From: Kim Roney <mskimroney@gmail.com>
Sent: 6/15/2018 7:58:21 AM
To: Adam Charnack <charnack@gmail.com>,Edward Johnson <ejohnson1869@gmail.com>,Calvin Allen <ca.allen1973@gmail.com>,Bruce Emory <emory22@charter.net>,Gary Ray <gary.hubert.ray@gmail.com>,Sabrah n'haRaven <wnchomeless@gmail.com>,West, Angi <angi.w
Cc: Elias Mathes <EMathes@ashevillenc.gov>,Janet GeorgeMurr <JGeorgeMurr@ashevillenc.gov>,Dianna Martinez <dmartinez@ashevillenc.gov>
Subject: TC Draft Notes for May 2018
Attachments: 15 May 2018 Minutes.docx.pdf

TC Members and Staff,

The draft minutes for the June Transit Committee meeting are attached and available in their entirety here:Â

Transit Committee ÂÂ ÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂ Regular Meeting
**Minutes - Final ÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂÂ

- Ely: The new UNCA/ABTECH didnâ€™t go by transit center.
- Calvin: Drew a similar route. If doing that, why not go through riverside instead of through town. If you do crosstown, you can pick up riverside easily.
- Dana: True, and thereâ€™s a lot of traffic in that area recently. If I wanted to go to Shakeys, Iâ€™d have to get off the bus and walk a mile. Thereâ€™s a lot of area that could utilize a bus stop.
- Ely: Itâ€™s a more circular route. Would have to work timing for an even longer, circuitous route.
- Calvin: Wouldnâ€™t have to go downtown, which would save time since Riverside Drive has no traffic except at 5 oâ€™clock.
- Bruce: Would have to take a bus away from Merrimon and S4.
- Calvin: Take the UNCA/AB TECH crosstown down depot street and riverside/broadway for backside of UNCA. Like by new belgium and roots hummus by 5-way intersection.
- Ely & Calvin converse details with map - UNCA to Riverside to ABTECH.
- Ely: Cutting out major population areas that the route serves in order to serve River Arts District, which has little population or employment.
- Bruce: Using this to serve both S4 and ABTECH.
- Sabrah: For timeline - if weâ€™re talking about year-one implementation, we still have option to make further refinements in future years.
- Bruce: The plan does include river arts route in later phase.
- Ely: More of the Southern portion.
- Kim: Since thereâ€™s so little activity, housing, and employment, have to note that weâ€™re spending a bazillion-million dollars there.
- Calvin: Plenty of employment within 5 minute walk to starline plastics plus 4-5 bars.
- Ely: Lose SFB service though.
- Kim: How does change in North-S4 crosstown route impact maintenance of SFB and Bartlett Arms?
- Ely: Future phase will include Lyman and Carrier Park, adding buses and revenue hours with flexibility to accommodate development and housing.
- Bruce: The I-26 Connector is going to wipe out some development on North side of Riverside Dr.
- Calvin: Confirm keeping one bus through SFB every 30 minutes.
- Ely: Will be 3 buses with half-hour headway.
- Calvin: I like that idea better.
- Kim: Including my support with Bruce and Calvin.
- Justin: Hear and add support as a fan as well.
- Sabrah: Iâ€™m not saying Iâ€™m a fan because itâ€™s hard to visualize without Remix software. Want to see timing.
- Bruce: Existing schedules for N1/N2 with additional service for existing route for S4.

- Emma/W5/Kenilworth updates:
  - Sabrah: No longer doing Emma/Merrimon route?
  - Ely: Still have W5, but will interline with S2. Will make S2 a one-way loop to service SSA and Kenilworth. Wouldnâ€™t add hospital on S2, but will still cover via Biltmore.
  - Bruce: Advantage of service every hour instead of every other hour.
  - Calvin: Would the timing be better if we ran the W5 the old way, where it used to go up Hazel Mill instead of going all the way down Patton to N. Louisiana?
  - LaShawn: Would cut off at least 7 minutes. Patton to Hazel Mill to Louisiana, would come back down Patton.
  - Ely Why was change made?
  - Calvin: Changed W5 with C route to go up Patton.
  - Kim: The sidewalk along Patton is a new addition since the change and much wider and more accessible, which may help with decreased service frequency along short stretch of Patton. Â
  - Bruce/Calvin: New apartments built along Hazel Mill.
  - Ely: Asking Justin to look at that one-way on the outbound with inbound being the same.
  - Justin: The stop at Patton and Louisiana is highest on the route, so would caution that the time savings arenâ€™t great enough.
  - Calvin: That stop would have 2 other buses to serve them.
  - Justin: Itâ€™s the outbound on the W5 that has the most use.
  - Kim: Is it within a Â¼ mile from the Hazel Mill stop to Patton shopping?
  - Tom T: Most riders from Emma are walking to Save-More and Kmart then riding up, which is why they are high ridership.
  - Bruce: This is the detail yaâ€™ll need to look at.
  - Ely: So far, my thinking is itâ€™s better to do that outbound on S2 to SSA to make that stop as direct as possible, going to Kenilworth on the inbound.

