

**Regional Mass Transit Study Advisory Committee Meeting  
Richmond Regional Planning District Commission  
June 11, 2007**

**MEETING ATTENDEES**

Lee Yolton - Richmond Regional Planning District Commission  
Dan Lysy - Richmond Regional Planning District Commission  
Archita Rajbhandary - Richmond Regional Planning District Commission  
Viktoria Badger – City of Richmond  
Lawrence Hagin – GRTC Transit System  
George Homewood – New Kent County  
Liz McAdory – VDOT  
David Williams – Powhatan County  
Scott Clark – GRTC Transit System  
Barbara Smith – Chesterfield County  
Jin Lee – Richmond Regional Planning District Commission  
Barbara Nelson - Richmond Regional Planning District Commission  
William Britton – Charles City County  
Tom Coleman – Goochland County  
Roy Bryant – NAACP  
Todd Eure – Henrico County  
Kelly Hickok – Resources for Independent Living  
Lloyd Vye – RABA  
John Zeuger – VCN  
Frank Spielberg – VHB (HNTB Consultant Team)  
Matthew Huston – HNTB (HNTB Consultant Team)  
Ross Burton – HNTB (HNTB Consultant Team)

The last page of the meeting minutes includes the sign-in sheet.

**MEETING MINUTES**

The Consultant Team gave a presentation regarding the items covered in Technical Memorandum #1: Area Development and Service Demand. The following sections summarize the items discussed during the meeting.

**Demographic Data and Forecasts**

1. Mr. Spielberg presented demographic data for the study area. He addressed the difference between the “official” forecast and the update forecast based upon feedback. Absolute population change is more substantial than density change. The following years were considered: 2006, 2016 and 2031.
2. In response to questions regarding the use of income in demand modeling Mr. Spielberg stated that:
  - Income better predicts transit demand than auto ownership
  - Density is an even better predictor of being able to support transit

**Review of Recent Transportation Studies**

1. Mr. Spielberg presented findings from the review by jurisdiction.
2. Ms. Badger suggested linking downtown Richmond to other downtown areas and making bus-to-rail (and *vice versa*) seamless at the downtown Main Street Station.
3. Mr. Lysy stated that the GRTC Streetcar Study is important
4. Mr. Spielberg reported the Richmond Rail Feasibility highlighted four corridors.
5. Regarding the transportation disadvantaged, Mr. Spielberg emphasized ADA requirements. The population change for these groups doesn’t get at a trip generation, but estimates can be made.

Approximately 16,000 daily trips requiring specialized service (not fixed route) are estimated for the region. Mr. Spielberg suggested from a land-use perspective that social services should be located close to transit.

6. Ms. Badger clarified that the trip estimate for the transport disadvantaged was region wide and that these will have to be served by specialized services not fixed route.
7. Mr. Bryant asked how do the low income make trips? Mr. Spielberg stated that the information came from census and the PDC survey. Mr. Lysy stated that the surveys had not been conducted recently and there would be an update in 2007. Mr. Bryant stated he would like to see more emphasis on serving low income people. Mr. Lysy reiterated the needs assessment was conducted focusing on low income populations.
8. Mr. Zeuger asked whether the routes for rural low income people would be fixed or flexible. Mr. Spielberg stated they would likely be flexible.

### **Review of Land Use Plans**

1. Mr. Burton presented findings from the review of land use plans and determination of transit generators.
2. Ms. Badger stated that there is a potential transit generator on Rockets Landing.
3. Mr. Eure said the Route 5 corridor should be shown as potential not existing and should be included in the Central Richmond map
4. Ms. Hickok asked about multi family apartment buildings. Mr. Burton stated that these are included in the mixed use areas
5. Mr. Vye commented on Table 6 referring to the following additional generators:
  - Mead Westvaco
  - New Federal Courthouse
  - Specific government offices
  - Belvedere corridor
  - New Market petroleum lab
  - Philip Morris HQ
  - Philip Morris R&D
  - Innsbrook (in Henrico County)
  -
6. GRTC asked whether VHB were using the same methodology in the COA as HNTB is in this study.
7. Mr. Zeuger suggested that high density projects would grow faster if transit is provided.

### **Items Outstanding, Schedule, Next Steps and General Questions**

1. Mr. Huston described the items outstanding.
2. Mr. Spielberg explained the schedule for the travel demand forecasting:
  - June 14 – VDOT to give regional model outputs for the planned network
  - Two weeks later spider diagram completed. This shows an abstraction of demand independent of the road network.
  - July 20 – alternatives provided to VDOT
  - September – likely date for alternative results from the regional model

Mr. Lysy: Would the alternatives be just GRTC (bus) or multimodal. Mr. Spielberg indicated multimodal.

