Role of the External Auditor

Actions
- Plan
- Perform

Results
- Express Opinions

Communication
- Independence
- Changes
Key Highlights

Financial Statement Results

- Opinion
  - Unmodified Opinion
- Internal Controls and Compliance
  - No Internal Control Findings
  - No Compliance Findings
- Required Communications
  - 2 PAJEs
Key Highlights
Internal Controls and Compliance – Single Audit

Federal Major Programs

- Federal Transit Cluster

State Major Programs

- State Maintenance Assistance Program
- Transit Development Program

Administrative Controls
Monitoring Reports
Compliance Matrix
Compliance Testing
Key Highlights

Uniform Grant Audit Results

- **Opinion**: Unmodified Opinion
- **Internal Controls**: No Significant Deficiencies, No Material Weaknesses
  - **Compliance**: No Material Noncompliance, No Nonmaterial Noncompliance
Key Highlights

State Single Audit Results

- Opinion
  - Unmodified Opinion

- Internal Controls
  - No Significant Deficiencies
  - No Material Weaknesses

- Compliance
  - No Material Noncompliance
  - No Nonmaterial Noncompliance
Key Highlights

Significant Audit Areas

Assets
- Cash & Investments
- Accounts Receivable & Revenue
- Capital Assets

Liabilities
- Payroll & Compensated Absences
- OPEB

Other Areas
- Single Audit
- Net Position
- Legal
- Related Parties
- Estimates
- Compliance
Findings and Adjustment Details

Passed Adjustments

Entry to correct allocation of OPEB expense between Ridesharing and Bus fund.

Entry to correct overstatement of revenue recognition in prior year for revenue related to current year.
Reporting

LGC Submission Date

• 10/30/2019

GFOA Certification

• Received for 24 consecutive years
Summary

- Unmodified Financial Statement Opinion
- Full Cooperation with Management
- No Management Letter Comments
- No Internal Control Findings
- 2 PAJEs
Thank You

Scott Duda | Partner

sduda@cbh.com | 919.782.1040 | cbh.com

Cherry Bekaert LLP
DURHAM COUNTY TRANSIT PLAN
Process and Engagement Update

GoTriangle Board of Trustees
January 22, 2020
AGENDA

A. What have we heard from engagement efforts to date

B. Key Items to Address in early 2020
   • Amendments to FY19-20 Work Plan
   • FY20-21 Work Plan
   • Upcoming Interim Decisions

C. Updated Preliminary Results from the Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Study: Alternatives Analysis Update and Further Study

ENGAGEDurham
Our Future Together

GO FORWARD
A COMMUNITY INVESTMENT IN TRANSIT
A. ENGAGEMENT TO DATE

- Listening and Learning Sessions
- Short Range Service Plan
- Move Durham
- Rider and Community Surveys
- FY20 Work Plan; 2017 Transit Plan
A. WHAT WE’VE HEARD TO DATE

Themes to inform the Community Transit Goals and Equity Principles:

- Improve Frequency
- Improve Geographic Coverage
- Environmentally Friendly Transit
- Improve Regional Connectivity
- Improve Bus Stop Infrastructure
- Ensure Transit is Affordable to All
- Improve Connectivity to Bus Stops
- Improve Information and its Communication
- Ensure Safe Travel for Youth
- Expand Paratransit Services
### B. CURRENT FY20 WORK PLAN PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY20 Budget</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GoDurham Service Improvements</td>
<td>$2,083,895</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoTriangle Service Improvements</td>
<td>$1,202,330</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Durham Vanpool</td>
<td>$66,960</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Transit Center</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill Road TEC</td>
<td>$886,450</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway Street TEC</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville Street TEC</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoDurham Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>$1,283,570</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoTriangle Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>$257,000</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southpoint Transit Center</td>
<td>$426,376</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Place P&amp;R Improvements</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Wake Commuter Rail Study</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham County Transit Plan Update</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. PREVIOUS FY20 WORK PLAN AMENDMENTS

COMPLETED:

