

## Meeting Summary

### US 29 Central Corridor Advisory Committee Meeting #11

Wednesday, May 24, 2017, 6:30pm – 8:30pm  
Silver Spring United Methodist Church, Parlor Room  
33 University Boulevard E., Silver Spring, MD 20901

#### Participants

<b>CAC Members (X for in attendance, blank for regrets)</b>			
Louis Boezi	X	Brian Morrissey	X
Marie-Michelle Bunch		Michael Pfetsch	
Karen Evans		Mark Ranze	
Joseph Fox (represented by Sanjida Rangwala)	X	Michele Riley	X
Sean Gabaree		Eugene Stohlman	
Melissa Goemann	X	James Williamson	X
Larry Goldberg		Teddy Wu	
Kevin Harris	X	James Zepp	
Jeffrey McNeil	X	Clifford Zinnes	
Karen Michaels			

#### **Staff**

Michael Weinberger, Foursquare ITP  
Joana Conklin, MCDOT  
Rick Kiegel, RK&K  
Darcy Buckley, MCDOT  
Tom Pogue, MCDOT  
Rafael Olarte, MCDOT  
Rebecca Martin, Foursquare ITP  
Josh Diamond, Foursquare ITP  
Dan Hibbert, MCDOT  
Sogand Serafi, MCDOT  
Otto Condon, ZGF  
Chris Sommas, ZGF  
Allison Berkheimer, RK&K  
Alanna McKeeman, Foursquare ITP  
Tamika Gauvin, MTA

#### **Members of the Public**

Brian Feit, 29 South CAC  
Harriet Quinn  
Rosemary DiPietro, resident of Woodmoor  
Tom Hucker, County Councilmember  
Reemberto Rodriguez, Silver Spring 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 he is excited to hold the first Central CAC meeting tonight, after the South meeting was split into two groups. The Central CAC group will focus more specifically on the Four Corners part of the corridor. 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 its 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. The 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 bus 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): A member asked how the study for the Emerson proposal will impact the current design work on the project. The member wondered how far the team should continue designing the project if the project may change with Mr. Emerson’s proposal.*

*Answer (A): Joana stated that the project design work will continue as is. The Emerson proposal examines a longer-term solution within the corridor. Michael added that retrofits of systems are common. The team will begin with the features as they are in the plan and update as necessary.*

*Q: A member asked whether the Emerson proposal would affect station locations. For example, what would happen if the team implements stations, and then must move the stations if the Emerson proposal is approved?*

A: Joana confirmed that it is possible to move stations after they have been built. The station design is intended to be scalable, and every part of the station could be moved to another location except the pad. In addition, there are only three stations on US 29 that would be affected by the Emerson study. In two of those stations, the team is considering a median station. The third is at Tech Road, where it is unlikely to be a median station.

### 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. Participants 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

The members 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 if 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 CACs are listed online.

## **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 stops at University Boulevard and Burnt Mills. These stops were chosen as relevant stops for this group. Each CAC group 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; 3-4 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, a sense of comfort, lighting, and protection from weather. In addition, a key requirement for the MWCOG 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 to reflect the Andes creates a sense of identity. A successful design will make the 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 and can also provide a sense of identity. Public art can be used to tie the station design to the community, encouraging stewardship and ownership. These factors are part of the framework that the team has identified to help make the system reflect its 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. This 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 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. Decisions to include Wi-Fi and cell phone charging will be policy decisions; these are not required amenities. These decisions will be recommended by advisory committees like the CACs.

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 in the station design that would be reflective of the county’s history and identity. Sustainability and energy production were also mentioned; to reflect

these, shelters could be net-zero energy use, 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 what the minimum width is for the platform.*

A: The design team is using 15 feet as the full platform width. This includes the tactile warning, required widths to accommodate ADA needs, ticket vending, benches, and a landscape area along the back.

*Member Comment (C): A member commented that at the Four Corners station, there are some locations that are not suitable for a station.*

A: Michael commented that we can get into specifics later during the activity. Otto has presented the menu for station design.

Otto discussed the idea of moving a station. The idea is to invest well in the beginning. Moving a station means moving a canopy. Otto discussed the height of the platform, which is ideally 10 to 12 inches. A curb is typically 7 inches high. To avoid having steps, the sidewalk can be raised, so that the whole sidewalk becomes a through zone for pedestrians and a waiting area for transit riders. Canopies can be included to provide protection, even downtown.

*C: A member commented that the station design will be built around the theme of smart transit.*

A: This will be the best practice in transit, and Otto thought Montgomery County could become a model for the rest of the country.

