



RPTAC and Project Steering Committee Meeting

Wednesday, August 19

1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

Virtual Meeting

MEETING MINUTES



RPTAC Members Attending:

Richard Ross – Chair
Annie Marland
Zachary Bass
Kim Curley
Casey Bergh
Brooke Eldrige – Alternate
Denise LaBuda – Alternate
Jordan Ohlde
Robert Bryant
Cora Ives
Brian Potwin
Nicholas Snead
George Conway
Bob Bryant
Jennifer Glover
James Halliday

Meeting Attendees:

Matt Kittelson – Consultant team
Miranda Barrus – Kittelson Consultant team
Tyler Deke – Bend MPO, PSC and Bend TAC member
Chris Cheng – ODOT and Bend TAC member
Gavin Leslie – Bend TAC member
Theresa Conley – ODOT
Erin Foote-Morgan – Hubbell Communications, Bend TAC member
Deborah McMahon – PSC member
Gregory Bryant – Bend TAC member
Chris Piper – Bend City Council
Bruce Abernathy – Bend City Council
Anthony Boardman – Bend City Council candidate
Jerry Brummer – Crook County Commissioner
Karen Swirsky – City of Bend
Gregg Morris – Commute Options Board Chair
Wendy Holzman – Deschutes County Bike/Ped Advisory Committee
Lou Capozzi – Bend TAC member
Eric Lint – Engineer
Sid Snyder – Bend TAC member
Carol Fulkerson – Central Oregon Coalition on Access

Laurel Brauns – The Source
Janet Gregor – Commute Options Board member
Tom Headley – Engineer

COIC/CET Staff:

Tammy Baney
Andrea Breault
Ashley Hooper
Rachel Zakem
Derek Hofbauer
Peter Werner

Welcome and Introductions – Richard Ross, Chair

- Attendees made virtual introductions to the group.
- Comments for the draft Transit Master Plan submitted between 7/15 and 8/18 were emailed to RPTAC, Project Steering Committee (PSC) members, and interested parties prior to the meeting for their review and consideration.
- A quorum of RPTAC members was present and two alternates took the place of two members who were not present.

Approval of the agenda and 7/15 meeting minutes – Richard Ross

- The 8/19 meeting agenda and 7/15 meeting minutes were unanimously approved by committee members.

Overview of new RPTAC bylaws – Derek Hofbauer, CET/COIC

- The COIC Board adopted new RPTAC bylaws during their August 2 meeting. The following additions and revisions were made to the bylaws:
 - Language was added regarding the roles, responsibilities, and voting rights for alternates.
 - Educational institutions and underserved communities were added to the list for community representation.
 - The allowance of remote/virtual meeting participation and voting.
 - The designation of two-year terms for the Chair and Vice Chair, with each officer serving no more than two consecutive terms.
 - Chair and Vice Chair nomination process to be determined by the committee.
 - Quarterly updates to the COIC Board by the Chair and/or Vice Chair.

Public comment period

Public comments regarding the Transit Master Plan and the planning process were provided during the meeting. Additionally, public comments were accepted through 8/18 at 5 pm via outreach@coic.org and also through public comment forms that were available at Hawthorne Station and the Redmond Transit Hub. All public comments received between 7/15 and 8/18, 2020 were sent electronically to committee members and interested parties prior to the 8/19 RPTAC meeting. The following summarized public comments were made during the meeting:

