

WAKE COUNTY TRANSIT PLAN

Transit Planning Advisory Committee

Regular Meeting

June 12, 2019

CAMPO Administrative Offices, Conference Room A

9:30 AM – 12:00 PM

Meeting Minutes / Summary

Voting Members & Alternates Present

Kevin Wyrauch, Town of Cary; Tim Gardiner, Wake County; Bret Martin, CAMPO; Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest; Akul Nishawala, Town of Fuquay-Varina; Dylan Bruchhaus, Town of Morrisville; Nicole Kreiser, Wake County; Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Het Patel, Town of Garner; David Eatman, City of Raleigh; Michael Clark, Town of Zebulon; Erik Landfried, GoTriangle; Saundra Freeman, GoTriangle; Jason Brown, Town of Knightdale (on phone)

Other Alternates Present

Bonnie Parker, CAMPO; Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle; Jeff Triezenberg, Town of Garner; Mary Kate Morookian, GoTriangle

General Attendees

Jonathan Jacobs, Town of Wake Forest; Ashley Schultz, GoTriangle; Samone Oates-Bullock, GoTriangle; Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle; Suzanne Clyburn, GoTriangle; Matthew Cushing, CAMPO; Anita Davis, Wake County; Megan Hoenk, North Carolina Railroad; Scott Saylor, North Carolina Railroad; Annemarie Maiorano, Wake County; Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle; Denise Foreman, Wake County

I. Welcome and Introductions – (Shannon Cox, TPAC Chair)

Ms. Shannon Cox welcomed all to the meeting.

II. Adjustments to the Agenda – (Shannon Cox, TPAC Chair)

None

III. General Public or Agency Comment – (Shannon Cox, TPAC Chair – 5 minutes)

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

None

IV. Meeting Minutes/Summary from April 23, 2019, Regular Meeting (Discussion/Action Item – Matthew Cushing, CAMPO Staff; 5 minutes) – **Attachment A**

Requested Action: Consider approving the Meeting Minutes/Summary from the April 23, 2019, Regular Meeting.

Motion by Mr. Bret Martin: Approve the Meeting Minutes/Summary from the April 23, 2019, regular TPAC meeting.

Second: Mr. Kevin Wyrauch

Motion passes unanimously.

V. Bus Rapid Transit Implementation Update– (Information Item – Mila Vega, City of Raleigh Staff – 15 minutes)

City of Raleigh staff will provide an update on the status of New Bern Avenue Bus Rapid Transit project development.

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Ms. Mila Vega, City of Raleigh, provided an update on New Bern BRT implementation, the results of the Raleigh Downtown Transportation Plan, and the City's work on planning for equitable development around transit. Ms. Vega reviewed the overall schedule for the City of Raleigh's implementation of the full program of BRT projects in the Wake Transit Plan, including the order of project implementation. Ms. Vega reviewed some of the planned high-level characteristics of the New Bern BRT corridor that are known to date.

Ms. Vega provided an overview of the City's proposal for multi-partner committees to inform implementation of the BRT projects, including a project management team (organizational leadership), a technical committee (technical staff), and a stakeholder committee. From the Raleigh Downtown Transportation Plan, Ms. Vega reviewed the proposed routing of the BRT corridors through downtown Raleigh and how they are planned to interact with the downtown area's passenger-facing transfer facilities. She explained that the downtown plan contains near-, mid-, and long-term recommendations for downtown BRT routing. Ms. Vega also covered how the City is planning to accommodate bicyclists downtown and which facilities would be used to preserve comfortable and efficient bicycle transportation circulation.

Ms. Vega proceeded to explain the City's goal of planning for equitable development around transit and why it is important to leverage economic development and affordable housing objectives around BRT as a significant community investment. Ms. Vega also mentioned an upcoming public open house on June 25th for the public to see the City's preliminary proposal for BRT planning-level design.

VI. Commuter Rail Major Investment Study (MIS) - Scenario Evaluation Results - (Discussion/Action Item – Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle Staff; 20 minutes) – Attachment B

At its March meeting, the TPAC recommended approval of a commuter rail evaluation framework developed to assess the relative performance of different operating and station location scenarios, as well as their ability to meet established community goals. This evaluation framework was subsequently utilized to evaluate the performance of 16 potential station candidate zones and seven (7) service scenarios along the corridor. The results of the application of the evaluation framework are provided in **Attachment B**. The MIS Decision Plan for Interim Deliverables prescribes that the final scenario evaluation report be considered as an action item by the Wake Transit and Durham County Transit governing boards.

