

WAKE COUNTY TRANSIT PLAN
Transit Planning Advisory Committee

Regular Meeting

April 23, 2019

CAMPO Administrative Offices, Conference Room A

9:30 AM – 11:30 AM

Meeting Minutes / Summary

Voting Members & Alternates Present

Kevin Wyrauch, Town of Cary; Tim Gardiner, Wake County; Bret Martin, CAMPO; Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle; David Walker, City of Raleigh; Mike Kennon, NCSU; Tim Brock, RTP; 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; Danny Johnson, Town of Rolesville; Mike Charbonneau, GoTriangle; Shannon Cox, Town of Apex; Shelby Powell, CAMPO; Het Patel, Town of Garner

Other Alternates Present

Bonnie Parker, CAMPO

General Attendees

Jonathan Jacobs, Town of Wake Forest; Ashley Schultz, GoTriangle; Samone Oates-Bullock, GoTriangle; Matt Van Hoeck, City of Raleigh; Adam Howell, Atkins Global; Nathan Spencer, Raleigh Transit Authority; Juan Carlos Erickson, GoTriangle; Suzanne Clyburn, GoTriangle; Will Allen, GoTriangle; Matthew Cushing, CAMPO

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 March 13, 2019, Regular Meeting** (*Discussion/Action Item – Matthew Cushing, CAMPO Staff; 5 minutes*) – **Attachment A**

Requested Action: Consider approving the Meeting Minutes/Summary from the March 13, 2019, Regular Meeting.

Motion by Mr. Bret Martin: Approve the Meeting Minutes/Summary from March 13, 2019

Second: Ms. Shelby Powell

Motion passes unanimously

V. Community Funding Area Program FY 2020 Project Selection –
(Information/Discussion Item – Matthew Cushing, CAMPO Staff – 25 minutes)

The Community Funding Area Program FYs 2019 and 2020 call for projects was announced in November of 2018 and closed in January of 2019. A total of two (2) applications were submitted by eligible applicants for consideration in FY 2019, and four (4) applications were submitted for consideration in FY 2020. At its March 13th meeting, the TPAC endorsed the Community Funding Area Program Selection Committee's recommendation to fund the FY 2019 projects, and the TPAC was introduced to the projects submitted for consideration for funding in FY 2020. CAMPO staff will share the Community Funding Area Program Selection Committee's recommendations for the FY 2020 projects at the TPAC's April meeting. The recommended FY 2020 projects are included in the draft of the FY 2020 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan (Item VI). The TPAC will consider its recommendation of funding authorization for the FY 2020 projects in its consideration of an action to recommend the FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan to the Wake Transit governing boards.

Requested Action: Receive as information as discuss as necessary

Mr. Matthew Cushing reminded the TPAC that information regarding submitted FY2019 and FY2020 Community Funding Area Program projects was presented at the last TPAC meeting. At that time, the CFAP Selection Committee had not yet made recommendations regarding the submitted FY20 projects, but these recommendations have since been completed and will be presented today.

Mr. Cushing summarized the submitted FY20 projects, noting that the Towns of Fuquay-Varina, Garner, and Rolesville submitted planning projects, and the Town of Wake Forest submitted an operating project. The selection committee recommended all FY20 projects for approval, with two of the projects having conditions associated with this approval.

The Town of Fuquay-Varina, in partnership with Wake County, submitted a project to complete a Microtransit Feasibility Study. This project was recommended with a conditional approval. The conditions associated with the project were related to information from earlier stages of project development still being included in the final application. Specifically, earlier phases of project development included pilot operations as part of the project. These pilot operations are no longer included in the final submission, but some of the application language still suggested inclusion of some of these operating components. The Selection Committee asked that the Town further clarify the project timeline and costs at the project kick-off meeting, with a goal of ensuring that no elements of a funded FY20 project are contingent upon a successful FY21 project application.

The Town of Garner submitted a project to hire a consultant to study the potential for a circulator loop in Garner, with connections to existing and planned transit service. This project was recommended for approval without any additional conditions.