- Janet Gregor
 - Commute Options is a longtime partner of CET and values the vital role the organization plays with respect to the area's transit network. In support of CET's 2040 Transit Master Plan, CET does a remarkable job on a shoestring budget without a dedicated revenue stream. This plan will modernize the region's transit system to better meet population growth needs over a realistic time horizon. Switching from a central hub and spoke network to mobility hubs and smaller buses will make for a more streamlined and efficient bus system. In the short term, simple changes can be made to Hawthorne Station. This plan is an important next step in our region's transit future and I urge you to support it.
- Erin Foote-Morgan
 - Representing the Hawthorne Avenue Neighbors, this plan does not adequately support the growth of the Bend transit system, and should be amended before adoption. The core flaws relate to facilities, specifically Hawthorne Station. Hawthorne Station is too small to handle future growth and CET and the Hawthorne Neighbors both support mobility hubs. This plan does not follow through with this idea of mobility hubs. We say this because you should expect to see an analysis that links growth in transit with facilities that can support this growth; the plan outlines needed growth in transit services but with no new facilities required in Bend for at least 10 years, and gives CET 20 years to employ any new mobility hubs in the facilities plan. The plan says CET may retain Hawthorne Station as the region's primary transit center through 2040. One year ago CET was saying that this station was at capacity. If CET is not actually willing to move away from a Spoke and Hub model, then build a hub with adequate capacity in an appropriate location. This is an immediate need now and not a 10-20 years from now. It is this committee's job to ensure that CET has created a real plan for transit growth with clear capital commitments to support it, and this plan does not.
- Gregg Morris
 - Thanks to everyone who essentially lives and breathes this type of work. I do support this plan and I love the idea of mobility hubs, I do believe we need that kind of thing and I also believe that in 5 to 10 years we have no idea if we are going to stick to this spoke and hub model and have a main centralized location and we have no idea where the best place is going to be, so moving towards a mobility hub I think is a great idea. I think this Master Plan is quite an innovative roadmap for what we are trying to do here in Central Oregon. As we build more communities we need more mobility hubs and I really like that idea. I just want to again say thanks to everyone for putting their time in and developing this plan which I support not only as Board Chair of Commute Options, but as somebody who uses public transportation and somebody who hopes that his daughter will use it when it's time for her as well. So again, thanks a lot.
- Eric Lent
 - I work with a lot of local civic organizations focused on equity and access and also serve on the board of my local neighborhood association, The Old Farm District, in the SE of Bend. There is not much transit that reaches our neighborhood. We are looking at growth into the SE with the elbow and expansion of city limits here and we are very excited by all of the planning that's happening here, CET's Master Plan, Bend's

Transportation System Plan, and we understand this is going to take time. We've got a lot of priorities that we're interested in. We're looking at upgrading Parrell Rd. for example, and we would love that to happen sooner than later, but it's on the later end of the spectrum. As far as CET's Master Plan goes, we're very encouraged by what's in this plan. We can always ask for more, but this is really a step in the right direction as far as we're concerned and we're eager to see this kind of service model expand in the future and serve all parts of the city.

- Sid Snyder
 - I just wanted to say that I am in favor of adopting this transit plan the way it is written. Based on a number of the objections that I've heard to going forward with it the way it is right now, I disagree strongly with the notion that Hawthorne Station is the heart of the transit system. The heart of the transit system are the people that use it. I'm more interested in seeing a holistic solution to everything and a functioning system and I think this transit plan goes a long way towards doing it. I do agree that I would love to see mobility hubs come online more quickly to help relieve the congestion at Hawthorne Station. The problems there are real, I acknowledge that, but they should not hold up the adoption of this master plan.
- Carol Fulkerson
 - I just wanted to say that Central Oregon Coalition for Access (COCA) has worked with CET staff members and we have really appreciated CET's commitment to improving accessibility both on the buses and just in general. It makes such a huge difference for the disability community to be able to get around in town and accessibility is important.
- James Halliday
 - I just wanted to make the comment on the Park and Rides in Warm Springs, as there are two listed in the plan. One is the Administration Building (the Agency) and the other one is the Clinic. The Clinic address is listed but the Admin address is missing. I just wanted to make sure that the address got in there. I also wanted to make a comment on Tumalo because it's not mentioned in the plan and I just wanted to maybe have a blurb that Tumalo would get a bus stop in the next 5 years or so.
- Ann Marland
 - We have a lot of seniors in our area, and it's very difficult right now to get them from Sisters to the medical locations. What I am really interested in is Hawthorne Station and not making our seniors have to change buses to go to the medical facilities, which are very important but are hard for seniors to do. Also, I'm excited about midday service (which is in the plan) because seniors and people who are going to school don't have to wait for 5 hours before they come back to Sisters. I'm happy with those elements in the plan.
- Jordan Ohlde
 - I'm very supportive of this Transit Master Plan and if it wasn't for transit I wouldn't be able to get to work and to do the things that I need to do on a day-to-day basis. So I am very much in support of the way the Transit Master Plan is written.

