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Define “Multi-Modal Transportation Network”
Brainstorm a list of words/ phrases that help define a multimodal transportation network.
- More than one mode per trip
- Connectivity
- Public or private
- Design of roads and sidewalks
- Accommodate different modes
- Accessibility and curb ramps
- Reduction of single occupancy vehicles (SOVs)
- Having options
- Multi-municipal/county communication and coordination
- Creativity in using space
- Expansion of services

Review & Discuss SW PA Transportation Services
Review handout of fixed route, demand response, human services, and private transportation services data from 2015 CTP. Discuss the transportation services that exist across our region today.
- Not meeting needs
- Limited and not much choice from agencies who provide the services
- More options in dense urban areas, but have major coverage and service gaps outside of these areas
- Lack of communication and affordability
- Not managing the system as a network
- Fragmented; funding is not coordinated
- State focus (PennDOT) is almost exclusively on roads and bridges and not bike/pedestrian
- Need local push and modernized Comprehensive Plans
- No seamless travel chains
- Outside of city, there’s a disconnect between transit and job centers

Please speak to the idea of equity in transportation. What does that mean and is our transportation system in SW PA equitable?
- Not enough services to Pittsburgh, especially for persons with disabilities
- Overall transit cost/income disparities (in urban, suburban, and rural areas)
- Wheelchairs – limited space on buses

Discuss the Challenges with Creating a Multi-Modal Transportation Network in SW PA
Make a listing of words, phrases, and other thoughts that could be used in a formalized “vision” for multimodal connectivity.
- Cross-county
- Multiple options
- Coordinated
- Safe
- Choice
- Innovative
- Inclusive
- Multimodal
- Convenient
- Affordable
- Availability
- Equitable
What are some of the challenges we might face in terms of pursuing and achieving a multi-modal transportation network that our region can be proud of?

- Money
- Political will
- Paradigm shift – not just car culture
- Maintain roads and bridges; build other modes into the system
- Responsibility, fragmentation, territorialism
- Who owns what
- Topography
- Lack of appreciation for existing transportation assets and their economic value
- Inadequate marketing
- Lack of communication, coordination, and collaboration
- Funding silos; lack of funding for creative ideas (i.e. colored pedestrian lanes)
- PennDOT Connects and transit – not yet routinely considered; also, PennDOT Connects is with this administration and could go away
- Funding – not enough to address each and every problem – Should we prioritize “low hanging fruit” or long-term/challenging projects?
- Looking to local municipalities for guidance – capacity concerns for smaller boroughs/townships; comprehensive plans’ lack of capacity in small, rural municipalities
- SPC regional assistance to local municipalities; identify which municipalities have Comp Plans and Bike/Ped Plans and which don’t; perhaps, develop a website with resources regarding plan development, in partnership with a couple of other organizations
- Can see rural county users more for needs than for commuting
- Currently, cross-county services are slim to none, creating a major barrier
- Lack of capacity for understanding transit
- Funding priorities don’t focus on sidewalks; rules for sidewalks are onerous; sidewalks are considered in “road system”
- Bike/pedestrian connections to transit are ok in the city, but not so much elsewhere
- Cultural views – wanting or not wanting transit stops in their community (i.e. Cranberry)
- Perceptions about who uses the bus
- Dispelling myth about who uses transit; it’s not just for poor people
- Concerns about loss of on-street parking
- TDM plans could require more transit and less single occupancy vehicles (SOVs)
- Lack of political will to change and become more multimodal in some places
- Land use decision disconnect – decisions made locally, but not generally thinking about pursuing outcomes for regional benefit
- Region and county can set agenda and vision, but have no ability to alter land use control (Zoning Ordinances, Subdivision and Land Development Ordinances overhaul to be continued)
- In suburban areas, decisions lie with residents and not commuters

Answer the Question: What other transportation services should be included in the revised CTP and why?

