Statewide Public Transportation Plan

Partner's Meeting Notes

Sound Transit, Ruth Fisher Conference Room

Seattle, WA

June 23, 2014

Attendees

In Person: Colleen Kuhn/Human Services Council, Michael Cardwell/Quinault Indian Nation, Kathy Leotta and Karen Waterman/ST (For David Beal), Paul Parker/WSTC, Bruce Tabb/Pullman Transit, Gordon Nielson/Skokomish Tribal Nation, Melanie Smith/ST, Geri Beardsley/WSTA, Gary Simonson (for Gil Cerise)/PSRC, Karen Waterman/ST, Justin Bergener/Medstar, Kevin Futtrell/Yakima Transit, Celeste Gilman/UW, Matt Hanson/King County Metro, Barbara Chamberlain/Washington Bikes, Tom Hanson/WSDOT, Robin Hartsell/WSDOT, Brian Lagerberg/WSDOT, Stan Suchan/WSDOT, Stephanie Postier/WSDOT, Rita Brogan/PRR, Jeanne Acutanza/PRR, Emma Mueller/PRR

Call-In: Matthew Kunic/WSDOT Planning, Teri Hickey/WSDOT Planning, Karen Parker/TRPC, Dennis Bloom/IT

Stephanie: Provided a short safety reminder for the room.

Brian: Discussed the consultant hiring process for a facilitation firm with the hopes of coming to closure on elements of the plan including vision, goals and principles. While the schedule provided previously is out of date, it would be ideal to have information ready to incorporate into the Washington State Transportation Plan (WSTP). To provide input to that plan, information would be needed by November 2014. **Paul Parker** indicated the WSTP 2014 update to legislature would be submitted in Jan 2015 and a draft will be available in three week for public review with public comment through Sept but encouraged not hurrying the Public Transportation Plan.

Brian: Explained that the issue/background papers, the first of which would be discussed today, were intended to help us start building the folios and the plan, which will be future focused.

Gordon: Re-affirmed that the plan needs to be forward focused and asked who are the audiences for this?

Brian: Suggested the audience as WSDOT, governor/legislature, and citizens.

VISION

Rita: Read the vision statement out loud inviting comments. Note that we will gain general consensus on a vision statement. It will remain draft and we can revisit later to make sure it is still relevant.

Michael: How was this vision statement informed?

Kathy: "reliable" is missing from the vision statement.

Barb: Need to add "economic" benefit as well.

Gordon: The Tribes are a missing piece of the mission statement and their sovereignty is not acknowledged in the statement—Michael Cardwell agreed with the statement—if a Tribe read this they would not see how they fit. Does it need a year or timeline. (In 10 years or by 20XX)

Justin: Need to reflect how private entities are reflected

Gordon: Suggested "We hook people up" as a tagline to increase urgency of the moment and looking to the future. Need to emphasize that there is a reliable ride/access for all. Need to give people confidence**.**

Rita: Suggest keeping the vision succinct so it is memorable.

Gordon: We might need some separate meetings with smaller groups (bicyclists, human resources) to see what matters to them.

Justin: Government is slow to change and has a complex process—but we need to emphasize adaptability. We should talk about adaptability with future technology (like self-driving cars)

Rita: So we might need to have a separate meeting about addressing future technology.

Kevin: Need to be inclusive of all modes.

Celeste: "Connecting Washingtonians together"

Michael: We need to emphasize efficiently with the system we have because we can't build away a solution—the system is built up.

Dennis: Make the verbs active verbs and not passive in the vision statement.

Rita: Our next step will be to incorporate those comments.

GOALS

Rita: Read the goals.

Justin: He thought that the goals said what they should.

Gordon: Questioned goals and noted they should include performance measurements.

Gary : Substitute: "Reliable access" to the Access Goal.

Michael: Refer to the Centennial accord between the state and theTribes that already exists so as not to reinvent the wheel.

Celeste: Need to "put the ME in the statement/goals," need to emphasize the customer.

Gordon: Are we the best informed to write these as 'customers'? Are we as a group representative of the customer? So we need to be aware of those other perspectives and find the problems that the public actually experiences.

Colleen: We need to talk about options that meet each individual's needs

Marlene: Need to have the word accountable in there.

Justin: Need to talk about communication and accessibility.