Public Engagement Summary Overview – Derek Hofbauer

Mr. Hofbauer thanked committee members for the time they dedicated to provide input on this project. He also thanked the Hawthorne Avenue Neighbors for their involvement during the planning process and acknowledged the impacts that are being felt by neighbors and businesses adjacent to Hawthorne Station. Mr. Hofbauer then provided an overview of CET's outreach and public engagement efforts that were conducted over the course of the project. He noted that one Project Steering Committee (PSC) and seven local Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) were formed to review consultant memos, provide feedback, participate in discussions, and make recommendations to the Project Management Team. The PSC was merged with the existing RPTAC to provide increased public participation opportunities and engage RPTAC members during the planning process. The PSC and TACs included representation from people of color, people with disabilities, tribal members, low-income individuals and communities, transit riders and advocates, veterans, older adults, businesses, educational institutions, and public health agencies, as well as cities, counties, and partner organizations. Key metrics associated with CET's public engagement efforts are listed below and also included in the Draft Public Engagement Summary that was included in the meeting packet.

- 7 regional PSC meetings with diverse community representation
- 2 rounds of local TAC meetings with diverse community representation across 7 communities; 3 additional meetings focused on Bend transit initiatives
- 2 regional TAC meetings
- 68 committee members (26 women)
- Over 45 hours of meetings with PSC and TAC members to discuss transit needs, including Bend-specific topics such as mobility hubs and transit facilities
- 24,267 total reach through social media engagement
- 1,500 individuals contacted through nine separate E-newsletters
- 260 open house attendees across Central Oregon
- 237 completed surveys for feedback on goals, vision statements, and transit needs
- 26 total press releases/public notices to ensure public visibility
- 413 completed on-board customer surveys
- 8 local agency briefings for county and city staff across the region
- 26 operator surveys
- 119 total estimated participants in the Virtual Workshop, which includes an additional 39 transit riders that completed paper surveys on-board local Bend and regional bus routes
- Key outreach materials and communications were available in Spanish
- Promotional fliers shared with 72 partner organizations to encourage public input, with focused outreach to organizations representing underserved and Limited LEP populations
- 51 events/presentations to organizations including Let's Talk Diversity, Native Aspirations, Jefferson County Disability Coalition, Council on Aging, Central Oregon Coalition for Access, and KWSO – Warm Springs radio interviews

TMP Adoption Draft Revisions and Timelines – Derek Hofbauer

A list of major text revisions incorporated into the TMP Adoption Draft based on feedback from committee members and comments from the public are included below:

- The Executive Summary was enhanced to include public outreach efforts and chapter descriptions
- Multiple references were added throughout the document for moving from a spoke and hub system to a multi-centric model to lessen impacts at Hawthorne Station
- Multiple references were included for timelines on projects to be expedited depending on funding opportunities
- Added to Goal 1: “Desire to move from a hub and spoke model to a more multi-centric transportation system and explore the feasibility of relocating or decentralizing Hawthorne Station to allow for expanded services to allow for multimodal transportation services such as electric charging stations, new mobility services, and personal mobility device parking and storage.” (3.2)
- Equity was emphasized in Goals 2 and 3 (2.2)
- Added “Efficient connections to Hawthorne Station (or another Community Connector stop) at convenient times” under Bend Employment (5.2)
- Added “explore the use of alternative fuel vehicles” (5.1)
- Added “purchase smaller fleet” (5.1)
- Added “meet ADA needs and requirements and access in multiple languages and formats” (5.1, 5.2)
- Added public health and safety information (5.2)
- Continue hiring bilingual staff (5.2)
- Expand connections to other transportation options (5.2)
- Develop facilities that support ADA access (5.2)
- Changed “Korpine” to “South Downtown” throughout the document
- Included a list of currently funded safety, security and access improvements at Hawthorne Station (8.1)
- Building renovations to improve ADA accessibility (8.1)
- Improved building interior to increase property value (8.1)
- Redesign of parking lot to address ingress/egress safety concerns, allowing smaller buses to queue in lot (8.1)
- Increased security presence (8.1)
- Well lit and accessible bus stops, strengthen safety at stops (8.2)
- Reference to Mobility Hub Feasibility Study (9.0)
- CET to establish a Facilities Committee and work to develop a plan regarding facility and mobility hub implementation strategies (9.0)

The following milestones and timelines were also discussed with the group:

- Adoption of the 2040 Transit Master Plan allows projects to be referenced for funding in upcoming STIF applications
 - STIF Discretionary Projects are due November 2

- STIF Formula Projects are due February 1
- 5310, 5311, and STF projects are due March 1
- City of Bend Transportation Bond on the ballot in November
- Committee will be formed to explore facilities feasibility, funding, and implementation

Ms. Baney provided the following comments regarding the establishment of a Facilities Committee:

- The goal behind the Facilities Committee is to explore CET's space, maintenance, operational, and administration needs.
- Additional studies such as mobility hub feasibility study, if funded, are going to compliment this work.
- As CET moves away from the spoke and hub model, mobility hubs will complement the work that is focused on facilities and the future of the transfer station should align with the implementation of mobility hubs.
- The Facilities Committee will explore CET's needs for any type of a transfer facility, as well as the future for Hawthorne Station.
- Membership on this committee is yet to be determined and will involve key partners and stakeholders, as well as RPTAC and COIC Board members.
- Outcomes will be presented back to the RPTAC so committee members and partners are aware of the work that's going on to continue to fold all of this information into future planning projects to identify facility needs.