The Town of Rolesville, in partnership with the Town of Wake Forest, submitted a project to hire a consultant to complete a comprehensive transportation study, considering multiple transit modes including ride hailing, demand response, and a flexed or fixed route circulator. Through the study, the Town aims to narrow down the target service modes to 1-2 options. The project was recommended with a conditional approval related to the scope and budget of the proposed project. To maximize the impact of the project budget, the Selection Committee recommended that the final project either a.) include fewer service modes for consideration, or b.) narrow the considered study

area. Additionally, the Selection Committee noted that the Town did not engage any potential transit service providers throughout the application process and asked that potential service providers be included in the project as soon as feasible to ensure that the study provides all the information needed for any next steps.

Mr. Cushing then summarized the funding request for the FY20 planning projects. Of the \$150,000 programmed for FY20, the Town of Fuquay-Varina requested \$12,500, the Town of Garner requested \$50,000, and the Town of Rolesville requested \$15,000. Cumulatively, these requests leave around \$72,500 in the FY20 Community Funding Area Program planning budget, which Mr. Cushing noted will be relevant during discussion of the submitted operating project.

Mr. Cushing then described the submitted operating project. The Town of Wake Forest, which currently has a one-way circulator loop, plans to mirror this service and add service in the opposite direction. The Selection Committee recommended this reverse circulator loop project for approval. Mr. Cushing also noted that the funding request for this project came in higher than the available funding programmed in the FY20 operating/capital budget, with \$160,000 programmed. However, he described that there is a Community Funding Area Program policy which allows unused planning funds to be rolled over to operating/capital projects. The Selection Committee recommended that unused funds from the planning budget be applied to the Town of Wake Forest project. When unused FY20 planning funds, FY19 rollover funds, and the FY20 Capital/Operating funds are considered, there is around \$260k available, which is more than sufficient to fully fund the Wake Forest partial year request of \$195,000, leaving \$65k in designated fund balance for the Community Funding Area Program.

Mr. Cushing noted that, while the Wake Forest FY20 request is for a partial year of funding, the total annual project costs are higher, at around \$390,000. Additionally, Mr. Cushing explained that the Town of Wake Forest is using its existing local funding contribution to the Wake Forest Loop service as the match for the project, as was previously approved by the Wake Transit Governing Boards. As some of the total cost for this existing service is covered by the City of Raleigh, not all of this total project cost is eligible as the Town's match. Mr. Cushing explained that the eligible match amount is around \$300,000, which is the amount being used to model future year costs to the Community Funding Area Program. The Town of Wake Forest has acknowledged in its application that it plans to cover any funding gaps that result from the discrepancy in CFA program funding availability and total project cost.

Mr. Cushing then explained that there is a difference between the funding requests shown on the slides thus far and the final project costs listed in the Recommended Work Plan. He explained that this difference is related to two Program Management Plan policies. First, the 30% rule specifies that no single Community Funding Area Program project can use more than 30% of the total annual Community Funding Area Program budget. No single project triggers this rule by funding request alone, but it was noted that this rule will be relevant when considered alongside the second described policy. Second, the Program Management Plan allows for a potential 10% cost overage on projects, which is only available to the project sponsor by bringing additional match funding. Mr. Cushing noted that this 10% overage cannot go over any other programmatic caps, such as the \$50,000 cap on planning projects, or the 30% rule.

Mr. Cushing explained that the Work Plan projects for the Towns of Fuquay-Varina and Rolesville include this 10% overage allowance. This allowance is also applied to the Town of Wake Forest project, but this amount is limited in years FY21 and FY23, as the 10% allowance pushes the

project over the 30% cap for those years. The 10% allowance was not included in the Town of Garner project budget, as this project already reaches the planning budget maximum of \$50,000.

Mr. Tim Gardiner asked about how the Selection Committee was developed. Mr. Cushing explained that committee members were invited from different transit and planning agencies from across the region, with a goal of not including any agency that might potentially be involved in a submitted project. Mr. Gardiner expressed an interest in ensuring the lessons learned in this program year have an ability to inform future selection committee discussion.

Ms. Shannon Cox asked if there will be an opportunity to look back over this program cycle to see if there are any needed tweaks to the Program Management Plan, to check funding health, and to evaluate the program structure more generally. Mr. Cushing explained that there will be a mid-year check-in for all projects, which would be a good time to do this. Mr. Gardiner asked whether something like the existing CAMPO Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) review committee will be set up. Mr. Martin explained that the Program Management Plan is working well in the first year, but that it may not always. As such, setting up a working group to review the program may be useful. However, he explained that there would be little of significance to report in the first year. Ms. Shelby Powell explained that the LAPP committee was set up after the first few years of the program, which may be a useful model timeline for the Community Funding Area Program moving forward. Ms. Nicole Kreiser expressed support for review processes for Wake Transit programs more generally.