- Sidewalk inventory for each county,
- Accessibility, sidewalks, and curb ramps
- Walkability assessments/studies
- Bike infrastructure (where located and how many miles?)
- Biking suitability classifications
- Bike share facilities
- Number of trips vs. population
- Number of cross-county trips per county and service type
- Regional multimodal network map
- Route maps that show levels of equity in transportation

Other Related Thoughts:

- Need flexibility in funding in order to retrofit the infrastructure we have, so that it adequately serves all modes.
- Utilize pilot projects, three-year demonstrations, and “tactical urbanism” to try out innovative ideas and approaches.
- Educate and inform the region’s residents about the benefits of a multimodal transportation network.
Seamless Travel Chains (STC)
Working Group Session #1
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Describe the Term, “Seamless Travel Chain”
Make a list of bullet points that describe what the STC Work Group thinks of when it hears the term “seamless travel chain”.

- Easy
- No gaps - modal
- Efficient and timely
- Fluidity and integration
- Amenities and safety
- Well-identified nodes
- Single fare payment instrument
- English language facility
- Service itself is key; not who provides the service
- Reliable and accessible information
- Customer-serving rather than customer-managed
- Easy-to-use multiple provider trip planner
- Not exclusively transit-based (Uber, Lyft, bike, pedestrian)
- Cross county boundaries without limitations
- Ease of mobility at transfer points
- Free or reasonably-priced transfers

What is essential for making a trip easy to navigate?

- Understanding of the system (i.e. PAAC’s bus, “T”, and incline services comprise one transit system)
- Explicit points of connectivity (i.e. Westmoreland County Transit Authority commuter services to Oakland and Downtown)
- Fare payment uniformity
- Shared ride services in which subsidy eligibility, per-trip costs, fare instruments, pickup/drop-off time specifications, vehicle types, and customer amenities are consistent across the entire SW PA region
- Transitions between shared ride and public transit services are effectively coordinated and made with ease

Come Up with Examples of Seamless and/or Easy-to-Navigate Trips

Reflecting on personal experiences, provide examples of “seamless” and/or “easy-to-navigate” trips.

- Port Authority’s “Rack and Roll” program allows bikes to be loaded on the front of their buses, providing opportunities for seamless multimodal transportation.
- Port Authority allows bikes to be taken on the “T” and incline as well.
- Through a partnering agreement between Port Authority and Healthy Ride, a ConnectCard can be used as the fare mechanism for Healthy Ride bicycle rentals.
- With a Port Authority ConnectCard, a person can use a Healthy Ride bike at no cost for a maximum of 15 minutes.
- Other transit agencies operating in SW PA teamed up with Port Authority on its smart card initiative (ConnectCard) with the intention of having a unified fare payment instrument (while each participating transit agency distributes their own cards and manages them differently, it’s considered by many as a step in the right direction).
- Transit trips traveling to/from Oakland and Downtown provide the greatest opportunities for seamless travel, primarily because of the number of bus routes and their spans and frequencies of service.
What can transportation providers (public and private) do to improve ease of navigation?

- Provide guidance on “system use” to consumers and, when necessary, assist with travel planning, tailoring trip chains to meet specific user needs.
- Educate coordinators and others (human service providers, educators, human resource managers, etc.) on not only the transportation services that are available and for whom they’re available, but also how to access, use, and pay for the services.
- Create a single-point entity for determining service eligibility and providing formal registration (when required).
- Deploy innovative technology, including way-finding maps, real-time information displays, etc.
- Become aware of any overlap or redundancy in services – for example, if more than one transportation agency provides rides along the same corridor, consideration should be given to redesigning the service(s) so there’s little to no redundancy.
- Develop a Transportation 101 training program, making it available (both in-person and online) to as many individuals and organizations as possible.
- Advocate for the streamlining of government-funded programs and their associated regulations to minimize confusion relating to an individual’s service options (i.e. ADA, MATP, etc.).

Trips viewed by many as easy-to-navigate may still be problematic for some populations such as seniors, persons with disabilities, and low income individuals. Please identify barriers that can hamper seamless travel.

