

Meeting Summary

**US 29 South Corridor Advisory Committee
Meeting #11**

Tuesday, May 23, 2017, 6:30pm – 8:30pm
Silver Spring Civic Building, Spring Room
1 Veterans Place, Silver Spring, MD 20910

Participants

CAC Members (X for in attendance, blank for regrets)			
Alan Bowser	X	Tom Lansworth	
Ilhan Cagri		Tracy Lewis	X
Barbara Ditzler	X	Anita Morrison	X
Sean Emerson	X	DeAndre Morrow	
Roberta Faul-Zeitler	X	Dan Reed	X
Brian Feit	X	Herb Simmens	
Dan Figueroa		Tina Slater	X
Avi Halpert	X	Brad Stewart	
Sean Heitkemper		Mel Tull	X
Linda Keenan	X	Lori Zeller	

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
Dan Sheridan, MCDOT
Otto Condon, ZGF
Allison Berkheimer, RK&K
Matthew Crooks, WMATA

Members of the Public

Reemberto Rodriguez, Silver Spring Regional Service Center
Nat Bottingheimer, Fehr & Peers, DC
Susan Neutish
Jane Redin
Pete Tomao, Coalition for Smarter Growth
Jim Williamson, CAC Central
Bill Conway, Bill Conway for Council
Tim Williard
Harriet Quinn
Raquel Montenegro
Dave Kunes, Councilmember Tom Hucker's office

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 reminded participants that his job is to hear what members say and make sure it is in the program. He invited members to “care loudly” at him. He introduced Joana Conklin, the project manager from MCDOT.

b. US 29 Project Update

Joana gave a project update. She said the County Council has been examining its capital and operating budgets over the past month. Last week, the Council unanimously approved funding for the project and appropriated funds for the design phase. It also approved additional funds for the planning phase for the MD 355 BRT.

Sean Emerson, a member of this 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, the 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 along the corridor 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 service have the same stops as the BRT?

Answer (A): Joana said the County will examine information from consultants about ridership data and may add a few stops. It will also consider the construction that will happen for the BRT stations, and will avoid having the new buses stop at the construction sites.

c. Updated Documents for Review

Michael announced that the CAC packets contain the updated Public Involvement Plan and 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 a summary of the March 2017 Open Houses that summarizes the data that was collected, including the trade-off activity and word cloud activity for the station design. Attendees 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 members and mailed packets prior to this meeting. The South CAC has now been split into two CACs to create manageably sized CACs and closer meeting locations to member's residences for each group. 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, and ZGF Architects. CAC members and members of the public introduced themselves. (The full list of attendees is above.)

f. Expectations

Michael explained 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. 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 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.

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 locations on the screen. The conversation focused on the stops at Fenton Street and University Boulevard, which 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 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.

Q: A member asked if they would be contemplating different designs for different stations.

A: Rick answered that the County is not considering different designs because it would like all stations to look and feel the same. However, the scale can be different at different locations. For example, in the morning, some stations will have lots of people traveling southbound, and these stations should be larger and have better coverage. People may wait 5-10 minutes for a bus at these stations. At other stations, riders are likely to be departing the bus and heading on their way, rather than waiting at the station. Therefore, the layout of the station can be different.

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.

Q: A member mentioned that on page three of the survey, there is a high percentage of people that prefer a faster transit trip with fewer stops. The member asked at which point the project team will incorporate that feedback into determining how many stops are created along the corridor.

A: Michael responded that that activity is geared towards the local bus service alignment, which will be discussed at the end of the meeting. Joana clarified that there are also very few stops along the corridor. Rick added that there are 11 stops from Burtonsville to Silver Spring, which is few in comparison with local buses since the BRT is providing limited-stop service. Tonight, the group would focus on where the stations should be located within an intersection or block.

b. Station Amenity Presentation

Otto introduced himself and stated that ZGF Architects is the consultant whose work is being funded 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 houses informed the way that ZGF developed the station prototype.

Otto reviewed the purposes 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 that is appropriate for 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 grant is that stations must be sensitive to the land use 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 examples from Brazil, where stations are fully self-enclosed for offboard fare collection. In Chile, some stations reflect the Andes to create a sense of identity. A successful design will make the station feel like it is part of the location. This can be achieved through thoughtful selection of materials. 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 also be used to tie the station design to the community it is in, 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. This design results in a BRT vehicle that is unique from a typical bus.

Otto described the matrix that was included in the handout 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 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. Decisions to include Wi-Fi and cell phone charging will be policy decisions; they are not required amenities. These 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 in the region. This could be an opportunity to use materials in the station design that would be reflective of the county’s identity and history. 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: In a residential area, would the platform be part of the sidewalk, or adjacent to the sidewalk?