Requested Action: Consider recommending acceptance of the Major Investment Study Commuter Rail Scenario Evaluation Results to the Wake Transit governing boards based on the TPAC's recommendation of approval of the Commuter Rail Evaluation Framework.

Mr. Patrick McDonough provided an overview of the commuter rail evaluation results from the Commuter Rail Major Investment Study (MIS). Mr. McDonough framed his presentation to share what we learned and what we know about the commuter rail corridor through completion of the MIS, as well as what we don't yet know about the corridor and what still needs to be figured out.

In providing the overview, Mr. McDonough reviewed a comparison of commuter rail travel times to existing bus service and to auto trips; an evaluation of station areas against specific selected criteria of regional and community importance, including land use and connectivity; and an evaluation of ridership results for various service frequency scenarios. Mr. McDonough proceeded to discuss what is not yet known about a commuter rail project within the corridor, including project cost, how a project would score against the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) rating criteria, final station locations, infrastructure requirements and impacts in constrained environments along the corridor, and identification of all the agreements with project partners and other stakeholders along the corridor.

Mr. McDonough mentioned that the results of the MIS are informing the next phase of study along the corridor. The results of this study should inform on whether there is a viable project that can produce regional mobility benefits and be competitive as an FTA New Starts project. The study results should also inform on when to proceed with a project if a project within the corridor is deemed to be viable and competitive.

At the conclusion of Mr. McDonough's presentation, Mr. Bret Martin (CAMPO) asked Mr. McDonough to make sure that an issue with distances used to measure certain conditions around station areas be reconciled in the final report. Mr. McDonough mentioned that he would follow up with the MIS consultants.

Ms. Shannon Cox, Town of Apex, asked if RTC modeling that is planned to be completed along the corridor in the next phase would give us more information on the competitiveness of commuter rail travel time versus automobile travel time. Mr. McDonough answered that the RTC modeling, in contrast to the Triangle Regional Model, will provide better information on how commuter rail service would perform under a variety of conditions rather than one set of routine conditions. Mr. McDonough also mentioned that operating agreements should also help with on-time performance for commuter rail service.

Mr. Het Patel, Town of Garner, asked if the set of agreements Mr. McDonough mentioned would be necessary for a project to move forward would be completed in the next phase of study or if they would be completed after the next phase. Mr. McDonough mentioned that the drafting of agreements that are sensitive to specific infrastructure requirements along the corridor will likely need to wait until the study reveals what infrastructure is needed. However, drafting and negotiating agreements that are infrastructure-neutral can begin in advance of receiving such results.

Mr. Chip Russell, Town of Wake Forest, mentioned that he is hopeful that work will occur on the agreement framework as we continue to study such that spending on the corridor does not happen unless desired terms from parties with an interest in the corridor are known.

Motion by Bret Martin: Recommend acceptance of the Major Investment Study Commuter Rail Scenario Evaluation Results to the Wake Transit governing boards based on the TPAC's recommendation of approval of the Commuter Rail Evaluation Framework, with the suggested reconciliation of references to distances used to measure certain conditions around station areas in the report. Second by Chip Russell. Motion passes unanimously.

VII. Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Project Management Structure– (Information Item – Jeff Mann, GoTriangle Staff and Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff - 20 minutes) – Attachment C

In its preparation for entering into the next phase of pre-project development (i.e., 2011 alternatives analysis update) to study the commuter rail corridor identified in the Wake Transit Plan and the 2045 CAMPO and DCHC MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plans, GoTriangle, in consultation with CAMPO, North Carolina Railroad, Wake County, Durham County, Research Triangle Park Foundation, and the DCHC MPO, negotiated and prepared a draft project management structure to serve as a blueprint for implementing any future phases of commuter rail project implementation. The draft project management structure contains the following elements:

- 1) Defined members of a project management committee (PMC) that will provide technical and project management direction to the project sponsor;
- 2) Formation of a technical advisory group, comprised of representatives from local/municipal governments along the corridor, that will provide input at key milestones throughout the alternatives analysis update and future phases of implementation;
- 3) Defined relationships between the project sponsor and the PMC for interfacing with stakeholders, consultants, the Wake County Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC), and cooperating and participating agencies involved in the Wake Transit Concurrence Process;
- 4) Defined relationships between the project sponsor and the PMC for developing and furthering project-level recommendations; and
- 5) Roles and responsibilities for communications related to commuter rail project development and design.

