



Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council

REGIONAL TRANSIT MASTER PLAN

Volume III: Outreach and Engagement

June 2013



Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Technical Committee	4
Regional Transit Stakeholders	5
Community Meetings	6
La Pine	6
Madras Area	7
Prineville	8
Redmond.....	8
Sisters	9
Appendix A Public Meeting Survey Results	11

Table of Figures

	Page
Figure 1 RTMP Technical Committee Members	4
Figure 2 Regional Transit Stakeholders.....	5
Figure 4 Survey Results - Jefferson County Senior Meal	12
Figure 5 Survey Results - Madras COCC Public Meeting.....	13
Figure 6 Survey Results - Metolius Public Meeting	14
Figure 7 Survey Results - Prineville Senior Meal	15
Figure 8 Survey Results - Prineville Public Meeting.....	15
Figure 9 Survey Results - Redmond Public Meeting	16
Figure 10 Survey Results - Sisters Senior Meal	17
Figure 11 Survey Results - Sisters Public Meeting.....	17

INTRODUCTION

The Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council (COIC) developed a five-part outreach and engagement plan for the RTMP:

- General public meetings – in all communities served by CET.
- Stakeholder meetings – in all communities served by CET.
- Technical Advisory Committee meetings – involving regional technical specialists.
- COIC Board meetings – to conduct high-level regional review of draft findings with the COIC Board.
- Presentations at appropriate meetings and conferences, as available and appropriate.

Public, stakeholder and technical review, as well as review by elected officials, was critical to ensuring that the service plans proposed by the RTMP were legitimate, understandable, and useful. Outreach was conducted to ensure parties had sufficient opportunity to comment on their needs and priorities for transit service. The outcomes from technical, stakeholder, and community meeting are presented in the subsequent sections and are organized by type of meeting and community.

Technical Committee Meetings

The Technical Committee met three times between November 2012 and March 2013 to review Regional Transit Master Plan progress and provide technical input into the service plans. Their feedback was incorporated into the Plan. More information

Public Meetings

From July 2012-October 2012, COIC staff conducted a series of public meetings in each community served by Cascades East Transit (CET). The meetings were an opportunity for members of each community to give input on priorities for transit and acceptable options to fund current and future services. COIC conducted surveys with service-specific questions for each community; however, many of the questions and discussion were overwhelmed by concerns about budget cuts and subsequent service cuts in each community that occurred in May and October 2012.

Community Stakeholder Meetings

From March 2013-May 2013, COIC held transit stakeholder meetings in each community served by CET. Transit stakeholders were identified as representatives from public agencies, schools, medical, and local chambers who were invited to learn more about transit service and voice the needs and concerns of their clients. The stakeholders reviewed the proposed short, mid and long-term service plan for their community and local funding options.

Regional Stakeholders Meeting

One “Regional Transit Stakeholders Leadership Meeting” was held in June 2013, with representatives from agencies, schools, medical and regional businesses to learn more about transit service, the proposed service plans and to hear their input and feedback. These transit

stakeholders were identified as representatives from organizations that work throughout Central Oregon, and have special interest in CET for their clients or patrons. A list of attendees is available in the Regional Stakeholders section of this document.

COIC Board Meetings

COIC staff presented findings and process to date at seven COIC Board meetings in 2012 and 2013:

- **March 1, 2012** – Presented on the upcoming RTMP process.
- **May 3, 2012** – Presented on funding and governance options for CET.
- **June 7, 2012** – Continued funding and governance discussion.
- **October 4, 2012** – Further discussion of funding and governance options.
- **December 6, 2012** – Presented on findings to date, including survey findings, public meetings, and transit demand estimates.
- **February 7, 2013** – General RTMP update and fare study proposal.
- **June 6, 2013** – Overview of draft service plans and fare change proposal.

COIC staff will request Board approval of the final Regional Transit Master Plan over the course of the October and November 2013 COIC Board meetings.

