
**COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONTHLY REPORT TO THE TPB**

July 16, 2025
Daniel Papiernik, CAC Chair

The July meeting of the CAC was held virtually on Thursday, July 10. The meeting featured a deep dive into DMVMoves. The CAC is preparing observations and recommendations to share with the Community Partners Advisory Group (CPAG) in September. This summary provides some highlights of the discussion.

DMVMOVES DISCUSSION

Following up on the June discussion, TPB staff presented information on the four initiatives that are public facing, including: fare policy integration; regional service guidelines and performance reporting; consistent bus stop design, wayfinding, and customer information; and a regional approach to bus priority. After each initiative was presented, the CAC discussed specific aspects of the initiative facilitated by prompting questions. Members were also polled to provide their feedback on overall aspects of each initiative. Draft notes and a summary of the CAC comments and recommendations will be shared with the CAC for review and a final version will be shared in September at the Community Partners Advisory Group (CPAG) meeting.

Questions and comments regarding fare policy integration:

Generally, there was overall support among the CAC members on universal transit credits and expanded regional transit passes. One shared concern was whether or not consideration had been given to potential impacts if there are cuts to programs that help people qualify for the discounted fares, such as SNAP and Medicaid. Staff indicated this has not been considered in DMVMoves yet, but the topic has come up a lot in the committees and may need to be addressed, perhaps by qualifying through some other means.

There needs to be a balanced approach to providing free or discounted fares. Consideration may need to be given to entire families, not just children or older adults. This effort could benefit by hearing from low-income families experiencing these challenges.

For people with disabilities and older adults, some consideration should be given to making it easier for them to receive their discounts from any transit provider. Currently it can be extremely challenging and difficult to navigate the various policies different providers may have, in addition to the physical challenges of actually obtaining the fare discounts

A unified approach should be considered for college students and youth. Encouraging transit use among teens and young adults develops the transit user base.

Micromobility providers should also be considered as part of fare policy integration.

It may take time to get all the operators to agree to a set of fare policies, not because they are unwilling, but because more riders will need to be convinced to take transit. For example, in Charles County, fares are free, but the buses are not reliable, timely or convenient.

Questions and comments on regional service guidelines and performance reporting:

Both guidelines and reporting are important to the CAC. Members would like to see these as transparent as possible to the public.

The question was asked if the idea of performance reporting is the obstacle that keeps the providers from agreeing to a standard set of service guidelines. The answer was no; they are open to working together on some standards. This might vary locally, though. Localities may want to keep some practices specific to them.

Having a common set of metrics would be helpful for understanding how regional service operators are performing individually and how the region is performing overall. There should be some common guidelines, such as meeting rider expectations for frequency, on-time performance, and safety. Perhaps a regional dashboard displaying the metrics would help with accountability and assurance.

Perhaps some guidelines on bus route naming/signage that identifies the current level of service that a route provides would be good. For example, quickly identifying routes on a map based on whether they have a commuter-level of service, regional-level of service, local-level of service, and rapid transit-level of service. That would help riders plan their transportation use efficiently and would help advocates and planners quickly identify where bus service is lagging current or planned development in an area.

Questions and comments on consistent bus stop design, wayfinding, and customer information:

The CAC members favored a bus stop design that met some agreed-upon standards, uniform wayfinding aids, and the one-call customer information number approach. Language access was also suggested as a uniform standard to be addressed, including the use of braille at a uniform location at all stops.

This discussion on consistency should include first-party apps, websites, etc. since these are often a primary method for wayfinding and trip planning. There should also be live location tracking as a means of knowing when other buses on other routes in the vicinity may be arriving so a person can make decisions. Bus stop designs should be friendly for everyone, and within the context of the surroundings. Adding cardinal points would also be very helpful, too. Connecting bike routes and sidewalks should be designed along with the bus shelter and kept in good repair.

When evaluating customer services region-wide, there should be some sort of level-of-service standard among the 14 different providers.

A regional approach to bus priority:

Since the meeting ran long, there wasn't as much opportunity to discuss this initiative, however members will be permitted to provide additional feedback via e-mail. In general, members support moving forward with the implementation of the bus priority routes, rather than waiting for more, and prefer action over a prolonged period of further analysis. The method of determining which routes to prioritize appears to be clear and needs to be administered in a coordinated and not haphazard manner. However, some consideration needs to be given to the next set of priority routes, such as MD 210, that could serve in to grow ridership. Pilot projects could be explored for routes experiencing congestion that may not otherwise meet the criteria for BRT.

ATTENDANCE

CAC Members

Daniel Papiernik, Chair
Ra Amin, Vice-Chair
Felicia Brannon, Vice-Chair
Martha Fedorowicz
Dan Hardy
Kevin Jiang
Madeline Kaba
Jenene Lee
Felipe Millan
Asa Orrin-Brown
Jeff Parnes
Lorena Rios
Gail Sullivan
Connor Young

Staff

Rachel Beyerle
Laura Bachle
Amanda Lau
Lyn Erickson
Pierre Gaunard
Eric Randall
Tom Harrington