



**Focus Groups of Durham and Orange County
Residents for 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan
September 2021**

Summary prepared by Aidil Ortiz
Aidilisms LLC
Durham, NC

Report date is January 10, 2022

In June 2021, Aidilisms, LLC was contracted by the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) to facilitate the execution of focus groups of Durham and Orange County residents to better understand their views on major transit projects for the upcoming 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The scope of work for Aidilisms included the tasks below:

1. Recruit 20-50 participants that fall under one of the following four categories - low income, Latinx, youth, and seniors (5-10 participants per focus group)
2. Manage a registration process for all focus group participants and send reminders to ensure meeting attendance
3. Craft promotional materials to explain the purpose of the focus groups
4. Hold four online focus groups between September and October with Durham and Orange County residents about long range transportation needs
5. Create the script for the hour long focus group sessions **key questions and objectives for the focus group must be developed by the DCHC MPO**
6. Download recordings of focus groups to review for themes regarding transportation in Durham and Orange County
7. Synthesize responses from focus group dialogue for the purpose of updating the long-range plan
8. Coordinate language interpretation for the Latinx group focus group
9. Ensure payment of all focus group participants
10. Submit all data (recordings, notes, synthesis) to the DCHC MPO

By late August 2021, the contract between DCHC MPO and Aidilisms was completed and planning meetings began immediately after.

Recruitment Process

The recruitment window for focus group participants was open for about 2 weeks. A recruitment link and flyer were developed to ensure enough interest from Orange and Durham county residents to create focus groups of participants with background demographics that have been historically underserved by transportation systems and government processes.

During this process, the focus was on recruiting enough people who identify as Latinx, youth, seniors and low income. Aidilisms already had an extensive contact list of Engagement Ambassadors based in Durham and deep connections with regional non-profit organizations, community groups, advisory boards, and government agencies that work primarily with each of these target populations. Selected participants were offered an incentive of \$25 for their time for attending and participating in a full one-hour focus group. After the two week recruitment period, 81 people were in the recruitment database, and 39 people attended the groups.

Dates and Times of Focus Groups

Groups were held on the following days via Zoom. Each person that was selected to participate received at least two notices via email, a Google calendar invite, and text, reminding them of the meeting content, time, and zoom link information.

Wednesday, September 8, 7pm *interpreter joined for this call
12 people attended

Saturday, September 11, 11am
11 people attended

Wednesday, September 15, 7pm
9 people attended

Saturday, September 18, 11am
7 people attended

Demographics

The 39 people who participated in the focus groups gave us the following information about who they are. Information was given voluntarily and may not be comprehensive.

RACIAL, GENDER, and AGE DATA

6 participants identified as Latinx - 15%

18 people identified as a person of color - 46%

29 people identified as women - 74%

1 person identified as a member of the LGBTQ community and non-binary - 3%

11 people identified as seniors - 28%

8 people identified as youth - 21%

INCOME DATA

6 participants currently live in public housing - 15%

10 participants are currently low income - 26%

6 participants have had housing insecurity in their life experience - 15%

DISABILITY DATA

8 participants are currently part of the disability community - 21%

*as a parent, caretaker or person living with a disability

GEOGRAPHY DATA

24 participants currently live within Durham County - 62%

15 participants currently live within Orange County - 38%

Format of Focus Group

A moderator guide for the focus groups was created in partnership with Andy Henry and Anne Phillips to ensure that we were learning new information from focus group participants. Aidilisms does not believe in engaging community residents in “decision making under duress” by not presenting definitions of key terms or critical information regarding proposed transit services funded by tax dollars before beginning a dialogue about the kinds of choices presented to our local community.

Three terms were defined to frame the conversation: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), commuter rail, and bicycling and pedestrian facilities. We wanted to make sure people understood the features of BRT and a map of a proposed route before asking how they felt about this proposed idea in the MPO region. Also, because many lay people are confused between what a commuter rail and light rail is, time was spent explaining the features of the proposed commuter rail and sharing a map on the proposed commuter rail route. We also didn't want to gather uninformed opinions from focus group participants about what was included in bicycling and pedestrian facilities. For instance, most people when thinking of large scale transportation think of highways and not trails.