VI. FY 2020 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan - (Action Item – Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff and Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle Staff; 30 minutes) – Attachment B

The Draft FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan was released by the TPAC on January 22nd and subsequently by GoTriangle for a 30-day public comment period running from February 1st through March 3rd. GoTriangle staff and staff from TPAC member organizations also participated in a number of events throughout the county to drive public review of and solicit input on the draft Work Plan. In early March, FY 2020 Work Plan project sponsors considered public comments that were received during the comment period and worked to refine cost estimates and scope details for FY 2020 requests. In mid-to late-March, the Budget and Finance and Planning and Prioritization Subcommittees held two joint meetings to review revenue and expenditure assumptions, discuss project scope details, and to determine whether assumed expenses for FY 2020 and future year projects could be accommodated by revised financial model assumptions. The subcommittees agreed that the scope details and assumed expenditures associated with the projects included in the attached draft of the FY 2020 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan were appropriate to move forward for investment. The FY 2020 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan is provided as **Attachment B**.

CAMPO and GoTriangle staff will provide an overview of the draft of the FY 2020 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan at the TPAC's April meeting.

Requested Action: Consider recommending approval of the FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan to the Wake Transit governing boards

Mr. Martin explained that the TPAC will be considering the Draft Recommended Work Plan for recommendation to the Governing Boards, which, if adopted, would become effective July 1, 2019. A Work Plan draft went out to the TPAC for review on April 9th, and minor comments have been received from Wake County. CAMPO and GoTriangle have also submitted additional minor comments on their own work. While an earlier version of the Draft Recommended Work Plan was

attached to the TPAC meeting agenda when distributed, an additional revised attachment B has been added to CAMPO's TPAC website, which incorporates changes from these comments. Mr. Martin noted that, overall, these comments were minor and did not result in substantive or material changes.

Mr. Steven Schlossberg described that there were only a few small financial changes from the Draft Work Plan to the Draft Recommended Work Plan. The FY20 budget was lowered by \$3 million, mostly in relation to the City of Raleigh lowering the cost of some projects. Debt proceeds are no longer included in FY20, and will instead start in FY21, as one of the major projects that will use debt proceeds had significant costs moved to FY21. Mr. Schlossberg also explained that revenues and operating funds are consistent with what were seen in the draft plan, with some small tweaks in transit plan administration. Mr. Schlossberg explained that capital costs went down, mostly in relation to one project that Mr. Martin will discuss.

Mr. Martin described the changes from the draft to the recommended in more detail. He explained that, in previous Work Plans, a staffing expense placeholder of \$150,000 was used generally across agencies, but this amount has been right-sized for all positions based on market range and indirect costs. Additionally, some staffing scopes were re-evaluated, especially those related to older staffing projects where needs may have changed. Overall, this right-sizing led to a reduction in the operating budget. Also, more information on external sources of revenue was included. An example is the City of Raleigh bus stop improvement projects, which received \$2 million in LAPP funding and allowed the adjustment of revenue and the reduction of the impact to Wake Transit funding. Additionally, some capital projects had schedule changes, with special attention called to the Town of Cary's Bus Operations and Maintenance Facility. This project was originally allocated around \$20 million for construction in FY20, but, as a result of an updated schedule, only \$1.5 million has been retained for FY20. The FY20 funding will be used to further the construction document preparation and bidding administration process. Other construction costs have been moved to FY21. The City of Raleigh also split many of its transfer point improvements over two years, with design occurring in FY20 and construction in FY21. Mr. Martin noted that the Community Funding Area Program projects described by Mr. Cushing are also included in the Draft Recommended Work Plan, with the Town of Wake Forest project appearing in the operating budget, and the planning projects appearing in the capital budget. As a response to public comment, GoTriangle Route NRX was changed from a 60-minute frequency to 30-minute frequency. Also, the New Bern Bus Rapid Transit project is now shown as a defined project in the Capital Improvement Plan and is moving forward in project development. The other future BRT corridors are still lumped together to be broken out individually via work plan amendment as they move forward. Mr. Martin commented that there are no FY20 costs for New Bern, as the project is still using funds from FY19.