Mr. Halliday asked about a potential bus stop in Tumalo and if such a stop is going to be added at all or if it is too late. He also noted he did not see the name Tumalo in the plan. Mr. Hofbauer noted a roundabout is being planned in Tumalo and CET is tracking that project and is interested in developing a bus stop in Tumalo when that project is finished. Mrs. Breault indicated she is in conversations with ODOT regarding the roundabout designs and CET is exploring placing a stop on Cook Ave. for the northbound and the agency is currently discussing southbound service facilities and operations. Ms. Breault noted a bus stop in Tumalo will likely be included on Route 29. The stop isn't specifically outlined in the plan, but the project is moving forward. Mr. Halliday noted when you get off on Cook Ave. heading towards Sisters, there is a turn lane by the store in the middle, so it is possible to get back on the highway going towards Bend without having to clear traffic both ways by using the exit near the store. He noted he was happy to hear CET is working on the planning and design for this stop. Ms. Conley noted she completed a quick word search of the Draft Plan and found one reference to Tumalo with regard to changes to RT 29.

Dr. Conway asked a question about funding and mentioned funding seems to be a major barrier for providing this very important public good and service. He asked if the plan is approved as written, does it in anyway imply a lack of funding? There is a section about future funding options, but it's unclear whether it implies any reluctance or lack of eagerness to seek more definitive funding like the transit districts formed in Portland (Trimet) and Eugene (LTD) and explore more assertive attempts to become funded via a property tax or another type of tax. Ms. Breault indicated existing funding sources are noted in the plan, as well as a variety of tax revenues from other transit agencies that are similar to CET in terms of size and operations. During that process, CET engaged with partners and members of the public to make sure that proposed funding scenarios were not too aggressive. The plan also shows the amount of projects that could be implemented using those different types of revenue sources. As a

result, those funding scenarios are feasible options community members may vote on in the future. Ms. Breault added those funding scenarios don't hinder or limit any other future options, but instead describe what is applicable and appropriate to propose in a plan such as this.

Ms. Curley mentioned she serves on the Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) for the state. She noted when the Statewide Transportation Improvement Funds (STIF) started coming to transit providers, the issues with funding an agency like CET through a Council of Governments came to light because of the current language provided in the written rules for mass transit districts and qualified entities. This means CET has to go through 3 counties and the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs to make project lists and get those approved and then get reimbursed once project tasks are completed. The importance of having potential projects in this plan is crucial to getting county commissioners to understand what types of projects can be proposed and completed. If those projects are not in an adopted plan, they can't be referenced in the applications.

Mr. Hofbauer shared Mr. Bryant's letter to the committee and offered Mr. Bryant an opportunity to provide further information. Mr. Bryant noted he recognized the amount of work that went into this plan and asked what strategy was used to constrain the plan given uncertainties around funding. He also noted the importance of including a chapter that is more of an aspirational plan for a regional transit system, and whether that chapter could include an illustrative list of needs or desires for what the future transit system could look like for Central Oregon in 20-50 years from now with the goal of having transit become a much stronger component of the overall transportation system. Ms. Breault noted aspirational concepts are included in sections regarding transit technology; however, this technology is changing at such a rapid pace. She also mentioned community-specific pull out sections in the plan that allow each jurisdiction to take a portion of CET's plan and include that language into their Transportation System Plans and/or Comprehensive Plans to foster transit supportive development and growth that is consistent throughout our region. These efforts help ensure CET and local jurisdictions are not operating in silos. Ms. Breault also noted that some of the technology advancements and equipment that are currently being procured through STIF projects will allow CET to explore Mobility as a Service (MaaS) concepts such as real time information, customer facing applications, same-day reservations, microtransit, micromobility, and integration with other modes of transit. Those types of projects are currently being explored; however, they are not articulated in detail within this plan. She also noted STIF funding has allowed CET to branch out beyond public transit by distributing funds to organizations that specialize in certain aspects of transportation demand management. Lastly, she noted CET worked collaboratively with each of the municipalities to develop code language to make biking, pedestrian, and transit more attractive and explore land use and its connection to transit and transportation as a whole.

