Meeting Summary

US 29 North Corridor Advisory Committee
Meeting #11
Thursday, May 25, 2017, 6:30pm – 8:30pm
East County Regional Services Center
3300 Briggs Chaney Road, Silver Spring, MD 20904

Participants

CAC Members *(X for in attendance, blank for regrets)*			
Fisseha Adugna	X	Ayana Lambert	
Carole Ann Barth	X	Peter Myo Khin	X
John Bowers		Shane Pollin	X
Brian Downie	X	Rob Richardson	X
Oladipo Famuyiwa		Mike Rosenberg	
Kevin Gunthert		Sebastian Smoot	X
Latisha Johnson		Joseph Tahan	
Bernadine Karns	X	Dan Wilhelm	X
Matthew Koch	X	Eric Wolvovsky	X
Jones Zepp (member of US 29 Central CAC)	X		

Staff
Michael Weinberger, Foursquare ITP
Joana Conklin, MCDOT
Rick Kiegel, RK&K
Darcy Buckley, MCDOT
Tom Pogue, MCDOT
Rafael Olarte, MCDOT
Bruce Johnston, MCDOT
Rebecca Martin, Foursquare ITP
Josh Diamond, Foursquare ITP
Dan Hibbert, MCDOT
Otto Condon, ZGF
Chris Sommas, ZGF
Allison Berkheimer, RK&K

Members of the Public
Jeffrey Land
Jewru Bandeh, Eastern Montgomery Regional Service Center Director

1. Welcome and Introductions

a. Welcome

Michael Weinberger, meeting facilitator from Foursquare ITP, welcomed the CAC members and thanked them for attending the meeting. He noted that his job is to hear what members say and make sure it is in the program, and he invited members to "care loudly" at him. He reviewed the agenda for the meeting and introduced Joana Conklin, the project manager from MCDOT.

b. US 29 Project Update

Joana gave an update regarding project activity. The County Council has been examining the capital and operating budgets over the past month. Last week, the councilmembers unanimously approved funding for the project and appropriated funds for the design phase. They also approved additional funds for the planning phase for the MD 355 BRT.

Sean Emerson, a member of the US 29 South committee, proposed a concept for a reversible bus lane along US 29 that the Council would like to examine further. Council requested that MCDOT submit a supplemental request in the fall that includes a budget to undertake this study. This will be part of the capital budget.

As part of the operating budget, Council approved a peak period, limited-stop service to run along the US 29 corridor, which will be run by Ride On starting in January 2018. This service will fill the gap between the existing local bus service and the future BRT service before it goes into effect in late 2019 or early 2020.

Member Question (Q): Will the amenities be the same in the Ride On service as they are planned for the BRT service?
Answer (A): No, only the service would be the same, with limited stops.

Q: Has the state changed the lane width requirements?
A: The State has not committed to anything but will consider various options. The Emerson proposal will involve coordinating with the state and determining which types of analysis will be required.

Member Comment (C): A member commented that Joana's testimony on the 19th was outstanding.
C: Another member commented that she should do more testimony.
A: Joana thanked the members for this feedback.

Q: A member asked whether January 1, 2018 is a fixed date for the start of the [new Ride On limited stop] service.

A: It is not fixed, but the service will begin sometime in the beginning or middle of January. It will serve Burtonsville, not Columbia.

Joana mentioned that Howard County has money from the State to do additional studies of a BRT line that would service Howard County.

Q: Is there formal coordination between Montgomery County and Howard County in planning their respective BRT lines?
A: Yes, the team is working with the Howard County team to create an agreement. Howard County has coordinated with the architects and will have a similar station design.
A: Michael clarified that the region is a mega-region. The Montgomery County BRT service will have its own brand, but will be part of a regional network, which is not a novel arrangement in this region. It is intentional and collaborative.

Q: A member asked whether the team can coordinate with Howard County given that projects in Montgomery County may provide benefits and traffic alleviation for Howard County.
A: The team will work with advisory committees for the Howard County project.
A: Michael commented that knowing that this is a topic of interest to the group is helpful, and we can plan to address this topic further at a future meeting. Depending on the progress of the Howard County BRT, it may be possible to provide an update during Meeting #15.