Once key terms and critical information about BRT and commuter rail were shared (how much will it cost to build, proposed fare, when can it be built, where does each mode of transportation go, and the frequency of the buses/trains), the discussion centered around three questions described in the script below.

The agenda below is the format for each focus group. Slides that were shared with focus group participants can be found [HERE](#).

**https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1lqHE_Nh1zHzRMDLOF0esDXSho9OQQcb-Gb-AjC7LTr0/edit?usp=sharing

Hello. My name is Aidil Ortiz and I'm the moderator for today's focus group discussion. (_____ MPO or city staff, will be taking notes.)

Our purpose today is to learn your thoughts on the needs we have in Durham and Orange County regarding transportation projects such as future highway, bicycle, pedestrian, trail and transit projects.

***Slide with map of geography of MPO*

This project is being conducted by the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC-MPO) which is responsible for transportation planning, coordination, and decision making in Durham County (entire county), a portion of Orange County including the Towns of Chapel Hill, Carrboro, and Hillsborough, and Northeast Chatham County.

***Slide of group agreements and notices*

We want this to be a free-flowing discussion and there are no right or wrong answers. We will be recording this call so that we can have a record of what was said to inform the research being done, but we will not link comments with anyone personally. We will only use first names during this discussion, and we won't ask questions that would identify where you live or other personal information. The audio recording will be destroyed when we have completed the study.

Please list your first name correctly in your screen. Before we get started, there are some ground rules and points of information that we need to cover:

- 1) Please talk one at a time so everyone will be able to hear and we can document your opinion clearly.*
- 2) We are not here to debate one another's opinions or experiences. We are here to receive the opinions, ideas, solutions, and experiences.*
- 3) We need to hear from everyone in the course of the discussion, but you don't have to answer every question.*
- 4) Remember to say what is true for you. We're interested in your opinion.*

We also need to cover Key Definitions before getting started.

Bus Rapid Transit - read definition on slide

Commuter Rail - read definition on slide

Biking and Pedestrian facilities - read definition on slide

**Now we can begin with questions - 40 min*

- 1) Icebreaker Question: How do you get around?*

Durham's population will increase by 50% by 2050. Because of this increase in people, the MPO understands that if we do nothing, travel times, traffic, and congestion will increase and this is bad for people and the environment.

***Slide of increased travel times*

We have some options for how to get people around and wanted to know what you think should be priorities. The two largest ways to get people around is by bus or train.

***Slide of BRT and Train details*

- 2) When you look at these two options, what are your reactions? Which do you feel more excited about?*

**slide of picture of biking and walking*

- 3) *What do you think about when you think about walking and biking safely around the community? What do you think needs to be done to encourage more of this and to do it safely?*

We're wrapping up now and wanted to know if you have any other questions or thoughts to share?

**slide of money symbol*

Those are all my questions. I want to thank you for your time today. Give me a little time to get your stipends out to you. If you want to keep up with information about this process, please visit www.dchcmpo.org for updates.

**Adjourn/Admin administers pay*

Findings

Residents with disabilities find our current infrastructure insufficient.

There were a variety of comments and considerations that people living with disabilities had about their ability to walk, roll, bike, or ride within the transportation system. First and foremost, focus group participants stated that the paratransit resources were not meeting their needs. This deficit is so large that local non profit organizations are organizing a corp of volunteer drivers to get people living with disabilities and other mobility needs to necessary appointments. Focus group participants shared that these volunteer resources are not enough to support their participation in the full spectrum of community life, but connects them to vital medical care.

Crossing county lines and navigating different systems remains difficult and means that many people with disabilities narrow the scope of their travel because of these difficulties.

Aside from paratransit, focus group participants were concerned about poorly constructed sidewalks and issues like curbs at crossings not being able to accommodate wheelchairs appropriately. Lack of access to sidewalks in many cases was of great concern for people living with a disability that need public transit to live as independently as possible.