Mr. Snead noted that he appreciated the comments that have been made and reflected back to when the Bend Area Transit (BAT) was formed and the difficulty and the progress we've made thus far. He noted, from a state law perspective, it is fairly easy to complete this plan via the typical steps or requirements. He understands the funding constraints that exist today but also believes we should to lift the bar a little higher. He reflected on his experience in the Eugene Springfield area listening to various regional transportation planning commission meetings about Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and the need to replace a bridge, but without identified funding. He noted the difficulty of getting funding for projects if they are not written in plans. Mr. Snead indicated through various economic upturns and downturns, the State of Oregon, the federal government, and the municipalities found a way to fund those projects.

And now, when you look at that BRT or the bridge over the river, they are hallmark pieces of the transportation system and positively reflect those communities. Mr. Snead indicated he struggles with this plan because he doesn't believe that it is aspirational enough. He noted we have to provide transit for our at-risk populations and that should be expected as a minimum, but the technology that we're talking about is not the visionary component he wishes we had in the plan. He noted we've traveled a long way since BAT was formed and as such, it's perhaps the responsibility of the region to figure out another way to create a visionary guide. If we don't have that vision, we're never going to get to where we actually need to go. Mr. Snead indicated he understands that most streets in Central Oregon, except for maybe HWY 97, but possibly that too, are not sufficiently designed and constructed for transit services, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't plan for it. In summary, he noted this planning process is generally on the right track; however, the only shortcoming is the plan is not visionary enough and he worries CET could miss out on funding opportunities to accomplish some of our greater desires as a region.

Mr. Potwin commented that he is the new Executive Director of Commute Options, but not new to Commute Options, as he has worked for the organization for 13 years. He worked with Ms. Curley that entire time and appreciates her clarifying comments regarding funding streams. Mr. Potwin's wheelhouse is within school Transportation Demand Management work and he sees firsthand how the students of the region are going to be benefiting from this plan and the strategic planning that goes along with that. He offered support from Commute Options specifically for this 2040 Master Plan.

RPTAC member vote to recommend the adoption of the TMP by the COIC Board of Directors – Richard Ross

Prior to the vote, Chair Ross noted the comments from Bob Bryant and Nick Snead regarding a visionary "companion piece" to the TMP that would highlight new concepts and regional projects for which CET could potentially plan with unconstrained funding. The companion piece was identified as an additional component of the plan that is not part of the consultant's scope of work, and would be developed by CET staff in cooperation with RPTAC in the coming months. Chair Ross noted Eugene and Springfield developed a successful Bus Rapid Transit system that is nationally recognized now. Chair Ross entertained a motion to RPTAC members to recommend the plan's adoption to the COIC Board and noted the need for additional work by this committee to develop a visionary companion piece.

Chair Ross indicated a roll-call vote would be taken due to the large number of participants on the call. Per the newly adopted bylaws, both RPTAC alternates were allowed to vote in place of two RPTAC members who were not present during the meeting.

The motion to approve the recommendation of the 2040 Transit Master Plan Adoption Draft to the COIC Board with some additional follow-up work by CET staff and RPTAC members to develop an aspirational companion piece for the plan was made by Mr. Snead and seconded by Mr. Bryant. Each RPTAC member and the two alternates who were present during the meeting voted in favor of recommending the TMP for adoption by the COIC Board. Zero members voted no and no further discussion took place. The motion for advancing the 2040 Transit Master Plan Adoption Draft to the COIC Board of Directors for their consideration for adoption was unanimously passed by a quorum of RPTAC members.

Chair and Vice Chair Nomination Process – Derek Hofbauer

Mr. Hofbauer proposed a Chair and Vice Chair nomination process to committee members that included emailing nomination forms to RPTAC members in September. The nominations received will be reviewed and discussed by RPTAC members during the next meeting that will take place on October 21.

Next Steps – Derek Hofbauer, CET/COIC

- The next COIC Board of Directors public meeting is Thursday, September 3 from 5:30 – 7:00pm. For more information, visit the [COIC website](#).
- The next RPTAC meeting will take place virtually Wednesday, October 21 from 1:30 – 3:30pm.

Adjourn