- Paratransit and ADA services are not equal in terms of service options and cost, which makes the programming of funds more complex.
- User eligibility and transportation subsidy is tied to a specific program funding source.
- ConnectCard machines for purchasing and/or cash-loading are not geographically distributed.
- Lack of first- and last-mile services can result in a given trip not being at all feasible.
- Unfamiliarity with the transportation provider, its processes, and its staff (i.e. drivers) can create apprehension on the part of the user.
- Non-English speaking people and undocumented immigrants who rely on transit and other alternative transportation services may face language and/or cultural barriers, which can impede access.
- Barriers for “captive riders” and “choice riders” are often much different, with the impact being greater for “captive riders”.

Answer the Question: **What features make a travel chain most viable for seniors, persons with disabilities, and those without access to a car?**

Identify what is considered most important for ensuring ease-of-access to jobs, healthcare, social services, and community interaction for these populations.

- Safety
- Reliability and convenience
- Physical access and comfort
- Duration of one-way trips / round trips
- Accessibility of destination
- Ease of fare payment
- Ability to bring along an escort, if needed
- Pickup and drop-off amenities (seating, curb ramps, signage, lighting, etc.)
- Vehicle features (wheelchair accessible, comfortable ride, etc.)
- Guaranteed Emergency Ride Home (GERH) program
Discuss the Challenges with Integrating Transportation Services in SW PA to Provide More Seamless Travel Options

Make a listing of what the group sees as possible challenges for transportation providers to develop, schedule, and implement public transit services that can work in combination with services of other providers, with the goal being to create more seamless travel options.

- Act 89 will sunset in a few years (2022) and it’s uncertain how the impending funding shortages will be addressed
- The mantra nowadays is “Do more with less”; not sure this is a sustainable operating model
- Much of the legislature doesn’t see the value of public transit; nor does it understand how important public transit is to many people, including the legislators’ constituents
- Lack of understanding on the part of public officials, property developers, and others on both the value and importance of public transit
- Ability to secure financial support for alternative transportation services from property developers, employers, and others
- Without reliable long-term funding, successful transportation service pilots may not be able to operate past the designated demonstration period
- With volunteer driver-based transportation services, getting rides when needed may not always be possible
- In order to discourage driving, in particular SOVs, other transportation options need to provide an equal OR better alternative
- Car travel time / transit travel time parity

Other conveyed thoughts:

The STC Work Group suggested that the SW PA region encourage regional collaboration to achieve the following outcomes:

- Integration of services
- Fare system integration
- Trip planning (transparent to user)
- Data sharing and integration
- Alternative fuel vehicles and fueling stations
- Including transit in all PennDOT Connects discussions
- Addressing and minimizing “turf” issues and concerns

During their Work Group Session #1 discussion, the STC Work Group devised a simple, but important wish-list that supports a future where seamless travel chains are a reality across urban, suburban, and rural areas in SW PA.

- Developers effectively link land use to transportation.
- Employers incentivize employees’ use of non-SOVs.
- Transit-oriented development (TOD) is strongly encouraged.
- Affordable, accessible, and senior housing is built near transit.
- Reliance on travel in a single occupancy vehicle (personal car) steadily decreases.
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Describe Transportation Accessibility in SW PA’s Urban, Suburban, and Rural Environments
Brainstorm a list of words/phrases that capture the USRE group’s view of transportation access in the different environments that make up our ten-county region.

- Fragmented
- Challenging
- Expensive
- Time-consuming
- Disregarded
- Inconvenient
- Inefficient
- Ineffective
- Inaccessible
- Unreliable
- Classist
- Ever-Changing
- Misunderstood
- Not prioritized
- Over-regulated
- Unfunded
- Unaffordable
- Stuff-centric rather than people-centric
- Some niches served well
- Limited with success in some pockets
- One-size-fits-all tendency
- Primarily viewed from an urban perspective
- Has not kept up with movement and growth
- Suburbs/rural communities a challenge

Describe a network that provides sufficient connectivity between urban, suburban, and rural areas.

