



cascades east transit	TIME 1:30	SUBJECT Welcome and Introductions	LEAD PRESENTER Andrea Breault COIC	GUIDANCE REQUESTED
Meeting Agenda	1:35	Public Comment	Derek Hofbauer COIC	
	1:40	CET Updates	Derek Hofbauer COIC	Confirm Understanding, Questions for Clarification
	1:50	RPTAC Meeting Minutes	Richard Ross RPTAC Chair	Review and approval of August 20, 2019 RPTAC Meeting Minutes; Reflecting on member comments
	1:55	Project Status and Schedule	Susie Wright Kittelson & Associates	Confirm Understanding, Questions for Clarification, Reflect on member comments/input from the 8/19 meeting
	2:05	Mobility Services Overview	Susie Wright Kittelson & Associates	- Do you have comments on the example mobility hubs from other cities?
				 Do you have questions about the microtransit and micromobility overviews?
	2:25	Fixed-Route Transit Network		- Do you have comments on the recommended and candidate corridors?
			Susie Wright Kittelson & Associates	 Do you have comments on the fixed-route service alternatives proposed for evaluation or others we should consider?
				 Do you have comments on the transit center options?
	3:00	Mobility Hub Types and Strategy	Susie Wright Kittelson & Associates	- Do you have comments on the mobility hub types and typical characteristics?
				- Do you have comments on the draft mobility hub strategy map and NE Bend
				case study?
	3:30	Next Steps/Adjourn	Andrea COIC	



































Ridership and Operating Costs for General Public Demand Response Services (Table 1, Pg. 8)







Primary Transit Network	
The concept of primary transit corridors (introduced in the	
2012 Bend Transit Plan) identifies the roadway segments that are most significant for transit.	
Fixed-Route Transit	
 A mechanism to coordinate transit and land use to achieve land use characteristics that can support high level of transit service along Bend's most important arterial transit corridors. Securing a commitment from the transit provider (CET) Influencing the City's zoning and development policies Providing direction to City engineers and planners about where street rights-of-way should be designed and managed Encouraging dense and/or transit intensive land uses to locate on primary corridors 	

















Recommended Primary Transit Network

Fixed-Route	
Transit	
Network	
Analysis	

Corridor	Population Density [1]		Low-Income Population Density [2]	Employment Density [3]		Combined Population and Employment Density	
	2010	2040	2017	2010	2040	2010	2040
Definite							
Franklin Avenue	3.5	7.5	1.2	11.4	16.3	15.0	23.8
OSU Area (Simpson/Century/Colorado	0.9	10.8	0.4	6.0	10.9	6.9	21.7
Wall/Bond Streets	3.8	6.3	1.1	9.7	14.3	13.4	20.6
Greenwood Avenue	3.7	7.0	1.8	7.5	10.2	11.3	17.1
27 th Street	4.8	8.8	1.5	4.5	6.6	9.3	15.4
Newport Avenue	5.7	7.9	1.5	5.2	7.1	10.8	15.0
South 3 rd Street	3.8	7.0	1.9	4.5	6.9	8.3	13.9
North 3 rd Street	1.6	4.2	0.9	6.0	9.4	7.6	13.6

Recommended Primary Transit Network Classifications and Corridor Characteristics (Density – per Acre) (Table 2, Pg. 21)





















Fixed-Route Transit Network

- Do you have comments on the recommended and candidate corridors?
- Do you have comments on the fixed-route service alternatives proposed for evaluation or others we should consider?
- Do you have comments on the transit center options?

44



cet cascades east transit

Mobility Hub Types and Strategy

Additional Fixed-Route Service Options

Applications of Mobility Hubs

- Transit Centers
- Secondary Transit Hubs
- Major Transit Stops
- Park and Ride Facilities

Applications of Microtransit

Could be considered an alternative to fixed-route transit service for lower-density areas/lower demand times of day

Applications of Micromobility

 Could be considered for low-density areas within one mile of a fixed route stop (including a neighborhood mobility hub) to increase the access area for a transit route











cascades east transit

Conceptual Costs and Scenario Evaluation Measures

Mobility Hub Types and Strategy	Service Areas Considered and Evaluation Measures	1. Fixed-Route Extension	2. Fixed-Route Extension with Deviations	3. Microtransit / Shuttle Feeder to Secondary Transit Hub	4a. Core (non- Neighborhood) Routes	4b. Core (non- Neighborhood) Routes with Bicycle Pedestrian Enhancements, Mobility Hubs, and Micromobility	
	Assumptions	 13 hours per day, H \$100 per service hc Productivity of 7-10 hour (similar to low routes) 	ourly Frequency ur (similar to CEF) riders per service ss1-performing CET	 Up to 13 hours per day, on- demand \$20 per service hour (similar to RideBend) Range of 1 to 2 vehicles Productivity of 3 to 5 passengers per service hour 	 13 hours per day, 30 minute frequency (could disv any between peak and off-peak) \$100 per service hour (similar to CET) Productivity of 10 riders per service hour (similar to lowest- performing CET routes) 	 Same as 4a but with enhanced bike/ped connections, mobility hubs and micromobility 	
	Transit Access: # of Residents (2017)	1,800	2,000	4,000	2,000	3,500	
	Transit Access: # of Jobs (2017)	400	45	1,000	600	850	
	Low-Income Residents (200% of Poverty, 2017)	100	150	300	150	250	
	Annual Operating Cost	\$85,000 (extension)	\$120,000 (extension)	\$100,000 to \$200,000	\$450,000	\$450,000	
	One-Time Capital Cost	Existing Fleet or \$50,000 to \$100,000 for a new bus		\$50,000 to \$100,000 for 1 to 2 Existing Fleet and \$ vehicles		100,000+ for a new bus	
	Potential Annual Riders	6,000 - 8,000	8,000 - 10,000	6,000 to 20,000	Up to 40,000	Up to 70,000	
	% of local trips from NE Bend travel demand model zone to/from/within Bend	0.4% to 0.5%	0.5% to 0.7%	0.5% to 1.3%	2.8%	4.4%	
	Operating Cost per Rider	\$10 to \$14	\$10 to \$14	\$10 to \$16	\$10	\$6	
Service Options, NE Bend, Order-of- Magnitude Est. (Table 8, Pg. 43)	Bicycle/Pedestrian Connectivity Enhancements	Similar needs (described above) for all scenarios for the major roadways to provide access to transi stops				Bike/ped access enhancements focused on key stops and mobility hubs)	