The draft document detailing these elements is provided as **Attachment C**. At the TPAC's June 12th meeting, in addition to presenting the draft Greater Triangle commuter rail project management structure, staff will also provide an overview of the scope elements of the commuter rail alternatives analysis update, the proposed schedule for working through the scope elements, proposed membership on the technical advisory group, and the key milestones proposed by GoTriangle to involve participation and input from the technical advisory group.

Requested Action: Receive as information and discuss, as necessary.

Mr. Bret Martin, CAMPO, and Nicole Kreiser, Wake County, stood in for Jeff Mann, GoTriangle, to present the proposed project management structure for implementation of the Greater Triangle Commuter Rail. Mr. Martin mentioned that Attachment C in the TPAC's agenda packet is a document that defines the relationship between the commuter rail project sponsor and a project management committee (PMC), stakeholders, the TPAC, and others. He explained that the intent of the PMC structure is to facilitate a framework for a commuter rail project to move forward as part of a unified front of the project sponsor and significant project partners rather than the project sponsor moving forward in isolation. Mr. Martin then handed the item over to Nicole Kreiser.

Ms. Nicole Kreiser reiterated that the goal of the PMC structure is to make sure that there are not diverging project goals or opinions on direction from significant project partners before moving a potential project from the next phase of study into the project development process. Ms. Kreiser mentioned that Jeff Mann, the GoTriangle commuter rail project manager, would be sending out an invitation to jurisdictions along the commuter rail corridor within the next week to convene a technical advisory committee in July. The technical advisory committee will be the venue for local governments along the corridor to receive updates and provide input throughout the commuter rail alternatives analysis and project development process. Ms. Kreiser proceeded to share an overall schedule for the commuter rail alternatives analysis, including the timing of the study's scope elements. She mentioned that most of the stakeholder outreach will be conducted during the project development phases.

Mr. Martin proceeded to share the proposed agencies and local government jurisdictions that would be invited to the technical advisory committee, as provided by GoTriangle staff. Ms. Shelby Powell, CAMPO, mentioned that there were inconsistencies in the schedule provided for when and how the technical advisory committee will be engaged and suggested that more information be provided on the meaningfulness of the planned engagement of the technical advisory committee throughout the study. Ms. Kreiser mentioned that she would pass that request along to the project manager.

Kelly Blazey, Town of Cary, asked what would happen if there is disagreement by an agency along the corridor on how to proceed with a project that is not a member of the PMC. Ms. Kreiser mentioned that sort of scenario would be addressed through the concurrence process for the project. Mr. Martin mentioned that a concurrence plan is currently under development for the corridor and mentioned that the Town of Cary will be invited as a Cooperating Agency with concurrence authority to participate in the concurrence process. Ms. Blazey asked whether the PMC meetings could be open. Mr. Martin responded by saying that question would need to be deferred to the project manager.

Ms. Shannon Cox, Town of Apex, mentioned that one criterion used for determining agencies to be on the PMC is whether they are contributing funding toward the study. She asked whether a decision has been made about whether the Research Triangle Foundation (RTF) will be contributing funding toward the study or some phases of the project. Mr. Martin mentioned that the RTF has made it clear that it is interested in using its taxing capacity to contribute to a high-capacity transit project connecting to the park, although it hasn't been made clear as to whether that would be for a commuter rail project or another high-capacity transit project, such as bus rapid transit.