C: A member commented that Howard County residents will be able to use the new Ride On express service that Council just approved once it begins in January.

c. Updated Documents for Review

Michael announced that the CAC packets contain the updated Public Involvement Plan and updated CAC Program Plan. Both documents were updated based on feedback received during the April CAC meetings, and Michael encouraged members to read through these documents. The project team will conduct robust public involvement with an aim to include a diverse set of constituents. The CAC packet also includes an Open House Memo that summarizes the data collected in the March 2017 open houses, including the trade-off activity and word cloud activity for the station design. Members should feel free to contact Michael with any questions or comments about these documents.

d. Review of CAC Packets

The program team confirmed addresses for CAC and members and mailed packets prior to this meeting. Each member should have received an activity packet in the mail, including a station siting activity and amenity packet. If you did not receive this, please contact the project team to update your address [mweinberger@foursquareitp.com].

e. Introductions

Each member of the project team introduced themselves. Organizations include MCDOT, RK&K, Foursquare ITP, ZGF Architects, and Ride On. CAC members and members of the public introduced themselves. (The full list of attendees is above.)

Q: A member asked whether it is possible to get a list of all staff who introduced themselves.
A: Yes, this list will be sent out with the meeting minutes.

f. Expectations

Michael introduced the expectations of the CAC meetings. Discussions have been aspirational in the past, examining the ideal alignment for the route. Now that the alignment is set, discussion will center around what the service will look like, and we will soon see the design come to fruition. Michael reminded members that the CAC is designed to be an advisory committee, not a decision-making committee. The overall purpose is to understand the concerns of *all* communities represented. The project team can conduct community updates and standalone meetings to reach the community. Although CAC members represent their communities, they should make a distinction between their individual points of view and those of the communities they represent. The BRT will serve transit-dependent populations as well as choice riders. The full list of rules and guidelines for the CAC are listed online. Michael mentioned that the South group was split into two separate groups.

Q: A member asked what the demarcations are for the Central and South groups. The member mentioned that he sees the corridor as an entire stretch, rather than segmented.
A: There is not a hard line between the groups. The central group is more focused on the Four Corners area. The division is designed to make sure that all members can provide input on the issues that affect them the most.
C: A member commented that what happens in Four Corners also affects the northern part of the corridor, and would like the team to be careful to see the corridor as a whole corridor, rather than segmented.
A: Joana responded that the groups were split to each have approximately 20 members each. Members can switch groups if they wish and can also attend the other CAC meetings. [They can attend another group's meeting during a month's set; they cannot participate as a member in more than one meeting.] The groups represent Silver Spring to the beltway; the beltway to New Hampshire Ave.; and north of New Hampshire Ave.
A: Michael clarified that the team encourages members to communicate with each other.
C: A member commented that he would like to know which issues are being covered in each location.
A: The team would like representatives from each group to present to the other groups. This has not yet been planned, but the team will consider it.
A: Rick commented that 60 people in one room is a lot of members, and is contrary to the kind of discussions that the project team would like to facilitate. He prefers a smaller group to have a more intimate discussion.

Q: A member asked what "Get On Board BRT" is, and whether it is a commercial entity because of the ".com" in the web address.
A: This is the educational campaign for the BRT, which is run by the County.
Q: The member asked who speaks for the campaign.
A: Montgomery County. The promotional materials include the County seal and County logo to make this clear.

Q: The member asked for clarification on the project map. Which CAC represents the Greenbelt metro station?
A: The map shows that there is a connection between the BRT, the Metrorail system, andthe proposed Purple Line. There is no advisory committee for Greenbelt, which is located in Prince Georges County.
Q: The member asked for clarification of the geographic region for this activity.
A: The US 29 corridor runs from Burtonsville to Silver Spring. The regional area map is also included.

2. Station Design Activity

a. Introduction

Rick Kiegel introduced the station design activity. The room was laid out with tables set up in a square with printed maps of the station areas on the tables to aid the discussion. Rick's goal was not to present to members, but rather to encourage discussion around the table. Allison Berkheimer used Google Earth to display relevant street views. Specifically, this meeting covered the stations at White Oak and Briggs Chaney, which were chosen as relevant stations for this group. Each CAC focused on different station areas. However, the booklet sent to members in advance and provided at the meeting did include all station locations. Rick asked how many members had completed the activity; roughly half of members said they had. Rick advised the members that if they had a special interest in any station, they should feel free to discuss it with him or another team member.

Rick overviewed the plan for the evening. Otto Condon would provide a brief overview of station design principles and components, and then Rick would review the amenities packet that members received in the mail.

b. Station Amenity Presentation

Otto introduced himself and stated that ZGF Architects is the consultant through the MWCOG [Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments] Transportation/Land Use Connections grant to create station design prototypes for the future BRT system. He recognized the need to

create a common design for stations, but also remain flexible to fit the context from one station to the next. Otto reviewed the design goals, best practice examples, program parts, types, and amenities for station design. He highlighted how input received in the open house has informed the way that ZGF developed the station prototype.

