the released work plan draft. Mr. Kreiser commented that the note in the Capital Improvement Plan should not include considerations related to fare box revenues.

Mr. Martin asked the project sponsors to review future years projects especially, as the language related to these projects came from Nelson\Nygaard, and not from the project sponsors. Mr. Martin asked that any requested updates are received before release of the approved draft and explained that he will also be updating the project summary sheets to account for any suggested modifications.

Mr. Gardiner asked whether the TPAC recommending approval of the draft work plan will account for these pending changes. Mr. Martin recommended that the motion focus on the release of the draft work plan, including the discussed changes to the notes in the Multi-Year Operating Program and Capital Improvement Plan, while also including an additional review of the costs shown in the project summary, and allowing modifications related to any comments received by 1/24 for the future year project sheets.

Ms. Cox asked a question regarding whether comments should be limited to future year project sheets for project sponsors. Mr. Martin responded that he is open to general comments through 1/24 to allow release on 1/28. Mr. Gardiner commented that the scope of suggested changes should not modify intent but should focus on any needed clean-up of the document.

Ms. Powell asked about the planned public engagement process for the draft work plan, referencing the Public Engagement Policy, which has been approved by the CAMPO Executive Board, and which will be reviewed by GoTriangle Boards this week.

Mr. Martin commented and clarified that there will be a 30-day public comment period, and then an option for speaking in front of the board when approval of the recommended work plan document is considered. Mr. Martin then asked if anyone from the GoTriangle team could comment on their plans. Mr. Juan Carlos Erickson commented that plans are still being developed, but they should be similar to prior years. Mr. Gardiner suggested that a timeframe for public engagement should be documented moving forward. Ms. Powell suggested that the public release would benefit from including explanatory language describing the more detailed draft work plan.

Ms. Powell also asked about how and when the Community Funding Area Program projects will be incorporated into workplan. Mr. Martin commented that the CFAP budget is currently shown as a CAMPO line item, but that this project will be split up and assigned to individual project sponsors based on the results from the project selection process, and this break down will be updated in the recommended work plan.

Motion by Ms. Powell: Release the Draft Work Plan for public review and comment based on administrative changes received through a comment period closing on Thursday, 1/24/19

Second: Ben Howell

Motion passes unanimously

X. **Wake Transit Concurrence Framework** – (Discussion/Action Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff, 20 minutes) – **Attachment E**

The proposed concurrence framework identifies roles and responsibilities of various organizations that will be invited to participate in verifying compliance of key project-specific decisions with laws, policies, and regulations throughout the implementation of major capital projects funded with Wake Transit Revenues. The concurrence framework identifies potential sequential points at which verification of compliance will be checked by impacted agencies throughout project development and subsequent phases for major capital projects. It also establishes triggers for the applicability of the policy/process to projects, as well as for the inclusion of organizations at specified levels of participation. The concurrence framework provides an opportunity for agencies to make compromise-based decisions at key milestones throughout project development and project implementation and to pledge to abide by said decisions that cumulatively inform later decisions.

Requested Action: Consider recommending approval of the Wake Transit Concurrence Framework to the Wake Transit governing boards.

Mr. Martin began his presentation by reminding that the concurrence framework came to the TPAC as an information item in September/October of 2018, when a draft was produced for the MIS CTT, and comments were received on this previous draft of the document in late summer/early fall. Mr. Martin noted that most feedback from the previous round of comments has already been addressed, but the item was pulled from the planned schedule to be reviewed by the Wake Transit Governance ILA parties due to questions relating to the governance framework. Following these conversations, the document is back on track for TPAC consideration and was presented again to the MIS CTT. Mr. Martin noted that additional comments have recently been received from Wake County and the North Carolina Rail Road Company.