Mr. Martin then described the structure of the Work Plan document, explaining that the document is longer than in previous years but is an example of a fully built out Work Plan, including all sections that will be seen in future years. These sections include the budget ordinances and project sheets supporting all new FY20 projects as well as updated financial model assumptions. In the appendix, there are project sheets for projects initiated in prior years but that impact the FY20 budget and a Multi-Year Operating Program and Capital Improvement Plan. Project sheets in the Multi-Year Operating Program include projects through FY2024, and the Capital Improvement Plan includes projects through FY27, similar to the detailed project sheets in the Bus Plan, which was used to populate these sections. The appendix also includes roll up financial summaries as a crosswalk to the financial model.

Mr. Martin then described the next steps for the Recommended Work Plan. Comments resulting in administrative modifications will be accepted through April 30th. Following this, the document will be posted online for a 30-day public comment period beginning no later than May 6th in order to allow the comment period to wrap up before review by the Technical Coordinating Committee on June 6th. On June 19th, the Recommended Work Plan would go to the CAMPO Executive Board for public hearing and consideration of adoption, and to the GoTriangle Board of Trustees on June

26th, where another public hearing would be held. A log of any changes made between the Draft and Recommended Work Plan is available and can be shared with anyone interested.

Ms. Kreiser commented on some additional steps related to certain projects included in the Work Plan. She described that the Fare Work Group will be reconstituted, as well as a group to coordinate applications for outside grant funding. Ms. Kreiser stressed that the financial model relies on projects receiving about \$25 million of outside funding, and that this grant coordination group will help to annually coordinate among all agencies to ensure that these grant applications are being submitted. The Fare Work Group will be re-considering assumptions about anticipated fare revenue, as the existing assumptions have not been discussed in detail and may be inaccurate.

Mr. Martin expressed that he received a request from the Town of Cary at the beginning of the meeting regarding the Work Plan project for the Holly Springs Park-and-Ride, which will be served by the Holly Springs Express Route. The Town of Holly Springs has expressed a desire to split the allocation for this capital project across two sites. As the current project scope is written for one site, further action would be required for this change to occur. Mr. Kevin Wyrach explained that the Town of Holly Springs already has a shelter in place at its Town Center shopping center that it would like to serve with the route. Some additional pedestrian improvements may be made at this shelter, but there is also a desire to add a stop in the DOWNTOWN/Village District, which currently does not have transit infrastructure. This Village District stop would not act as a park-and-ride but would serve walk-up traffic. Mr. Wyrach reports that there is running time in the HSX schedule to fit both stops and that setting up both stops would not increase project costs. Mr. Wyrach also reported that GoCary has had conversations with the Town about the need for limited stops for express services.

Mr. Dylan Bruchhaus commented that the Town of Morrisville recommends approval of the Work Plan more generally, but that the Town is not in favor of losing service on Paramount Parkway as part of changes to Route 310. Mr. Bruchhaus reports that the Town has been in contact with GoTriangle about this concern. Mr. Schlossberg commented that none of the GoTriangle service planning staff are in attendance. Mr. Tim Gardiner asked whether specific alignment is included in project scope. Mr. Martin explained that no specific alignment is defined in the Work Plan. A map is included on the project sheet, which is pulled from the bus plan, but specific alignments can change once service level planning occurs. He further explained that the scope of a service project includes considerations like running frequency and span, and the major destinations and transit centers being served. Mr. Schlossberg expressed that he will go back to GoTriangle planning staff to express the Town's concern. Mr. David Walker explained that the City of Raleigh is still working on specific route details with the Towns of Knightdale, Garner, and Rolesville for Work Plan projects, and what is seen on the maps may be altered based on these conversations. Mr. Gardiner recommended that the Town's concern be noted in the minutes, but that there should be an expectation that these conversations will continue outside of the TPAC. Ms. Kreiser asked Mr. Bruchhaus whether the Town was comfortable with the project sheet, not including the alignment shown in the included map. Mr. Bruchhaus responded that the project sheet was sufficient and that the Town did not want to hold up the Work Plan process but felt a need to express this concern.

Mr. Gardiner expressed an interest in having additional conversation regarding the Fare Work Group and Grant Coordination group later in the agenda.

Motion by Ms. Nicole Kreiser: Recommend approval of the FY20 Wake Transit Work Plan to the Wake Transit Governing Boards, with an amendment to split the Holly Springs Park-and-Ride into two locations within the same budget.