Otto reviewed the purpose of having a BRT station. These included rider comfort, such as overhead protection from rain and vertical protection from cold breezes; good information for riders about when buses will arrive; and seating, depending on the length of the wait. To support rider usage, stations need to be easy to find and easy to use. They need to meet ADA accessibility standards, and should provide a sense of safety, sense of comfort, lighting, and protection from weather. In addition, a key requirement for the grant is that stations must be sensitive to the context, affordable, adaptable, maintainable, and have low life cycle costs.

During the open houses, the project team displayed images of station examples to encourage the attendees to think about how scale, form, and image can create identity. Otto discussed examples of other BRT systems with notable stations, including in Brazil, where stations are often fully self-enclosed for offboard fare collection. In Chile, station design reflects the Andes to create a sense of identity. A successful design makes a station feel like it is part of the location. This can be achieved through the selection of materials to use in the design. For example, in the northwest, stations incorporate wood into the design to reflect the landscape. In Arizona, stations incorporate “green” design to create microclimates, addressing heat and creating a more comfortable experience for the rider.

Lighting can be used to provide a sense of safety at stations, but can also provide a sense of identity. Public art can also be used to tie the station design to the community where it is located, encouraging stewardship and ownership. These factors are part of the framework that the team has identified to help make the system reflect the community.

The platform can also accommodate multiple ways of boarding. A typical station fits a side-loading platform. This could be adjacent to a building or in the median of a road. Buses typically exit from the right side of the bus, but sometimes left side doors are needed as well. The BRT can have the flexibility of having doors on both sides. Level boarding allows riders to walk on and off to meet ADA standards. In addition, this design results in a BRT vehicle that is unique from a typical bus.

Otto described the matrix that was included in the handout that members received. The handout shows the program requirements for a bus station. The blue represents shelter architecture. The columns address how station context and capacity influence station design. The station prototype can be modified accordingly to fit the context and capacity. The shelter can be modified; for example, in locations where most people will alight rather than board, a station could just have a marker. If the station is mostly for boarding, then it may have a larger

waiting area. The purple indicates communication elements, including maps and real-time information. The inclusion of Wi-Fi and cell phone charging will be policy decisions; these are not required amenities. The decisions regarding amenities can be recommended by advisory committees like the CAC.

At the open houses, participants filled out a word cloud activity to show how they feel about Montgomery County and what they would like reflected in the design. Responses included words like "diverse" and "green." Otto noted that responses included not only what residents value, but what their biggest concerns were. ZGF was inspired to do more research into what makes Montgomery County unique, and discovered that Montgomery County used to have multiple quarries, which provided stone for prominent structures throughout the region. This could be an opportunity to use materials in the station design that reflect the county's history and identity. Sustainability and energy production were also mentioned; to reflect these, shelters could be net-zero energy use, and/or landscape could provide storm water management.

Otto reviewed the station design workbook. Stations could be located on an urban street front or shared sidewalk. Station amenities can be determined based on how much space is available at the station site. There may be room for a canopy, but in urban locations, it may also be possible to use canopies of adjacent buildings. In a residential neighborhood, there may be more room for a canopy, but there may also be less ridership. In addition, a station may include multiple canopies or space for multiple buses to be there at the same time. A station may also include a center platform.

Q: A member asked about terminology used by the team. Is it a station or a platform?
A: We will discuss stations. [The station architecture refers to the vertical station elements, such as the canopy and windscreens. The station platform refers to horizontal surface that anchors the vertical elements.] The team clarified that a station can be made up of one or two platforms.

Q: What are the additional features in the handout?
A: For example, you could add another canopy shelter to some stations, or additional windscreens. This is a guiding framework showing that amenities can be adaptable to the site.

Q: A member asked what the design budget is for the stations. He mentioned that the Chicago Loop BRT had an international competition for the design of the stations, but the cost of each station was very high. He believes there should be a limit for the costs of amenities.
A: The budget includes $13 million for all stations. Each station will vary based on the location. At the Silver Spring Transit Center, for example, the cost will not be high. However, stations at park and rides will be much more expensive. There is no specific budget for each individual station.

Otto discussed different station capacities and context, and reviewed the "plus" and "minus" signs on the matrix that indicate that certain amenities can be added or removed from each station.

