



MODUS

from insight to impact

Appendix 1

TRANSLINK TRANSIT FARE REVIEW CONSULTATION

Phase 1 Stakeholder Engagement Summary



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Introduction..... 3**
- Part 1. What we did 3**
 - Notification and Promotion 3**
 - Engagement Activities..... 3**
 - Participants 4**
 - Event Design..... 3**
- Part 2: What we heard 3**
 - Exercise 1 4**
 - Exercise 2 20**
 - General Comments..... 24**
 - Feedback Forms 25**

INTRODUCTION

TransLink is currently reviewing its 3-zone fare structure, which has remained relatively unchanged for over 30 years. In Phase 1 of the Transit Fare Review process, we asked key stakeholders, transit users and the general public to identify issues associated with the current fare structure, and to identify the objectives that are important to them for the future fare system.

In Phase 1 of the Transit Fare Review, TransLink held three stakeholder forums and three individual stakeholder meetings to help understand the needs and concerns of key stakeholders. This was done in addition to running and promoting a public, region-wide survey.

This document summarizes the results of the Phase 1 stakeholder forums and individual meetings.

PART 1. WHAT WE DID

STAKEHOLDER NOTIFICATION AND PROMOTION

Through February and March of 2016, TransLink worked with Modus to develop a comprehensive database of key organizations to engage as stakeholders in the Regional Transit Fare Review process. The BC211 service supported the identification and prioritization of key stakeholder groups by providing TransLink with a list of the most referred organizations by area of focus and geographic region.

During April 29 and May 11, 2016 TransLink sent 526 invitations to regional stakeholders inviting them to attend one of three stakeholder forums being organized as part of Phase 1 of the Fare Review process. Due to the nature of the forums, social media was not used to promote these three events. The week prior to the forums being held, phone calls were made to all organizations that had not responded to email invitations. The phone calls served to ensure that organizations had received the invitation and were able to attend an event if interested.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

STAKEHOLDER FORUMS

Three stakeholder forums took place between May 18 and 19 in three sub-regions: Vancouver, Coquitlam and Surrey at different times of day. At the forums, attendees sat at tables in groups of seven or less.

The events began with an opening presentation by TransLink staff, introducing stakeholders to the Transit Fare Review process and its objectives, as well as the history of the fare system and recent changes. Staff asked for questions from the floor, and provided answers before moving on.

Stakeholders then participated in two small group exercises:

- In Exercise 1, participants individually ranked 14 “current issue” statements regarding the existing fare system before engaging in group discussion of their ranking.

- In Exercise 2, participants individually voted for the four objectives that they felt were most important from a list of 11 statements before engaging in group discussion of their votes.

TransLink staff served both as content experts and facilitators for each small group.

The outcome of each group exercise was a summary of attendee concerns related to the current fare system and feedback on the most important objectives for a future fare system.

INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS

Three meetings were held by request and followed the format used at the stakeholder forums. The meetings were hosted by stakeholder groups at locations best suited to their representatives. During the individual meetings, the stakeholders participated in the same two exercises presented at the forums. A fourth meeting was held with the Users Advisory Committee and six committee members also provided input through the same two exercises. In this report, input from all meetings and committee members is identified under the heading of “Individual Meetings.”

PARTICIPATION

A total of 66 stakeholders attended the three forums, with 11 stakeholders attending the individual meetings. In total, there were 77 participants.

These stakeholders included representatives from:

- **Local governments**
- **Transit oriented groups**
- **Secondary & Post-secondary institutions and student societies**
- **Accessibility and diversity groups**
- **Social Service organizations & care providers**
- **Local policy advocacy groups**
- **BIAs & Chambers of Commerce**
- **Neighbourhood houses & community associations**
- **Seniors Groups**

PART 2: WHAT WE HEARD

EXERCISE 1

In Exercise 1, participants were asked to provide feedback on the “current issues” with TransLink’s fare system. Groups were presented with 14 “statements”, one at a time. They were then asked to rate each statement on a Likert scale by placing a sticky dot on the rating bar provided. The rating bar ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Below is a summary of feedback for each statement. Additional comments made during the discussion of each statement are noted below each graph.¹

Ratings are also sorted by the three locations where the forums took place: Coquitlam, Surrey and Vancouver. Ratings from individual meetings are also included.