“I’m here for my son who is autistic and he lives in an independent living situation with eleven other folks. They all rely on the bus.” ~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“My son has a disability and uses a wheelchair and he would like to be independent and use public transportation...we used it and that did not go very well for him so we sort of abandoned that.” ~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“The design of the sidewalks...what my son experiences is that when he goes on sidewalks the ramp tilts and the street part is not wide enough for his chair to stay straight.” ~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“I don’t have any way to get to public transportation.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“I feel that very much that for the underserved population that is exactly why they are underserved. That’s where the focus should be for the funding, and after they are served we can go on to talk about new routes and how to add new bus things.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“I worked in mental health for years and years and my clients did not have the rights to do easy transportation and they were always left out.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“Now I’m physically disabled and dependent on EZ Rider and that doesn’t do me much good.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“I am physically disabled. I only have EZ Rider, they won’t take me there. Hillsborough, I would have to change three times...I couldn’t manage the three transitions. It would have been hours....they don’t have enough drivers and they have tons of money.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“I paid my taxes and right now I am an impoverished aging disabled individual who is not counted. I do not get the transportation I need.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“I’ve been since 2010 dealing with transportation problems...There are so many people in this area and they have given up...You have got to think about disabled people as much as needed as the person who is working.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“Most of my travel was driving folks to their health care appointments because of the lack of county connectors for folks living anywhere in Orange County to get over into Durham County.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

More Focus Group Participants Prefer Bus Rapid Transit

Upon considering information regarding proposed bus rapid transit and commuter rail projects within the region, most participants expressed more excitement for bus rapid transit than commuter rail. Many participants felt that BRT would be more practical, flexible, cost effective, far reaching in serving more residents in the MPO region, and more feasible for GoTriangle to achieve than commuter rail.

Other participants also stated that because Orange and Wake County are already investing in BRT, lessons can be shared to improve the way BRT is rolled out for more high quality and effective delivery of transit improvements.

Focus group participants were also excited that BRT could be delivered much earlier than commuter rail because this meant that congestion and environmental benefits could be realized sooner. Finally, participants liked that the fare would be aligned with other Go Triangle bus fares.

“It would be more flexible so that if you find a certain route doesn’t have a lot of people you can shift it to another route where it will serve more people...Flexibility is an important part of the bus system.” ~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“It’s much more economical and financially realistic and saves a lot of money to do the bus versus the rail.” ~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“The bus rapid would be good because most of us use buses more than the commuter in my opinion.” ~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“BRT would serve more people in a quicker time frame. Looks like it has more definitive kind of predictable costs and the commuter rail project has a lot more variables...” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“When you’re talking about rapid transit and riding, really people that actually rely on that as their main source of transportation should be the closest to this conversation.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“Driving to Chapel Hill is a parking nightmare but I really want go to Chapel Hill more often. I would honestly take that bus and make that part of the adventure of going to dinner and going to see friends...I need to be concerned about the schedule.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“BRT is more flexible in terms of your destination so that you’re not committing all these resources to rail corridor.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

“You just can’t beat every 15 minutes.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

Participants were not against commuter rail but worried about the implications.

As mentioned above, participants did express worry about what trade offs they’d be asked to make in order to build a commuter rail. Focus group participants were concerned about route limitations of the commuter rail, the project cost, and the length of time it would take to build the system.

Orange County participants were concerned that the proposed route only connected Durham and Wake County. Commuter rail was also seen as less attractive because it would reach fewer places and the cost of using the system would be potentially higher (i.e. concerns over ticket price and whether there will be charges to use the park and ride lots).

Funding this with so many local tax dollars felt challenging to a few participants and they worried that another bond would have to be passed in order to fund the project and that a lot of money has already been spent without a positive outcome previously on the light rail. There are so many ways in which our local transit is not meeting the connection and safety needs of residents and there was concern that pursuing a commuter rail would distract from consistently stated needs.

The time it would take to build commuter rail was seen as a barrier to experiencing environmental benefits sooner compared to BRT.