*Q: Do all BRT stations have platforms?*

A: Yes, platforms allow for offboard fare collection. Having a clear platform and clear signage is important for BRT systems to be recognizable and therefore successful.

*C: The Institute for Transportation and Development Policy (ITDP) did a study 3 to 4 years ago, which states that platforms on US 29 are not justified.*

A: Allison responded that platforms allow for faster boarding, and are helpful in facilitating a better BRT experience.

A: Michael responded that part of the issue is to provide those who use paratransit the same opportunity to use the system with the same accessibility. For bus operators, it can take 2 to 10 minutes to get a person with a disability onto the bus.

A: Otto was surprised at this finding, since the leaders of ITDP typically go for the “gold standard” of stations, including fully-enclosed stations. They have stated that a 3-lane BRT system is optimal. In DC, for example, the K Street context didn’t work well for a BRT.

*C: The member read verbatim from the report. The member said he has not seen a study stating that the BRT will work well along US 29 and is concerned that the team is designing a system that will not work.*

A: Michael responded that three years ago when the study was conducted, the corridor looked different than it does today.

*Q: A member commented that the problem with platforms is that local buses will need to stop there too. Will there need to be separate stops for local buses?*

A: Otto responded that buses may use the same platforms or adjacent platforms, that that is a policy decision that will be made later in the project planning process.

*Q: A member asked whether local buses will be able to use the platforms.*

A: Joana responded that physically, the buses will be able to use the platforms because the floor height is not very different. Whether the local buses will use the platforms will ultimately be a policy decision.

*Q: A member asked whether the platforms are interchangeable.*

A: Joana responded that they can be. If the platforms are built 14 inches high, that is too high. Platforms will likely be built lower so that a local bus can also use them.

*Q: Will the local buses use the platforms?*

A: Joana responded that yes, they could be able to use the platform. However, whether they will use the platforms is a policy decision that has not been made yet.

A: Otto confirmed that, in terms of design, local buses can use the platforms. In DC, local buses cannot use the streetcar platforms, but here, they may be able to.

A: A representative from Ride On stated that this is also an operational decision. Dedicated stops for the BRT will make them run faster.

A: Joana confirmed that this is a good question to discuss during the activity. For example, at University Boulevard, there are many buses and many transfers. It is important to think about how things physically fit. It is necessary to consider how many bus stops will integrate and how it will be possible to facilitate transfers.

*Q: A member asked how bicycles fit into this plan.*

*Q: A member asked whether there is a dedicated area in the plan for bicycle and pedestrian considerations. Does this coordinate with the County’s bicycle plan? Currently, the corridor is not bike accessible.*

A: Rick stated that there is not space for bicycles on the front of the bus [as is currently done with local buses in the county]; rather, there is space inside the vehicle itself.

*C: A member commented that having bicycles inside the bus, rather than loading them on the front, will make the bus run faster.*

*C: A member commented that part of the focus should be not to disrupt local bus service, because the BRT will not serve everyone.*

A: Michael responded that Josh will discuss local bus service later, and he said coordinating the BRT with local bus service will make transit service better.

*C: A member commented that he would like to see bus stop improvements on all 80 bus stops on the corridor, rather than just the four for the BRT service. He is concerned about the safety of riders, and many bus stops don't have shelters and additional amenities.*

C: Another member commented that they are interested in pedestrian and sidewalk improvements along the corridor.

A: Joana clarified that later CAC meetings will cover bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and the County has other programs to address bus stops that are not part of the BRT system.

### c. Local Station Location Activity

#### Four Corners

Rick introduced the Four Corners station and asked members for impressions from their visits. The packet includes sections where there may be locations appropriate for stations.

*Q: A member asked whether a section should have been yellow rather than gray in the packet.*

A: Yes, that section should be yellow.

Rick confirmed that the station cannot be in front of the Woodmoor Shopping Center. There is potential for a stop to the south. In the morning, the southbound ramp [entrance ramp to I-495] is backed up to the bottom of the hill.

*C: A member commented that traffic is backed up beyond that point.*

*C: A member commented that the local bus often does not stop in front of Four Corners Park because the buses cannot get to the stop. WMATA has a policy of not stopping there because of the traffic.*

*C: A member commented that the express bus will also not stop there.*

*C: A member suggested the corner by University Boulevard would be a good location for a major bus stop, especially to facilitate transfers.*

*Q: A member asked what the criteria are for determining where to put a bus station.*



A: Rick responded that the decision is mainly based on professional experience. As the team decides where to put the stop, the team members will examine the impact.