- Hawcreek / 170 / MAHEC / South updates:
  - Ely: Trifecta bus eliminated with this, so weâ€™d put the Haw Creek service on 170 inbound and outbound with service every other hour for 9 trips. The biggest inconvenience is to Black Mountain riders, but itâ€™s doable.
  - Ely: MAHEC will be eliminated in 2020, but talking about Mission and MAHEC setting up their own shuttle. They claim the service of 90 minutes doesnâ€™t work for them and has only 6 riders a day.
  - Kim: Confirm that Shiloh is still covered.
  - Ely: S6 would continue along Hendersonville and Long Shoals, picking up Biltmore Park inbound.
  - Dana: Saw future shuttle for Shiloah.
  - Ely: Other way to service that is flex service. Right now, showing same service with loop through West Haven. Weâ€™d service Biltmore Park in/outbound.
  - Dana: Itâ€™s generally on time and reliable. For a community with no sidewalks, having less service is not ideal.
  - Calvin: Confirming S6 meets up with 191. Plenty of job opportunities (Night Pro / CSK) that currently arenâ€™t serviced.
  - Justin: Going clockwise with loop due to controlled left-hand turns.
  - Ed: The other facility you were talking about with Mission/MAHEC shuttle iss Vanderbilt Park Drive, which would be very nice with the health services and offices there. Having just 6 riders for MAHEC is not as much of a burden for them to return service for.
  - Ely: Thereâ€™s a version of that in the plan for Vanderbilt. MAHEC shuttle was new information, but itâ€™s a lot better than 90 minute service we currently provide. Â
  - Amy: Add Minnie Jones and C3 to the list, which are just a block from the hospital. Can we make contact with employers about schedules? Theyâ€™re big employers but not many of them, so should be easy to ask about shift changes.
  - Dana: Support those additions.

