CAC MEETING #5

MAY 29TH, 2019 – 1:00 – 2:30 PM
TRANSLINK – 239 E BARNETT ROAD, MEDFORD, OR

MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDEES

CAC MEMBERS:
Jay Harland, Eric Leal, Greg Holmes, Patrick McKechnie, Francis Plowman, George Adams, Tom Fink, Christi McGonigal, Al Densmore

RVTD STAFF:
Paige West, Melissa Lowry

CONSULTANT TEAM:
Susie Wright, Molly McCormick

MEETING PURPOSE

- Review Draft Transit Master Plan
- Solicit input from the CAC on draft TMP

DESIRED OUTCOMES

- CAC input on Preferred Transit Network and Projects
- CAC input on TMP document

TIME	SUBJECT	LEAD PRESENTER	GUIDANCE REQUESTED
1:00	Welcome/Project Updates	Paige West/ RVTD	Confirm understanding Questions for clarification
1:10	Project Schedule and Next Steps	Susie Wright/Kittelson	Confirm understanding
1:15	Transit Master Plan Overview	Susie	Comments on Draft TMP Do you have any comments on the Preferred Transit Network? Do you believe the Preferred Transit Network addresses the Vision and Goals?
2:25	Next Steps/Adjourn	Susie	

NOTES

- Welcome/Project Updates
  - About 18 months into the process to get to this draft plan
- Project Schedule and Next Steps
  - This group will not meet again until the fall to talk about the supplemental work to the adopted plan
- Transit Master Plan Overview
  - There are eight sections, covering all previous work and the recently completed work on the preferred plan and financial assessment
  - Needs assessment – how does the needs assessment matrix help to achieve better performance?
    - Earlier in the project, the CAC and TAC helped come up with a list of potential performance measures and then narrowed it down to performance monitoring measures
    - The current plan focuses on the measures relating to service enhancements and comparing the preferred systems against the existing system. Some of those measures (like number of community meetings) are not part of this draft plan because they are related to the operations of RVTD
      - Operations and implementation will be covered in the further work to be completed after adoption
  - Section 8.0 Preferred Transit System
    - Three future preferred transit systems (short-, mid-, and long-term)
    - Identification of potential locations for transfer centers or locations
  - System-level performance

- Productivity measures were compared against the 2042 current system (with no service changes) to show the increases in ridership and other measures with the preferred plan
- Question about bus dimensions
    - Would like the dimensions to be less tight to allow those with power chairs to maneuver easily
    - This is determined by the department lead
- Accessibility measures show increases in providing access when comparing the current system to the preferred plan
    - The models could only provide output for fixed routes, but it should be noted that any expansions of fixed-route service also expand the area covered by Valley Lift service
    - These numbers do not project Valley Lift ridership. There are not great models to predict this
    - Ridership sensitivity – most of it is coming from the increased frequency of service and in proportion with the service increase
        - Locally, have these types of ridership increases actually happened with service enhancements that RVTD has done previously (like the increases in frequency)?
            - RVTD has seen almost proportional decreases when have had to decrease service hours in the last 10 years
                - For example, RVTD had to decrease hours by 29% in 2009 and saw a 32% decrease in ridership
                - The similar immediate change can't be said for new service because it takes approximately 3 years to understand the ridership impacts. It is more gradual.
            - The general increase/decrease that has happened in the past should be documented in the plan.
            - Could also give some rule-of-thumb discussion. The plan might be slightly optimistic but other places have modeled much less likely productivity increases.
        - It should be noted that the model is based on current trends of Rogue Valley, relatively low congestion, free parking, policies. If there were policies put in place by local jurisdictions that provided more incentive, there could be a lot more ridership grabbed by transit
    - The measures showing coverage of transit supportive areas (TSAs) were disappointing considering the number of new routes identified
        - As a community, how do we address this?
            - If RVTD is not able to reasonably achieve access for all those people, is it RVTD's responsibility to keep trying to expand beyond the available funding? What can the community do?

        - Through this plan, RVTD has planned for expanded service in areas of need.
    - This plan does not forecast additional multi-family housing locations. For the multi-family housing located outside the read of RVTD, not sure what to do. The cities have the ability to add locations that are zoned for these densities within the RVTD service area
        - Do cities adopt car-sharing programs, e-scooters programs, etc.?
        - This plan is still leaving enough of a gap that the region needs to consider other options
    - The TSA threshold used in the plan might be too low for actual transit-supportive densities in the region
        - Consider redefining to seven dwelling units per acre
    - Most of the multi-family homes are already outside the service area or have an existing linkage to transit that's not shown
        - The Manor is an example where there is a separate service. Don't have RVTD transit within a quarter mile but have a community shuttle that takes them where they want to go
            - Additionally, the Ellendale/Barnett bus stop is just down the hill. A resident can ask Manor staff to set up a ride there to connect to RVTD's system
        - The additional east Medford route could move the needle with Medford's updated UGB. Might not be within the 2042 timeframe
        - The CAC does not encourage RVTD to expand into areas before they have people working or living
- The CAC has been very interested in Title VI coverage, and Table 28 shows how this preferred plan improves access for those populations
    - The preferred 2027 system focuses on coverage and then the preferred 2037 and 2042 systems focus on service quality
- The "land use/code issues" sections may need to be relabeled
    - Reads more like a status update than identification of issues; maybe "context" would work better
    - Land use and code issues will be better covered through the future RVCOG task
        - Opportunities to re-zone
        - Service may not be provided at a higher frequency until a certain density is reached
        - Greg could potentially help with some of land use and code issue identification
- Has weather been factored in for the new routes?
    - Mainly considered with routes that have steep inclines

        - The current fleet can't go up the Ashland hill, but 30-foot buses could and may be used for circulators specifically
        - Not something applicable for this plan but will be considered as each route is further defined before implementation
    - There is a big structure change between mid-term and long-term preferred systems in terms of frequency and high capacity transit (HCT)
        - This needs to be defined in the plan; frequent service and limited stops, could have exclusive right-of-way, transit signal priority, very convenient transit that starts to attract choice riders
            - Highway 99 is the route that is being worked on immediately
            - Barnett has great ridership trends but also congestion constraints; would serve the future southeast TOD
            - Other routes identified include ones to Central Point, Eagle Point, and W Main
            - HCT often replaces the old route with the more frequent route, so there can be savings which were not forecast in the plan
        - This plan helps set the stage for other smaller plans and projects
            - Can't pursue a grant to determine specifics of potential HCT service in the region unless it is in this plan
    - Around fall 2020, RVTD with have completed a portion of the planned projects through the STIF funding and will rest see how the enhancements are working
        - Check in with the system before moving forward
    - One potential additional project to the mid-term system is a Foothill Road route
    - Can we get to mode share at a corridor-level? The MPO-level data does not serve RVTD well or showcase the enhancements occurring in the RVTD service area
        - Could grab the TAZ info along the corridors
            - Can Jennifer pull any of that from our current model or would it be a separate model run? The project team will explore this
        - A model check could use ODOT automatic traffic recorder data and create a ratio with ridership data
            - Likely tube count data available between almost all bus stops
        - Could map TAZs with a mode share of 4% or more to understand the local impact
- Next Steps
    - Provide comments to Paige and/or Susie within three weeks
      In addition, the board will be opening up a public comment period