“Solutions that go more places is greatly needed.” ~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“Just thinking about commuter rails in other areas that are more strategic in long term planning...I think this one isn’t. It’s not really thinking about the whole growth not just of this area but as the state in thinking of how commuters actually travel across the state knowing that people commute from Greensboro to the Raleigh-Durham area.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“Commuter rail and light rail is a much more expensive costly ride than catching the bus. The \$2 we pay to ride the bus in Durham won’t be the \$2 you pay to ride the commuter rail.”

~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“Commuter rail conversation is basically dead on arrival and that’s because so many tax dollars were spent in the failed light rail conversation that were never accounted for and people were very skeptical about that....And to this day we don’t have anything to show for it.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“It would need to run four times an hour, almost 24 hours a day...My schedule is unpredictable enough that I can’t rely on it unless I know that those trains are gonna be there very frequently.”

~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“Hyper focus on able bodied professionals is at the expense of those who are disabled.” Focus Group 3 Participant

“Bringing so many people to the table to agree on a really large project only to have it canceled is not good.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

Residents feel that hours and frequency of operation on public transit are too limited.

Focus group participants mentioned that using transit to get to points of interest in the early evening was possible, but returning home from late shifts, community events, or other recreation was not feasible with the current bus schedules. Many people mentioned that they would use public transit more often if they felt they could get to and from where they are going during off peak times. The pandemic has changed expectations around commuting and when work is done. The traditional morning and evening rush hours don’t apply to many workers anymore including white collar workers that used to have traditional commuting patterns. This is a [national trend](#) that transportation organizations need to plan for.

“I’m all for the public transportation and increasing routes. I think it would open jobs too.”

~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“I moved here three years ago and really thrilled about the possibility of using the bus to get around, but then I discovered here in Chapel Hill that if I wanted to go to an event somewhere in the evening there was no way to get back home....I have a bus stop down the street in my house and I have yet to be on the bus in Chapel Hill.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“There’s no transportation in Orange County for anyone practically.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“The frequency of the schedule would make a huge difference there.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

“One issue that came up about the bus system was the fact that when I wasn’t able to take the bus for work, I would have liked to have used it on the weekends....but that was also when the service was nonexistent or least frequent. That in and of itself has discouraged me many weekends and holidays from using the bus system.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

Trails and protected bike lanes are very desired amenities for active transportation.

Many focus group participants commented on how unsafe they felt walking, rolling and biking in places that have close proximity to cars. They also mentioned that walk and cycling amenities need to be seen as part of a collection of strategies to prevent damage to the environment and reduce carbon emissions. In several focus groups, there was a desire to see the MPO look at trails, sidewalks, and bike lanes comprehensively so that travel can be done safely across county lines. Participants wanted a whole trail system where one could use these features as regular transportation and not just exercise or recreation. Participants also stated a preference for wider bike lanes that are protected and paved trails like the American Tobacco Trail. Wayfinding for pedestrians and cyclists was also requested as a way for people to know where they are headed in much the same way as cars are assisted with signs.

“The design of the sidewalks need to be more progressive and not just the minimum code so that wheelchairs can go safely.” ~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“In my neighborhood, there are no bike lanes or sidewalks.” ~ Focus Group 1 Participant

“Bicycling scares me around here.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“It seems like a lot of the investment in making it more accessible to walk or bike is concentrated in areas where people have walking and biking as like an option and not a necessity for them.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“Most of the places where we have our largest population of underserved individuals usually don’t have access to bike lanes, usually have the poorest of sidewalks, the poorest of lighting, and I watch students every day trying to catch a bus without a sidewalk anywhere....and they’re literally putting their life in danger.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“I have a bike and the trails make me feel better and even though we have dedicated bike lanes on Fayetteville Street the cars don’t pay it any attention.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“I would walk and bike more if there were more accessible paths.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“I feel like bike lanes actually aren’t enough and like I’m not personally comfortable even riding in a bike lane...I think actually protected trails that are not adjacent directly to a road where cars and trucks would be would definitely me personally a lot more comfortable.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“The American Tobacco Trail here is the epitome of what would be ideal.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“We have in Durham two maybe three blocks of what we consider really aspirational what we should be shooting for everywhere...where there is you know a painted bike lane, bollards kind of blocking traffic as well as some extra space between the cars. ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“In addition to trails though we need to connect roads to trails and have dedicated bike lanes in between....we need trails, we need dedicated bike lanes, we need sidewalks that are all interconnected.” ~ Focus Group 3 Participant