Rita: Do we need to add another goal that addresses rider perspective regarding providing customers a more reliable experience.

Celeste: Connectivity," seamless travel experience regardless of providers"—customer safety and connecting choices. Goal that the legislature wants to read and the goals that the customer and public has—so how can the language span those two spheres?

Add "high" in front of quality in the Stewardship and Funding sustainability Goal.

Kathy: Encourage healthy communities in the environment Goal.

Brian: Need to acknowledge community building and "eliminate transportation as a barrier to being part of a community.".

Geri: Need to acknowledge all of the WSDOT filters, how will the separate divisions use this plan?

Integration—Amtrak is not here at the table—do we need to expand out to include them in the discussion (and other private transportation options).

Celeste: Need to emphasize that transportation/transit builds its own community.

Brian: "Develop a system that meets our needs in the near future" for people who can't or choose not to drive (new perspectives of younger generation and older generations that do not choose to drive).

Michael: We need to talk about all modes—ferry, Amtrak, bingo buses.

PRINCIPLES

Rita: Read out the principles and opened the floor for comments.

Geri: Why is a definition of public transportation a principle? Looks like this is still the 1992 version which doesn't seem to incorporate the definition of public transportation that we've updated. ACTION Geri will provide other versions of the public transportation definition.

Karen: Partnership can we add "individuals".

Gordon: Are these principles durable? Will they fit tomorrow/future? Include adaptive capacity and technologies and multimodal LOS.

Celeste: Consider ridesharing, we need to call out vanpooling and carpooling separately.

Michael: We need a safe experience across modes, will there be jurisdictional issues for defining safety.

Geri: Partnership Goals: FHWA is missing, Federal (FRA), so say state and federal agencies for partnerships.

Celeste: Clarify the role that principles play versus goals.

Brian: Principle number 1 shouldn't be a principle—think of it as a definition. "Public investment in transportation" rather than defining public transportation. What constitutes public transportation? We need to consider how the public USES TRANSPORARTION services including private sector.

Melanie: What's the difference between goals and principles - we need to rework it in a way that emphasizes that this is a BELIEF?

Rita: Asked Geri to send her definitions that have been made for defining public transportation.

Kathy: Safety should be a goal and not a principle.

Celeste: Wanted to emphasize simplicity but Geri said that the government/federal agencies have an engrained complexity that make it difficult to keep it simple

Jeanne: Next steps are to re-craft some of the principles and goals.

Celeste: Once we have settled on the visions and goals, can we have them be larger—so they can always be present. (Poster Size)

Gordon: Please include a point of contact so we can provide feedback.

LUNCH DISCUSSION

Stephanie: Scheduling—is meeting once a month too much of a commitment or is a two-day session every two months better? Is Seattle a good location (Michael said no).

Matt: Let's vary the locations.

Gordon: We need to be able to get to the meeting location by public transportation.

Michael: Can we get work done via web?

Geri: If we lose a person who can't come for a two day session we lose them for two months, so a once a month commitment is better.

People said that the conference call is not particular effective—can we find a better technology for telecommuting.

Robin: Looking into technological tools for sharing and collaborating on line.

Karen and Jeanne—Maybe we should consider Link, so we will look into other options, maybe to take a poll about technologies for the meeting.

Gordon: "It is July 15, 2035 the public transportation community has surged over barriers engaging profit and non-profit transportation assets".

Gordon: Asked who was in charge taking over for Cathy?

We also need a new schedule since the new one is no longer in line- WTP doesn't have to be a hard linkage (what is a realistic timeline?).

Stan: Cathy is being replaced by this core team (Stan, Robin, Stephanie, Brian, Jeanne and Rita).

Brian: Said that a revised schedule will be developed an included in the action items.

Team will send out a list of action items.

Decision is to still meet once a month – But Bruce noted that attendance at the Seattle meeting has been the highest

STATES INTEREST ISSUE PAPER

Robin: In the last meeting we talked about the goals and the general feedback was that there were three: State interest in Public transportation, State investment in Public Transportation,

Decision was to use the issue papers/primer as a background—aim is to generate thoughts and feedback—incorporate those items into the final folio that becomes the plan. These folios will form the outline of a forward looking plan.

Robin: There are 22 topics (issues from which we can create the plan).

Bruce: How successful was the 1996 plan. Some topics are similar to the 1996 plan.