Q: A member asked about the specific design requirements versus optional amenities.
A: This is included in Otto's PowerPoint slide presentation. Offboard fare collection is a requirement, with an honor system often used in light rail and BRT systems. A station does not need to have a physical barrier in place.
C: The member commented that it is possible to have a person or police officer manning each station.

C: A member who has worked in landscaping commented that she does not think the stations will be low-impact and will therefore they will require stormwater management consideration.
A: Otto clarified that because of the size of the stations, there may or may not be a requirement for stormwater management. However, he sees effectively managing stormwater as an ethical duty.
C: The member commented that busting up pavement often triggers the need for stormwater management.

C: A member requested that ticket vending machines be simple and easy-to-use. In LA, planners chose to put up fare gates rather than doing random checks.
A: Otto confirmed that the overall goal is to make the BRT easy to use for riders.

c. Local Station Location Activity

White Oak Transit Center

Rick introduced the White Oak Transit Center station. It may be possible to construct a curb or median station. He asked members which aspects of the site they found interesting.

C: A member commented that he would not want to wait for a bus late in the evening behind Giant. The location does not seem safe.
A: Rick commented that there is an existing transit stop there, and one closer to the back entrance. It would be possible to combine these stops and create a larger transit center to create a safer environment for waiting passengers.

Q: A member asked how it would be possible to combine stations, if the BRT stations will have elevated platforms.
A: The stations will be immediately next to each other. It is best to have separate BRT stations to provide clarity for fare collection.

C: The member commented that there are many ways to differentiate one station from another. She thinks that there is a lot of pedestrian traffic in this area.
A: Rick agreed that places with high pedestrian traffic are good locations for bus stations.
C: The member commented that she would like the station to fit in without making it dangerous.
C: Considering that there may be neighboring BRT lines in the future that will be close to this station, it is important to make transfers between BRTs easy. The station should be moved closer to Randolph and University to encourage connection with future BRT lines.
A: Rick commented that New Hampshire Avenue is another corridor that will have a BRT in the future. Transfers would happen at Lockwood Drive, and the team will accommodate transfers as much as possible. The station should not be in the area with apartments, but should be closer to Lockwood Drive. The Oak Leaf station is on the other side of New Hampshire Avenue.

C: It may be best to bring the station closer, so that fewer passengers must cross the road.
C: There are many potential riders in the apartments because so many people live there. Because it is lower-income, those residents may be more likely to use the BRT.
C: It is not a good idea to plan platforms without thinking about feeder lines. Local bus stops should be close to the BRT to facilitate easy transfers. It is too difficult to have a station on the north side towards Giant, because there are too many curb cuts and the BRT will be very long. It is a better idea to have the station closer to the self-storage area.
A: Rick commented that this would be difficult because of the curve on this section of road. It is preferable to have a station on a straight section of road.

C: It is necessary to do a sidewalk inventory in these locations. There is a lot of parking, but few sidewalks, and it is difficult to have successful transit without sidewalks.
A: Rick agreed that sidewalks are necessary. Part of the project will identify gaps in sidewalks and fill in sidewalks near the BRT stations.

C: The station could be at Stewart Lane and Oak Leaf.
A: Rick responded that the team would like to have the station further south. Dan and Peter would like to have a station slightly to the north.
C: There is a station south of New Hampshire at April Lane.
A: Rick commented that there is a proposed station for Stewart Lane that is further north. It would serve a good amount of the garden style apartment buildings. Although a small area would not be served, local bus service (including Z routes and the 10) go up and down Lockwood Drive frequently.

C: Adding a station at this location will have serious traffic impacts. It will cause a dangerous mix of bus traffic and pedestrians and will cause traffic backups.
A: The team will have the results from the surveyors soon, and then will know how wide the area is. The median barrier that was installed to keep traffic flowing tightens the width. There may be more space in the center.

C: It may be a good idea to shift local bus stations later to minimize congestion.

Rick suggested that it is a good idea to discuss north- and southbound stations because they have separate conditions. For the southbound station, he would like to discuss a curbside station. There are existing stops to the north and a grass area that drops off in the back behind Giant. If the team builds a short retaining wall at the back edge of the pavement, there would be enough room for a station with a sidewalk that would traverse through the station. At a station where the sidewalk goes through the station, it is not advisable to build a minimum-width platform. A wider platform allows for pedestrians to walk through while others are waiting for the next BRT bus.

Q: What is the height of the curb?
A: 10 to 12 inches.

