

APS Multimodal Transportation & Student Safety Committee
March 5, 2014
Swanson MS Library

Attendees: Kristin Haldeman, Lauren Hassel, Ronna Weber, Jane Kim-Guthrie, Eric Goodman, Jack Owens, Gillian Burgess, Tim Rosato (by phone), **APS:** Scott Prisco, Kyle Lukacs

Absent: Aja Sae-Kung, Nancy Van Doren, Erik Maskelony, Jana Lynott; Dennis Leach – County DOT

The Committee first observed a moment of silence for the Nottingham parent killed the previous month.

Agenda approved; 2/19 minutes approved with discussed edits

Public Comment: No in-person public comment; Review of emails sent to MMTSSSC@yahoo.com

- 1) School buses parking in bike lanes: The Committee requested that these issues be brought to Bob Laws' attention and that bus driver training include information about how to safely operate with bicycles – including where to park when bike lanes are present, and how that training translates when operating in other jurisdictions for special travel, especially the District of Columbia, where bike lanes are more prevalent.
- 2) Nottingham accident: The Committee discussed the need to conduct safety evaluations at each school to include the transportation environment (e.g., speed; parking conditions). With Nottingham in particular, Kyle Lukacs noted that he is working with the church across the street to develop a shared parking program so parents can park there and walk across the street at the crossing to the school. Kevin Reardon, APS Safety/Security officer, has been asked to attend the March 19 meeting to discuss his role as it pertains to transportation safety.

APS Updates: *Budget* – Kristin shared that the School Board had thanked the Committee for its work on the philosophy and bus eligibility zones. The Board is taking them seriously and would like to schedule a work session on the recommendations in April. Scott Prisco noted that APS staff does not think the recommendations on the distances can be implemented in the coming school year. He told the Committee that staff does not want to roll out a new policy without having enough time to prepare. Committee members reminded Mr. Prisco that in Fall 2012 when APS began enforcing the policy distances there was a lack of consideration as to the effects on families and the Committee was formed to provide, among other things, carefully considered recommendations on the distances. Furthermore, the point of the Committee's recommendation is that APS is currently providing most of this service, so it is in the current operating budget. It also was pointed out that per APS' own September 2013 eligibility figures, if APS were to plan for full utilization of bus services, it would be required to transport about 15,000 students. Currently about 60% of those eligible take the bus. In addition, it was noted that not all of the safety evaluations have been completed – middle and high school are still outstanding. APS must complete them to be able to accurately evaluate bus eligibility.

Committee members asked that APS provide any data it has developed regarding the costs associated with changing the bus eligibility distances to those the Committee recommended.

CIP/CDP Schedule - The Committee should be aware of the schedule and the proposals as it makes recommendations. The Committee requested a presentation on the countywide/choice/transfer program for April 2. This will include a discussion about how policies related to countywide, choice and transfer programs impact the APS transportation system and how many students use the bus system for these programs.

TDM Plan – TDG will return on March 19 for a work session with the Committee on Task 4 of the TDM plan. This task is to develop TDM program goals and performance targets for the TDM plan. The Committee will develop inputs to be used in a prioritization process using a tool called DecisionLens. APS staff will provide a brief written overview to the Committee ahead of the work session.

Final Report – Small Groups: Those present broke into two groups focusing on bus transportation and active transportation respectively. Groups will review the interim report, budget guidance and latest Board memo to begin developing recommendations for these two areas to be included in a June report. The following five questions are to be addressed for each recommendation:

- 1) Is there a policy framework (Policy/PIP)?
- 2) Is there a budget impact (FTE, Capital, Operating)?
- 3) Is County collaboration required?
- 4) What's the timeline? (use school year designations, eg 2014/15)
- 5) Is this a safety-related recommendation?

The two groups will write up their respective notes for the next meeting.

Adjourn 9pm.