South Bay Cities Council of Governments

March 1, 2014

TO: **Steering Committee**

FROM: **Jacki Bacharach, SBCCOG Executive Director**

RE: **Comments on Metro's First Last Mile – submitted February 10, 2014**

Adherence to Guiding Principles:
Represent the interests of the South Bay with other governing bodies and organizations.

Comments:
Overall, it is very good that Metro is addressing the issue of access to the transit system so this report is an important guidebook for putting a spotlight on the ways that people get to the transit system and how difficult it can be. My comments are meant to be instructive and hopefully to add to the comprehensiveness of this effort.

While this guidebook seeks to address the physical challenges to accessing transit, it makes no mention of the different cognitive needs of seniors and the need to address the physical capabilities of the disabled. This is a significant omission and should be rectified.

1. Additionally, there are other barriers beyond just physical that should be acknowledged and addressed in the report such as:
    a. In some places, transit can be overcrowded and in others, the headways can be large. It was not clear to me when the term high quality transit is used whether that only refers to the rail system and fixed route BRT or is it the entire transit network? This needs to be clarified.
    b. Another barrier that should be acknowledged is riders not knowing the schedules or how long they will have to wait at a station. (Page 9)
    c. Also, the plan indicates that very few people access the system by car but there has been no parking analysis done so It is not clear whether there is sufficient parking on the system which would also attract more riders who want to use the system to 'intercept' their longer trip. (Page 8) Page 9 states that the parking facilities are 'highly visible' but those from outside the area may not agree.
    d. Additionally, wayfinding signage is addressed but for vehicle access, it should extend to freeway off ramps and other locations that may be farther than the radius in this plan.

2. Another barrier that isn't addressed in the report at all is what happens to the personal mobility devices when you get to transit. Buses can't take unlimited numbers of bikes

and Segways are very heavy to lift onto a bus. Storage facilities should be mentioned for those mobility devices that need to be prepared to stay at the station or buses and rail systems need to be able to accommodate not just more people, but also more equipment.

3. If a jurisdiction were to improve the First/Last Mile, is there any possible guarantee that they could get that there would be sufficient service to cover the increased ridership? OR, what is the capacity on the system? What is success and what would overload the transit system?

4. Page 3 – states that the rail system will have stations within 3 miles or less from homes of 7.8 million people in the County. I think you should add by when. Is this the current system under construction or some complete system which is defined how?

5. Page 7 – what is the definition of high quality transit? (and you shouldn't use the acronym on the right-hand chart without defining it.)

6. Page 12 – According to sources on the internet – "*On average, women walk at 3 miles per hour and men walk a little quicker at 3.5 miles per hour.*" I don't think it is appropriate to use 4 miles/hour as the speed that people will be walking to the stations.

7. Page 14 – There are boxes for different types of mobility devices shown on this page. I think that you should replace the 2nd from the bottom on the left (bike with big and small wheel) with a senior type tricycle.

8. Page 21 – On this analysis, there is no mention of other modes besides pedestrian or bike. This is the case throughout the report. It would be helpful if in each chapter, you addressed the different speeds of the access devices as you have done on Page 23 so that you are expressing how this guidebook applies in each case to Slow, Medium and Fast user speeds.

9. Page 23 – For Fast moving vehicles – this report can address using the street, not just the Path. There should be something in the guidelines that addresses their use of the street system.

10. Page 42 – Reduced Lane Width on streets should include NEV use.

11. Page 44 – If they are using information technology in Copenhagen to incorporate speed detecting signs that direct users to shift lanes in their 'Conversation Lanes', then this would be an ideal strategy for a Rolling Lane with multiple and various personal mobility devices.

12. Page 47 – Guidelines for car share say that an agency can contract with a private company to begin a car share program. This is not necessary. Car sharing should be non-exclusive and

the agency or Metro should create car share spaces that any car share company should be able to use.

13. Page 50 – Can these counters somehow be used to inform bicyclists if there is room on the transit system for their bike?

14. Page 52 – I am not sure that I understand why Micro Park and Ride lots are an improvement. While they allow for more development around a station, they would require additional wayfinding signage and another transfer to get to the transit trip. Is this done anywhere and if so, is it successful?

I must admit that I didn't read every component in detail but where I did read, I found the following spelling errors:
Page 9 – 1st paragraph – 'transit' and 2nd column, last line 'transfer'
Page 11 - #5 at the bottom 'currently'
Page 15 – 3rd line under Path Users – 'residents'
Page 20 – Points of Interest – 'defines'
Page 27 – 2nd column, 2nd bullet – 'transit'
Page 47 – last line 'areas'