Other Outreach

In addition to the above meetings and processes, COIC staff presented on the RTMP at the following meetings and events:

- **February 4, 2012** – **New Partners for Smart Growth Conference**, San Diego, CA. Presentation on RTMP process.
- **February 21, 2012** – **South County Plan Partners meeting**, Sunriver, OR. Presented on CET and RTMP process.
- **March 21, 2012** – **Regional Public Transit Advisory Committee (RPTAC) meeting**, Redmond, OR. Provided an overview of the RTMP process.
- **April 21, 2012** – **Central Oregon Earth Day Fair**, Bend, OR. Staffed booth with CET information and overview of RTMP process.
- **May 17, 2012** – **RPTAC meeting**, Redmond, OR. Overviewed public outreach efforts, early survey results, and discussed local funding options.
- **July 12, 2012** – **Central Oregon Area Commission on Transportation (COACT) Board meeting**, Redmond, OR. Provided overview of RTMP process.
- **July 17, 2012** – **RPTAC meeting**, Redmond, OR. Updated survey results and findings from Redmond public meeting.
- **August 6, 2012** – **Transportation Research Board Committee on Landscape and Environmental Design**, Bend, OR. Presented on RTMP process.

- **September 10, 2012 – Oregon Public Transit Conference**, Seaside, OR. Presented on RTMP process in concert with COTOP process and accomplishments to date; focus on multi-modal elements.
- **September 20, 2012 – Bend Metropolitan Planning Agency (BMPO) Policy Board meeting**, Bend, OR. Presented on survey findings.
- **November 13, 2012 – Central Oregon Coalition for Access meeting**, Bend, OR. Presented on findings to date and service changes.
- **December 5, 2012 – BMPO Technical Advisory Committee Meeting (TAC)**, Bend, OR. Presented on RTMP process and accomplishments to date (surveys and transit demand estimates).
- **February 12, 2013 – Central Oregon Coalition for Access meeting**, Bend, OR. Presented on findings to date and draft service plan.
- **March 19, 2013 – RPTAC meeting, Redmond, OR**. Reviewed fare study findings and draft staff fare proposal.
- **May 1, 2013 – BMPO TAC meeting**, Bend, OR. Presented on RTMP draft Service Plans.
- **May 21, 2013 – RPTAC meeting**, Redmond OR. Reviewed draft service plans.
- **July 23, 2013 – Madras City Council meeting**; Madras, OR. Presented on RTMP findings.
- **August 15, 2013 – BMPO Policy Board meeting**, Bend, OR. Presented on final RTMP.

COIC staff also met with countless stakeholders and partners on an individual basis during the course of the project.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

The technical committee was comprised of technical staff and stakeholder organization representatives from across Central Oregon.

Figure 1 RTMP Technical Committee Members

Joni Bramlett, ODOT PTD	James Lewis, City of Redmond
Jim Bryant, ODOT	Lonny Macy, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
Sherrin Coleman, ODOT PTD	Jeff Monson, Commute Options
Tyler Deke, Bend MPO/City of Bend	Eric Porter, City of Sisters
Scott Edelman, City of Prineville	Peter Russell, Deschutes County
Karen Friend, COIC/Cascades East Transit	E.V. Smith, City of Culver
Carol Fulkerson, Central Oregon Council for Access	Nick Snead, City of Madras
Patrick Hanenkraft, City of Metolius	Phil Stenbeck, Crook and Jefferson Counties
Joan Johnson, La Pine	Karen Swirsky, Department of Land Conservation and Development

The technical committee met three times during the project:

- **May 16, 2012**
 - Overview of project goals and outcomes
 - Study timeline and deliverables
 - Presentation of survey results (On board local, On board Community Connector, and Community Preferences telephone survey)
- **November 30, 2012**
 - Reviewed updated survey results
 - Reviewed existing conditions report and demographics data
 - Presentation of demand estimates
 - Committee input on the strength of the transit market
- **March 8, 2013**
 - Reviewed updated demand estimates
 - Reviewed CET goals and objectives
 - Presentation of draft service plans (short, mid and longterm) by community

REGIONAL TRANSIT STAKEHOLDERS

These stakeholders were selected as representatives from organizations that work at a regional scale and are primarily concerned in regional transit services.

