Statewide Public Transportation Plan

Working Group Meeting Notes

Tuesday, November 12, 2013

9:30 am-12:30 pm

Sound Transit

In Attendance: Gordon Neilson, Gordon Rogers, Michelle Zeidman, Barb Chamberlin, Brett Meldrum, Roland Behee, David Beal, Gil Cerise *Staff*: Kathy Silins, Stephanie Postier, Steven Abernathy *On Phone*: Karl Otterstorm

Cathy welcomed the members of the Working Group. She went over the expectations for the meeting today. The emphasis will be on discussing performance measures in the context of goals and objectives.

A. Announcements:
   a. Washington Bicycle Alliance is now to be called Washington Bikes
   b. Michelle Zeidman is leaving the University of Washington in January and will begin a year of traveling around the world. A replacement from UW will be named.
   c. Gordon Roger is retiring in January 2014. A replacement from an MPO/RTPO will be made.

B. Cathy gave a brief overview of a recent report, "Performance-Based Planning and Programming". (See Power Point presentation)
   1. Vision
   2. Goals/Objectives
   3. Performance Measures

C. Example

SAMPLE VISION

The State of Washington has a safe, reliable multimodal transportation system that is coordinated with land use planning, supports equitable access to opportunities, and protects the environment.

SAMPLE GOALS

- Accessibility
- Climate change/energy use
- Economic vitality
- Environment
- Community
- Public Health
- Safety/Security
- System Coordination
- System Performance

SAMPLE OBJECTIVES FOR COMMUNITY

- Create communities that are walkable and pedestrian friendly.
- Create communities that support density and integrate multiple land uses (residential, commercial, office, etc.)
- Create communities that support a range of lifestyle and transportation options (transit, bicycle, auto, etc.).
- Create communities that maximize the use of existing infrastructure through infill, redevelopment, and increased density.
- Create communities that preserve and leverage the natural environment.
- Create communities that are attractive, built to last, and integrated with their surroundings.

SAMPLE PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR COMMUNITY

Safety	By 2035, reduce the number of pedestrian, bicyclist, and motor vehicle occupant fatalities plus serious injuries each by 50% compared to 2015.
Public Health	By 2035, triple walking, biking, and transit mode share compared to 2015.
Accessibility	By 2035, increase by 50% the number of essential destinations accessible within 30 minutes by bicycling and public transit for low-income, minority, senior, and disabled populations compared to 2015.

D. Discussion

a. There is a difference between data and information. Public Transportation collects much data. Sometimes the data is not adequate to respond to the questions that are asked by decision makers.

1. Example: "How many PEOPLE ride the bus?" The expectation is that the response will identify the percentage of the population that use the bus – but public transit agencies do not generally collect this data, they track passenger boardings.
2. Boardings are influenced by operational factors. If a route used to take a person from their origin to destination, and now requires a transfer, the data will show that the boardings doubled for all individuals taking that particular trip.
3. Cathy also explained how estimated boardings (such as the Free Zone in downtown Seattle) can be recalibrated – and make significant changes to the statewide passenger boarding numbers.

b. In the example that was provided, members of the Work Group suggested that "cost effectiveness and efficiency" be included as goals. Others suggested that they be defined as measures.

c. Connectivity as a goal may require that we produce different maps. Look at where the transportation options are available and where they are not.

d. The Statewide plan should keep the perspective at the 30,000 ft. level. Allow the locals to decide how to implement the objectives and report on the goal attainment.

e. Consider the requirements of our future. Communication/information and connection to WiFi may be more critical to our communities.
f. Connectivity may also include facilities for modal choices such as bikes at bus stops, pedestrian facilities, working with local planning agencies on land use policies, integrating transportation networks into our community visions.
g. Identify how the local transit agencies provide services on state corridors. This may be a method for identifying the state investment in local transit.
h. Need to coordinate rural transport and urban transport. Rural privately operated service needs to have some type of fare subsidy to enable coordination of public transport and private transport. The way the system is set up with separate funding silos makes it difficult to collaborate on an even playing field. The provision of service needs to be improved within a coordination environment. There is also lack of a consistent standard for private non-profits in providing service that a coordinated methodology can be applied statewide.

E. Cathy shared the comments from the Planning Council on the Definition of Public Transportation and the Guiding Principles.
F. The next Work Group meeting will be on Tuesday, November 19th in Olympia. The State Agency representatives will be joining the meeting.