Mr. Martin explained that, regardless of whether a concurrence framework exists, sponsors of major capital projects must verify compliance of proposed actions and implementation approaches associated with their projects throughout project development, and they will need to get that verification of compliance from agencies that have jurisdiction over resources that could substantially be impacted. The concurrence framework is designed to bring order to and streamline this process. The framework focuses on bringing these agencies together at major decision points, rather than working with each agency individually, and is designed to make it easier to find paths forward that are suitable to all agencies involved and make it easier to find viable alternatives for moving forward that comply with the policies of all agencies.

Mr. Martin then explained how the concurrence framework relates to work plan. He explained that the work plan lays out individual projects or implementation elements at a programmatic level, and that the concurrence framework involves major decisions within an implementation element that are required for the element to be completed.

Mr. Martin described that major project milestones align with concurrence points, and, when an agency concurs, this means that there is no objection to the proposed action at the concurrence point. When an agency signals non-concurrence, this means that the proposed action violates a law, regulation, or policy over which the agency has jurisdiction. Mr. Martin added that the concurrence framework is modeled from the NCDOT merger process. Mr. Martin described that concurrence points build upon one another sequentially, and specific concurrence points are

determined on a project-by-project basis, with each project having a unique concurrence plan based on the character of the project. Mr. Martin explained that, if something changes that requires a change to a prior concurrence point, the concurrence team must go back and revisit that prior point, as later concurrence points are designed to build off previous points. Mr. Martin also clarified that more than one concurrence point can be discussed at a single concurrence meeting, and that more than one project can be discussed at a single concurrence meeting.

Mr. Martin then clarified some of the things that are not entailed in the concurrence framework. He specified that a concurrence team is not a project-level technical steering committee. He explained that large projects will likely have a steering committee or technical review committee but reiterated that this is not the scope of the concurrence team. Further, he specified that the concurrence framework is not intended to provide a platform for expressing opinions or positions, stressing that this is reserved for a steering committee, but rather focuses on verification of compliance with policies, regulations, or laws. Additionally, Mr. Martin explained that the concurrence framework does not authorize projects, or authorize funding for a project, explaining that this is a function reserved for the work plan or the TIP. Finally, Mr. Martin stressed that concurrence is not legally binding on the concurring agencies, and clarified that, for instance, a signal of concurrence does not guarantee a permit will be issued.

Mr. Martin then described the types of projects that are subject to the concurrence framework, highlighting that projects subject to the framework are major capital transit projects. He commented that there are more specifics included in the concurrence framework document, but listed that fixed guideway, shared park and ride, shared bus transit, maintenance facilities, and in-fill and additional fixed guideway stations built after a project is finished are some of the types of projects subject to the framework.

Mr. Martin then discussed the structure of a concurrence team. He described that the project sponsor serves as the Concurrence Chair and leads the process. The Concurrence Administrator is a neutral party that provides structure and facilitation, including working with the project sponsor and cooperating agencies to create a concurrence plan, scheduling meetings, distributing materials, collecting and storing materials related to concurrence points, and serving as recorder. CAMPO will serve as the concurrence administrator for Wake Transit projects. Mr. Martin explained that Cooperating Agencies, Participating Agencies, and Stakeholders also have roles that inform the concurrence process. Mr. Martin also explained that project sponsorship is assigned by the Wake Transit Work Plan, or by separate MPO action, as has been the case with CRT and BRT projects. The project sponsor then works with concurrence administrator to determine relevant cooperating agencies, and to develop a concurrence plan with concurrence points specific to the project and project schedule.

Mr. Martin continued explaining the constitution of the concurrence team. He explained that cooperating agencies have concurrence power, relying on them having institutional, policy, or regulatory jurisdiction over resources which could be impacted by the project. Cooperating agencies could be municipalities, counties, MPOs, or RPOs with impacted planning jurisdiction, or federal or state agencies with jurisdiction over environmental resources or property. As an additional note, Mr. Martin clarified that the project sponsor is also a cooperating agency.

