

Meeting Notes

RTP TAC Transit Subgroup

October 13 2016 from 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

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

Attending: Chuck Knoll, Chris Bailey, Jon Goldman, Lee Lazaro, Mark Volmert, Ken Bronson, Barry Hoffman, Scott Chapman, Chris Maciejewski, Theresa Conley

1. Agenda Review

Theresa Conley, AAMPO staff, called the meeting to order shortly after 10:00 am and reviewed the agenda. There were no changes to the agenda. Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Public Comment

There were no members of the public present and no public comment.

3. Minutes of August 29, 2016 RTP TAC Transit Subgroup Meeting

The minutes of the August 29, 2016 meeting were approved as written.

4. Transit Solution ‘Strawman’ Proposals

Theresa Conley and Chris Maciejewski with DKS shared a powerpoint presentation outlining discussion items for the meeting, goals to recommend 2 short-term ATS service scenarios, one mid-term, and one long-term service scenario. They also provided an overview of where the MPO is in the process of drafting the Transit Development Plan. Theresa reviewed averaged responses from the subgroup members regarding short, mid and long-term recommendations. In the short term, subgroup members had recommended retaining 60-minute service with demand-responsive service in Millersburg and Jefferson. In the midterm, all corridors would have 30-minute service, except North Albany and Knox Butte Rd (which would have 60-minute.) For the longterm, most corridors would have 15-30 minute service except North Albany and Knox Butte. Millersburg and Jefferson would have 60-minute service. The feedback received, along analysis from the consultant team, supports a slow transition towards a more productivity-based service.

Members asked if a flag stop for the Linn Shuttle could be included in Tangent and noted that CARTS service may be eliminated in the Santiam Canyon, north of Jefferson. A member pointed out that the Linn-Benton Loop and Linn Shuttle provide intra-AAMPO service.

Chris outlined several strawman proposals, which were built off of the feedback discussed above and technical analysis. Scenarios A and B illustrate tradeoffs between a coverage and a productivity services; A includes 60 minute frequency but shorter 30 minutes loops to maximize existing funding.; B is more productive but North Albany is not served. Both utilize the same level of funding. The midterm solution for the 10-15 year horizon introduces some services outside of Albany. The longterm solution further expands coverage and frequency, and proposes service to Salem.

Members discussed that a comparison with existing ATS routes really demonstrates the shift towards more direct, efficient service. A member inquired how special transportation services are addressed and also that Linn Benton Community College is a key transit hub to serve. A member pointed out that AAMPO should address how the Loop and Shuttle service the AAMPO area. Additional discussion was deferred to the subsequent work session.

5. Transit Solution Worksession

Subgroup members were asked to discuss the scenarios in more detail and develop recommendations for further analysis. Subgroup input is outlined below and proposed refinements are shown on in images the next page. Discussion included:

- If we simply add frequency to existing ATS routes, we may just dig a hole. It is time to make changes.
- Members discussed transfer points and if ‘pulse’ transfers would be possible
- Park and ride sites, at LBCC for example. Members requested that Park and Rides be added to the maps
- A & B have 30 minute headways but 60 minute frequencies... a member stated that they would like to see shorter headways in order to increase ridership. Chris noted that the system is constrained with only having two buses to work with – it is hard to increase frequency without greatly diminishing coverage area. As more buses are added over time, we can work toward shorter headways and increased frequency. Headways and travel time are the main issues now – solutions are compromises to try to address these issues. It was noted that with 3 vehicles, operations might be able to increase by 30%.
- There was a discussion on requirements for commuter service and whether additional stops could be added to the Linn Shuttle within AAMPO
- A member noted the need to coordinate with TSPs to ensure they include infrastructure projects to support transit improvements
- Some offset in routes is good to cushion a bus that might be running late
- Strawmen need to serve key areas.

Scenario A

- In Scenario A, there is no service north of the North Albany Park and Ride, which might allow service to the West Albany High School (Route 4?). A need for better service to that part of town was discussed.
- Can’t go up 1st St due to the railroad trestle or down Queen to 99E due to rail switching yard
- LBCC is currently the largest trip generator for transit but there is only one route there. People going to LBCC come from all over the city, and will need to transfer from short routes through the neighborhoods.
- Need to serve the Winco and Costco area. Are we serving the low income residents? Having a route go up Salem Ave would help serve key populations
- At Springhill, not efficient to turn left onto Hwy 20, also a turn was shown onto 20/99E that is closed traffic.
- Shuttle markings were incorrect
- There is no good way for transit to get in and out of Mennonite Village; also there are few requests for transit there.

Scenario B

- For Scenario B, members asked if service could extend farther east or do a small loop up in North Albany. It also doesn't serve the Winco/Costco area. This proposal has challenges and is an unlikely solution. It does move the system more strongly into a 'productive' system however, leaving some corridors unserved and others with higher levels of service. The slight increases in headway might not be worth the loss in coverage.
- The Route 2 shopping Loop is good – connecting downtown, Heritage Plaza, and Walmart.
- Generally, members discussed that B would need to be revised to be more coverage-based, and the consultant team should refine two scenarios with a coverage strategy.

Scenario C

- This scenario looks at how soon we can push towards a more productive service. Members discussed pushing for this scenario in the short-term – what would it take to do that? For the mid-term service, it would include \$150-200,000 more funding and add one additional bus
- Do we need to serve east Albany, around Timber Ridge, sooner in the short term? Also, what about service to Mennonite Village?
- This scenario can illustrate the benefit of having an MPO with increased funding for transit – it still serves North Albany and has good coverage and frequency.

Scenario D

- If we keep changing routes, what will happen to infrastructure that was put in place (shelters, stops)? Make this more of a 'build out' from Scenario C, instead of establishing new routes. With some adjustments this would be good for the longterm.

6. Update on Transit Technical Memos

Additional details will be added the transit technical memos to better address regional services within the AAMPO area, and to refine funding information. The revised memos will be sent out to the group within a week or so.

7. Next Steps

- Analyze recommended alternatives against evaluation criteria
- Identify improvements to other AAMPO-Area services
- Refine designs and present findings in Tech Memo 14

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned shortly after 12:00 pm

Scenario B - Short Term