Second: Mr. David Walker

Motion passes unanimously

VII. FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan Project Agreement Groupings and Reporting Deliverables – (Action Item – Steven Schlossberg, GoTriangle Staff and Bret Martin, CAMPO Staff - 25 minutes) – Attachment C

Throughout March, the TPAC's subcommittees and CAMPO reviewed and provided feedback to GoTriangle on the agreement grouping structure for projects included in the FY 2020 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan. The Planning and Prioritization Subcommittee also worked to recommend specific reporting deliverables for each type of project included in the FY 2020 Recommended Wake Transit Work Plan such that each project type, regardless of project sponsor, has consistent and useful reporting requirements. The project agreement grouping structure and associated reporting deliverables for each project type are provided in **Attachment C**.

Requested Action: Consider recommending approval of the FY 2020 Wake Transit Work Plan project agreement groupings and reporting deliverables to the Wake Transit governing boards

Mr. Schlossberg introduced the Agreement Grouping and Reporting Deliverables and noted that there has been a slight change to the document as compared to the shared exhibit C. The City of Raleigh's bus stop improvement projects were originally shown in the general capital agreements category but have been moved to the special agreements category due to the inclusion of the LAPP funding source. Mr. Schlossberg expressed a willingness to take comments leading to administrative changes through April 30th. Mr. Martin added that the Reporting Deliverables were developed over 3-4 Planning & Prioritization Subcommittee meetings and stressed that these comments should focus on clarity of deliverables or identifying typos, not on the general content of the deliverables. Mr. Schlossberg commented that GoTriangle will begin work on the agreements shortly, based on these reporting deliverables and agreement groupings.

Ms. Kreiser asked whether the agreement templates have changed since reviewed by Planning and Prioritization and Budget and Finance. Mr. Schlossberg replied that they have not.

Mr. Martin made a comment about parties to the agreements, which are not noted on the Agreement Groupings and Reporting Deliverables document. He expressed that GoTriangle has a list of agreements that CAMPO will be a party to, as well as the reasons for CAMPO inclusion in these agreements. He noted that these reasons will be the same as in previous years.

Ms. Kreiser requested an amendment to the agreement groupings, which includes moving the Youth GoPass project to a special agreement

Motion by Ms. Kelly Blazey: Recommend approval of the FY20 Wake Transit Work Plan Project Agreement Groupings and Reporting Deliverables, including the discussed edit, to the Wake Transit Governing Boards

Second: Mr. Chip Russell

Motion passes unanimously

VIII. Fixed Guideways Major Investment Study – Commuter Rail (CRT) System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework - (Action Item – Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle Staff, 15 minutes) – Attachment D

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.

The System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework report was presented as information to the TPAC at its January meeting. The MIS Decision Plan for Interim Deliverables prescribes that the System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework be considered as an action item by the Wake Transit and Durham County Transit governing boards. The report is included as **Attachment D**.

Requested Action: Consider recommending approval of the MIS CRT System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework to the Wake Transit governing boards

Mr. Bret Martin explained that he would be presenting for the Commuter Rail MIS Project Manager, Patrick McDonough, as Mr. McDonough had another meeting that could not be rescheduled. Mr. Martin reminded the TPAC that the CRT System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework was presented as information in January and is coming back today for TPAC action, as is required in the MIS Interim Deliverables Decision Plan.

Mr. Martin then moved on to explaining the document contents. He described that the document identifies a transportation problem to be solved, which can be viewed as a precursor to the purpose and need statement required for any federally funded project. The problems identified in the MIS were to 1.) Address existing and projected growth in travel demand, 2.) Improve transit service and customer experience including reliability, particularly as compared to the roadway network, and 3.), to support local plans to preserve and enhance quality of life. The document also includes commuter rail design guidelines and performance targets, as well as an evaluation framework. Mr. Martin noted that the Core Technical Team has already begun assessing the framework scenarios against this evaluation framework, and the results are being reviewed by the Core Technical Team.

