

## **DRAFT Meeting Notes**

### **RTP TAC Transit Subgroup**

July 25, 2016 from 3:30 – 5:10 pm

Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments, 1400 Queen Ave. SE, Albany

#### **1. Agenda Review**

Staff reviewed the agenda. There were no proposed changes.

#### **2. Coordination of Planning Efforts**

This discussion topic grew out of a request of an RTP TAC member that the AAMPO RTP and TDP further discuss services outside of the MPO area. Staff explained that the Albany Area Transit Development Plan (TDP) will focus on the federally-designated MPO area and will guide the expenditure of transit funds allocated to the MPO. This primarily includes ATS and Call-A-Ride, and the Linn-Benton Loop to the degree appropriate considering that service is guided through a regional partnership. Regional connections are key, however, and it is important to coordinate planning efforts to ensure that the full regional system is being planned for. Services funded through Linn County and Benton County provide important services to and within the MPO area. The TDP will also discuss the role of other regional services within the MPO, and provide findings for how those services may be improved to better serve the MPO area. The TDP can look at how to coordinate with other services or look at fare reciprocity or other coordination opportunities. The Linn County TSP focuses on the rural parts of the County and will roll up findings from other planning efforts.

The remainder of the conversation focused on how to coordinate regional transit planning efforts to ensure that the full regional system is being planned for. These efforts include the Linn County Coordinated Plan, Benton County Coordinated Plan, Linn County TSP, and Lebanon TDP. Discussion included:

- The various regional plans are like layers of a cake and are interrelated.
- There is a need for a regional transit map and general discussion of regional transit services in each planning document. This should include STF-funded services, and could discuss how to support social service agencies that work with transit-dependent populations. It would be efficient and most appropriate for the TSPs and RTP to reference the transit planning documents.
- The Albany Area TDP is not a chapter of the Albany TSP. The TDP is an operational document and may inform, but is separate from, a TSP or RTP. It will provide an opportunity for the city to consider restructuring their services and service throughout the MPO. The City of Albany is not required to adopt the TDP.
- Coordination of transit programs, and identification of ways to best spend limited resources, is a key goal. For example, improved coordination between ATS and the Linn Shuttle for service within Albany. Members were reminded that there are specific requirements tied to urban and rural services.
- In Benton County, there is a desire to serve the full 99W corridor in coordination with Lane Transit District
- The TDP should outline funding alternatives and creative funding options. It should describe what different service alternatives would cost, and what it would cost the various jurisdictions. This information can be brought to policy makers.

- The transit planning efforts can include discussion of ADA compliance

**Outcomes:**

- Each plan can include a regional transit map, illustrated in a readable way, and description of the regional system. This could be included in the ‘plan overview’ or ‘existing conditions’ section. Nelson Nygaard provided the two attached maps, which were developed for the Linn County Coordinated Plan and AAMPO TDP – these can provide a foundation for that map.
- Further coordination can occur to identify common priorities for regional transit projects and other common elements

**3. Transit Future Conditions and Transit Funding**

A revised Transit Funding memo would be available on August 1<sup>st</sup>. There were few suggested changes for the Transit Future Conditions memo. Comments provided via email are being reviewed, and it will also incorporate findings from the transit needs work conducted in the spring. ‘Local match’ should be listed more broadly on page 11.

**4. Transit Goals Discussion**

Members were asked to consider if the goal is to retain the current ‘coverage’ based system, or if it is to become more ‘productivity’ focused. Jean Palmateer stated that members can consider what they perceive as a ‘successful’ system. It is important to have a serious discussion about the pro’s and con’s of the two approaches. Members stated that it would be an efficient use of funds to focus on key areas, and that when changes are made to a system it is the most difficult for those who lose service. Due to limited time, members agreed to continue this conversation at the next meeting.

**5. ‘Aspirational’ Transit System Goals**

This conversation was deferred to the next meeting.

**6. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

**7. Next Steps**

Staff will send out a Doodle Poll for the next Transit Subgroup meeting. Proposed meeting topics include:

- Recap the Existing Conditions and relate it to the ‘Sample Service Design’ memo.
- Review of two Future Transit System ‘Strawmen’, drawing from the Goals. Strawmen should include a general description of how the system will change, examples of corridors that will be served, and areas that may lose service.
- Recap revisions to the Future Transit and Transit Funding memo, as needed

**8. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10.