Q: What are the ramp requirements for ADA?
A: Since the platform height will be slightly higher than the standard curb height, small gradual ramps will be needed to facilitate ADA access. These ramps will create a transition area from the sidewalk to the platform and aren't expected to be longer than ten feet.

C: If pedestrians can walk through the stations, there will be significant foot traffic going to the shopping center. This could create problems.
A: There is a location in the back area that pedestrians can cut through.

C: A member commented that when the State and County were working with FDA, they made changes to the intersection that made traffic worse in this area. They added the traffic light, but it is not coordinated very well. People coming out of 7-Eleven activate the light. There should be a button for the pedestrian crosswalk, but it is in the median, meaning that pedestrians must first cross traffic to get to the crosswalk button. Congestion during rush hour could be reduced if the signals worked together effectively. This will need to be changed if there will be additional buses in this area.

C: A member commented that bus stops on New Hampshire could be moved further down to alleviate traffic issues.

C: A member commented that he would like stations to have protection from the rain and water from the road. He has found that drivers sometimes don't see riders if they are huddled in the bus station avoiding the rain.
A: This can be taken into consideration when the canopy is being built. BRT stations will be well-lit, so the driver will be able to see waiting passengers.

Q: Are there buttons on the bus to request a stop?
A: No, the bus will stop automatically at every station, so there is no need to request a stop.

Rick directed the conversation to the northbound station. There are many more problems on this side, specifically, the driveways along the road. It is possible to shift driveways, but it would add additional cost to the project. There are about 75 feet available in one location and 67 in another.

C: It would be possible to put a center median station for the northbound side online. Most of the density here would be heading north.
A: This would be possible, and the southbound station would stay on the curb.
C: A member commented that this would require many riders from the south to unnecessarily cross the street.
A: Riders will cross the street no matter where the station is located.
C: A member is worried about pedestrian safety, and thinks it would be possible to move the northbound platform farther up.
Q: A member commented that we haven't yet examined the use of the space in front of businesses. Is it possible to coordinate with business owners to eliminate curb cuts? This occurred successfully in Burtonsville.
A: On Rockville Pike, this was part of the Master Plan, but it is not here. Businesses are unlikely to accept a new service road that would reduce existing parking.

C: If the station is in the middle of the road, this would eliminate left turns into curb cuts. A business owner is unlikely to appreciate this solution because it blocks left turns into the businesses.
C: A member commented that he would be happy to have a transit route directly outside of his businesses if it meant giving up a little space. In fact, business owners may appreciate this possibility.
A: Rick confirmed that we can discuss the possibility with business owners. However, the County would also have to purchase the right-of-way.

C: A member believes that having pedestrians, buses, and cars in the same space is intense. It is best to put in extra effort and add pedestrian crossings.
A: Pedestrian crossings will be added where needed to connect stations with sidewalks. Although this may increase interactions between cars and pedestrians, it also means that cars may be more aware of pedestrians, and therefore more careful.

Briggs Chaney

Rick introduced the Briggs Chaney station activity. As the end of the line, there will be restroom facilities and a comfort station. It will be designed to match the context of the community. The platform must be 125 feet long to accommodate two buses at one time. The platform will be 15

feet wide. It is not possible to share a platform with a local bus at this location. The existing island is only 15 feet wide, making it impossible to accommodate the higher-level BRT platform on one side and the lower level local bus curb height.

Q: If riders would like to go to the shopping center, is it a better idea to have the station there rather than at the park and ride?
A: Because this is a terminal station, it is best to take advantage of the park and ride rather than the shopping center.

Q: Why not use the restroom of a neighboring business rather than build a new facility?
A: Rick said that this may be tricky depending on open hours of neighboring businesses. Joana commented that this is a current issue, and it has been difficult thus far to come to an agreement.

C: A member expressed concern about facilitating transfers with local buses. It would be possible to have buses come in by the rec center.
A: Rick responded that there are some concerns with curves there, and it may not be as maneuverable for buses.

C: A member would like to see a green space here so that riders can use it while waiting.
A: Rick agreed that the current design is 20 to 25 years old and needs to be refreshed. It would be possible to redevelop the plaza, add a green space, or add art.

C: The Ride On station on this side could be relocated.
A: There is a good amount of width at this location, meaning that the platform could be expanded. The BRT would then have space for a station without encroaching into the parking lot.
C: A member commented that this would impact the senior center.

C: A member commented that riders would prefer to wait in their cars, rather than stand outside to wait for the bus. The station should have amenities to keep passengers comfortable.

C: A member commented on the need to maintain separation between the park & ride traffic and the bus traffic.