- Additional Timing & Routing
  - Sabrah: These headways couldâ€™ve been a huge problem if Bruce hadnâ€™t caught it. Suggest double/triple checking the schedules to make sure weâ€™re not missing critical timing again.
  - Ely: Wasnâ€™t just missed...
  - Justin: Had to take that hit across one corridor for increased frequency balance across whole corridor. There was another option that wouldâ€™ve balance things a little better on Southbound trip, but wouldâ€™ve had overlapping Northbound trips. We wouldâ€™ve addressed that frequency issue with a future Merrimon route to rebalance. It was on the radar.
  - Kim: I just heard you say that you were aware of that, so to be super-clear: Are there are any other routes where the addition of frequency on the front end is different than the frequency on the back end?
  - Justin: Weâ€™ve got to revise all the schedules based on these changes weâ€™re discussing at the moment, but no, that was the one area where it was a major concern.
  - Bruce: There was one other case - The outer section of the E1, which currently has service in both directions, because they went with 20-minutes outbound, it has a 20-45 inbound. Itâ€™s not as bad as the 5-55 on Merrimon.
  - Justin: Even on the existing network, the W4/W5 has that issue where they leave downtown at the same time.Going to have to reshuffle things based on these changes to see where things fall.
  - Sabrah: That puts a different light on it - if I had known that the problem with the Merrimon headways was intentional with plan to resolve a few years later, I couldâ€™ve lived with that as a temporary fix. The 30-minute service on S4 is a show-stopper and didnâ€™t have a future resolution planned. Wondering if we really need to redo all the things we discussed today.
  - Kim: I think we do because of the huge impact on S4. Was concerned about the trifecta bus when we already have issues with OTP with interlining of 2 buses, while 3 is asking for a miracle. I appreciate the Kenilworth service, and see all the positives, including 30-minute on S4.
  - Bruce: Adding a 4th bus onto Merrimon may have even headways on one direction, but not in the other. Just saying - the difference wonâ€™t apply whether itâ€™s 3 or 4 buses.
  - Thomas: Nervous about dropping service to MAHEC, but if youâ€™re confident it will be covered by them, itâ€™s okay. Those 6 people riding probably canâ€™t get to health care without it. Confirm itâ€™s adequately covered?
  - Ed: As someone who rides that, the shelter where youâ€™re dropped off has a sign to call number for shuttle pickup. Adequately covered with multiple buses. Can take S3, and theyâ€™re spot on within 5 minutes with the shuttle.
  - Ely: Regular service every 15 minutes means not having to get picked up on Hendersonville, which should be easier. Signage explains the service.
  - Kim: Good point though, Thomas. Sometimes we forget that the 6 people who rely on things have no other option.
  - Ely: Hearing concern about Downtown Shuttles with hospital loop - thinking there was it was it is better to put those resources towards other routes. Showing removal of one downtown shuttle, but keeping one to provide key service with shorter downtown trips, which should help with over-crowding on routes. Key component to keeping service operating as it should.
  - Justin: Think that, depending on what happens with fares in the long term. Will help with short trips downtown and hopefully the hospital shuttles will help corridor. Downtown shuttle is for mobility.
  - Kim: For people who werenâ€™t in the room Monday morning - the conversation was, in my opinion, we could have 2 downtown shuttles that operate free and alleviate the burden of getting around downtown or we could push for moving towards higher frequency Eastbound along highest frequency routes, one of the routes keeping us from moving towards fare-free sooner. So do we set up for a full fare-free system within 5 years, or do we provide free service for some people downtown now? Personally, Iâ€™d like to see us move towards more frequency, which we know is a well-established way for us to increase ridership and mobility, addressing OTP for our riders along our most-ridden route then provide 2 free shuttles for downtown.
  - Ely: Weâ€™re not talking about doing it immediately, weâ€™re pushing it back because there are other priorities we want to push forward. Looking at 3-4 years backâ€¦
  - Vaidila: We have a comprehensive parking study, including looking at a downtown circulator, which happened in part with the parking study. The goal was to alleviate parking problems. The Downtown Commission is very interested in this and want circulator to be linked with parking to make a compelling argument to come close to downtown to park and feel like they can park just once to meet their needs. Wants above and beyond existing garages. Itâ€™s important to think about the parking situation in this context.
  - Kim: Iâ€™ve been attending the parking sub-committee for DTC the past couple months. They are very frustrated that downtown isnâ€™t getting the attention it deserves as the economic engine for the city, but it seems to me that the vibe is - are we going to have increased density, access, opportunities, and system-wide benefits for the whole city, or are we going to just move people around downtown?
  - Ely: Itâ€™s not either-or with this plan. Weâ€™re doing both. If youâ€™re looking at these improvements and saying weâ€™re just looking at downtownâ€¦
  - Kim: Oh, no no no - we keep having this conversation. Iâ€™ve been attending the TC/MMTC/parking meetings/Councilâ€¦ told weâ€™re going to do the circulator, then told itâ€™s off the table when there are complaints. Anyone else going to echo that concern?
  - Bruce: This circulator proposed in this plan isnâ€™t going to do what you said it is about satellite parking and alleviating the parking situation.
  - Vaidila: Heard the Commission is trying to find or identifying need for local, downtown parking above existing parking, so youâ€™re right.
  - Ely: Again, not wed to a design. Coordinating and able to make modifications to it. We have until 2023, and possibly bumping back a year. From our perspective, important to at least keep at least one of those circulators in this plan. Thatâ€™s not meant to stop fare free or anything like that, itâ€™s going to compliment that system. Another point, weâ€™re asking Justin to include on the phasing sheet - we want to include a row on here for fare changes. Iâ€™d like to incorporate into [timeline] fare changes to look at fare-free or increased fares. Big thing with fare-free: we donâ€™t have a good case study for another city. One we found was Green Bay, where they did a trial with fare free on weekends and they continue to do that. Would like to proposed that we do something similar. Showing that in year 1 for Saturday and Sunday for a full year to look at impacts. Will obviously we different than a weekday, but look for overcrowding on buses, OTP issues, etc. Biggest concern isnâ€™t lose of revenue, thatâ€™s something we can make up, but want to make sure that we donâ€™t leave people behind or have the buses constantly late. This kind of trial will give us the hard data to know where we need to plug another bus in or how to tweak OTP. The following year we would review that and go to Council for their specific guidance. Weâ€™d need their permission to do away with fares, and then by 2024, would be in position with higher-level frequency to support fare-free if we did go in that direction.
  - Sabrah: confirming duration of trail as one year.