Figure 2 Regional Transit Stakeholders

Molly Baker Ray (Citizens Action Group, La Pine)	Donna Nordstrom, Redmond Proficiency Academy
Christina Barragen, Central Oregon Council on Aging	Ron Parsons, DHS
Ana Bergren, Full Access	Robin Popp, Goodwill Industries
Russ DeBoodt, EDCO	Gordon Price, Central Oregon Community College
Kim Dickie, City of Redmond/RDM Airport	Dave Rathbun, Mt. Bachelor
Ken Fahlgren, Crook County	Matt Shinderman, OSU-Cascades
Gary Farnsworth, ODOT Region 4	Andrew Spreadborough, COIC
Angie Gilley, Crook County Veterans Services	Cary Stanfill, Mt. Bachelor
Elaine Henderson, Regional Public Transit Advisory Committee	Jon Stark, EDCO/REDI
Seth Johnson, Opportunity Foundation	Karen Swirsky, Deschutes Land Conservation and Development
Jim Kinney, Mt. Bachelor	Alan Unger, Deschutes County Commissioner
Jim Kirkbride, St. Charles Medical Center	Jim Wilson, COIC Board Member (Jefferson County)

The regional stakeholders committee met one time to review the short mid and long-term transit service plans and discuss permanent funding options for transit. COIC staff reviewed the current service and the system performance measures that have influenced the service plans. They also explained the current funding realities and budget. They emphasized that without a more sustainable local funding mechanism they would not be able to sustain service, and any service additions would be completely funded locally (there are not any more grant programs to tap into).

Opportunities

- Building additional parking lots to serve facilities like St. Charles and COCC is becoming infeasible. This may present an opportunity for investment in transit and increased stops to serve travelers to these locations.
- Stakeholders emphasized that transit should be sold as a benefit to economic development, but COIC will need to prepare the proper argument to convince the public of transit's benefit.
- There is an opportunity to better inform the public about transit service through marketing and outreach.
- COCC may be interested in developing a group pass program that could help provide sustained local funding for the system.

Challenges

- COIC needs to rebuild trust with partner organizations who were not informed during service cuts, and create a standard for information sharing and outreach.
- Regional partners and COIC lack clarity on the best geography for a transit district with a permanent tax funding base (ex. all tri-counties, Bend and Redmond only, Redmond only).
- There was some concern about the cost of benefits for the transit system because they are PERS employees.

COMMUNITY MEETINGS

LA PINE

Public Meetings

On October 9, 2012, COIC staff held two public meetings in La Pine to discuss transit service, one at the Senior Meal (Senior Center) and the second co-hosted with the City of La Pine (La Pine City Hall). Community members were vocal in stating their opposition to CET cutting services to La Pine (specifically reducing the service area which would leave some clients without service). They questioned the credibility of CET and felt disenfranchised because they were unable to attend the COIC board meeting when the decision was made to reduce the service area (evening meetings in Redmond cannot be accessed with transit service). However, they agreed that they needed bus service and were interested in CET developing stronger community partnerships with the community.

The meeting attendees voted overwhelmingly in favor of having transit service in La Pine. They were divided on future priorities for service, with the top two choices being to switch from Dial-A-Ride to fixed-route service and to add La Pine-Bend Community Connector shuttle runs. During public comment, many expressed their willingness to pay higher fares, and this was reflected as the preferred method for funding in the survey. Meeting survey results are available in Appendix A.

Stakeholder Meeting

CET held a La Pine transit stakeholders meeting on March 27, 2013. The stakeholders emphasized that the community desired more convenient service, and asked about the feasibility of fixed route service for La Pine. They also requested earlier in the morning and later into the evening community connector service to Bend for commuters. The stakeholders were very interested in providing local funding to improve their service and suggested approaching Mid-State Electric Cooperative about a utility fee.

Opportunities

- The Deschutes County Community Action Group (CAG) is currently providing the local portion of La Pine's transit funding and is committed to additional fundraising to maintain service to the area.
- The public is interested in building community partnerships and organizing a volunteer program to serve those that live outside the CET service area.

- Mid-State Electric Cooperative may be able to implement a utility fee for transit.

Challenges

- The City of La Pine has a very limited tax base (currently collects \$200,000/year) and currently does not provide any transit funding.
- Very few of the people who live in La Pine live within the City limits. It is difficult to provide such a low population density area with adequate transit service.
- There is perception of CET as an “outsider” providing transit service. This will need to be addressed through better and consistent communication with the community members and leaders.