- GoDurham increased service frequency on top five routes (by ridership) on nights and Sundays (January 2020)
- Purchase Durham County Access vehicles (2020)
- Mobile ticketing (Summer 2020)

Each of these previously approved work plan amendments addresses responses we have heard from engagement efforts to date.
### What / When

- Amendments to the Work Plan $ allocations for this fiscal year.
- Amendment applications are being submitted
- SWG will consider Jan 29
- DECISION: Feb 26 GoTriangle board

### Possible Amendments:

- *Commuter rail early project development activities**
- *Bus stop and access improvements
- Expand Fayetteville Street Transit Emphasis Corridor
- Bus speed and reliability improvements
- Mobility and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) options to support emerging job centers (e.g. Treyburn)

*These projects would require Durham BOCC and MPO board review and approval of a Transit Plan Amendment

**Decisions on the Durham County Transit Plan amendment for CRT early project development activities may occur after Feb 26.
B. UPCOMING FY20-21 WORK PLAN [July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021]

What / When

- Transit Plan $ allocations for next year
- Project applications due: Feb-Mar
- Apr 29 GoTriangle budget WS
- INPUT: Jun 8 Durham BOCC
- INPUT: Jun 10 MPO board
- DECISION: Jun 24 GoTriangle board

Possible Work Plan Projects

- Commuter rail early project development activities
- Bus stop, facility, access, and reliability improvements
- Develop Transit Emphasis Corridor Program
  - Fayetteville Street
  - Holloway Street
  - Chapel Hill Road
  - Evaluate and prioritize other potential corridors
- Upgrade and expand fleet and maintenance facilities
- Fleet renewal and expansion

DUE: Feb
DECISIONS: June
Draft Plan: NOV 2020
Complete: early 2021

GO FORWARD
A COMMUNITY INVESTMENT IN TRANSIT
B. INTERIM DECISIONS FOR MID- TO LONG- TERM PROJECTS

- **FY 19-20 Work Plan Amendments:** Winter 2020 [Durham Transit Plan*]
- **Additional CRT Study:** Winter 2020 [County Transit Plans*]
- **FY 20-21 Work Plan:** Spring 2020 [Durham Transit Plan*]
- **SPOT 6.0:** Spring 2020 [NCDOT prioritization process for state funding]
- **Pipeline Highway Projects:** Timing uncertain [NCDOT]
- **2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan:** Ongoing; transit network decisions needed by Summer of 2021 [MPO + Federal requirement]
- **FY 21-22 Work Plan:** Winter - Spring 2021 [Durham Transit Plan*]

*CRT is an example of a cross-county / regional project. There are many regional projects that require coordination among county transit plans during work plan development and adoption.
C. Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Study

Update of Alternatives Analysis and Further Study

Updated Draft/Preliminary Findings Snapshot
Why Is This Study Being Conducted?

• Give elected officials the data needed to decide whether to take the project to the next phase of development
• Examine scenarios adding Johnston County/Selma and Orange County/Mebane
• Refresh and update ridership estimates, infrastructure assumptions, and cost estimates that were included in prior high-level planning studies
• Identify additional activities necessary before initiating project design and implementation
This is a Preliminary Feasibility Study