*Q: A member asked whether it would be necessary to take part of lane, since the BRT station would need 15-20 feet of width. The member estimated that the median is only 13 feet.*

A: Joana responded that the project will not take part of the lane.

A: Rick added that the ground survey has not been completed yet, so the exact width of the median has not been determined.

A: Allison noted that the platform width could be reduced in specific areas to fit within constrained environments. For example, in a median setting, the width reserved for landscape could be eliminated. Also, if ridership is projected to be lower, the platform width can be further reduced if ADA requirements are maintained.

*C: A member commented that this seems too tight to him, especially for riders with special needs.*

*Q: Can students use the BRT free of charge?*

A: The current Ride On policy is that students currently ride local buses free from 2pm-8pm, but they must pay in the morning. The BRT will use the same fare structure as Ride On.

*C: This station would tie up two lanes of traffic feeding into the beltway. This would create a choke point for traffic and would be unsafe for pedestrians.*

*C: There would also be a problem if the bus pulls into a median station. The problem is getting past the beltway ramp, but after that, travel is smooth. It is unsafe for a bus to pull out into traffic from a stop.*

*Q: Where do buses make the transition?*

A: Rick responded that the median station would likely be for the southbound stop only. The next stop is by Burnt Mills (near Trader Joe's) and there could be a center platform there. From Rockwood, the bus could stay in the left lane. This would assist the bus in avoiding the right-lane traffic that is backed up to beltway.

*Q: A member asked why there is a southbound station at this location.*

A: Rick responded that the team has determined there is a need there.

*Q: Where does the County anticipate that people will be going from there – will they be boarding or alighting at the southbound station?*

A: Rick responded that there is a high school, a residential area, and retail in this area. Based on initial evaluations of ridership, this is an important stop and warrants stops in both directions.

A: Joana responded that this is also a transfer point from the C lines.

*Q: Would it make sense to put a station on University Boulevard?*

A: No, this would significantly slow down the travel time.

*C: To facilitate transfers from the C line, the station could be in front of the office park.*

*C: It depends which way you are transferring on the C line.*

A: Michael confirmed that the team will examine the C line data for transfer information.

Rick encouraged members to visualize the location. There is a sidewalk at the Shell station, in front of the shopping center. It is narrow, and the State does not have the right of way there. There is a cash depot at the end, and there is no driveway there. There is a potential opportunity to have a station from the Shell driveway to close to the cash depot.

*C: A member commented that this would be less convenient for transfers.*

*C: A member commented that this make sense, as it would connect local buses to the BRT.*

Rick mentioned that one advantage of this location is that it would get the bus out of the backup and out of the right lane.

*Q: A member asked whether the team will run traffic analysis to see what the impact will be.*

A: Allison responded that they would determine the impact for a median station if that concept were to move forward.

A: Rick responded that a median would result in a left lane for the bus, right lane for traffic turning right, and one lane for through traffic when a BRT vehicle was stopped at the median station. In this case, SHA would require simulation of impacts. In the case of a curbside station, there are buses that pull through there all day already, and one more bus will not have a significant impact, so traffic evaluations will not be done in those situations.

Rick turned the conversation to the northbound part of the station. North of the high school, there are a variety of opportunities for a curbside station. There are four through lanes and a fifth lane for vehicles turning right. In terms of where to be along the curb, it is best to be closer to the crosswalk.

*C: A member commented that the BRT stop should be adjacent to an existing bus stop and the crosswalk.*

A: Joana confirmed with Dan Hibbert from MCDOT that local bus stops can be moved.

*C: A member commented that it is ideal not to disrupt the right turn lane.*

*Q: A member asked where the next stop is.*

A: It is towards the beltway, with both an eastbound stop and a westbound stop.

Rick mentioned that one positive here is not encroaching on property.

*C: A member expressed concern about the median potential and width.*

A:-Otto explained that the platform width could be reduced slightly when considering each width element individually such as tactile warning, ADA requirements, furnishings, and shy distance from moving vehicles.

*C: The member expressed concerns about pedestrian safety.*

A: Otto responded that it is possible to build a more enclosed shelter with windscreens.

*C: A member expressed opposition because of pedestrian safety, problems for car traffic, and the issue of the bus crossing multiple lanes of traffic.*

*C: Four members expressed agreement.*

Rick encouraged members to think of the net positive effect the system will have.

