1. Public Comment Period – There were no members of the public present

2. Current TAC Vacancies: Districts 1 & 3 – These vacancies remain unfilled as of 1/25/21

3. Selection of Committee Chair – The Committee decided to wait for vacancies to be filled before selecting a chair.

4. Recap of Transit Tomorrow Plan and Comments to submit to GPCOG

On January 20, 2021, GPCOG staff gave the TAC a presentation of the draft Transit Tomorrow Plan. The TAC met to discuss and gather comments to submit to GPCOG.

List of Comments from Bus Service Staff

1. Transit Scenarios - The “Targeted Transit” scenario excludes improvement to the most transit-dependent areas of South Portland, such as Redbank and Brick Hill.

2. Frequency – It is recommendation to "improve frequency in the most populated urban areas." How are "most populated urban areas" defined? This should include designated
growth areas as well with a potential future density that would warrant transit improvements.

3. Local Circulators - There are no local circulators recommended in South Portland. We see a potential for a circulator that travels from Redbank to the Mall and Scarborough Gallery commercial area and from Redbank to Mill Creek and/or Portland.

4. What is the timeline for extending bus service to Gray, Standish and Bridgeton? How does this affect funding for existing routes given the “ambitious” goals for very expensive BRT? What “local frequency” gets priority? The most populated areas, highest ridership stops, regionally significant stops, the “10 selected high capacity routes” the BRT from Gorham to Portland? Please define "local frequency and service" that you state as highest priority.

5. Page 54: Is the second paragraph, stating that the "existing network" as identified in priority 1 on p 53., are those routes that support BRT? If that is the case, our routes that service Redbank and Brick Hill are not priorities?

6. The cost of BRT is very high and will make it difficult to achieve many other goals relating to increased frequency on existing routes and transit stop improvements.

7. Target Investments to zoning. This should be expanded to include existing land use and/or comprehensive and other plans that demonstrate a community’s contribution to higher density housing and transit-oriented development.

8. Priority Corridors and Centers – Is a priority center a point in the GIS layer or a polygon? Can you share these layers so we can assess the area that is within 1/4 mile of a center? We feel scoring points should not be limited to ¼ mile proximity to priority corridors and centers if we can demonstrate the project is in a location as worthy of a transit improvement as these somewhat arbitrary dots or blobs on the map.

9. Complete Streets is a great idea that we support, but this too will compete for project funding. We could easily add $250k to a pedestrian project by adding transit stop improvements along a corridor. Again, this is good, but how does that compete with BRT, service to Gray, frequency, etc. How does building to complete street standards in the existing service area rank compared to extending service to Gray and BRT?

10. The plan does not address the mandate in the One Climate Future Plan to convert our bus fleets to battery electric buses or the need for EV charging infrastructure in the region. This too will compete with BRT for limited dollars.

11. Equitable Access – Could you provide a map that shows where the increased equitable access is occurring? Is this based on the 10 priority routes? If so, will equity increase in those areas but decrease for areas like Redbank/Brick Hill?
**Additional Comments from Transit Advisory Committee Members**

1. Would like to see more in the plan addressing transit service to parks and beaches. This seems to be a commuter-oriented plan and for people to give up cars they need to be able to get to recreation sites by bus as well.

2. Would like to see more hubs in South Portland for transfer connections. Redbank for example.

3. Feeder Services – Advisory Committee member has expressed strong disapproval of partnering with Uber or Lyft. This member feels these companies should not be named in the plan.

4. Concern with the statement by GPCOG that the plan has already been approved by PACTS and that their feedback is being requested after the fact. Public process for getting feedback should have been planned in advance so the public was included throughout, not just PACTS members and other officials.

5. More frequent service to Redbank and Brick Hill going to Maine Mall, Walmart and also over to Mill Creek and downtown Portland.

6. Fine for a 30-year plan, but can’t force property owners to redevelop their property.

There was also some discussion about increasing frequency to Brick Hill and Redbank. Staff agrees with the need, but explained the limitations of existing bus fleet and driver pool. Staff will present a history of the bus service at the next TAC meeting and explain the requirements for increasing frequency and adding routes.

The TAC would also like to discuss increased marketing of the transit system on our buses, shelters, etc.

**5. Next Meeting February 22nd**

**6. Adjournment** – The TAC adjourned at 10:15am