3. Mr. Spielberg indicated that in the first stage jurisdictional policies should be set aside. The SAC needs to give guidance on how policies (such as funding participation) should be taken into consideration.
4. Mr. Lysy asked if some alternatives would be excluded based on the study team's assessment. He also stated that it seems early in the process to look at alternatives. Mr. Spielberg stated it was necessary to try to keep to schedule and that areas for fixed route service are more conceptual.
5. Mr. Zeuger wondered what the environmental impact of transit is; what impact would gas prices have on demand in the future and what Federal requirements are there to push transit?

6. Mr. Spielberg said the study would look at the effects of current policies on the successful provision of transit and how those policies might be changed to better support transit.
7. Ms. Badger asked where fertile ground for transit is.
8. Mr. Spielberg: Based on the current plan some areas would be appropriate for transit service, but on the TAZ level very few may be identified. On the specific project level or generator level other potential service areas may show up.
9. Mr. Zeuger suggested that the study team look at both gross numbers and densities. Jurisdictions need to look at both roads and transit in their plans. Individual jurisdiction plans have consequences for the region because the region shares the same funding pots as well as the same air and other natural resources.
10. Mr. Yolton pointed out that if transit can provide travel time savings then choice riders may emerge. This will help identify transit demand. Mr. Spielberg said that the base travel demand forecast for 2031 is expected from VDOT this month. This will help to identify anticipated congested corridors and may point to where park-and-ride lots could be located with frequent express bus service.
11. Ms. Badger asked what the travel demand is based on. Mr. Spielberg replied RRPDC 2031 forecasts. Mr. Lysy stated that socioeconomic forecasts have been updated.
12. Ms. Badger asked for clarification on the spider diagram that was to be produced. Mr. Spielberg said that it was a diagram that showed lines connecting areas where a high number of trip interchanges are expected. The lines do not follow the existing transportation network, but rather are straight lines between the generating and attracting zones. It is also unconstrained in terms of capacity.
13. Mr. Vye said that parking costs are a demand driver. The stop locations are critical to encouraging transit use.
14. Mr. Lysy stated that the GRTC user/ nonuser survey (telephone) more general – not detailed by site.
15. Mr. Homewood believes that the study should look at the full extent of the jurisdictions not just the parts of the jurisdictions within MPO boundaries. The area outside of MPO is the area of concentrated transportation disadvantaged populations.
16. Mr. Spielberg stated that the percent transportation disadvantaged came from the census jurisdiction-wide. He applied the forecast to TAZs within MPO to obtain the numbers of trips by transportation disadvantages persons. He said that typically non-urbanized areas are served by demand responsive service. The study would quantify the general level of service and general costs for these areas. Mr. Homewood reiterated that the study does not examine only fixed route service.
17. GRTC asked what geographic limits were put on the transit generators. Mr. Burton stated no boundary was provided and that entire jurisdictions are included.
18. Mr. Homewood stated that the Route 33 Corridor had been provided as a generator. He wants to see maps extend to the limits of jurisdiction, not just in MPO boundary. He noted that rural poverty is the hardest to address, because transportation disadvantage is so hard to overcome.
19. Mr. Lysy said that the human services coordinated plan is being developed both statewide and for the tri-cities area. He recently held a meeting between DRPT and PDC staff. The regional plan covers the whole PDC area. Information is being mapped now and eastern New Kent County is jumping out as an area with particular needs. This information will be provided to the study team.
20. Ms. Badger asked if the study was looking at 2031 only or also 2016 as well. Mr. Spielberg said that the concepts will be based on 2031 then the study team will step back and see what is appropriate for 2016.
21. Ms. Badger said that near term and long term plans would be helpful. She asked if the study would provide development recommendations for identified corridors, and ideas on how not to preclude development patterns that help transit. Mr. Spielberg stated that these points would be addressed in Tech Memo #2 including developer guides to support transit services.
22. There was general discussion of what to cover in the upcoming meetings. There was discussion whether to have another SAC meeting on July 13. Mr. Yolton said the PDC is moving offices June 28 – 29 and that it will take time after that for them to get settled. GRTC offered to host the next meeting, rather than having it at the PDC. Mr. Lysy said July 13 may be difficult to achieve from a staffing standpoint. A meeting on July 31 for the SAC in the morning and the CTAC and EDAC in the afternoon has been on the calendar for some time. It was agreed that the consultant would propose a SAC meeting in the July 13 timeframe to replace the July 31 meeting. At this

new meeting the group would discuss Tech Memo #2 (which would be distributed a week in advance) as well as review preliminary transit corridor concepts that will be fed into VDOT's regional travel demand forecasting model.

23. There was discussion of the upcoming public meeting and how to inform the public about this study. There was discussion about posting information to the PDC's Web site, keeping mind it will be down during the move. Other jurisdictions can link to the PDC's site from their own Web sites.
24. Mr. Lysy requested a report on the GRTC/PAT merger. The GRTC representative said that the merger study concluded early on that the merger would be infeasible due to labor rate differences across the broader region and that no further study would be required.