MADRAS AREA

Public Meetings

Between September 27, 2012 and October 2, 2012, COIC staff held three public meetings in the Madras area to discuss transit service, one at the Senior Meal (11:30am), one at the Madras COCC campus, and the third at Metolius City Hall. Many CET service cuts were effective October 1, and the majority of the meeting time was spent discussing these cuts and funding options.

The Madras Area meeting attendees were most interested in adding Community Connector shuttles and improving the convenience of local service. Specifically, they requested same day rides on local dial-a-ride (currently required to call a day in advance for a ride). They expressed their willingness to pay higher fares and were also interested in increasing the City General Fund outlay or passing a City Transit Utility fee in order to create a more stable local funding source for transit. Meeting survey results are available in Appendix A.

Stakeholder Meeting

CET held a Madras stakeholder meeting on April 16, 2013 to discuss draft service plans and receive feedback about potential funding options into the future for Jefferson County/Madras transit service. The stakeholders requested higher fares to demonstrate more user pay before the general public was approached for funding through taxes. They also emphasized the need for CET/COIC to build a relationship with City Council and communicate directly and clearly with them. They recalled that changes in service have not been well communicated in the past, which may contribute to limited community buy-in.

Opportunities

- Drivers are willing and able to pass information about service changes on to their riders, but they need to be better informed about any changes to service.
- Desire for increased education about and advertisement of service in order to boost ridership. Meeting attendees emphasized the need to explain the reservation system for local dial-a-ride and how it differs from non-reservation Community Connector service.

Challenges

- Service between Warm Springs and Madras is desired by both Warm Springs residents and Madras residents traveling to Warm Springs to work (specifically at Warm Springs Forest Products and the Warm Springs Administration building). Consistent local

funding from Warm Springs to maintain Community Connector service has been challenging.

- Riders need service consistency in order to plan their work and school schedules around using transit. Inconsistency and seemingly sudden service cuts have made people less likely to trust that transit will be able to serve their needs.

PRINEVILLE

Public Meetings

On August 20, 2012, COIC held two public meetings in Prineville (Crook County Senior Center and Prineville City Hall) for public input on transit service and funding priorities into the future. Meeting attendees expressed that CET should have better marketing and advertising to expand ridership. They also agreed that transit service helps community members maintain independence and is essential for many persons, specifically veterans, to get where they need to go. The meeting attendees discussed cutting service and agreed that if services must be cut they should be eliminated based on ridership. Meeting survey results are available in Appendix A.

Stakeholder Meeting

COIC held a Prineville stakeholder meeting on April 1, 2013 to discuss draft service plans and receive feedback about potential funding options into the future for Crook County/Prineville transit service. The stakeholders requested better marketing and information about service that they could share with their constituents. They agreed that maintaining connectivity and providing service for those without other options was extremely important but also agreed that new taxes or funding mechanisms would likely be unpopular.

Opportunities

- Increased marketing and advertising of service could improve community awareness and willingness to fund service (ex. a leaflet on transit service could be included in the City's utility bill).

Challenges

- Riders requested more convenient service, specifically same day rides for local service; however, this is more expensive for CET because it makes grouping rides efficiently more difficult.
- The current level of transit service is not convenient for people with other options which prevents them from seeing the value and makes them more likely to vote against funding.
- Generally Crook County and Prineville residents are not in favor of new taxes and would most likely vote down a tax for transit service.

REDMOND

Public Meeting

On July 11, 2012, CET held a public meeting to discuss priorities for transit service in Redmond. The meeting was well attended by local stakeholders, but lacked a strong general public presence. Due to the make-up of attendees, the meeting focused on CET reporting to the stakeholders,

rather than the group relating personal priority transit needs back to CET. Attendees were interested in switching from general public dial-a-ride to a modest fixed-route system but requested proof that capacity had been reached on the dial-a-ride system. They agreed that Redmond residents would prefer the convenience offered by fixed route service. Meeting survey results are available in Appendix A.