“Other people who live near Cornwallis can’t really walk...I would have to walk through yards in order to avoid being hit by a car.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

“I would love to bike more and I only felt safe doing it in parts of downtown Chapel Hill and even then only during daylight hours. I would love get to Durham on a bike, but there are really scary corridors I would not feel safe biking.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

“These paths from neighborhoods that go through shared green space that take a 30 minute walk into a 10-12 minute walk and a safer walk...There are a lot of little trails that can be made in between developments.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

“I would love to ride to work...but none of the roads have bike lanes.” ~ Focus Group 4 Participant

The bus system is difficult to understand and therefore there is hesitancy in using it.

Many participants in the focus groups moved to this area for retirement and looked forward to not driving in their older years. They looked forward to using public transit and chose housing near public transit, sidewalks, and trails. Even with the assistance of orientation sessions offered by senior centers in the region, they felt that the system was confusing and overwhelming to understand. This has limited their use of the system. Participants felt that existing tools to let you know where the bus is located are not as accurate as they’d like.

“The bus system isn’t easy to navigate. They can have more maps and do better things to show people how the buses connect....I had to find out by just ride them to know what buses went where.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

“One of the first things I did went to Seymour Center’s class on how to ride the bus and when I came out my eyes were glazed over because it was such a complicated thing.” ~ Focus Group 2 Participant

Recommendations

In the transportation planning field, equity considerations are usually limited to discussions of the legislative concept known as environmental justice. Environmental Justice (EJ) is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of race, ethnicity, income, national origin, or educational level with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies.

It is seen as a key metric and aspect of various [goals and objectives](#) for the 2050 MTP and even the notes from [public comments](#) emphasized that residents who hold historically marginalized identities or communities of concern (youth, seniors, BIPOC, disability community, LGBTQ+, non-English speakers, and low income people) should be seen as a priority in terms of what they experience as deficits within their transportation experiences in the region.

For these focus groups, special consideration was taken to make sure that members of historically marginalized communities and those who are dependent on public transit were successfully recruited to participate in the conversations.

An equity driven framework was applied in analyzing the comments produced within the four focus groups of this community research along with other existing research and data to produce the recommendations below to support the development of a 2050 MTP that meets the needs of the residents in this metro area. For the writer of this summary report, that means placing a special emphasis on recommending steps that can address issues directly tied to what the most negatively impacted people experience within an institution or industry. That often means that recommendations will look like a “super” serving of people who have been historically underserved by systems and institutions.

Recommendation #1 - Increase funding for resources that support the mobility of residents living with disabilities or experiencing other mobility issues. This includes funding for paratransit in the region, sidewalks, trails, ADA compliant bus stops, improved signaling, etc.

People with disabilities and those who support people with disabilities consistently shared their inability to use the services, deficits in the system, and the length of travel and wait times for services. Other data sources from recent community outreach efforts conducted by Kimley Horn for the update to the Durham Transit Plan demonstrated that paratransit was a top priority for future public transit investments. A recent bus stop audit in the region shows that out of the 945 stops assessed for ADA compliance, only 136 of them met that standard.

Investing in paratransit beyond federal requirements and connecting paratransit systems so they work seamlessly in the region would better serve the disability community.

Recommendation #2 - Include funding for high-quality Bus Rapid Transit. This project was seen favorably because it was seen as financially feasible. The \$220 million cost means that

other long standing priorities for public transit will not have to be sacrificed or reduced by this choice while still effectively cutting travel time and making public transit a higher quality experience. The ability to build it sooner, have cost savings in building a high quality version of this transportation technology because of upcoming projects on North Carolina Highway 147 and Interstate 40, eligibility for state and federal funding, and opportunity to add more BRT routes to other locations as development occurs is also attractive to MPO region residents.