- Further detailed railroad capacity modeling would be needed to confirm infrastructure requirements
- Cost estimates require further definition
  - Cost estimates are planning-level
  - No engineering has been performed yet as part of this study
  - Cost estimates would be refined once preliminary engineering work and railroad capacity modeling is completed
- Ridership estimates would require further refinement
# Evaluated Eight Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Garner</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-2-8-2</td>
<td>$1.4B – $1.8B</td>
<td>$29M</td>
<td>7.5K – 10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Garner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5-1-5-1</td>
<td>$1.4B – $1.8B</td>
<td>$20M</td>
<td>5K – 7.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Garner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3-1-3</td>
<td>$1.4B – $1.7B</td>
<td>$13M</td>
<td>4.5K – 6K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mebane-Selma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-2-8-2</td>
<td>$2.5B – $3.2B</td>
<td>$57M</td>
<td>8K – 11.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mebane-Selma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5-1-5-1</td>
<td>$2.5B – $3.2B</td>
<td>$40M</td>
<td>6K – 9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mebane-Selma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3-1-3</td>
<td>$2.3B – $3.1B</td>
<td>$26M</td>
<td>5K – 7.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsb.-Clayton</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-2-8-2</td>
<td>$1.8B – $2.4B</td>
<td>$44M (+$15M)</td>
<td>8K – 11.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Clayton</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-2-8-2</td>
<td>$1.6B – $2.1B</td>
<td>$37M (+$8M)</td>
<td>7.5K – 10K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Current Wake Transit Plan assumes $1.33B capital cost for Durham-Garner 8-2-8-2*

*Cost: Year-of-Expenditure Dollars (YOE$)*  
**Daily Ridership: Average of Current Year and Horizon Year Forecast*
Funding Capacity

Needs federal funding to be affordable

**Orange:** Incremental cost to include Hillsborough and/or Mebane is large relative to est. ridership

**Johnston:** Would require significant additional new revenue

**Durham and Wake:** Affordability will depend on:
  - Cost share
  - Prioritization versus other investments
  - Ability to control costs
Federal Criteria: Must Score Medium in Both Categories

Individual Criteria
- Mobility Improvements (16.66%)
- Environmental Benefits (16.66%)
- Congestion Relief (16.66%)
- Cost-Effectiveness (16.66%)
- Economic Development (16.66%)
- Land Use (16.66%)

Summary Ratings
- Project Justification\(^1\)
  (50% of Overall Rating)
  *Must be at least “Medium” for project to get “Medium” or better Overall Rating*

Overall Rating
- Local Financial Commitment\(^1\)
  (50% of Overall Rating)
  *Must be at least “Medium” for project to get “Medium” or better Overall Rating*

Overall Project Rating
Lower Service and Higher Cost Scenarios Do Not Score Well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End Points</th>
<th>Weekday Round Trips</th>
<th>Service Level</th>
<th>Expected Score</th>
<th>“Upside” Score</th>
<th>“Downside” Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mebane-Selma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-2-8-2</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mebane-Selma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5-1-5-1</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Weak Medium</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mebane-Selma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3-1-3</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Weak Medium</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Garner</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-2-8-2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Garner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5-1-5-1</td>
<td>Weak Medium</td>
<td>Weak Medium</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Garner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3-1-3</td>
<td>Weak Medium</td>
<td>Weak Medium</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsb.-Clayton</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-2-8-2</td>
<td>Weak Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Clayton</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8-2-8-2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scenarios rated as “Weak Medium” are projected to score at the low end of the Medium range, meaning that if any single component score is reduced, the overall score would fall below the eligibility requirements.

To be eligible for federal funding, project must score a Medium rating
Peer Comparison

Prior Major Investment Study identified peer systems for comparison of key metrics:

- System Capital Cost
- Capital Cost Per Mile
- Average Weekday Trips
- Average Trip Length
- Capital Cost Per Passenger Mile Traveled
- Operating Cost Per Passenger Mile Traveled

note: not all data were available for each peer system
System Capital Cost (2020$)

System Capital Cost in 2020$
Source: 2019 CRT MIS Report
System Capital Cost in 2020$ divided by length of system.
Source: 2019 CRT MIS Report
Average Weekday Trips (2018)

Average Weekday Ridership for 2018.
Average Unlinked Trip length.
Capital Cost (2020$) / Annual Passenger Miles Traveled (2018)

- MetroRail (Austin): $15
- Music City Star (Nashville): $17
- Northstar (Minneapolis): $22
- SunRail (Orlando): $40
- Durham - Garner 8-2-8-2: $49
- A-Train (Denton, TX): $52
- Mebane-Selma 8-2-8-2: $77

Average System Capital Cost in 2020$ divided by total annual passenger miles traveled.

