

## Durham Staff Working Group

December 21, 2022

### MEETING NOTES

The Durham Staff Working Group met on Wednesday, December 21, 2022, at 3:00 p.m. in the Conference Room at GoTriangle, as well as through the Zoom teleconferencing platform. The following members and guests were in attendance:

Ellen Beckmann (Chair, Voting Member)	Durham County
Doug Plachcinski (Voting Member)	DCHC MPO
Jay Heikes (Voting Member)	GoTriangle
Andy Henry (Alternate)*	DCHC MPO
Filmon Fishastion	DCHC MPO
Sean Egan*	City of Durham
Evian Patterson*	City of Durham
Bill Judge*	City of Durham
Erin Convery*	City of Durham
Eric Simpson	City of Durham
Tom Devlin*	City of Durham
Tom Ten Eyck*	City of Durham
Katharine Eggleston	GoTriangle
Katie Urban*	GoTriangle
Sandra Freeman	GoTriangle
Steven Schlossberg	GoTriangle
Jennifer Hayden*	GoTriangle
David Jerrido III*	GoTriangle
Liz Raskopf*	GoTriangle
Rocio Antelis*	GoTriangle
Adam Howell	Atkins

Quorum Count: 3 of 3 Voting Members

\*Attended remotely

#### 1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Ellen Beckmann called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

#### 2. Approval of October 2022 Meeting Notes (MPO)

Chair Ellen Beckmann made a motion to accept the October 12, 2022 Durham Staff Working Group (SWG) Meeting Minutes. Doug Plachcinski seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Plan Updates**

#### **a. Durham County Transit Plan (MPO)**

Chair Ellen Beckmann provided an update of the Final Durham County Transit Plan (DCTP). Chair Ellen Beckmann said that the DCTP has been released for public comment and that the report will be presented for approval by the Durham Board of County Commissioners, Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO), and the GoTriangle Board of Trustees.

#### **b. Transit Governance Study (Durham County)**

Chair Ellen Beckmann provided an update of the Transit Governance Study. Chair Ellen Beckmann said that they would be moving into the second phase, which includes developing supporting agreements, financial policies, new staff working group. The contract with Atkins has also been extended.

#### **c. Wake-Durham Bus Plan (GoTriangle)**

Jay Heikes provided an update to the Wake-Durham Bus Plan in lieu of Jenny Green. Jay Heikes stated that Wake County would be moving forward with public engagement next spring and for Durham County a decision has been made wrap up the work for GoRaleigh, GoCary, and the Wake portion of the GoTriangle routes.

#### **d. Commuter Rail (GoTriangle)**

Katharine Eggleston provided up update to the Commuter Rail. Katharine Eggleston stated that they are preparing for a lot of public engagement. Katharine Eggleston also stated that in January there will be discussions on how to bring the current process to a decision by the spring or early summer.

### **4. SWG Administrator Discussion (MPO)**

Steven Schlossberg brought up conversations on who would run the SWG administrator and asked for the next steps in the conversation. Doug Plachcinski brought up a couple points. The first being that Orange County has asked to take on the SWG administration responsibilities. For the Durham County SWG Doug Plachcinski brought up communications with Durham County as well as the MPO's staffing transitions. Sandra Freeman asked if there was a job description that outlines the exact roles of the administrator. Doug Plachcinski added on that in addition to the previous responsibilities outlined by Aaron Cain, additional responsibilities and tasks are also being considered. Doug Plachcinski stated that they would like to identify the changes in responsibilities and whether that still fits best with the MPO or if there were another partner that would take up that role.

Katharine Eggleston stated that the Durham and Orange conversation should be held together and expressed some benefits of having a single entity as the administrator. Chair Ellen Beckmann shared that Durham County is not opposed to taking on the role but would like for the decision to be one that all parties can agree on and work with. Chair Ellen Beckmann then shares the intended deadline for the decision. Sandra

Freeman brought up concerns about things falling through the cracks if it is not clear on what needs to be done. Doug Plachcinski asked the group if, when the body developed the SWG bylaws, did it envision covering the duties and responsibilities of the administrator.

Steven Schlossberg reiterated Katharine Eggleston's perspective of having a single entity as the administrator and asked for clarification on the MPO's reasons for relinquishing control of the SWG administrator. Doug Plachcinski brought up staffing and resources as well as the desire for the MPO to focus more on progressing the work of the SWG rather than admin duties. Chair Ellen Beckmann stated that the role will be funded regardless of who does it. Doug Plachcinski informed the group of anticipated costs and the implementation of a comp study. Sandra Freeman reiterated her requested clarification of the roles and responsibilities of the administrator and expressed concerns for things that will get lost in the shuffle.