Recommendation #3 - Increase the hours of service to nights and weekends, frequency of routes, and number of routes. Investing more dollars in local transit is, and has been seen, for a very long time as the most helpful way to make public transit accessible and practical for more users. Accomplishing this in the midst of a nationwide shortage of drivers requires that Go Triangle raises pay for drivers, offers shifts that are not as long, and continues to cover any training expenses of selected job applicants.

Recommendation #4 - Invest in a comprehensive Bike and Walking network that considers these modes of travel as seriously as travel by automobile. Protected bike lanes are too few throughout the region and are seen as the best incentive by focus group participants to increase cycling. Where protected bike lanes may not be feasible, it is recommended to invest in creative solutions such as a trail to connect people to destinations. There is a desire to see our sidewalks, bike lanes and trails operating as a comprehensive and seamless system complete with wayfinding and signage.

Recommendation #5 - Commuter Rail funding should rely more heavily on state and federal resources rather than local tax funds. Focus group participants expressed a desire to see money that would be spent on the process of exploring rail as an option to deliver long held needs of regular bus riders, low income residents, and people with disabilities. The \$180 million to explore the possibility of building a light rail could have funded about 50 years of free bus transit in our region and now that the region is experiencing tough economic times, there is less political will to take such risks again with local dollars before GoTriangle has built more community trust.

In a recent presentation of [community research by Kimley Horn during their Phase II outreach](#) (page 27, 31 and 37 of a report to Durham County Commissioners on October 4th), for those who identified as Persons of Color, youth or daily transit riders, transit improvements such as 15 minute service, more buses to more places, extended service on weekdays, and extended service on Sundays are more important than a passenger train. This answer in the survey was chosen more often than other choices.

It is also a public concern that the commuter rail's fare is not yet known, that agreements for necessary land use are still not complete, companies consistently brought up as justification for a commuter rail (i.e. Nike, Google, Apple, etc.) will not actually be located along the route of the commuter rail, and that the cost share to fund this project would come at the expense of many equity related needs within this region's public transit system. Residents want more visionary

solutions when it comes to rail and don't see the proposed route and service as compelling enough for the price.

Recommendation #6 - Invest in eco-friendly vehicles for improved environmental sustainability. Residents are concerned about the environment and with technology for buses that use cleaner energy and lower harmful emissions. Vehicles that contribute to our environmental goals should be purchased as we expand the fleet or replace vehicles that need to be taken out of service.

Recommendation #7 - Improve communication tools for how to navigate the public transit system. Apps for how to navigate the GoTriangle system and other auxiliary communication tools need to be improved for a more positive and effective user experience. Currently many errors occur in the accuracy of where buses are stated to be and this had made users of these tools find them unreliable. Invest in technology and communication expertise that can tailor tools that center the user experience.

Conclusion

Equity is stated as a goal of the 2050 MTP for DCHC MPO and CAMPO. It is important to note that equity is not just who we listen to but what stories we see as worth acting on when investing our resources. If equity is to be seen as a serious goal of any transit agency, then they must fund transit options with the view that they are essential social service functions for the most vulnerable in our communities. And they must be funded in a way that demonstrates the needs of the most vulnerable, before working to convert those who most often travel by car. Equity demands that you prioritize those most harmed by institutions and does not take the stated ideas and needs of all equally.

Residents living with a disability and low income people in the MPO region have fatigue from the transportation systems not working at the level that they need and much of that frustration was expressed in all the focus groups. Trust has been broken and many do not believe that our plans will deliver on their repeated requests. Continuing to neglect to respond appropriately at the scale of their needs while exploring options like commuter rail with so many local tax dollars for those with more privilege further erodes trust and lowers the opportunity for this plan to support a more equitable transportation future. Participants want to use public and active transportation even more than they do now, but the current logistics were a common barrier for many, even those who are dependent on our public transit systems.

Reference: Taylor, B.D., Morris, E.A. Public transportation objectives and rider demographics: are transit's priorities poor public policy?. *Transportation* **42**, 347–367 (2015).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-014-9547-0>