Mr. Martin explained that participating agencies do not have concurrence power. Participating agencies are public agencies that have an interest in the project, but that do not have jurisdiction over a resource which could reasonably be impacted by the project. As these agencies do not have

relevant jurisdiction, they can provide input to inform decisions, and are invited to concurrence meetings, but do not indicate concurrence or non-concurrence. Mr. Martin also discussed stakeholders, which are non-governmental organizations with an interest in the project. He explained that stakeholders provide input regarding projects, but do not participate in the concurrence process itself.

Mr. Martin then moved to discuss the dispute resolution process for the concurrence framework, noting that this topic is where most of the disagreement between ILA parties occurred. Mr. Martin explained that the concurrence framework starts at the concurrence team level, which is staffed by CAMPO and the project sponsor, with the project sponsor leading. In the event of non-concurrence, or if CAMPO and the project sponsor don't agree on concurrence team membership, the executive transit team meets. This team is also staffed by CAMPO and consists of principals or executives from the cooperating agencies and the Wake Transit Governance ILA parties: CAMPO, GoTriangle, Wake County. If the executive transit team still cannot find a resolution, and if the situation qualifies as a significant concern under the ILA definition, a significant concern can be listed, which would lead to calling a Wake Transit conference committee, staffed by Wake County, which would consist of board members from CAMPO, GoTriangle, and Wake County, and any Wake County appointees.

Ms. Kreiser asked a question about the status of the comments submitted by Wake County. Mr. Martin replied that the slide shown on the screen does not include adjustments as a response to the Wake County comments, due to when the comments were received. However, he explained that the following changes will be made. First, the line describing the staffing of the concurrence team will describe that this team is staffed by both the project sponsor and CAMPO. Second, the line describing the executive transit team will explain that this team may also be activated in the event that there is disagreement on concurrence team membership. Finally, Mr. Martin commented the Wake County comments led to the document's two main components – the Executive Summary and the Practitioner's Guide – being handed separately, with the Executive summary now being proposed as the policy document targeted for adoption, and the practitioner's guide being positioned as a more administrative document that will allow quicker modification based on need.

Ms. Kreiser requested an additional modification to the line describing whether a conference committee can be called, requesting that the text, "if qualifying," should be removed. Mr. Martin commented that the suggested modification is out of line with guidance received from CAMPO's attorney and replied that whether or not this language is in the diagram specifically, the definition of a significant concern is listed in the Governance ILA. Mr. Martin then added that because the term is defined in the ILA, it can be removed from the diagram in the framework document.

Ms. Kreiser then asked how the comments from NCRR would be addressed. Mr. Martin replied that the NCRR comments ask to switch the term "agency" with the term "entity" throughout the document. He commented that these recommendations cannot be implemented, as this does not align with guidance from the FTA Council for Environmental Quality. Mr. Martin also described that NCRR's suggested revisions remove the NCDOT Rail division where this division is shown as an example of a member on a suggested concurrence team. Mr. Martin explained that this concern should be addressed at a specific concurrence plan level, rather than a concurrence framework level.

Ms. Kreiser then acknowledged the delays that have occurred with the timeline for the concurrence framework, but asked if there were projects, such as the BRT, that would be impacted by pushing

approval of the document to the next meeting. Mr. Martin replied that pushing this document back further could be problematic and that, to the MPO, this framework is one of the most important items required in the governance ILA. He explained that once a locally preferred alternative is chosen, the MPO will need to adopt it, and the concurrence process is a way to ensure that a verification of compliance process has occurred. Mr. Martin then reminded that, even if the TPAC recommends the document for approval, the governing boards will still need to approve it. He then reiterated that the received comments will be incorporated as discussed. Additionally, he reminded that the agencies who would be directly impacted by the framework have already reviewed this document, and that the only major change since this review is that the framework no longer lists omnipresent cooperating agencies, and membership of the executive transit team has changed. Ms. Powell then commented that delays with this framework are now holding up project sponsors from advancing projects, and that this framework doesn't need to do this. She stressed that the merger process, upon which this framework is based, has been in practice now for 15 years.