Chair Ellen Beckmann then began the conversation on how to proceed beginning with the desire for specifics on the roles and responsibilities. The body then discussed the division of these responsibilities and how it will fit into either one role or several roles. Katharine Eggleston asked if Atkins would be handling the assigning of responsibilities. Chair Ellen Beckmann brought up that the ILA states that the role would need to be approved by the three boards and provided an estimated timeline for the process.

Katharine Eggleston asked about following up with the Orange County SWG and Doug Plachcinski suggested to bring it up at the next Orange County SWG meeting. Adam Howell stated that they will contact Orange County beforehand to initiate the conversation.

##### **5. FY22 Financial Actuals (GoTriangle)**

Jennifer Hayden provided the financial report update for GoTriangle. Jennifer Hayden broke down the revenues of the fiscal year totaling to \$43 million with \$40.3 million coming from the half cent sales tax, \$1.7 million from the \$7 DMV vehicle registration tax, \$1.4 million from vehicle rental tax, \$719,000 from the \$3 DMV vehicle registration tax, and other revenue totaled \$7,261. Jennifer Hayden also covered the investment income and the unrealized investment loss. The actual revenue not including the unrealized investment loss totaled \$44.8 million.

Jennifer Hayden then went on to go over expenditures for the year with the largest allocation being \$30 million to fund balance and the remaining \$13 million were spent in a variety of ways. Chair Ellen Beckmann then asked Jennifer Hayden if this presentation was ready to go to the Durham County and MPO Boards.

**6. Progress Report Template (GoTriangle)**

Steven Schlossberg provided the update to the Progress Report Template. Steven Schlossberg went over the report which provides more details on milestones and highlights. Steven Schlossberg then spoke about the mid-year and technical report and what he envisioned as the template for those reports. Chair Ellen Beckmann reminded the group of the March 15 deadline set by the ILA.

**7. FY23 Amendment Schedule (GoTriangle)**

Steven Schlossberg provided the update to the FY23 Amendment Schedule. Steven Schlossberg reminded the group of the upcoming deadline for Q3 amendments to be submitted to the MPO.

**8. Annual Work Program Schedule (MPO)**

Doug Plachcinski provided an update on the Annual Work Program Schedule. Doug Plachcinski informed the body that the MPO is currently compiling project sheets and is communicating with local partners for any questions or concerns.

**9. Update from City of Durham: Better Bus Project (City of Durham)**

Eric Simpson provided the presentation for the Better Bus Project. In the presentation Eric Simpson gave an overview of the scope, schedule, quality, and forecast of the six major focus areas and their phases. Steven Schlossberg asked if Holloway and Fayetteville had been put in for a grant. Eric Simpson replied that they received a debrief with WSP and came close but feels that they have a good chance should they submit again. Jay Heikes asked for clarification on if the cost per square ft. includes the contingency or not. Eric Simpson replied that it does include the contingency at around 40%.

Jay Heikes then asked for clarification on the figures on slide 15. Evian Patterson responded that the figures were based on estimates that were received from the planning phase. Jay Heikes asked if the revenue available was for prior years or for future years. Chair Ellen Beckmann responded that they were for prior years and noted that the table seemed short term since the numbers were only for the next year and not the whole project. Evian Patterson responded that the reason for the short-term forecasting is to refine the numbers to expect for construction. Chair Ellen Beckmann expressed concern on making sure that we are consistent and keeping focus on the Transit Plan. Chair Ellen Beckmann stated that they need to define the scope of work on projects and make sure that everyone is in agreement. Eric Simpson agreed that the examples shown are higher than the estimates, that the next steps are to move forward with a designer, and that the scope should be defined early on to figure out what is needed for the construction process. Doug Plachcinski asked if the costs would be further defined once designers came on board. Eric Simpson reminded the group that the project is still in the conceptual phase. Eric Simpson then confirmed that the construction costs should be delivered soon and proceeded to go over some of the steps still needed such as getting a designer on board. Eric Simpson went over a high-level

scope for the project and Chair Ellen Beckmann asked for something more definite. Doug Plachcinski brought up the Capital Improvement Program and how it can be used to get a better idea of the scope elements for each project. Chair Ellen Beckmann agreed with Doug Plachcinski. Eric Simpson asked Jay Heikes how detailed the cost estimates of the commuter rail is. Jay Heikes responded that it was more agreeing about what scope elements the Transit Plan would pay for. Doug Plachcinski asked if the group is looking to establish what the Transit Plan will pay for on a project-by-project basis. Chair Ellen Beckmann confirmed that that would be the case for these projects.

**10. Next Meeting – January 18**

Chair Ellen Beckmann announced the next meeting to be on January 18.

**11. Adjournment**

With no further business before the Durham SWG, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.