
**TPB CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONTHLY REPORT**

June 21, 2017

Jeremy Martin, Chairman

At its June meeting, the CAC discussed how it can best weigh in on the work of the Long-Range Plan Task Force. The committee also received an update and provided input on the TPB's public opinion survey and outreach activities related to the TPB's 2018 long-range transportation plan.

UPDATE ON PLANNED PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE 2018 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Ben Hampton of TPB staff reminded the committee that this summer the TPB will be conducting a public opinion survey on regional transportation challenges. He emphasized that in past meetings the CAC members provided suggestions regarding outreach that have been very useful in developing the current plan of activities related to the survey.

Mr. Hampton said the survey will be conducted both with a controlled sample that will statistically reflect the region's residents and as a public survey that will be open to anyone who wants to take it. He explained that the survey will use the MetroQuest software, which is visually engaging and has been widely used by a variety of planning agencies, including the TPB. For the open survey, the TPB will be sending out teams of intercept survey takers to locations throughout the region and will conducting digital outreach to increase the number of responses. In his presentation, Mr. Hampton also unveiled the plan's name, *Visualize 2045*, and new branding for the plan.

Member comments and questions included the following points:

- ***Suggestions for outreach locations and approaches.*** Committee members provided feedback on community events throughout the region and offered suggestions about where outreach would be effective. CAC members also volunteered to be ambassadors for the long-range plan outreach. They agreed to spread the word about the survey at community meetings, through email, social media, newsletters and at events. To help them with their efforts, staff said they would provide CAC members with postcards and digital copy describing the survey, which they could distribute widely.
- ***What is the "end game" for this survey research?*** Members asked how the input from the survey would be used. Staff said the survey is designed generally to "take the pulse of the region" on attitudes, which will provide general context for the decisions reflected in the long-range plan. It would specifically be used to provide background information in the Call for Projects document, which will be released later this fall and in the final long-range plan document, which will be released in 2018. The survey findings will also provide questions to further explore in focus groups or forums that are tentatively planned for the fall and winter.
- ***It is important not to raise expectations.*** Members cautioned that the TPB and staff should be careful not to create the impression that by taking the survey, participants are somehow "voting" on projects or on a specific policy direction.

LONG-RANGE PLAN TASK FORCE DISCUSSION

Lyn Erickson provided an update about the work of the Long-Range Plan Task Force. She explained how the task force has consolidated and simplified the large list of bundles that include projects, policies, and programs. After Ms. Erickson's presentation, the committee discussed how they should convey their thoughts and opinions about their preferred bundles. The committee decided to provide their input to the CAC Chairman and to Emmet Tydings, the CAC representative on the task force.

Member comments and questions included the following points:

- ***Simplified bundles are an improvement.*** Committee members said that on first glance, the new list of bundles, which was consolidated and more clearly thematic, was much easier to understand than the much longer earlier list.
- ***General confusion about the process for selecting bundles for analysis.*** Members expressed a sense of confusion about how the process for identifying bundles for analysis is supposed to work. Some wondered whether inadvertent consequences might result from the complicated nature of the process. One member suggested that highway projects could be favored. Others discussed whether additional funding for Metro should or would be assumed in the analysis baseline.
- ***Questions about the content and purpose of the study's final products.*** Members said it was difficult to visualize the specific characteristics of the final product (e.g., How many individual initiatives will be endorsed? How specific will they be?). Members also suggested the ultimate purpose of the study's process was still not clear. One member observed that the analysis would essentially provide new data points. But it was not clear how that new information would be useful and how/whether it will generate consensus about what should be funded.
- ***"Where's the sizzle?"*** Some members said they had hoped the study would galvanize support for key projects that would make a real difference in the future of the region. They expressed concern that the task force's work did not seem to be heading in that direction.

OTHER DISCUSSION

- Lyn Erickson, Plan Development & Program Coordination Director, reviewed the June TPB agenda.

ATTENDEES

MEMBERS PRESENT	ALTERNATES	TPB STAFF AND GUESTS
Jeremy Martin, Chairman	Evan Papp	Lyn Erickson, staff
Emmet Tydings	Jessica Smith	Abigail Zenner, staff
Jeffery Parnes	Ronit Dancis	Ben Hampton, staff
Katherine Kortum	Paul Angelone	John Swanson, staff
Nancy Abeles		David Murphy
Robyn Jackson		Bill Orleans
Meredith Howell		
Rob Jackson		

POLL ON LONG-RANGE PLAN TASK FORCE BUNDLES

After the meeting, CAC members were polled on the 14 bundles prepared for the Long-Range-Plan Task-Force. 16 CAC members voted. To avoid confusion resulting from the complex rules, CAC members were simply asked to express their support or opposition to the 14 bundles on a 5-point scale, where 1 was strong support and 5 was strong opposition.

The top 5 bundles based on average votes were

- #1 R4. Metrorail Expansion – Stage 1
- #2 R6. Circumferential Light Rail System
- #3 R5. Metrorail Expansion – Stage 2
- #4 R3. Expanded Commuter Rail System
- #5 (tie) R2. Regional Rapid Bus System and Arterial Transit
R10. Increase Accessibility – Stage 2: Support Underserved Communities

The bottom 5 bundles were (from the most opposed)

- #14 R1. Regional Express Travel Network
- #13 R12. Shared Mobility Focus
- #12 R13. Increase Price of Driving
- #11 R14. Cordon Pricing
- #10 R8. Technology and Design Improvements

Several bundles were especially controversial, drawing both significant support and significant opposition. The most controversial proposals were:

- R7. Cross-Region Connection/Relieve Regional Congestion Hotspots (7 supported, 6 opposed)
- R13. Increase Price of Driving (8 supported, 5 opposed)
- R14. Cordon Pricing (7 in favor, 5 opposed)

Details LRP-TF Poll results

	Support	Oppose	Average vote	Rank	Strongly support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly oppose
R1. Regional Express Travel Network	6	4	3.1	14	2	4	6	2	2
R2. Regional Rapid Bus System and Arterial Transit	13	0	1.9	5	6	7	3	0	0
R3. Expanded Commuter Rail System	14	0	1.7	4	5	9	2	0	0
R4. Metrorail Expansion – Stage 1	16	0	1.3	1	10	6	0	0	0
R5. Metrorail Expansion – Stage 2	14	1	1.6	3	7	7	1	1	0
R6. Circumferential Light Rail System	11	2	1.6	2	6	5	2	1	1
R7. Cross-Region Connection/Relieve Regional Congestion Hotspots	7	6	2.5	9	5	2	3	3	3
R8. Technology and Design Improvements	7	1	2.5	10	4	3	8	1	0
R9. Increase Accessibility – Stage 1: Optimize Land-Use/Regional Balance	10	2	2.1	7	7	3	4	2	0
R10. Increase Accessibility – Stage 2: Support Underserved Communities	12	0	1.9	5	7	5	4	0	0
R11. Travel Demand Management	10	1	2.4	8	3	7	5	1	0
R12. Shared Mobility Focus	8	2	2.8	13	2	6	6	2	0
R13. Increase Price of Driving	8	5	2.7	12	3	5	3	1	4
R14. Cordon Pricing	7	5	2.6	11	3	4	4	2	3