- Ely: Would be year-round with data for all the seasons.
- Sabrah: Iâ€™m the biggest, most vocal opponent of the downtown circulator, so if we end up going fare-free first, I would have not objection to circulator. Even if that doesnâ€™t happen, after 2020, it will be hypothetical anyway.
- Kim: Thanks to quick response from consultants and staff for actually getting the data we do have about fare-free, and some sort of plan because I made the request specifically.
- Justin: Thanks for the positive feedback, always appreciated.
- Amy: Thereâ€™s a long list of communities in the U.S. doing fare-free. The faster we do it, the better off we are, because the more people we have on the buses, the more federal funding we are eligible for. The less time spent on collecting fares, the more positive impact on OTP, and supports equity of access, especially to jobs and resources. Could improve OTP, and fare-free should come on sooner rather than later. Itâ€™s a no-brainer and we have the money to do it today with the political will to move this forward.
- Ely: Itâ€™s entirely the discretion of Council, but my concern is being over capacity. If tomorrow they said weâ€™re going to do fare-free, starting next fiscal year, we could do that.
- Justin: Itâ€™s not just capacity of routes but the dwell time at every stop. In some other communities weâ€™re working in right now that have fare-free, theyâ€™ve overextended their system, havenâ€™t been able to satisfy ADA demands, and had to cut local service because the ridership on ADA is uncontrollably growing, so there are negatives. As much as I want to subsidize transit as much as roads, weâ€™re on the same page there, there are unintended consequences from capacity, OTP, and paratransit standpoints. Itâ€™s nuanced and weâ€™re trying to lay that out for you all.
- Ed: Not a zero-sum gain. The time you gain by losing fare box is offset by more frequent stops because of increased ridership. A route running on time with a fare system could be put behind by having more people ride.
- Kim: I agree, but we want more people riding the bus. If itâ€™s 28% or 58% increase or any numbers in the middle, thatâ€™s where we advocate with the County and ask them to back up their strong environmental policies with action thatâ€™s visible to the community, that impacts the entire city. Iâ€™m really worried about us privatizing our local hospital system, but if we have 10 million dollars in extra revenue, every major corridor in the city should have 15-minute frequency.
- Ed: Thatâ€™s perfectly fine, but I want to make sure Iâ€™m clear that jumping into something like this without planning is a really bad idea.
- Sabrah: As much as Iâ€™d like to have fare-free tomorrow, if weâ€™re making route changes, Iâ€™d rather test them with current ridership.
- Ely: This timeline could be advanced with additional funding and additional buses. Still think having the trial is a pragmatic approach. Itâ€™s a good problem to have, but if youâ€™re the person whoâ€™s being passed by when youâ€™re late to work, thatâ€™s not good.
- Thomas: Iâ€™m in favor of a plan and a trail, but itâ€™s amazing to me that every ciritque is that too many people would be on the bus. What weâ€™re saying, the ingress of that is that fare is a disincentive, to stop people from riding the bus. In regarding to OTP, theoretically, this is getting more people out of cars, which improves traffic times. Last point: partly related to my new job, but our office is on Charlotte St, not far from Downtown. We need documents from people all the time, and we hear that people canâ€™t bring them because they canâ€™t afford to take the bus. They donâ€™t live far, but are unable to walk or drive, and they donâ€™t have the dollar. Itâ€™s hard for me to imagine or believe, but thatâ€™s the reality for a lot of people. Just to push back a little bit, itâ€™s a real problem, but I donâ€™t think itâ€™s a problem that more people ride the bus.