SUMMARY OF EXERCISE 1 RESULTS

When forum participants were asked what level of agreement² they had with a set of four statements on the current fare policy, the statements with the highest level of agreement were³:

- There should be fare product options to make transit more affordable for families to travel together (95% Agree or Strongly Agree with this statement).
- There should be more fare products for different periods of time (68% Agree or Strongly Agree with this statement).

Statements with the highest level of disagreement were:

- The current zone-based fare structure works well (60% Disagree or Strongly Disagree with this statement).
- The current transfer window (90 minutes) is long enough (63% Disagree or Strongly Disagree with this statement).

When forum participants were asked what level of agreement they had with a set of 10 statements on transit fare system preferences, the top three statements with the highest level of agreement were:

1. Fares should be set to be a cost competitive alternative to driving (90% Agree or Strongly Agree with this statement).
2. Fares should be lower for people with less ability to pay than for people with more ability to pay (76% Agree or Strongly Agree with this statement).
3. Fares should be lower at less busy times of day and higher at busier times of day (54% Agree or Strongly Agree with this statement).
4. Fares should be lower for shorter distance trips than longer distance trips (44% Agree or Strongly Agree with this statement).

¹ “Additional Comments” are intended to be representative of what was discussed at the stakeholder forum for each survey question. It is not a comprehensive documentation of every comment received.

² “Don’t Know” responses are excluded from the summaries of responses. This report summarizes how those who expressed an opinion (even a neutral opinion) who use a service being rated, or expressed a reaction (even a neutral reaction) to a statement or priority rate their level of satisfaction with how fares are determined for that service. “Don’t Know” responses range from 0%-11% of total responses depending on the question.

³ There is a subtle difference in the phrasing of these four statements on the current fare system. Two of the four statements use the phrase “there should be” and are asking respondents to use the current system as a baseline and compare a future transit fare system with what is available today.

The statement with the highest level of disagreement overall was that “Fares should be the same for all customers and all trips.” 85% of stakeholders Disagree or Strongly Disagree with this statement.

Forum participants also expressed strong disagreement with the statement that fares should be lower for people who use transit frequently than for people who use transit occasionally (61% Disagree or Strongly Disagree with this statement).

The following is a summary of the votes and comments received for each of the statements discussed in Exercise 1. The additional comments are taken directly from participant exercises.

A. THE CURRENT ZONE-BASED FARE STRUCTURE WORKS WELL




Figure 1 Responses to "The current zone-based fare structure works well."

Additional Comments

- Zones are ineffective and don't represent the public's travel needs (4 comments)
- Disagree with multi-zone system, prefer one zone (2 comments)
- Zones are complicated (2 comments)
- Zones penalize people near boundaries (2 comments)
- Too expensive
- Travel purpose – need vs want
- People with disabilities may be unable to pay for more zones
- Inconsistencies with fare structure on the North Shore
- Outdated pre-technology

B. THE CURRENT TRANSFER WINDOW (90 MINUTES) IS LONG ENOUGH




Figure 2 Responses to "The current transfer window (90 minutes) is long enough."

Additional Comments

- Need longer transfer windows for travelling to suburbs because of transfers/connections
- Not extending time is inconvenient and increases walking time
- South of Fraser takes longer to get places
- Should be the window for the longest ride
- No time cap encourages sprawl
- Students should be able to go to class and back on the same ticket
- Bowen Island inconvenience, sometimes cannot make the connection in the time frame
- The region is big, sometimes cannot complete trips especially on the bus
- Wait time for buses causes delay
- More data needed on revenue loss

C. THERE SHOULD BE FARE PRODUCT OPTIONS TO MAKE TRANSIT MORE AFFORDABLE FOR FAMILIES TO TRAVEL TOGETHER




Figure 3 Responses to "There should be fare product options to make transit more affordable for families to travel together."

Additional Comments

- How is "family" defined? (5 comments)
- Needs to be cost competitive when compared to travel by car (4 comments)
- Family pass, more affordable and flexible fare products makes transit more useful (4 comments)
- Not enough time for return trips, bus pass-ups an issue
- Support transit to events

D. THERE SHOULD BE MORE FARE PRODUCT OPTIONS FOR DIFFERENT TIME DURATIONS (E.G. MULTI-DAY, WEEKEND, ANNUAL).




Figure 4 Responses to "There should be more fare product options for different time durations (e.g. multi-day, weekend, annual)."