Average System Operating Cost in 2019$ divided by total annual passenger miles traveled
Percentage of Riders from Zero Car and One Car Households

Next Steps

- Present updated results and metrics
- Present risk assessment - GoTriangle board workshop on Jan. 22
  - Primer on risk for transit capital projects
  - Walk-through of initial risk assessment findings
- Consider pursuing early project development activities necessary prior to initiating project design and implementation
- Consider adopting memorandum of understanding among project management partners for early project development activities
  - Roles, responsibilities, and goals of the project management partners, municipalities, and other stakeholders if moving forward
Risk Assessment

• Public Participation Process
  • Equitable Community Engagement Blueprint
  • Seek Resident Input Before Options Are Limited

• Inclusion of Municipal Governments as Partners
  • City of Durham
  • City of Raleigh
  • Other cities and towns in the five counties along the potential alignment

• Roadway Interfaces
  • Grade Crossings
  • Bridge Clearances

• Apportioning Capital and Operating Costs
Questions
Wake Transit Plan: Four Big Moves

In November 2016, Wake County voters approved a transit-dedicated half-cent sales tax investment.

1. **CONNECT the region**
   - Building a 37 mile commuter rail system and regional routes

2. **CONNECT all Wake County communities**
   - Expanding Bus Service to all Wake communities

3. **PROVIDE frequent, reliable urban mobility**
   - Implementing Bus Rapid Transit and increasing frequent network

4. **ENHANCE access to transit**
   - Community Funding & Increased Rural On Demand Trips
2017-2019 Service Expansion

Wake Service Hours (Cumulative - All Systems)

- 2017: 470,971
- 2018: 503,483 (+6.9%)
- 2019: 545,695 (+15.9%)

Go Forward: A Community Investment in Transit
2017-2019 Ridership Growth

Wake Ridership Growth (Cumulative - All Systems)

- 2017: 5,725,657
- 2018: 6,120,311 (+6.9%)
- 2019: 6,514,563 (+13.8%)
Why Update Now?

• Better Information on Major Capital Investments

• 10-Year Plan Requires More Frequent Extension of Planning Horizon

• Better Sync Transit Plan with Regional Multimodal Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process

• Discuss Community Priorities to Extend Investment Focus for 2027-2030
Extending the Wake Transit Plan Horizon

Years Covered by Original Plan: 2018-2027

Years Added to Planning Horizon for Updated Plan: 2028, 2029, 2030

Go Forward: A Community Investment in Transit
Three More Years of Investment
Plan Update Process

How We Get There

- **October-February**: Refine Costs/Schedule
- **October-December**: Transit Market
- **Early 2020**: Financial Capacity
- **Early 2020**: Choices and Tradeoffs
- **Mid 2020**: Develop and Evaluate Alternatives
- **Late 2020**: Select Preferred/Final Alternative

**Plan Update Process**

**GO FORWARD**
A COMMUNITY INVESTMENT IN TRANSIT
How We Get There With Engagement

PHASE 1: Update Kickoff - Fall 2019
PHASE 2: Choices & Tradeoffs - Early 2020
PHASE 3: Investment Alternatives - Mid 2020
PHASE 4: Final Plan Review - Late 2020

Engagement Strategy for the Wake Transit Plan Update

Go Forward
A Community Investment in Transit
Major Capital Cost/Schedule Feasibility Findings

- BRT Project Schedules Slightly Elongated Compared to Previous Assumptions But Still Deliverable By 2027
- BRT Cost Assumptions Changed from Original Plan But Can Still Currently be Accommodated by Financial Model
- Delivery of CRT Project Assumed to Conclude in FY 29 – Moved from FY 27
- Wake Share of Assumed CRT Cost Updated (Still Currently in Review)
Market Reassessment Findings

Areas Projected to Be Ripe for Consideration of Higher Capacity Transit Investment:

- North Raleigh and Along I-440
- Along U.S. Route 1 Between Raleigh and Apex
- Along I-40 Between Raleigh and RTP
- North of RDU/Brier Creek
Questions?
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INTRODUCTION

On February 19, 2016, a group of concerned citizens from Southeast Raleigh met at Richard B. Harrison Library to discuss the pending Transit Referendum. The group, which became the United Wake Transit Committee, was comprised of collaborating citizens, representing eight community organizations and activists concerned about the Wake Transit Plan and its potential impact on Wake County and the surrounding region.