- Angi: The notion of a trail in a bubble is it doesnâ€™t seem like you actually have a place to know what fare-free would change. Itâ€™s one thing for Green Bay to try fare-free on the weekends forever, which is not the needs of most of the riders. Perhaps you choose one day, but youâ€™re not reaching everyone. The point of trying it is to see if it works. Small increments donâ€™t provide implerical data.
- Kim: Appreciate what staff put together as a timeline, which shows improving OTP, increasing frequency on major corridors, and sets us up for success. That way, if we can do it in 1-3 years, like you said, accelerate timeline with flexibility, these are things we need anyway. We know that OTP is an issue, and we know that that we need frequency of routes. I think itâ€™s headed in the riht direction.
- Angi: With trying to add fare-free as a trial, itâ€™s not as effective as moving forward to see if the changes effect ridership.
- Kim: The fare consideration is in year 4, including increase in monthly passes from $20 to $35, and whether that would cause ridership to go up or down.
- Ely: Hear your point that weâ€™re not going to get as good of data on a Saturday, but the benefit will be not seeing to overcrowding. Could just go fare-free for 3 months system-wide, but worried about negative side of that.
- Dana: If weâ€™re thinking about weekend trials, confirming Sunday service on all routes. If itâ€™s getting to the point where a bus is regularly having OTP because it was so full, I hope we can have plan to build up to solve the issues. If we see that happening, hope we can predict an answer.
- Ed: That means putting in more buses, which donâ€™t pop out of thin air, including the time it takes to get a bus. My larger point - the last thing I want to see is for us to move into fare-free system and it break the system. Worst would be fare-free where nothing works.
- Kim: Pages 44-46 address a lot of your concerns including projects of which routes would have standing-room only, with the most likely routes being E1, S3, W1, and E2.
- Ed: Right, so if we implement tomorrow, I donâ€™t think we have the fleet to cover those.
- Kim: We donâ€™t. But if we took the 2 Downtown Circulator buses, which I thought were in year 1, and put them on the E1 and S3...
- Ely: If we arenâ€™t happy, we can take the trial out, advocate for full-system fare-free a month after itâ€™s passed, Â they can do that. Have to pick a date, push other things back, put buses on key routes, delay expansion, but there will be trade offs.
- Sabrah: Want to see language that this is a sample timeline with flexibility, not recommended. Want Council to understand they arenâ€™t beholden to these dates, but thereâ€™s structure.
- Group support of the timeline.
  - Bruce: Like this timeline, and can change later.
- Sabrah: Question about holiday service - Find it easier to give staff off Good Friday/Easter than Christmas and Thanksgiving.
  - Ely: Confirmed that Good Friday is no-longer an option.
  - Justin: Christmas and Thanksgiving with bare-bones coverage with annual service hour estimates.
  - LaShawn: Confirm driver request for Easter off.
  - Ely: Prefer to have holiday service.
- Calvin: Why are we going to use a full-size bus for a circulator? Smaller bus more efficient.
  - Dana: Brought that up 2 meetings ago. Heard 75% of the cost is the driver, but agree with you.
  - Ely: In the plan, showing full-size buses but could do other routes.
- Dana: Know we were considering service for South Slope, but tourists would be more likely to take small shuttle than full bus, seeming easier to navigate.
- Calvin: We petitioned the Council regarding signage for bus, and the only thing that kept Slidr out was the change of ordinance.