Mr. Martin explained that the design guidelines were developed by looking to peer systems as benchmarks, considering items such as ridership, station spacing, amenities, etc. Mr. Martin then commented on the differences between commuter rail, light rail, and Bus Rapid Transit, clarifying that commuter rail is usually designed for longer distance commuting trips, and that these trips usually occur at specific times of day. Additionally, commuter rail station spacing is usually farther apart, closer to 4 miles for Commuter Rail, whereas Bus Rapid Transit is closer to .5 miles. Mr. Martin then discussed the suggested amenities identified in the document, including platforms, ticket vending machines, real time passenger, train location information, and parking for all modes. Regarding service design guidelines, the MIS identifies a minimum span of service from 6am to 10am and 3pm to 7pm, and a minimum service frequency of one one train per hour per direction. Regarding performance guidelines, the MIS performance targets suggest an on-time performance rate of 95%, an average operating speed of 35mph, 45 passenger boardings per vehicle revenue hour, \$30 operating expense per vehicle revenue mile, \$20 operating expense per passenger boarding, and 15% fare box recovery.

Mr. Martin then explained the Evaluation Framework section, noting that this section is not assessing the design of the project, rather it is evaluating operating scenarios and how they achieve certain goals. The specified goals are speed and travel time competitiveness, connectivity, equity, ridership, transit-supportiveland use, sustainability, and regional access. Within these 7 categories, there are 15 metrics being assessed, which will be used to evaluate 7 scenarios. As the route alignment is determined, the variables considered in these scenarios are the number of stations,

the frequency of service, and headways. The Core Technical Team has already examined these scenarios and are compiling a final report now.

Mr. Martin then drew attention to page 3 of the MIS System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework report, where language exists referring to the Durham-Orange Light Rail project as part of the shared 2045 MTP. He noted that, until the MTP is amended, this language is technically correct. However, he pointed out that new modeling assuming the removal of the DOLRT project is anticipated to occur in the alternatives analysis phase. Mr. Chip Russell commented that it would be appropriate to remove the sentence referencing the DOLRT project, to which Mr. Martin mentioned that Ms. Shannon Cox also proposed removal of this sentence.

Ms. Cox asked whether the station spacing guidelines are to be measured based on current density, projected density, or both. Mr. Martin responded that both are included. He commented that 2045 density comes from inputs provided for the Triangle Regional Model, which uses projected socio-economic data, land use, and distribution of population growth but noted that this data could change based on modeling of stations in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Mr. Martin noted that other factors are also considered, such as the closeness of stations and the number of stations, especially considering how these station characteristics impact average speed. He noted that no weight is assigned to each metric.

Mr. Russell requested clarifications to section 1.2, which references the number of people at poverty level. Mr. Russell commented that specifying the dollar amount for this threshold would add clarity to the section, especially as there are other references in the document that specify a dollar amount used for calculations.

Motion by Mr. Mike Charbonneau: Recommend approval of the MIS CRT System Guidelines and Evaluation Framework, including the discussed edits, to the Wake Transit governing boards.

Second: Mr. David Walker

Motion passes unanimously

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

a. Budget and Finance

Ms. Kreiser commented that this may be a good time to return to discussion regarding the Fare Work Group and efforts towards coordinating grant activities. She commented that the Budget and Finance Subcommittee's Work Task list is complete for the next few months, but that the subcommittee has questions regarding the original fare assumptions in the Wake Transit Plan as compared to Nelson Nygaard fare recommendations. She explained that, by the end of 2027, there is around a \$2 million difference between these assumptions, and there is a desire to discuss this in more detail. Additionally, Ms. Kreiser explained that this group would also aim to discuss the "Hold Harmless Subsidy for Implementation of Countywide Fare Strategy" project, and how the financials associated with this project would be calculated.

Mr. Gardiner expressed a desire to formalize the process for setting up subgroups through the TPAC, rather than having subcommittees set up sub-groups. He also expressed that it may be beneficial to have one of the subcommittees list the subgroup tasks as part of that subcommittee's work task list. Ms. Kreiser asked if a motion for the TPAC to reconstitute the Fare Work Group would be appropriate. Ms. Cox asked whether the proposed tasks of this subgroup are already included in the Budget and Finance Work Task list. Ms. Kreiser responded that, as the proposed discussions are related to financial model assumptions, these tasks fall within the scope of the existing work task list. Ms. Kreiser then questioned whether the Fare Work Group was ever formally disbanded after convening to discuss the Youth GoPass or the development of regional fare strategy, noting that the proposed conversations seem to be an extension of these earlier conversations. Mr. Schlossberg remarked that the progress of the work group could be monitored

as a subcommittee report. Ms. Kreiser asked whether it would be more appropriate to bring proceedings back to the TPAC as an update, or whether a formal TPAC endorsement was still preferred. Ms. Shelby Powell commented that these discussions are within the realm of the Budget and Finance subcommittee, and that, if this work group did not cease to exist, it may be best to just reconvene.