C: A member suggested having the station be parallel to Briggs Chaney, which would allow buses to pull out more easily. In addition, the station would be more visible. This would involve rotating the station by 90 degrees.
C: Although this would enhance visibility, it would impact 20 parking spots. The advantage is that the bus would not have to make the turn.

C: A member commented that he is never sure where to enter the park and ride. The buses could claim one entrance as an entrance solely for buses, which may improve traffic flow by providing clarity. Cars and buses would not get in each other's ways.

C: A member commented that they have never seen a conflict between a car and bus.
C: This could be a bigger problem when there are more buses entering and exiting the park and ride.

Rick commented that two members looked at all 11 station sites and wrote a 7-page document with their recommendations. Please email Michael (mweinberger@foursquareitp.com) if you would like a copy.

3. Local Bus Service Planning

Michael introduced Joshua Diamond, a service planner from Foursquare ITP. Josh will introduce concepts and principles used in local bus service planning. Recommendations for local bus will be presented to the CAC at a later meeting.

Josh introduced the basic concepts of local bus service planning. To function best, the BRT must move fast, and it is best to minimize impacts with other transit services and vehicles. Local services can be used to feed into the BRT, but local services can also operate underneath the BRT for shorter trips. The team will look at the existing conditions report and examine data about the on-time performance of local buses, boarding and alighting data, route levels to understand where people travel to and from, and performance data such as riders per trip or per hour. The team will also use propensity tools and 60 transit-related variables including total population, density, and percent of transit-oriented population against the total. The team will examine not only the data along the corridor, but also throughout the region.

In addition to examining data, the team will collect input from the public. The team will collect individual transit stories from people who ride the bus, as well as their thoughts and ideas. Information collected through the open houses, including the trade-off activities, will inform the service planning. Michael commented that the tradeoff activity can be found in the memo. Responses are coded based on location.

Josh asked members to consider the local routes as they are. Whether members are riders or not, Josh encouraged them to think about ways to improve these routes. Routes can be adjusted by offering higher or lower frequencies or expanded service hours. New service types can be added based on distinct trip purposes, whether that is for long trips, short trips, express service, neighborhood circulators, or limited stop overlays. In addition, bus stops can be relocated, moved, or eliminated. Routes can be realigned to offer crosstown services or be feeder services for the BRT. Routes can be extended to serve additional neighborhoods. Josh

encouraged members to think about the concepts and routes and provide any feedback directly to him or to the project team.

Q: Can members receive a copy of the existing conditions report?
A: Yes. The County currently has a draft of the report and will release the final version when it is ready. The report is very comprehensive, and members will have access to all this information.

Michael commented that Josh will be available to talk about specific routes. In addition, the team will send out a survey that will allow members to comment on routes.

C: A member believes that there should be continuity in the method of payment between the BRT and local bus.
A: Yes, this will be considered.

C: A member commented that he would like it if everyone examined where there isn't bus service and where it would make sense to have it. Where are the new markets? He would like buses to expand into new places.
C: A member commented that there is no bus service in the Rolling Hills Neighborhood.

C: A member commented on the success of Houston's Reimagine Transit project. This redesign was data-driven and straightened routes. He believes that time is lost in cul-de-sacs.
A: Josh responded that he designed the BaltimoreLink redesign with two goals in mind: increasing the speed of vehicles and increasing safety. The overall purpose is to have a system that is working optimally.

C: The member expressed a desire to have expanded on-demand transit options.
A: FITP has written a white paper on flex routing.

C: A member commented that every time there are budget cuts, local routes are cut or reduced, sacrificing local bus service in favor of express services. He believes that this promotes sprawl development by providing better transit to those who live farther away. In addition, cutting weekend service also hurts residents and discourages a transit-oriented lifestyle in closer neighborhoods.
C: Another member commented that in Four Corners, residents have been fighting for 20 years to get better transit access and are constantly losing. She believes that riders will be very angry if local service are sacrificed any further.
C: A member commented that he was on the County Transit Task Force with 33 people, and only two used transit. He feels that the County ignores transit users.
A: Josh confirmed that local service is still necessary along US 29 to operate underneath the BRT and to provide the best service. The team will develop realistic run times based on real data. The team wants to improve local service, not to make it suffer.

4. Next Steps

Michael announced that the next CAC meetings will be held in July. The project team will review feedback and set up focus groups along the corridor. The team will also set up a digital survey during the summer for riders and those interested in BRT. The team will examine operational feasibility, analyze data, and prepare local bus recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:45pm.