Ms. Powell made a motion to recommend approval of the Wake Transit Concurrence Framework to the Wake Transit governing boards. Mr. Kreiser asked that the motion specifically mention that comments from NCR and Wake County will be incorporated as discussed. Ms. Powell agreed. Ms. Cox recommended that members of the committee should look in the FHWA's PlanWorks tool, which she describes as following a similar structure. Mr. Martin added that other MPOs, such as the Minneapolis-Saint Paul MPO, also follow similar structures.

Motion by Ms. Powell: Recommend approval of the Wake Transit Concurrence Framework to the Wake Transit governing boards, with the remaining modifications discussed at the meeting incorporated

Second: Ben Howell

Motion passed unanimously

XI. Fixed Guideways Major Investment Study – Commuter Rail (CRT) Existing Conditions Report – (Information/Discussion Item – Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle Staff, 15 minutes) – Attachment F

The Commuter Rail Existing Conditions Report summarizes the travel market analysis and existing conditions along the CRT corridor identified in the Wake County Transit Plan. The information in the report provides a baseline that will help define the Purpose and Need for the project and ultimately guide the evaluation and selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative for the corridor.

Requested Action – Receive as Information

Mr. Patrick McDonough introduced the Commuter Rail Existing Conditions report. He explained that the consultant team began their work on the Existing Conditions Report by looking over previous studies. Mr. McDonough listed relevant studies, describing that there was a 2008 NCR study assessing capacity from Greensboro to Goldsboro, followed up with ridership and market study for the same area in 2010, then there was a Durham-Wake alternatives analysis performed by GoTriangle in 2011, and a 2015 follow-up study involving GoTriangle, Norfolk Southern, and NCR, and, finally, the Wake Transit Plan in 2016-17. Mr. McDonough explained that, in addition to looking at previous studies, the report focuses on understanding travel demand in the corridor and the natural features that may be impacted by the project.

Mr. McDonough summarized the report section illustrating travel demand. He explained that the region is growing quickly, and presented a map showing flows into downtown areas for commuters.

He commented that the report also includes a separate map showing flows to non-downtown areas. He remarked that this information was used to create transit propensity maps for travel demand in 2040.

Mr. McDonough then summarized the environmental screening section of the report. He described that all NEPA processes will ask how the project impacts low-income and minority communities, and then showed maps indicating minority population in the project area by census tract, and a poverty map for the project area. Mr. McDonough then showed a map highlighting areas flagged as potential environmental concerns in the project area. Mr. McDonough noted that this map shows details at the corridor level and described that the report originally started at the station level, but the technical committee didn't want to suggest that station locations were pre-ordained.

XII. Fixed Guideways Major Investment Study – Commuter Rail (CRT) System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework - (Information/Discussion Item – Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle Staff, 15 minutes) – Attachment G

The Commuter Rail System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework serves to identify the existing and future transportation problems in the Triangle region and provide guidelines for design of the Commuter Rail Transit (CRT) system, including stations and performance targets for operations and how these targets will be evaluated. The deliverables produced in this document are (1) System Transportation Problem Identification, (2) Design Guidelines and Performance Targets, and (3) Evaluation Framework. The document identifies challenges that affect mobility and accessibility, both now and in the future within the CRT corridor defined in the Wake and Durham County Transit Plans. The CRT design guidelines and performance targets were developed following a peer agency review. The review was used to represent different investment strategies and service levels and their applicability to the Wake-Durham CRT corridor. The evaluation framework will be applied to understand relative performance to different scenarios of operating plans and station locations, and their ability to meet the community's goals.

Requested Action: Receive as Information

Mr. McDonough introduced the System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework and remarked that the goal of this document is similar to the BRT evaluation framework document, with the primary difference being that there are not numerous potential alignments for the CRT project. Instead, this report focuses on operational scenarios, and on assessing the performance of individual stations.

Mr. McDonough explained that the document contains a transportation problem identification, which focuses on addressing projected growth in travel demand, improving transit service and customer experience, and supporting local plans to preserve and enhance quality of life.