A: It could be either way. If there is not enough room for a separate platform, the sidewalk could go through the platform. This option also will depend on ridership.

Q: A member asked for clarification about the 15-foot width requirement [for station platforms]. Is that with only the platform, or with the setback?

A: This width represents the required size to accommodate all the elements proposed for the platform including the tactile warning strip, passenger waiting and ADA space, furnishings, ticket vending and landscaping.

Q: A member asked for clarification about the 22-foot platform width in the urban context.

A: In an urban environment where there is insufficient width because of buildings, etc., the existing sidewalk can be accommodated by having pedestrians walk through the station area by using the platform as opposed to a separate sidewalk around the back side. When raising the platform height (sidewalk in this case) to allow near-level boarding, consideration must be given to the potential impacts at the building face.

Member Comment (C): An urban zone may also need streetlights between trees.

A: Yes, the images provided are simplifications. It will be necessary to examine where the lights are and modify the existing curb. The images are intended to lay out rules, not examine specifics of each site.

C: A member commented that these examples are conceptually fine, but the two sites that will be discussed tonight have significant current restrictions in terms of what is available and what is not, and there may be many issues with these sites.

A: The team has examined the sites and has some ideas how to fit these stations in. The discussion will cover the specifics of each site.

Q: What do the pluses and minuses [on the matrix] mean?

A: Pluses indicate that additional elements can be added to a station, either because of more room or more demand. Minuses indicate elements that can be removed based on the context, i.e., if there is not enough space. The plus and minus symbols are not value judgments about each element, only an indication of things that can be added or removed based on the context.

c. Local Station Location Activity

Fenton Street

Rick began the station activity by discussing the Fenton Street station. He asked how many members have completed the activity of going to the station site to observe the characteristics. About half the room had completed the activity, and a variety of the members live in this location.

C: A member commented that the sidewalk is about 18 feet wide, rather than 20.

A: Rick responded that, in situations like this, it is sometimes possible to narrow the platform to accommodate both the platform and existing sidewalk. Alternatively, through pedestrian movements can be designed to traverse through the platform. Again, raising the sidewalk from the curb to the building face would require further investigation.

C: A member commented that raising the sidewalk 6 to 8 inches would be problematic, because it is not possible to raise doors into businesses by 6 to 8 inches as well.

A: Rick agrees, this is the issue. He posed the possibility of sloping the sidewalk, but then noted this creates a potential water management issue if the sidewalk is sloped towards doors to businesses.

C: A member commented that many transfers occur on Colesville Road, Fenton Street, and Cedar Street heading outbound. Ideally, riders will not have to watch the buses that they need leaving as they exit the bus. Parking should be limited for businesses. In addition, the BRT stop must be long enough to ensure that an articulated bus can be at the stop without blocking any other lane. The member also suggested that the shelter and technology need to be as helpful for local bus riders as they are for BRT riders. The member believes that the Fenton Street stop should be in the middle of the block because there are so many buses.

C: A member commented that it may be easier for passengers to transfer at the transit center, rather than at Fenton Street.

C: A member commented that when heading southbound, there is not as much traffic as northbound. On the southbound side, passengers get off the bus coming down on Georgia Avenue, rather than getting tied up going into the Sarbanes Transit Center. They are likely to walk and get the F4 going out.

C: A member commented that passengers transfer at Fenton Street because they do not want to miss their transfer bus in the additional time that it takes to enter and exit the transit center.

Q: A member asked how many people alight at this station. Who would come here instead of the transit center?

C: Another member commented that anyone coming to downtown Silver Spring would get off at Fenton Street.

C: A member commented that passengers who want long-distance rides will get on the BRT and not get off for some time. For example, people from Takoma Park or College Park would get on the BRT to head out to Burtonsville.

Rick agrees that the subject of transfers is an important conversation for this location. The idea of forcing everyone to walk to the transit center is too onerous, and it is a good idea to locate a station in the downtown business center. He asked the group to consider how to best ensure that transfers are as seamless as possible. Where can we put the station to facilitate that?

Michael asked Rick to clarify where the stations are planned to be. Rick explained that the northbound and southbound station platforms (which are referred to as one station) are currently planned for anywhere between Spring Street and Fenton Street on both sides. There is a driveway at the hotel entrance, so a station cannot be there.

Q: A member asked what it means when Rick says that a station cannot be there.

A: Rick clarified that a station must be 65 feet long and cannot cover a driveway.

C: A member commented that it would be possible to have a station immediately north of the driveway.

A: Rick clarified that a station must accommodate all 65 feet without crossing a driveway.

C: A member commented that if a person is traveling south on Colesville Road, part of the road is not straight, and there is a brick wall. There may be right-of-way issues if the brick wall needs to be changed.

