# APS Multimodal Transportation & Student Safety Special Committee June 13, 2013 Minutes

<u>Attendees</u>: Kristin Haldeman, Jana Lynott, Tim Rosato, Ronna Weber, Eric Goodman, Jane S. Kim, Nancy Van Doren, Erik Maskelony, Penny Everline, Jack Owens, Gillian Burgess, Lauren Hassel John Chadwick (APS), Bob Laws (APS), Dennis Leach (County DOT)
Speakers: Diane Lambert & Jim Elliott, Toole Design Group (TDG)

**Guests:** Donna Owens

The meeting began shortly after 7pm. The Committee approved the evening's Agenda; minutes from the 6/5/13 meeting were not ready and would be ready for approval at the next meeting.

**Public Comment Period** – No comments.

## **APS Staff Update: John Chadwick**

## 1. SRTS Position

- The position is full-time and funded for one year.
- It will be housed in the APS Dept. of Instruction and will focus on assisting teachers and staff with SRTS programming and communication.
- If APS meets its goals for the program, funding could be renewed.
- In the next year, APS expects to hire a TDM coordinator staff person. APS is in the process of putting together a job description based on a template.
- The SRTS staff member will work with County DOT very closely and will attend MMTSSSC meetings.

#### 2. TDM Study

- This study will result in a living document that takes a long-term view of where APS wants to be with school transportation.
- The main goals: student safety at schools and reducing congestion around schools.
- Other goals are: reducing congestion on County streets and APS' carbon footprint; as well as enabling greater choice in transportation modes used to get to schools.
- The County also required that APS conduct a TDM study as a condition of reducing parking requirements where new APS construction is occurring.
- A systemwide TDM plan will have HR, transportation and budget implications.
- APS anticipates that the Board will adopt a new TDM policy next year.
- Overall plan will include a framework to guide specific projects, as well as plans for each school.
- Diane Lambert, TDG Project Manager, gave a presentation outlining the specific tasks outline in the TDM scope of work. (*The presentation is available on-line on the MMTSSSC webpage with* other June 13 meeting materials.) One note on peer review, TDG has been unable to find student-level TDM programs, so the peer review piece of the study will focus on staff travel.

#### Committee Comments on presentation:

• Add parents and visitors to the trip-maker categories to be studied

- Differentiate between student drivers and parent drop-offs
- The cost/benefit analysis should recognize that reducing costs for APS in some areas may shift those costs to the County.
- Implications of choice schools, boundary changes and admissions policies should be studied. \*Mr. Chadwick noted that the recently announced (at 6/6/13 SB meeting) Superintendent's "Blue Ribbon Panel" will look at rationalizing the choice program and will be developing site selection criteria for new schools. They'll begin with elementary, then move the middle and high schools.
  - The APS project team for the TDM study includes: transportation, facilities and instruction.
  - Ms. Van Doren asked if APS is predicating the TDM plan on not driving big yellow school buses? Mr. Chadwick replied, no it is not.
  - This effort should be primarily about data collection and getting the information APS needs to make sound transportation decisions.

The final scope will be available in mid-July. Survey administration will take place in late Sept/ Oct. The Committee will have time to discuss the questions with the Consultant.

Jim Elliott (TDG) gave a quick overview of the McKinley SRTS survey process (presentation available on MMTSSSC webpage).

## **Committee Comments on presentation:**

- Will the TDM study conduct safety assessments around schools? No. The County is forming an
  internal review team but does not currently have the capacity to conduct a review at all
  schools. As with the McKinley example, some safety evaluations will be conducted in the areas
  immediately surrounding schools. The TDG studies are producing lists of safety related projects
  and the County is trying to prioritize them through the CIP.
- Mr. Chadwick noted that the SRTS position will serve as a point of contact for parents to report safety issues; they will then be reported to the County DOT.
- The County needs to have a mechanism for parents to report safety issues to the County DOT.

#### **Report Development**

Regarding the section on APS and County collaboration, Mr. Leach noted that the County is offering its assistance in many areas, but has no one staff person dedicated to school issues. In addition, at times, there is no APS counterpart available to work on certain issues with County staff. It is a resource issue on both sides.

Each voting Committee member in attendance was polled as to their edits to and approval of the version of the report posted on June 11, 2013. During this process, several edits to the latest draft were suggested:

Mr. Goodman requested that additional language to the 'active transportation section' be
included to address incorporating opportunities for active transportation in the bus stop siting
criteria. Committee members felt this required more discussion, so should be addressed more
as a next step.

- Additional language regarding health benefits of active transportation, which had been
  included in earlier drafts, would be supplied by Mr. Rosato. The committee agreed it should be
  included.
- Ms. Van Doren would supply a definition of 'school travel plans.' The committee agreed it should be included.
- Language from an earlier draft of the document regarding the RFID roll-out would be added back into the report. (Requested by Mr. Maskelony) The committee agreed it should be included.
- Language from an earlier draft of the document, that was previously voted on by the committee, regarding the preservation of open space as part of new school construction would be added back into the report. (Requested by Ms. Lynott) The committee agreed it should be included.
- It was determined that the 'next steps' section included a reference that recommendations be institutionalized at the operational level. (Per Ms. Hassel) The committee agreed it should be included.

Ms Burgess moved to adopt the report with the edits described above. Mr. Maskelony seconded the motion. The Committee then voted to approve the version of the document including the edits agreed upon above.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50pm.