Gordon: One topic paper that talked about how we measure public transportation performance.

Robin: We do have data and we do include that data, and we have achieved a lot, but this paper was more about the future and less about the past.

Stan: What do you need us to comment on for these interest papers?

Geri: We need better information and we need better means of gathering data and we have gaps—we are missing something in this paper—a mix of data, performance measures, money. The issue paper is very DOT focused any doesn't speak to the other agencies/interest groups.

Matt: What is this supposed to accomplish? We need to consider whether we need this to be practical or aspirational. We need to emphasize the PRACTICAL but needs the nugget to change somebody's mind.

Celeste: Who are our audiences—we've said that this is for us more internally. I am eager to get the point of outward facing—pyramid structure—the most important at the top and the more detailed to the back. We need impact at the beginning. We are never going to get there, but we can have continuous improvement. Framing issue, the enduring love of cars, and that that might not be the future.

Brian: The purpose of the Issue paper—SHOULD the state care about the public transportation—this paper sets up that history—but WHY is that different from other levels (federal, agency). But do we (the state) have to be the one to provide individuals with their transit needs? We have interests in providing services because of the values/goals, but is it up to the state to do what a private or other transit agencies are providing? I have a timeline in getting this report done, but getting the plan itself implemented can't be put on that timeline.

Michael: This paper is a good literature review (build on the past to create a future") but there are missing elements—like walking.

It should note the Centennial Accord with the Tribes in the literature review. Talk about how Washington State is leading the way but also show where there are gaps.

Barb: How do you make a report that spans the various realities of transportation across the state. When we need to write the final plan are compelling stories and charts to show various approaches the state has taken for various modes. Safety, security, and health need greater emphasis.

Gordon: Focus on "what WSDOT can DO"—what can be something simple that we can do that is low cost?

Geri: This is a background doc, so I don't want to spend some time on it. But the folio should be more aspirational and future thinking.

State interest and State role are two very different things

Celeste: Transportation is a means to an end—it connects all the other part of life—what are the articulated goals for all of the elements of living and how do those interests feed into transportation?

Michael: What are our deliverables (what are state deliverables?)

Brian: Let's reiterate the goals as those are the State's interest and reflect a role in transportation. The folio is an articulation of the goals.

Karen: It reads that transit is for people who don't have other transport opportunities, but more and more people are choosing not to drive.

Stan: Read the temperature of the room.

- Agreed that the folio should align with the goals
- Agreed that the folio should focus on the outcomes and goals, but not how you get there
- Agreed it should use compelling visuals and data
- Agreed it could queue up some performance measures (TBD) It could note that the state is interested in crafting performance measures.
- Agreed it should cover the roles of all state agencies and not just WSDOT.

Colleen: How involved can those agencies (state health, etc).

Stephanie: We do have an agency board that we are waiting to engage until we have something to show them.

Stan:

- Agreed it should be broadly inclusive with all sorts of people and governments
- Agreed it should be appealing to a wide geographical demographic
- Agreed it must be future focused
- More practical or aspirational?

Melanie: For many years the state has not had a significant role in public transportation, so this piece should make the case for the state to be invested in public transportation.

It should call out personal health more clearly.

It needs to be structured to not juxtapose driving in your car versus everything else.

Paul: When I think of the state role, the whole state might have a different role than just the DOT.

Tom: We need to be more inclusive of the whole state and not just being Sound-centric. Need to be beyond what has been accomplished in just the Sound. **Gordon**: reiterated this in the Tribal perspective.

Brian: WSDOT invests in planning and building infrastructure for public transportation—but after 695 they may have invested less in public transit agencies. The argument that the DOT is not investing in public transportation is not necessarily valid but we don't try and actually quantify that.

The state's interest is one thing and the Tribes, the feds, also have their own interests and programs—how do we articulate the whole system with all of these players.

Geri: State only pays 1% of the money on public transit—and they could put more money in, even if only on state highways. But is their role negotiating partnerships, helping federal money get to the right agencies and programs.

Celeste: The state's role is to make sure that the needs are met, even if it's not directly in their hands.

Next Steps

Team to send out revised goals, principles and vision statement

Reestablished what the folio will focus upon

Everyone is invited to put their input in the WTP

Get a better definition of what is public transportation (Geri will send it along).

Next meeting will in one month at a transit accessible location/Seattle