A: Rick responded that the sidewalk gets much wider along almost the entire section of apartments. However, the station is likely to be an alighting station rather than a boarding station, so people will likely be exiting the bus and leaving, rather than waiting at the station.

Two members discussed whether the F4 stops at this location. There was some discussion about the map on the table. Rick turned the discussion back to the southbound platform, where the area is much wider. He asked whether there is consensus that the station should be closer to Fenton Street.

C: One member commented that she still does not understand why anyone would get off at this location.

A: The rest of the group seemed to agree that there is significant demand at this location.

A: Rick commented that Georgia Avenue is a major pedestrian crossing. There is shopping, businesses, doctor's offices; and it is common for people to exit at this location.

C: Another member commented that about half of the people on the bus usually get off at Fenton Street rather than waiting to exit at the Transit Center.

A: Rick agreed that the central business district is an important destination.

C: A member commented about a potential bus stop in front of the hotel. During the morning rush hour, most buses continue to Colesville Road rather than going to the shopping center.

A: Rick responded that pedestrians frequently go on to the sidewalk at Georgia Avenue.

C: A member commented that they are not opposed to a stop there, but would like to consider a stop in front of United Therapeutics, where there may be more room for a stop.

C: Another member commented that the main issue there is that the sidewalk is well over ADA.

C: Another member commented that the sidewalk would be set back significantly.

A: Rick commented that the curb is steeper on one side, and the platform must be in line with the road. It is preferable to have a platform in a flat spot.

C: A member commented that that is preferable anyway, since the bus should be closer to the transfer location. It is better for the stop to be closer to Fenton.

Rick guided the conversation to the northbound part of the station. Here, it is necessary to consider a flat station versus a station on a steep hill. He pointed out that the team would like to avoid taking out light poles to avoid additional costs. In the area, there is a liquor store, a restaurant, and a UPS store. If the sidewalk in back is higher, then it may simply involve leveling rather than sloping or raising.

C: A member commented that many drivers take a right onto Fenton street from Colesville Road, which will cause problems for the bus.

A: Rick commented that articulated buses need stations to be straight in line at the curb, to ensure that the trailer is not hanging out into another lane. Articulated buses are typically 60 feet long, often 40 feet for the initial part and 20 feet for the trailer. They usually have three or four doors on each side, while typical buses only have two doors.

Q: A member asked about the difference between a raised platform that is 10 inches high versus 14 inches high.

A: Joana responded that the lesson learned from existing BRT systems is that it is better to build a lower platform. 14 inches is too high, while 11 to 12 inches may be ideal. BRT vehicles typically have a bridge plate with a 3-inch play that can bridge an additional gap. For example, the bridge plate could bridge a bus that is 14 inches high with a platform that is 12 inches high.

A: Rick commented that the front door of the bus will have a large ramp that opens, in the case that the bus would need to evacuate while not at a station. The middle door will have a bridge plate to maintain ADA compliance.

A: Joana added that at different times of the year, the tires may have differing pressures and the bus may have a different passenger load, meaning that designing the system to line up perfectly will not work because of these factors. The bridge plate will help with these changes.

Q: A member asked whether a canopy is necessary at the northbound Fenton station.

A: Rick responded that a canopy cannot block the business signs, so the team is not necessarily planning on installing a canopy at this location.

C: A member commented that there is only one canopy from a business for passengers to stand underneath. In addition, businesses may not appreciate having riders use their canopy space.

A: Rick responded that the team will have the opportunity to use a more transparent canopy that could be closer to businesses, and that would help define the platform space from the sidewalk. However, it will be necessary to have something smaller, and it is possible to nest a smaller canopy within a larger one. In addition, there will need to be a way to protect the ticket vending machine from rain.

C: A member commented that it would be possible to offer a bonus to businesses for using their canopy or space.

A: Otto responded that this has been done before and is a possibility.

C: A member commented that Pepco and WSSC plan to tear up this block this year and next year.

A: Rick commented that the team will follow up with utility companies about that.

University Boulevard

Rick turned the conversation the University Boulevard / Four Corners station. It may be possible to construct a curb or median station at this location. Three members visited this site in advance of the meeting. There are plenty of constraints at this site with most being on the southbound side.

Rick began the discussion with the northbound station site. There is a large church and shopping center, and it is best to avoid these sites for the station. It is also not possible to go farther north for the station. It may be best to be closer to the high school. The sidewalk is wide enough here that the station can be anywhere. There are likely many alightings, with few boardings at this site.

Q: A member asked if the team expects riders to take the BRT only two stops to get to this station. The local bus stops about five times in between downtown and this location.