- Enka Candler Extension w/ Justin: Strong desire to extend service to Enka/Candler in year 1 - in order to do that, save every minute we can. Turn around still at less-than-ideal location of Porterâ€™s Cove, so we would not make that make that connection with the Warren Wilson crosstown. Do not recommend 2-way service on smokey park hwy because of limited access and railroad crossing. No sidewalk and no ridership generators. Just connecting to the Ingles would be a good generator, but nothing on the South side is good transit territory. If we want to make the commitment to extension, we do so with one-way loop in outer year. A lot of this stemmed from the long layover time we have planned at Goodwill park and ride, which was set aside to provide flexibility for Patton/Tunnel. That 6 minutes is more of an effort to pad the schedule, so weâ€™re thinking on the busiest times of day, that layover doesnâ€™t exist. So what weâ€™re showing: if weâ€™re extending to Enka/Candler, would take the run time up very close to the 2 hours we were using to complete the round-trip operating with 2 vehicles on hourly service. The entire 120-minute route would only have 6 minutes of layover. A lot of pressure on the operators to keep that thing moving. No layovers at the ends. Thereâ€™s even less time at the Downtown station. We really donâ€™t want to take this thing into Downtown, which was some of the feedback we got. Eventually will tie into crosstown station. Still have W1/W2 with South routes for transfers on-street. Options: 1) Could run routes to see how transfers work after trial; 2) could be extend to Enka/Candler then review OTP without Downtown transfer. Negates the impact of the crosstown; 3) could do both, but pushing luck with a long 29-mile route.
  - Ely: Down time is a paper-layover. Suggest phasing out - downtown transit center transfer.
  - Ed: 29 miles is a long way to have lots of little things happen.
  - Bruce: Go back to the slide with the times. I looked at your remix, and your run time showed 52 minutes. Combined that with E2 run time with Porterâ€™s Cove of 44 minutes, thatâ€™s a total of 96 minutes. If Iâ€™ve done my math, the layover time is 24 minutes.
  - Justin: Remix is a tool for visual sketching, but not reliable for scheduling and talking about concepts.
  - Sabrah: Just from Downtown to Goodwill is a long ride. Prefer to see Enka/Candler on separate route as soon as feasible.
  - Kim: Having spent a decent amount of time out there recently in someone elseâ€™s car, there are a lot of businesses, headed in Tunnel Rd. direction over there on Smokey Park. Thereâ€™s Home Depot, AB Tech, trailer park communities, Dollar Tree - weâ€™re talking about low-wage jobs.
    - Justin: Weâ€™re talking about servicing Monta Vista and Sandhill Rd, not the whole corridor.
    - Ely: Showing the bus would come down and do full loop. If youâ€™re going to go out there, go ahead and do a loop. Are you talking about the North side?
  - Calvin: Yeah, What about circling back by McDonaldsâ€¦ how much time would it be? If you couldnâ€™t thread a better time period.
    - Jacob: That might be what the trailblazer does. It does 2 routes out there.
    - Ely: Want to include housing. Not that much activity.
    - Calvin: (Conversation engaging map projections.) If you come back this way, and come back to town past McDonalds, could connect with trailblazer at Acton Circle.
    - Ely: Running out of time soon. Could play with route to see if thereâ€™s a better turn-around location. Key things: are we going to make that extension and are we going to try to do that and go through the ART station?
    - Bruce: If Remix time was wrong, then my assumption was wrong. So, given that, still make sense to keep the Goodwill terminal. However, I still would push to have cross-town routes deviate to the existing transit center. Use 6 minutes at transit center. Using layover at East terminal in year one doesnâ€™t make a whole lot of sense because thereâ€™s nothing to transfer to there. To start off, should have existing routes transfer at center.
    - Ely: Youâ€™re right. Wouldnâ€™t need to make additional facilities until additional crosstown routes. To be clear, wouldnâ€™t need to change the facility, just using existing bathrooms. Just adding stops.
    - Bruce: No shetlers?
    - Ely: Maybe, but not at the scale of the transit center.
    - Justin: Remember itâ€™s the concern about taking everything to transit center when we have other options. Most of the time, itâ€™d be a quick stop for a 2-3 minute restroom break.
    - Angi: Whatâ€™s the necessity of layover at transit center?
    - Kim: Just because the East and West have the highest ridership, doesnâ€™t mean itâ€™s all coming from East and West. People are connecting North and South, all over the City. If you make it so people have to come from their transfer across town, it will make it harder.
    - Ely: Wouldnâ€™t have to walk from here to ART station, would have to walk a block from Patton avenue to the ART station.
    - Angi: Yeah, I guess that was my thought.
    - Bruce: Facilities for weather and connectivity as well as schedule, which wouldnâ€™t be tied into meets on half-hour and hour.
    - Kim: Another thing I heard Bruce say, if weâ€™re going to phase later the N/S cross town, why not wait until that time to move the E/W crosstown out of the transit center.
    - Calvin: Could see how that could work, because if you think about it, if thereâ€™s only people having to walk for Southbound routes. They could get off at Pritchard Park to catch the N buses.
      - Justin: And the N1 if we have them interline with S4. Would just be the impact to W1/W2 and PVA where you would require a 1-block walking transfer, which is why itâ€™s still a good service to people trying to get through Downtown.
    - Ed: Hearing Bruce say to run things through transit center for time being, delay Enka with preference of having it run through transit center. I like that too.
    - Sabrah: I already told the consultants this - My recommendation was to let one of the E/W crosstown go through transit center. Donâ€™t see why itâ€™s all or nothing.
    - Ely: Part of that is itâ€™s more confusing.
    - Angi: Yeah.
    - Bruce: If someone wants to go out to Walmart, on the current plan, youâ€™d be catching the transit center on the half hour. Itâ€™s more straight forward to have everything running through the transit center.
    - Thomas: Bruce has convinced me of this on the confusion point. As someone who doesnâ€™t like to transfer, i donâ€™t mind having to deviate at the transit center. What I donâ€™t like is having to get off the bus and wonder if I missed my bus. If iâ€™m sitting in the same seat, I donâ€™t care.
    - Ed: This also give us a chance to look at OTP for cross towns, giving us change to more carefully consider Enka/Candler and deviations with data. I like options and assessment.
    - Justin: You have service on hour and half hour to Walmart.
    - Calvin: I thought Walmart was taken off?
    - Bruce: Any other destination other than Walmart, youâ€™d have to choose your destination of where to get on with the current plan.
    - Group confirmation Walmart is still on S5.