Mr. Martin commented that the audience of the Fare Work Group is slightly different than the audience of the Budget & Finance subcommittee, especially considering that the Fare Work Group includes transit planning staff. Ms. Powell asked who is leading this group, and Ms. Kreiser replied that Ms. Mary Kate Morookian is leading the group. Mr. Martin expressed that the institutionalization of the Fare Work Group has already occurred, but that it may be appropriate to take action to put items on their agenda. Mr. Martin also noted that the reporting deliverables for the mobile ticketing project describe that it will be revisited by a fare work group.

Ms. Cox commented that, because the Fare Work Group is not a formal subcommittee, the TPAC doesn't receive a work task list for this subgroup, and this subgroup doesn't have a chair. Ms. Cox questioned whether this subgroup should be a separate subcommittee. Mr. Gardiner commented that he thinks of this group as an ad hoc committee but noted that conversation about how these ad hoc committees are formed and report has not occurred.

Mr. Russell commented that he doesn't see a problem with a subcommittee consulting a subgroup for a specific topic. Ms. Kreiser commented that other subcommittees will need to be informed in regard to the discussions of the Fare Work Group as well, such as the Public Engagement and Communications, and Planning and Prioritization subcommittees. Mr. Danny Johnson commented that it may not be appropriate to set up the Fare Work Group as reporting to a specific subcommittee, as the work of the subgroup will impact many of the subcommittees.

Ms. Cox asked that the Fare Work Group plan to present an agenda item for next TPAC meeting, with the goal of letting the TPAC know what is on the work task list for the group and to explain what will be reported back to the TPAC.

b. Planning and Prioritization

Mr. Martin described that the next meeting of the Planning and Prioritization Subcommittee is scheduled for 4/30/19, and that the subcommittee will be beginning a discussion regarding how reporting on deliverables will be used to make future decisions.

c. Process

Mr. Gardiner explained that the April Process Subcommittee meeting is canceled, due to a conflict with the NCAMPO conference. Generally, Mr. Gardiner explained that the subcommittee is continuing work on multi-year agreements, with a current focus on what kind of items are needed in an agreement in situations where a transit provider enters a new municipality.

d. Public Engagement and Communications

Ms. Bonnie Parker noted that the Public Engagement and Communications (PE&C) Subcommittee has not held a meeting in April, but that work on PE&C tasks has continued. GoTriangle, as the lead agency, has been monitoring fare and route updates. The subcommittee has also continued sending a monthly report of public engagement and communications activities including information from all 3 transit agencies. Additionally, the Work Plan outreach summary has been completed and will be routed to the governing boards. The Commonly Asked Questions have been themed by GoTriangle, and work to finalize this document with input from content experts is ongoing. The final CAQs document will be shared with the TPAC.

The Public Engagement & Communications subcommittee will be meeting on May 9th, with a discussion on how to leverage regional TDM efforts for Wake Transit projects.

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

a. New Business

Mr. Charbonneau commented that he sent an e-mail to the GoTriangle planning team regarding the route 310 discussion brought up by Morrisville earlier in the meeting. He mentioned that the planning team will be addressing the Paramount Parkway concern and will send more details to the Town of Morrisville.

Mr. Martin communicated that a new TPAC Administrator was hired and will start work on July 1st.

b. TPAC Member Discussion

None

c. Next Steps

Ms. Cox described that the next TPAC meeting is scheduled for May 8th. Mr. Martin commented that this meeting is around 2 weeks away, and that it is not anticipated that there will be any new agenda items at this time. As such, he commented, it may be worth canceling this meeting. If the May meeting is canceled, the next scheduled meeting will be held on June 12th.

Ms. Kreiser commented that, if the May meeting is not held, updated Work Task lists can be sent to CAMPO staff and distributed to TPAC as appropriate.

Ms. Shannon Cox requested that CAMPO staff follow up with project managers to check in on any unforeseen agenda items and communicate the need for a May meeting by the end of the week.

XI. Adjourn

Motion to Adjourn: Ms. Kelly Blazey

Second: Mr. Danny Johnson

Motion passes unanimously