Het Patel, Town of Garner, mentioned that he wasn't sure how the proposed schedule is going to meet its end and appropriately engage the technical advisory committee. Mr. Patel also mentioned that he isn't sure that the agreement structure discussed as part of the preceding agenda item could progress along in accordance with the aggressive schedule shown for the alternatives analysis and for there to remain an expectation to move directly into project development when the alternatives analysis is completed. Mr. Martin agreed with Mr. Patel's points. Mr. Martin mentioned that from CAMPO's perspective, he isn't confident that a project will be ready to move into project development by the end of the year. Mr. Patel mentioned that it would be a good idea to get an update from GoTriangle staff on what tasks associated with the study have been completed or that are already underway, and if there is an expectation for the technical advisory committee to meet in July, for the committee to go ahead and receive materials to review that are related to the type of input that will be solicited.

Mr. Martin explained that some tasks associated with the alternatives analysis are on the critical path to completing the study, and others are not. He mentioned that the development of operating scenarios is on the critical path. Because the task would involve identifying station areas that would need to be assumed for the operating plans to be evaluated, he has suggested to the GoTriangle project manager that the technical advisory committee be provided an opportunity to provide input on station areas before they are locked in for running the scenarios. Mr. Martin also mentioned that he suggested to the GoTriangle project manager that the municipalities along the corridor be provided an opportunity to inform the risk assessment for a project within the corridor.

Ms. Cox asked the TPAC how it would like to proceed even though this is just an information item, especially given that the CAMPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) had specific questions of GoTriangle about the PMC before the consideration of the PMC structure is considered by the CAMPO Executive Board. Mr. Martin mentioned that the GoTriangle project manager did provide him with a response to those questions, and Mr. Martin shared those responses with the TPAC. Ms. Shelby Powell asked whether any TPAC members have received an invitation to the technical advisory group, and multiple TPAC members indicated that they had not received an invitation.

Scott Saylor, North Carolina Railroad, spoke to the agreement structure that the TPAC referenced in earlier discussions. He mentioned that the agreement structure will be complicated because the project involves making use of an already active railroad.

VIII. Overview of Electronic Coordinated Care Networks for Human Services Transportation- (Information Item – Nicole Kreiser, Wake County Staff and Denise Foreman, Wake County Staff - 20 minutes)

Over the past few months, transit agencies and other community safety net providers in Wake County have been receiving requests to sign up for multiple electronic coordinated care platforms to be resources for providing human service transportation options. These include NCCARE360, the Wake County Network of Care, and an initiative known as the Health Opportunities Pilot, administered by the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services. Wake County staff will provide an explanation on why transit providers are being asked to sign up for these care networks, how they are intended to be used, and how they do or do not relate to Medicaid transformation to a managed care model.

Requested Action: Receive as information and discuss, as necessary.

Nicole Kreiser, Wake County, introduced the item and handed the presentation over to the Denise Foreman. Ms. Foreman provided an overview of the various layers of coordinated care networks for human services that include transportation services.

At the conclusion of Ms. Foreman's presentation, Mr. Martin made a statement that the recently adopted Locally Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan identified mobility management and helping human service clients navigate through their transportation options as a need in the region and mentioned that the coordinated care networks can be used as a tool to help fill the void until a mobility management program is fully developed.

IX. Wake Transit Vision Plan Update – (Information Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff – 15 minutes) – Attachment D

At the TPAC's March meeting, CAMPO staff provided an overview of desired scope elements and outcomes, as well as a proposed approach, for completing an upcoming update to the Wake County Transit Plan. In mid-April, a scoping committee comprised of staff representatives from several TPAC member agencies held a scoping meeting to provide input on Wake Transit Vision Plan update outcomes, stakeholder and public involvement, and other major considerations for completing the plan update. Taking the provided input, CAMPO staff prepared a detailed written task description for the scoping committee's review and solicited further input from the committee to better shape the scope elements and approach for completing the Vision Plan update. This task description is provided as **Attachment D**. In consultation with the scoping committee, CAMPO has determined that it will use its existing on-call transit planning services consultant list to assist in completing the Vision Plan update, which will not require a separate solicitation of professional services. CAMPO staff will provide an overview of the scope and schedule for the Vision Plan update at the TPAC's June 12th meeting.