- Wrap-Up
  - Kim: This is the last TC-MMTC session before TMP goes to Council with the budget. Are we going to endorse today?
  - Ely: Yeah, weâ€™re looking for recommendation with changes weâ€™ve gone over. Could do same with MMTC, then incorporate final changes to go before council.
  - Bruce: Isnâ€™t related to the budget.
  - Ely: Just happens to be on the same day as the budget, but not related directly.
  - Tom T: In the last TMP, the N route didnâ€™t go to transit center. We got a lot of flack having to walk from Rankin to transit center for transfer. The E1/W3/4 will get flack.
    - Kim: Think we have to remember itâ€™s not everyone walking, itâ€™s also rolling. Not everyone has the ability to walk, so consider friends in wheelchairs.
    - Sabrah: Also, those happy to walk most days might not with weather consideration
  - Kim: Consideration motion. When it first came out, I was going to make a move to throw the thing in the trash. The consultants have been responsive and staff have worked overtime diligently. I feel heard, and I appreciate the TC who have participated in so many ways, from the beginning to the last minute. I feel like I can support with recommendations.
  - Ed: Confirm consensus on option 1.
  - Bruce: 2nd Kimâ€™s motion and add my thanks to Ely and consultants for turning around comments quickly from yesterday.

- Ely: These are in addition to other changes.
- Ed: Have endorsement with changes outline today.
- Thomas: So grateful to consultants and City staff. A great example of good government. We care a lot about these issues, and governmentâ€™s not usually this responsive. Weâ€™ll have a much better bus system because of it.
- Calvin: The Leicester route - confirming it still goes to Erwin.
    - Ely: Yes.
- Bruce: Do think weâ€™re talking about extension into the County. Need to keep as much leverage as possible. If we commit to making these extensions without County funding, we lose leverage.
- Sabrah: I think weâ€™ve been clear about this.
- Calvin: This is the time to push to get County residents to the Commissioner meetings to let them voice their opinion. Everybodyâ€™s coming here or to Council when they need to go to Commission. It looks better coming from them than us talking for them.
- Kim: Confirming PVA still has access to Ingles.
- Ed: Giving our approval to this plan with recommended changes.
    - Passes unanimously.

5:19 New Business

- Kim: suggest moving all other items to next meeting.
    - Ed: agreed.
- RFP for Next Bus w/ Ely: update that we have RFP out for contract that expires in October. Evaluation committee includes Thomas from TC and Vicky from Mountain Mobility. More updates next time.

5:20: TC Business

- April MMTC w/ Bruce: Reviewed TMP.

5:23 Public Comment: None

Adjourned 5:24. Next meeting: June 19th, 3:30pm in Municipal Building.

--
Kim Roney - Pronouns: She/Her/Hers
Piano Teacher
Asheville City Multi-Modal Transportation Commission & Transit Committee Member