- Transportation and land use are inextricably connected (e.g. new zoning ordinances).
- Local municipalities, employers, and developers are part of the transportation access discussion.
- There’s strong political will to influence and support public transportation efforts.
- Transit facilities are located in urban, suburban, and rural areas where people can easily access them.
- Affordable, convenient, and reliable transportation meets people where they choose to live.
- Fixed route, shared ride, and a hybrid of the two have important roles to play in the transit ecosystem.
- Different-sized areas have their own distinct issues (FMLM, door-to-door, healthcare access, etc.)
- Communities throughout the SW PA region embrace and support all transportation modes.
- State transportation funding supports projects that enhance regional connectivity in practical ways.
- Legacy projects like MFE may no longer be the right solution to provide cross-community connectivity.

Consider Multi-Modal Transportation in the Context of Traveling Within and Across Urban, Suburban, and Rural Environments
Come up with some examples where traveling by more than one mode might make sense in these three different environments.

- Most people are single mode users. People say they want transit, but “for someone else”.
- Eighty percent of Port Authority transit riders also own cars.
- Flight from the cities to the suburbs created the “beginning of car-centric America”.
- In the rural parts of Washington County, shared ride services, while expensive to provide, make the most sense at this point in time. It can, however, take ½ hour or longer to travel from one community to another. Shared ride trips can be lengthy, primarily because they’re not typically direct (Pt A to Pt B).
- Public transit users traveling from Westmoreland County to Allegheny County (Oakland or downtown)
will drive their car to a park-and-ride facility and catch a ride on a WCTA commuter coach. The commuter service is, however, experiencing declining ridership.

- Beginning in July 2018, Butler County residents will be able to commute to Allegheny County (Downtown Pittsburgh) by driving their car to a park-and-ride facility and catching a ride on a BTA Commuter coach. This is a three-year demonstration project.
- While there are numerous job opportunities in Cranberry Township, Butler County, public transportation between Butler City and Cranberry is not currently available.
- Port Authority of Allegheny County’s ‘hub and spoke’ system requires, for example, a Bellevue resident wanting to access shopping on McKnight Road to travel into Downtown Pittsburgh and then catch a second bus to McKnight Road.
- The overarching objective of the Alliance for Nonprofit Resources and BART (Butler County) is to move people and the more people they’re moving together, the better.
- Veterans might be better served if bus transportation were a more accessible mode option than it is today, especially in the outlying counties.
- When designing fixed route, shared ride, and other transportation services, strong consideration must be given to times-of-day for determining the most appropriate service options.
- Urban living provides many different transportation options (walking, biking, public transit, carsharing, taxi, ridehailing, etc.) – however, these options may not be necessarily affordable and accessible to everyone.
- The utilization of different transportation options requires a certain cultural mindset — I can be safe on a bus; I can be safe on a bike; I can be safe as a pedestrian.
- Sidewalks must be contiguous and wheelchair feasible.
- Unsubsidized shared ride services, while open to the general public, are too costly.
- Ridehailing services like Uber and Lyft have yet to launch viable services in SW PA’s outlying counties. Some people view ridehailing services as a possible solution for addressing transportation needs in places where fixed route public transit is not sustainable.
- In order to create a multimodal transportation network suitable for easily accessible multi-mode trips, there needs to be compromise and a lot of give and take.

Answer the Question: What needs to happen to enhance urban/suburban/rural connectivity in SW PA?

Identify ways in which the urban, suburban, and rural areas can be better connected and discuss the specific needs of transportation-disadvantaged populations in terms of accessing jobs, healthcare, social services, and community interaction within and across urban, suburban, and rural areas.