Requested Action: Receive as information and discuss, as necessary

Mr. Martin, CAMPO, provided an overview of steps that have occurred since the TPAC's March meeting to determine the scope for the Wake Transit Vision Plan Update. Mr. Martin mentioned that the scope of work for the Vision Plan Update has been provided to the TPAC as Attachment D and that the referenced scope will be the blueprint for completing the overall task. Mr. Martin then

proceeded to cover the major scope elements and anticipated outcomes of the Vision Plan Update. Mr. Martin also reviewed the proposed schedule for the Vision Plan Update.

Erik Landfried, GoTriangle, asked if there have been any discussions with Durham County or the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO to coordinate the Wake Transit Vision Plan Update with the simultaneous update to the Durham County Transit Plan. Mr. Martin responded by mentioning that he did not have complete clarity on the schedule for updating the Durham County plan, but the concurrent update to the Durham County plan is on his radar to make sure the two county plans can be coordinated where possible. Mr. Landfried mentioned some specific inconsistencies with cross-county investments and connections, particularly with bus services, between the two county plans in the past. He mentioned that to the extent possible, we should try to avoid those issues with the opportunity to now align investment recommendations more closely.

X. FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan Commonly Asked Questions – (Information Item – Samone Oates-Bullock, GoTriangle Staff – 10 minutes) – Attachment E

The Draft FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan was released by GoTriangle for a 30-day public comment period running from February 1st through March 3rd. GoTriangle staff provided a summary of the outreach conducted and comments received in response to the draft work plan at the TPAC's March meeting. As usual for annual Wake Transit Work Plans, a compilation of commonly asked questions and answers was prepared by GoTriangle staff to circle back with responses to the 74 comments/questions received from the public during the 30-day public comment period. This compilation of commonly asked questions is provided as **Attachment E**.

Requested Action: Receive as information and discuss, as necessary

Samone Oates-Bullock, GoTriangle, provided an overview of comments received in response to the Draft FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan and mentioned that Attachment E contains responses to common themes of comments and questions received.

XI. Update on Status of FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan Consideration of Approval – (Information Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff – 10 minutes)

During CAMPO's public comment period for the TPAC-Recommended FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan, CAMPO staff received a few comments from project sponsors that would result in minor modifications to the work plan. While these modifications will move forward for consideration by the CAMPO Executive Board and GoTriangle Board of Trustees, CAMPO staff will provide a brief update to the TPAC on the modifications that were requested and their impact to the TPAC-Recommended FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan.

Requested Action: Receive as information.

Mr. Martin, CAMPO, provided a brief explanation of a comment received from the City of Raleigh since the TPAC's recommendation of the FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan that will move forward for consideration by the Wake Transit governing boards.

XII. TPAC Fare Working Group Work Task List – (Action Item – Mary Kate Morookian, GoTriangle Staff – 10 minutes) – Attachment F

At the April 23rd regular meeting of the TPAC, the TPAC Chair requested that the TPAC Fare Working Group develop a work task list that is similar to the work task lists developed for the established TPAC subcommittees and that explains what information will be

reported back to the TPAC. It was requested that this work task list be provided to the TPAC at its next regular meeting. The TPAC Fare Working Group work task list is provided as **Attachment F**.

Requested Action: Consider approving the Fare Working Group Work Task List.

Motion by Bret Martin: Approve the TPAC Fare Working Group Work Task List with the condition that a timeframe be inserted to indicate when the tasks will be completed. Second by Kelly Blazey. Motion passes unanimously.

XIII. Subcommittee Chair Reports – (Information Item, TPAC Chair – 15 minutes)

- a. Budget and Finance
- b. Planning and Prioritization
- c. Process
- d. Public Engagement and Communications

Subcommittee chairs provided updates on ongoing discussions and proceedings within their subcommittees.

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

- a. New Business
- b. TPAC Member Discussion
- c. Next Steps

Mr. Martin informed the TPAC of personnel changes that will leave vacancies on elected seats on the TPAC and on the Planning and Prioritization Subcommittee that will need to be filled. He mentioned that the new TPAC Administrator will begin in July and will be at the next TPAC meeting. He also mentioned that Matthew Cushing would be leaving CAMPO staff by the end of the month and briefed the TPAC on upcoming TPAC agenda items. He mentioned that the next meeting of the TPAC will be August 21st.

XV. Adjourn

The TPAC meeting was adjourned by the Chair.