Stakeholder Meeting

COIC held a transit stakeholder meeting on May 22, 2013 and communicated the high demand for service in Redmond, shared a cost-neutral service plan to switch to a modest fixed route system, and discussed potential local funding mechanisms. Attendees were interested and supportive of the draft service plan for fixed-route service but funding remained an unanswered question. The City of Redmond still needed to review the service plan and decide independently if it would be the best decision for Redmond to develop fixed route.

Opportunities

- Attendees were interested in the opportunity to develop a fixed route system and confident in its convenience benefits.
- The availability of transit service could attract new businesses to the City. Meeting attendees encouraged that a pre-investment could support economic development.
- Advertising and partnerships with local businesses (advertising on bus shelters) could generate income and business community support for transit.

Challenges

- Redmond has a high demand for transit service and high ridership, but limited local funding. Some were concerned that fixed route would be developed and subsequently lost because of the lack of permanent local funding.

SISTERS

Public Meetings

On August 7, 2012 CET held two public meetings in Sisters (Sisters Senior Meal Site and Sisters City Hall) to determine community priorities for transit service. Senior meal attendees requested more education about the service that was available and explanation as to how it was different from the senior-specific transportation service that served them previously. The City Hall meeting attendees were adamant that they needed service, wanted service and didn't want CET to give up on providing service to the Sisters community. Some were interested in switching the Community Connector service to run directly to Bend, but most were utilizing the service directly to Redmond (in special demand by parents whose children attend Redmond Proficiency Academy). All agreed that CET should be better advertised to gain more ridership. Meeting survey results are available in Appendix A.

Stakeholder Meeting

CET held a Sisters transit stakeholder meeting on March 25, 2013. The stakeholders emphasized tourism as the primary opportunity to build transit ridership in Sisters and that there should be a direct shuttle connecting Bend and Sisters. They requested a special service on the weekends of

major events (e.g. the Quilt Show and Folk Festival), and guaranteed that there would be a high demand for the service to those events.

Opportunities

- Attendees were interested in finding solutions to maintain service in Sisters.
- CET needed to be better advertised community-wide in order to increase ridership.
- Tourism is the primary opportunity to build ridership and community support (especially business support) for the service.

Challenges

- The community is divided on whether the Community Connector service should travel Sisters-Redmond or Sisters-Bend. For tourism purposes, Bend would be the better connection but current riders preferred that it maintain its connection to Redmond.
- Transit is not emphasized as a priority in the current Sisters Transportation Systems Plan.

Appendix A Public Meeting Survey Results

La Pine

Figure 3 Survey Results - La Pine Senior Center and Public Meetings

Should La Pine have some form of transit service?	
Yes	22
No	0
In the future, CET may be able to add service in La Pine. Please indicate what type of service you would like us to add. Choose up to 2.	
Switch local (in-town) service to fixed route (no reservation required)	9
Add evening hours to local in-town service	3
Add morning hours to local in-town service	3
Add La Pine-Bend Community Connector Runs When? Evening Day or Evening Midday Allow for workday in La Pine Both morning and evening Replace ones that were eliminated (2) Daytime	8
Add La Pine-Bend Community Connector Stops Where? COCC (2) Library/Parks and Rec Area (also near schools) Close to areas that are no longer served To my home in Pine Crest	6
Add weekend service to local Dial-A-Ride Sat (2) Sun (1)	3
Add weekend service to Community Connector	7
Other Ideas? Please Explain: <i>More carpool connections and information sharing, getting the word out so residents become aware. Call in reservations on Monday for same day service (in case of emergency, sickness or other reasons) If commuting from Bend to La Pine, need to be in La Pine for 8.5 hours (8 hours work, ½ hour lunch). Can't work all day on this schedule. Don't need to add, just arrange later/earlier with transit time too.</i>	