C: Another member answered that there are 12 stops between downtown and University Boulevard (although the local bus may not stop at each stop).

Q: The member asked if this justifies a northbound stop at this location.

C: Another member commented that they would be willing to take the BRT to that location, if they didn't want to drive.

C: A member commented that ridership numbers will inform this decision.

C: A member commented that one reason why people will take the southbound BRT is that there are few stoplights between downtown Silver Spring, Fenton Street, and University Boulevard. The local buses only serve half of the corridor, and riders must cross six lanes of traffic to access the other half. This conundrum isn't obvious until a person must attempt to cross the street, and then they understand how difficult this is.

Rick examined the northbound map. There is the high school parking lot entrance. In normal situations, right-of-way impacts should be minimized, but that problem does not exist here. The existing three through-lanes, with a right turn lane will be maintained.

C: A member commented that there are four lanes through the light, and five after the light.

Rick commented that a median platform could be in the curb lane, or in the fifth lane after the light. He asked the Ride On representative if this is acceptable from an operational standpoint – is it more difficult to get back into traffic, or is it better to have the station farther to the south?

A: From an operational standpoint, it is better to have the station farther to the south.

Rick commented that in terms of Four Corners access, this solution adds about 100 feet of walking distance.

C: A member commented that in this scenario, if riders transfer at University Boulevard, they must walk farther to transfer.

Rick directed the conversation to the southbound side. There is a 7-Eleven store, and there is no opportunity for a station there. Going farther south, there is a reasonable area for a station. This would allow the northbound and southbound stops to be in the same vicinity. However, at the southbound location, WMATA chose not to create a stop because of the backup from the ramp to the beltway. It is not feasible or realistic to construct a station at this location. There was general agreement in the room.

C: A member commented that the map only shows a portion of Four Corners. The side north of University Boulevard is densely developed with multiple uses, including commercial, residential, and parking. The high school is on the other side. The northbound side is relatively empty towards the crossroads, and then becomes dense in the residential area, creating a vacuum.

This member thinks that this would be a good location for a bus station because the bus stations are not central to a crossroads, but the southbound station would be in the busiest part.

Rick mentioned that the southbound portion of University Boulevard has some width restrictions. North of University Boulevard, there is a Shell gas station and parking lot. Closer to the shops, the entrances are down and back behind it. The sidewalk is very narrow there, making ADA access difficult. The state highway administration doesn't own the area, so it would have to buy access. A better solution would be a stop closer to the entrance.

C: A member commented that it would be possible to do a median station on the southbound side. It would be more convenient for the bus.

Rick responded that there is the potential for something small in that location. It would also be possible to have a median platform with left-boarding buses. The survey of the area has not been completed, but once it is, the team will know the exact width of the area. The team will work on ways to make a median platform safe for pedestrians. A barrier wall is a possibility. This type of station has not been used in Montgomery County before, and the Burnt Mills station could have a similar layout. Although the left lane is typically the fastest lane, during rush hour, traffic is generally moving very slowly.

C: A member commented that the left lane does travel quickly.

C: A member commented about another location for a bus station that would limit conflict with traffic on the beltway and avoid the two right lanes for traffic turning right.

Rick suggested that this member send a sketch to Michael after the meeting.

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 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. Responses from 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.

C: A member commented that the biggest problem with Ride On routes is the reliability of when the bus will arrive. The schedule tends not to be accurate. Upgraded technology could be helpful.

A: Josh responded that moving local routes can reduce congestion, improving on-time performance.

C: A member commented that she lives in North Sligo Hill, and there is no access to the BRT in her neighborhood. She would not like to lose local bus service on US 29 because they will not have access to the BRT.

A: Josh responded that there is a gap in the BRT service at Sligo Creek, where it does not make sense to force transfers. That is one reason, among others, why there is not a stop at Sligo Creek. The main goal of the BRT is to get people where they want to go, reducing trip time from what it is now. So even if riders must transfer, their total trip time should be shorter.

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 for riders and those interested in BRT during the summer. The team will examine operational feasibility. The team will analyze data and prepare local bus recommendations.

Q: A member asked why Four Corners was included in the Southern group's discussion, rather than in the Central group.

A: Rick responded that each CAC will examine two stations of interest. There is no defined line that separates the southern part of the corridor from the central. The team will also solicit feedback in the central meeting.

C: A member of the Central group affirmed that he will provide input at the Central meeting tomorrow.

Michael encouraged members to reach out to the project team with ideas regarding the station siting activity.

Q: A member asked if the team could supplement meetings with videos of existing BRT systems, for example, the Reno BRT. This would help the CAC members visualize the station design elements.

A: Joana agreed that this is a good idea. Each place does station design a little differently.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.