*C: A member expressed support for adequate shelters.*

### Burnt Mills

Rick introduced the activity covering the Burnt Mills station. At Trader Joe's there is a signalized pedestrian crosswalk, and there are no additional stops or crosswalks until the Lockwood intersection. They team is considering a basic right-side curb for both south- and northbound stations, assuming there is not much impact. If there are existing Ride On or WMATA bus stops, it is possible to ask that those stops be moved to accommodate the BRT station.

*Q: A member asked whether there is demand for boarding the BRT at this location.*

A: There is a grocery store and shopping center at this location. There is also an office park that is currently empty, but will be leased in the future.

*Q: A member asked whether there is ridership data for this location.*

A: Rick responded that the team is looking at existing boarding numbers.

*C: A member commented that there is a medical center parking lot that is often full a quarter of a mile away.*

A: Rick responded that the team believes there will be significant demand for boarding at this station.

A: Michael commented that the team will also look at this station during the local service planning phase.

Rick mentioned that side-boarding platforms are reasonable at this location. On the southbound side, there is a retaining wall that is set back from the road, so the station must not impact the foundation of the wall.

*C: A member commented that there is heavy northbound traffic.*

*C: Another member commented that this location is well past the Tech Road backups.*

Rick mentioned that one southbound service pattern for the BRT will be coming from Burtonsville, and the other from Briggs Chaney. The station can be on the right side of the lane or the left side. The U-turn lane could be used for buses rather than traffic. This would mean eliminating the northbound left U-turn to create platforms at this location. A dedicated crosswalk would need to be created there. It would be possible to time the signals together, so that having an additional traffic light at this location would not have an additional traffic impact.

*C: A member commented that the problem is that this is not close to a light.*

A: Rick clarified that a light would be added at this location, as well as a crosswalk.

*C: A member commented that drivers of cars would not appreciate an additional traffic light.*

A: Rick clarified that if the lights operate together, then an additional light will not mean any additional wait time.

*C: A member expressed concern about bus stations in the median. Traffic is traveling faster in that lane, so the member is concerned about pedestrian safety.*

A: Rick responded that this will not be a problem for the northbound station, but could be an issue with the southbound station.

*Q: A member asked whether a median station is a good idea, and why is it uncommon?*

A: Rick and Allison responded that this is frequently used in BRT systems, but that regular buses cannot use median stations because they have doors only on one side.

A: Rick clarified that at a median station, passengers must cross three lanes of traffic. At a regular curb station, passengers will either cross no lanes of traffic, or they must cross six lanes of traffic. Either way, passengers must cross the same number of lanes.

*C: A member commented that in 1996, there was a proposal for a dedicated bus lane, but it was denied. He thinks that this project will only complicate matters and will create stop-and-go traffic. He thinks traffic lights in general should be better synchronized, and this will solve the traffic issues.*

### **3. Local Bus Service Planning**

Michael introduced Joshua Diamond, a service planner from Foursquare ITP. Josh's role is to 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 along the same corridor 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, collecting their thoughts and ideas. Information collected through the open houses, specifically 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 high 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.

*C: A member commented that he has heard people complain that the Ride On Route 19 was changed. It used to go into his neighborhood in Forest Glen, but does not go there anymore. The route was also shortened so that it no longer connected to the metro station. He believes that routes should end at a major hub.*

A: Michael responded that this is a good point, and that the 19 is a feeder service.

Josh commented that when the BRT is running, the team will also look at run times, segment by segment. Even if alignments change, the team will know what the feeds are. More accurate run times will mean that buses will be more on time.

*C: A member commented that she sees a catch-22 on some bus routes. The bus doesn't come often, so people don't ride it. Because there is low ridership, the bus service is unlikely to be expanded. However, it's important to run buses often enough to make it attractive to residents.*

*C: A member commented that he would like to see bus stops improve along the corridor, not just the BRT stations.*

A: Joana responded that the project budget includes \$2 million for bicycle and pedestrian improvements. However, there will not be enough money to improve 80 additional bus stops

along the corridor since the BRT project has a defined scope. Feedback that the team receives can be shared within the County; there is a section within MCDOT that deals more directly with bus station improvements.

*Q: The member asked how many of the 80 local bus stops along the corridor have shelters.*

A: The Ride On representative said that they have the data, but because there are 5,000 bus stops in the County, it would be difficult to say offhand.

#### **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.

*Q: A member asked if there will be a study about whether TSP will negatively affect traffic at University Boulevard and Four Corners. Traffic is frequently backed up there.*

A: Michael responded we will discuss TSP at the July CAC meeting. He requested that members should contact the team with concerns before the next meeting so that we can address these concerns at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:45pm.