Mr. McDonough explained the design guidelines and performance targets component of the document, noting that the term "guidelines" was discussed in detail with the technical committee, and was selected in favor of the term "design standards," as not to imply similarity to standards such as the AREMA standards. Mr. McDonough explained the team looked to peer agencies in establishing guidelines for infrastructure, types of service, and performance targets.

Regarding the infrastructure guidelines, McDonough discussed station spacing and described that there is tension between stations being spaced further apart, which makes trips faster, and having more stops, which provides higher access to the travel market. He also described station design and amenities, mentioning that stations should have a platform, ticket vending machines, real-time information and bike/scooter parking.

Regarding service design guidelines, Mr. McDonough described that there were many different opinions on the project team regarding appropriate minimum service, but agreement on a minimum

span of service and frequency, with service from 6am—10am, and then again from 3pm - 7pm, with 1 train per hour per direction. Mr. McDonough described this level of service as a “4-0-4-0,” which he clarified means 4 trips in the morning, 0 midday, 4 in the afternoon, and 0 in the evening.

Mr. McDonough then explained the performance targets, which are based on peer review. He listed the target for on-time performance at 95%, average operating speed at 35 mph, passenger boardings per vehicle revenue hour at 45 passengers, operating expense per vehicle revenue mile at \$30, operating expense per passenger boarding for \$20, and farebox recovery at 15%.

Mr. McDonough explained that the evaluation framework has 7 categories and 13 metrics. He then listed the categories, which include speed, travel time competitiveness, connectivity, equity, ridership, transit supported land use, sustainability, and regional access.

Mr. McDonough then explained how alternatives and scenarios are being compared. He described that the team is currently modeling scenarios ranging from minimum service (4-0-4-0), medium service (8-2-8-2), and maximum service (30 minute headways at peak, 60 minute headways for the remainder of day). He also commented that the team is modeling across a variable number of stations, considering scenarios with 10 stations, 12 stations, and 16 stations.

Ms. Cox expressed surprise that the minimum service guideline does not include mid-day service, as most of the peer systems do have midday service. Further, as most of the expense is in the infrastructure, she asked, why is this level of service considered a reasonable minimum? Mr. McDonough replied that there were a wide variety of opinions on this topic within the technical team, and the model runs are designed to help measure potential variations related to the level of service. He also commented that starting with such a minimum may allow for an incremental approach to growing the service.

XIII. 2019 Update of TPAC Bylaws Exhibit A (TPAC Weighted Voting Structure) – (Information Item – Adam Howell, TPAC Administrator, 5 minutes) – Attachment H

In accordance with the TPAC bylaws, the TPAC Administrator updates data used to determine weighted voting assignments based on population information acquired from the North Carolina State Demographer’s Office. This information is updated on an annual basis and is presented to the TPAC for review.

Requested Action: Receive as information

Mr. Howell described that the weighted voting structure is updated on an annual basis, and called attention to the material in the agenda packet. Mr. Howell summarized that the only change for the 2019 voting structure is for the city of Raleigh, which gained one additional weighted vote. Mr. Howell explained that seats are gained based on population of 50,000.

XIV. Subcommittee Chair Reports – (Information Item, TPAC Chair – 10 minutes)

a. Budget and Finance

Ms. Kreiser commented that the Budget & Finance Subcommittee has requested information from providers on supplantation and fares to help create the recommended work plan

b. Planning and Prioritization

Mr. Martin commented that the Planning & Prioritization subcommittee will be discussing how to better standardize reporting deliverables for projects in an upcoming meeting, to facilitate the development of project level agreements

- c. Process

No report

- d. Public Engagement and Communications

No report

XV. Other Business – (Information Item, TPAC Chair - 5 minutes)

- a. New Business

Mr. Martin reminded the TPAC that the current TPAC Administrator, Mr. Adam Howell, is leaving CAMPO. He explained that any TPAC Administration questions can be directed to Mr. Martin until the position is filled. He also commented the position is currently posted.

- b. TPAC Member Discussion

None

- c. Next Steps

None

XVI. Adjourn