<p><i>Ask the legislator for a local option sales tax authority.</i></p> <p><i>No recommendation on where/when service is needed, as I don't use it – I just know transit services are needed everywhere</i></p> <p><i>Volunteer Drivers using COIC van/insurance</i></p> <p><i>Community resources to get to CC hub/pick-up location</i></p> <p><i>This the same as De Kalb County Illinois. It was very good!</i></p> <p><i>People plan appointments for Bend during certain times (ie Tuesday, Thursday morning) as much as possible. Working together instead of individual demands and plans. Coordination-team work, goal focused.</i></p> <p><i>Better communication with dispatch</i></p>	
How should bus service be funded? Please indicate your preferred method of funding. Choose up to 2.	
Maintain current funding profile (decreasing revenues)	3
Increase fares	13
Increase City General Fund contribution	6
Property Tax Measure	9
Payroll Tax Measure	
Pass a City Transit Utility Fee	8
<p>Other Ideas? Please Explain:</p> <p><i>Business Contributions (2)</i></p> <p><i>What area for the property tax? Service area? Whole tri-counties? – I'd vote for it!</i></p> <p><i>Pay more</i></p> <p><i>Partnerships – COCC, COVO</i></p> <p><i>Anyway to share funding with schools? Use the school bus drivers during non-student time?</i></p> <p><i>Seek local sales tax option</i></p> <p><i>Let passengers who aren't in the service area pay more</i></p> <p><i>Some method of taxing the surrounding area that use the service</i></p> <p><i>Coordinate and bring together the other options, from the American Legion Volunteers in Action, Commute Options, etc.</i></p> <p><i>Funding: Partner with private organizations, churches too!</i></p>	

Madras Area

Figure 4 Survey Results - Jefferson County Senior Meal

Should Jefferson County have some sort of transit service?	
Yes	10
No	0

In the future, CET may be able to add service in Jefferson County. Please indicate what type of service you would like us to add.	
Switch to fixed route local service (no reservation required)	2
Add evening hours to local Dial-A-Ride	2
Add morning hours to local Dial-A-Ride	1
Add Madras-Redmond Community Connector Runs	2
Add Madras-Warm Springs Community Connector Runs	
Add Madras-Metolius/Culver Community Connector Runs	4
Add weekend service to local Dial-A-Ride	4
Add weekend service to Community Connector	2
Other Ideas? Please Explain: <i>Replace services CET cut (2)</i>	
How should local public bus service be funded? Please indicate your preferred method of funding.	
Maintain current funding profile	
Increase fares <i>Increase fares for pick-up outside the area</i>	4
Increase City General Fund contribution	3
Property Tax Measure	1
Payroll Tax Measure	
Pass a City Transit Utility Fee	2
Other Ideas? Please Explain: <i>Take 1% of PDX LightRail wasted money!</i> <i>Obama money</i> <i>Pay extra for additional services</i>	

Figure 5 Survey Results - Madras COCC Public Meeting

What is your priority additional service for Madras?	
Switch to Fixed Route local service	
Add evening hours to local DAR	
Add additional morning hours to local DAR	
Add Madras-Redmond Community Connector	7
Add Madras-Warm Springs Community Connector	2
Add Madras-Metolius/Culver Community Connector	1
Ad Saturday or Sunday service to local DAR or Community Connector	1
Other Ideas- Same- Day Service	5

How should transit service be funded?	
Maintain Current Funding Profile (decreasing revenue)	
Increase fares	5
Increase City General Fund Outlay	5
Property Tax Measure	
Payroll Tax Measure	
Pass a City Transit Utility Fee	5
Other Ideas – Please Explain	

Figure 6 Survey Results - Metolius Public Meeting

Should Jefferson County have some sort of transit service?	
Yes	9
No	0
In the future, CET may be able to add service in Jefferson County. Please indicate what type of service you would like us to add. (Choose 1)	
Switch to fixed route local service (no reservation required)	4
Add evening hours to local Dial-A-Ride	2
Add morning hours to local Dial-A-Ride	
Add Madras-Redmond Community Connector Runs	
Add Madras-Warm Springs Community Connector Runs	
Add Madras-Metolius/Culver Community Connector Runs	1
Add weekend service to local Dial-A-Ride	2
Add weekend service to Community Connector	1
Other Ideas? Please Explain	
How should local public bus service be funded? Please indicate your preferred method of funding. (Choose 1)	
Maintain current funding profile	3
Increase fares	
Increase City General Fund contribution	
Property Tax Measure	
Payroll Tax Measure	1
Pass a City Transit Utility Fee	5
Other Ideas? Please Explain: <i>County General Fund/Regional Public-Private Partnerships (1)</i>	