- The majority of the people residing in southwestern Pennsylvania live in the suburbs. As an example, most constituents of North Hills Community Outreach (NHCO) are from suburban communities, where the assumption is “everyone has a car”. This is not, however, a correct assumption.
- There’s a growing trend: “poverty pushing” out to the suburbs. The working poor, whether white or a minority, who now live in close-in suburbs are having to move further away from the urban areas and available public transportation. (Monroeville is one suburban community that has begun to acknowledge this demographic shift.)
- People who take public transit are considered by many as “those people” (i.e. seniors, the working poor, minorities, etc.).
- In places like Cranberry Township, many of its residents don’t want transit riders in their communities and, therefore, do not support public transit.
- In Washington County, Freedom Transit is faced with having to decide which communities make the most sense (both operationally and financially) to serve.
- States such as California and Washington require businesses to take part in addressing transportation issues.
- A couple of businesses located in and near Cranberry Township, Butler County – Marriot and FedEx - are considering using their vehicles to get people to work – having their employees park their cars at the 528 park-and-ride lot, then getting picked up by corporate vans to take them the last-mile to the job facilities. Employers who are struggling to get workers may find themselves having to financially support transportation options.
- One of the barriers to getting the BTA commuter service up and running (which will start operating July
1st) was the County match. Shouldn’t the needed match come from the MPO/State (i.e. CMAQ)? State and federal dollars can only be used for specific purposes and that’s a problem. Also, discretionary funding sources (which don’t necessarily maximize benefits) are highly competitive, with PennDOT often trying to short-circuit these dollars. Seems to be a complete disconnect there.

- Before BTA can consider feeder services, the Butler-to-Pittsburgh commuter service must demonstrate mass appeal with adequate ridership.
- It’s not necessarily true that people just want to own cars; they have, however, been trained to NEED to own cars.

Discuss the Idea of Transportation Services Being Administered and Delivered at the Regional Rather than County Level

Does this even make sense? Outline the advantages and disadvantages of creating and implementing a regional public transportation system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOES THIS MAKE SENSE?</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a federated system (similar to the airlines) that looks the same to the user, but is really a collaborative, partnering effort</td>
<td>Agencies maintain local identities</td>
<td>Needs strong political will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional (full or partial) consolidation of public transit services</td>
<td>Initial cost savings</td>
<td>Savings expected to diminish over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the TOC develop a working agenda to coordinate services across the SW PA region</td>
<td>Utilize resources more effectively</td>
<td>Need for common technology/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter services from outlying counties meet up with PAAC buses at or near the Allegheny County line, taking riders to their AC destinations</td>
<td>Eliminate need to dead-head back to originating county</td>
<td>Challenges from labor unions (DOL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other conveyed thoughts:

- All transit agencies, including PAAC, go through the Public Utilities Commission when considering their services. When an agency applies for a grant, the FTA or PennDOT sends a notice to the Department of Labor, informing the unions about the capital or operations proposal.
- Transit funding falls under two classifications – urban and rural. There are restrictions as to how the dollars within each classification can be expended.
- While the regionalization of transit services (some or all) may make sense for the purpose of “moving people” better, it may not be a priority for the county commissioners.
- Securing the political will may not be insurmountable; it would, however, require the need to educate users as a means of gaining their ‘buy-in’ to a transit consolidation idea.
- Local funding would be needed to design, develop, and implement a regional consolidation campaign – asking for public response to, “Wouldn’t it be great if we could do...” (determining what it is that the general public really wants from public transit across the region)
- **Important to Note:** Ninety percent (90%) of the region’s public transit riders use Port Authority transit.
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ARAI WORKING GROUP SESSION #2: Details will be shared as soon as they are available.

Define “Equity in Transportation”
Brainstorm a list of words/phrases that define what is meant by “equity in transportation”.

- Availability
- Affordability/accessibility are #1
- Income is important
- Transit is a right (isn’t it?)
- Think of everyone — service design
- Anyone, regardless of age, race, etc.
- “Protected classes” as defined by Civil Rights Act
- “Temporarily-abled” — if no need now, likely to have later
- Prohibit blaming and shaming to include all!
- To some, driving a huge SOV just because they can
- Equity isn’t necessarily fair

Discuss How Best to Ensure SW PA’s Transportation Network Works for Everyone
Identify where the region falls short in terms of making transportation accessible and equitable, especially for disadvantaged populations.