During the ensuing months, the United Wake Transit Committee held a Town Hall Listening and Validation Community Meeting. In addition to the Town Hall, Chairperson Jerome Brown spoke at a Joint CAMPO and Go Triangle Public Hearing. In June 2016, the Wake County Board of Commissioners held a public hearing. Chairman Brown also presented at that hearing. During the preceding months, the United Wake Transit Committee had presented to the Wake County Commissioners in June 2016. The following issues were presented during that meeting:

1. Creation of a mechanism that will provide a path for citizens’ review of the Transportation Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)

2. Representation on decision-making boards
   a. Inclusion is important
   b. A diverse representation with grassroots input
   c. Transparency and open communication for successful process

3. Citizen involvement in project planning and implementation
   a. Formal engagement of the public
   b. Development of a citizen-based steering committee to provide input in a timely manner so as not to delay projects

4. The issue of governance and access to County Commissioners
   a. Needed to be better explained
   b. Needed a “real” people approach with those familiar with and who have relatable life experiences, i.e. riding on buses, etc.
   c. Needed open communication to help in problem-solving process

Following meetings with the Wake County Manager, representatives from his staff, GO Triangle representatives, and CAMPO representatives, the committee chairperson, Jerome Brown, presented five (5) vital interest areas for consideration. The initial 5 points of interest for Southeast Raleigh included the following:

1. Economic development commitment
2. Housing commitment
3. Representation on decision-making boards
4. Displacement issues commitment
5. Quality of life issues commitment

The United Wake Transit Committee realized that the initial organizational structure proposed by GO Triangle did not have a citizen-empowered link that would allow ongoing input into the Transit Planning discussion and implementation. Continued support of the Wake Transit Plan relied on this area being addressed.
The efforts taken on by the United Wake Transit Committee led to the adoption of Operating and Protocol Guidelines for the Transit Advisory Committee. They were adopted on October 30, 2017, and amended on March 28, 2018. On October 13, 2018, the TAC members elected Jerome Brown, Wake County, chairperson; Nick Norboge, Durham County, vice-chairperson; and Gabe Talton, Wake County, secretary. The TAC officially began meeting on January 10, 2019, at the Regional Transit Center, 901 Slater Road, Durham, NC. Subsequent meetings were held on February 20, March 20, April 17, June 19, June 26, September 25, November 13, and December 11, 2019.

The TAC has been able to develop three (3) subcommittees based on interest areas:

1. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
2. Advancing Equity Through Transit
3. Systems Integration and Information Coordination

Each subcommittee coordinator has been able to arrange meetings as the focus for each sharpens and researches each subject area. A fourth subcommittee on Operations has not yet been able to meet. Three subcommittee summaries are included in this end-of-year report.

Following the conclusion of the first year of the Transit Advisory Committee, the first year-end report is being submitted to the GO Triangle Board of Trustees. This report will show the progress made since the TAC began meeting in January 2019 through December 2019. The TAC has been evolving over the past year and is positioned to move forward as 2020 approaches.

We are grateful to all of the TAC members for their contributions this year and for their steady focus on the TAC as together, we forge ahead in 2020. We want to express our thanks to the GO Triangle staff for their support during this initial year. We also want to thank the GO Triangle Board of Trustees for making the Transit Advisory Committee a reality.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerome Brown, Chairman (Wake County)

Nick Norboge, Vice Chairman (Durham County)
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

BUS RAPID TRANSIT SUBCOMMITTEE

The Bus Rapid Transit Subcommittee has identified the following issues for study and possible recommendations:

- Thinking regionally about BRTs
- BRT development and the environment: effects and opportunities
- Prioritizing buses over cars in BRT corridors: how and to what extent
- Development around BRT stops and corridors

The subcommittee has begun by focusing on how BRTs can be used regionally. We decided to try to learn from other regions that have put BRTs in place. We have gathered information about the Washington, D.C.; area, the Bay Area in California; the Minneapolis-St. Paul area; and, the Hartford, CT, area. In our initial examination of the information, we have gathered about these cases, we have begun to address the following questions and issues:

- What makes transit regional, as opposed to local?
- How can BRTs provide important linkages in a regional transit system?
- How can research before BRT design begins shed light on key questions and guide design? For example, in the corridor under examination, what most slows buses down?
- What regional BRT options should be considered? How do they differ in cost and disruption?
- How is coordinated regional BRT development best achieved?

We will continue to investigate our first concern with using BRTs to connect the region, and we hope to formulate useful recommendations. Then we will turn to the other issues identified above. area being addressed.
SYSTEMS INTEGRATION AND INFORMATION COORDINATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Possible topics to research, discuss and/or ask staff to present on include the following as a starting point:

INFORMATION SHARING

• How to put systems in place whereby Wake County shares its BRT experiences more broadly with the rest of the Triangle or where Durham shares its affordable housing initiatives around transit. (These being two areas that were identified where particular jurisdictions may be fairly far advanced).

SYSTEMS INTEGRATION

• How Go Triangle might use Google, Uber and/or Lyft (more than it already does) to fill systems gaps (and risks in doing so)

• Getting an understanding of what customer-facing systems currently exist that aren’t used GoTriangle wide.

ADVANCING EQUITY THROUGH TRANSIT SUBCOMMITTEE

INFORMATION SHARING

The focus of this committee is to consider the ways that transit affects equity and the ways that Go Triangle’s services can more effectively serve to advance equity and serve all people. We are considering many dimensions of equity, including low-income status, race, gender, disability, and language barriers.

ACTIONS TAKEN THUS FAR:

Subcommittee members, based on their experience and preliminary research, have met to discuss possible recommendations to Go Triangle. An initial brainstorming list of recommendations has been created. Some of the suggestions on the list included actions that could be undertaken solely by GoTriangle and other actions that would require coordinating with outside stakeholders.

PENDING RECOMMENDATIONS:

• Late-night on-demand service for third-shift workers
• Conduct a study of access to frequent transit users by race and income
• Fund improvements to bike-ped connections to transit stops by charging for parking
• Provide all transit employees and contractors a living wage
• Diversify the Go Triangle Board of Trustees so that it is representative of its ridership. In addition, require the attendance at racial equity and implicit bias training
• Hold community engagement events in places where low-income and People of Color already go (in Orange County- Hargraves and RENA Community Centers), at bus stops, and churches
• Fund simple fixes like street and bus shelters lighting, trash cans, and fixing potholes to make riders feel safer. Suggestion to consider solar powered lighting
• Create a stream of funding that is controlled by community members
• Prioritize bus shelter placement in transit dependent neighborhoods
• Expand the GoCrew program and pay them
• Hire locally
• Implement low/reduced/no- cost tickets or fare capping for low income riders

GOTRIANGLE TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
The GoTriangle Board of Trustees appointed 30 people to the Transit Advisory Committee, with 14 from Wake County, nine from Durham and seven from Orange. Keeping a regional focus, members will keep the board informed of community issues so that our high-quality transit network better serves the needs of our entire region. Committee members will:
  • Provide advice and feedback to the board during planning for public transportation systems,
  • Offer views of constituent groups,
  • Suggest how transit can assist with equity issues, such as homelessness, affordable housing, economic opportunity and living with disabilities,
  • Provide information regarding the customer experience of transit riders, communicate stakeholder opinions, attitudes and needs to the board, identify areas of concern and recommend changes.

The committee will meet four times a year. Members will serve two two-year terms. This was voted on by the GoTriangle Board of Trustees on October 30, 2017 and amended March 28, 2018.