Prineville

Figure 7 Survey Results - Prineville Senior Meal

Should Prineville have transit service?	
Yes	16
No	0
What potential service additions would you use? (Choose 1)	
Saturday local public bus service in town	5
Sunday local public bus service in town	0
Fixed-route (buses come to stops at scheduled times) local service	10
Weekend Community Connector Service	3
Other _____	
Cost reduction options (Choose 1)	
Reduce size of local public bus service area	4
Cut Community Connector service to Redmond: early morning trips (Depart Prineville: 5:13a and 6:36a)	2
Cut Community Connector service to Redmond: mid-morning trips (Depart Prineville: 7:56a and 9:11a)	4
Cut Community Connector return from Redmond: late afternoon trips (Depart Redmond: 2:42p and 4:02p)	1
Cut Community Connector return from Redmond: Evening trips (Depart Redmond: 5:22p and 6:37p)	3

Figure 8 Survey Results - Prineville Public Meeting

Cost Reduction Options (Choose 1)	
Reduce Service Area to City Limits	1
Cut Juniper Canyon CC	4
Cut CC: early morning	1
Cut CC: mid-morning	0
Cut CC: late afternoon trips	0
Cut CC: evening trips	0
Other: Reduce service based on lack of use	7

Funding Options	
Maintain Current Funding Profile	2
Increase Fares	2
Increase City/County General Fund Outlay	8
Property Tax Measure	
Payroll Tax Measure	
Pass a City Transit Utility	8
Other: Jefferson and Deschutes Counties contribute	4

Redmond

Figure 9 Survey Results - Redmond Public Meeting

Indicate your short-term, cost-neutral priorities for transit	
Maintain Current Demand-Response Public Bus System	
Switch to "modest" fixed route	11
Other: <i>Remove airporter service</i> <i>Eliminate service to Eagle Crest (2)</i> <i>Eliminate service to Terrebonne (1)</i> <i>Eliminate Community Connector shuttles that are not being used</i>	
Indicate your preferred service addition, if any	
Further Expand Service Area <i>Additional capacity for curb-to-curb</i>	1
Increase # of Community Connector Shuttles <i>Relate to work-force needs</i>	1
Extend evening service hours	
Add Saturday service	8
Other Ideas: <i>Increase bike capacity</i> <i>Integrate subsidized ridership (school buses, VA buses, etc)</i>	
Cost Reduction Options to Offset Service Additions	
Reduce Service Area to City Limits	11
Reduce or Eliminate Community Connector Shuttle	1

Sisters

Figure 10 Survey Results - Sisters Senior Meal

What service addition would you use?	
Mon-Fri local public bus service	10
Sunday local public bus service	1
Fixed-route (buses come to stops at scheduled times) local service	2
Additional Community Connector Service (service to other towns)	4
What service would you cut?	
Shrink local public bus service area	
Cut Community Connector service to Redmond: morning trips	2
Cut Community Connector service to Redmond: midday trips	10
Cut Community Connector service to Redmond: late afternoon/evening trips	5
Would you prefer a shuttle to Redmond or to Bend?	
Community Connector trip to Redmond	6
Community Connector trip to Bend	13

Figure 11 Survey Results - Sisters Public Meeting

Should the Community Connector go to Redmond or Bend?	
Community Connector trip to Redmond	10
Community Connector trip to Bend	3
Cost-Reduction Service Options	
Reduce service area to city limits	11
Reduce or eliminate morning CC shuttles (6:32a or 7:52a)	0
Reduce or eliminate late morning/early afternoon shuttles from Sisters (9:07a and 3:12p)	2
Reduce or eliminate evening return from Redmond (5:22p)	1
Comments: <i>If the shuttles worked with better timing, there could be two in operation rather than three.</i>	
Transit Funding Options	
Maintain Current Funding Profile	
Increase Fares	
Increase City General Fund Outlay	7
Property Tax Measure	7
Payroll Tax Measure	1
Pass a City Transit Utility Fee	3

[Regional Transit Master Plan] | VOLUME III
[Outreach and Engagement]

Other: Vehicle Registration Transit Tax	5
---	---