- Due to the lengthy distances between communities and low population densities in rural areas, it’s both non-productive and expensive to provide the right transportation services to sufficiently meet all needs.
- Many communities know what is needed in terms of transportation for their residents, but getting the legislative and financial support necessary to meet the needs is often difficult.
- Transportation services are primarily designed by planners who may or may not seek outside input. Gathering meaningful input from actual system users results in better outcomes in terms of service usability.
- The region should think beyond traditional “buses” when developing and supporting services to meet the transportation needs of different populations.
- Transit operations are based on a business model, where the measure of success is profitability rather than productivity. Given that the provision of transportation (because of the cost to provide it) is a losing proposition, the focus should be on ensuring as many people as possible are able to get where they need to go (i.e. productivity).
- At any given time, there are multiple shared ride vehicles on the road that may have room for more passengers. Due to funding program rules and constraints, the provider is only able to pick up ride-qualifying people. There must be a way to more effectively utilize shared ride services so that the vehicles are filled to capacity the majority of the time. This would require, among other things, a different service model, strong coordination, advocacy, and changes to the law.
- Right now, big companies and other ‘connected’ stakeholders drive policy. We should come up with a way to change that.
- A major problem with providing paratransit services is driver retention. Is a higher wage, along with health and vacation benefits, what is needed to incentivize people to become HST drivers?
- There is no local support or funding base for public transportation in general, let alone equitable public transportation. While local governments “talk the talk”, they don’t “walk the walk”.


People don’t realize how expensive it is to provide transportation whether it’s public transit or something else like driving one’s own car. One approach for educating the public about the “true costs” of transportation is to institute a fee (based on VMT maybe) when people use a personal car for travel.

Very little, if any, funding comes from car manufacturers, employers, and local governments to support transportation infrastructure and services.

Answer the Question: What are the distinctions, if any, between transportation accessibility for seniors, persons with disabilities, and the poor AND everyone else?

What does the phrase, “anyone, regardless of ability or income”, mean to the ARAI group?

- “Anyone, regardless of ability or income” is a loaded statement.
- Physical abilities can dictate what type(s) of transportation services a person can use.
- Personal financial capacity can dictate what type(s) of transportation services a person can afford.
- Individual preferences can dictate what type(s) of transportation services a person chooses to take.
- All transportation is personal, meaning transportation accessibility is distinctive for everyone.

Outline what the group thinks might be the best approach for ensuring everyone has access to the transportation services they need to live full and productive lives (not necessarily making a population distinction).

- Eliminate arbitrary barriers.
- Allocate more funding to centralized, larger, and more populated counties.
- Shared ride services are defined locally and, as such, should be designed to address local needs.
- Provide transportation block grants at the local level wherein the funding can be used to provide services for anyone, making it more inclusive and equitable.

Consider the Adaptive Changes that Occur During a Person’s Lifespan, Especially in the Context of Transportation Accessibility

Think about transportation system planning based on universal design concepts.

- Design impacts use. Choice impacts participation.
- Important to understand a given technology (to a certain degree at least) before you trust it and are comfortable using it
- Want to be able to determine if the underlying issue is transportation or something else (i.e. communication)
- Autonomous vehicles are solving what problem exactly?

Discuss the merits of transportation system planning that is based on universal design concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defined Transportation Needs by Population</th>
<th>MEET EVERY NEED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENIORS</td>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>Affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient</td>
<td>Convenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-use</td>
<td>Easy-to-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>Timely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful</td>
<td>Respectful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other conveyed thoughts:

- Take a look at America and its public policies related to “equity in transportation” and compare it to other countries. What are the other countries doing that we might want to consider doing as well?
- Compare the efficiency of transportation models deployed in other countries to what we have in the U.S. Also, consider the level of financial support provided for public transit services in places outside the U.S., noting any distinctions between ‘there’ and ‘here’.
- Funding for improving and enhancing transportation services is stagnant or decreasing, which means system changes will be hard to come by. What seems to be misunderstood by society is, if tax revenues (such as the gas tax) stay the same, services (in this case, public transportation) are not likely to get any better.
- The human perspective as it relates to transportation needs to change.