Additional Comments

- Should have more time-based passes – e.g. weekly passes

E. FARES SHOULD BE LOWER AT LESS BUSY TIMES OF DAY AND HIGHER AT BUSIER TIMES OF DAY




Figure 5 Responses to "Fares should be lower at less busy times of day and higher at busier times of day."

Additional Comments

- Individuals may not be able to choose when they travel, need system changes (3 comments)
- Transit pricing should be more equitable like MSP
- Transit should not be redistributive
- Discounting fares for low-income will not attract middle class riders
- Transit reduces barriers and is needed
- Non-profits should be able to buy fares in smaller increments more easily
- This is incentive for travelling at different times

F. FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR PEOPLE WITH LESS ABILITY TO PAY (E.G. CHILDREN, STUDENTS, LOW-INCOME) AND HIGHER FOR PEOPLE WITH MORE ABILITY TO PAY




Figure 6 Responses to "FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR PEOPLE WITH LESS ABILITY TO PAY (E.G. CHILDREN, STUDENTS, LOW-INCOME) AND HIGHER FOR PEOPLE WITH MORE ABILITY TO PAY."

Additional Comments

- How do you prove inability to pay, overcome stigmatizing and administrative barriers (7 comments)
- Proportionate to income (3 comments)
- Those with more ability to pay may not use transit (2 comments)
- Calgary system uses income tiers
- Could make it easier to take transit
- Could encourage abuse of the system, status quo may be better
- Better understanding of pricing needed
- Consider families, immigrants, single parents, students, student-parents with children and other groups with low incomes and their needs

G. FARES CURRENTLY COVER A BIT MORE THAN HALF OF THE COST OF OPERATING TRANSIT. FARES SHOULD BE SET TO COVER A HIGHER SHARE OF TRANSIT COSTS




Figure 7 Responses to "FARES CURRENTLY COVER A BIT MORE THAN HALF OF THE COST OF OPERATING TRANSIT. FARES SHOULD BE SET TO COVER A HIGHER SHARE OF TRANSIT COSTS."

Additional Comments

- Transit is public (2 comments)
- Should encourage transit use, mobility (2 comments)
- Pay more taxes and less fares
- Transit fares should cover more costs
- Increasing price will not increase ridership

H. FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR SERVICES THAT COST LESS TO BUILD AND OPERATE, AND HIGHER FOR SERVICES THAT COST MORE TO BUILD AND OPERATE




Figure 8 Responses to "FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR SERVICES THAT COST LESS TO BUILD AND OPERATE, AND HIGHER FOR SERVICES THAT COST MORE TO BUILD AND OPERATE."

Additional Comments

- Variability in service type prices will skew usage
- Equal opportunity for all services
- Encourage more SkyTrain use by keeping price the same
- Most users utilize a variety of services
- Hard to predict cost to user
- Invest in services

I. FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR SHORTER DISTANCE TRIPS AND HIGHER FOR LONGER DISTANCE TRIPS




Figure 9 Responses to "FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR SHORTER DISTANCE TRIPS AND HIGHER FOR LONGER DISTANCE TRIPS."

Additional Comments

- Penalize based on where you live and work/study (5 comments)
- Housing price moves lower-income out of Vancouver (3 comments)
- Identify benefits for suburban commuters (i.e. charging more needs longer transfer windows)
- Low fare for shorter trips
- Businesses would prefer clients to have access to whole region at same rate
- Low income clients aren't going far
- Look into new partnerships with developers and employers
- Lower fares for standing rather than sitting on crowded busses
- There are many services that are only available in Vancouver, paying more is unfair
- Vancouver residents pay a premium to live closer to these services
- Some health services are only downtown, lower income households suffer

J. FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR SLOWER AND LESS DIRECT SERVICES AND HIGHER FOR FASTER AND MORE DIRECT SERVICES




Figure 10 Responses to "FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR SLOWER AND LESS DIRECT SERVICES AND HIGHER FOR FASTER AND MORE DIRECT SERVICES."

Additional Comments

- Equity issue, could create a 2-tiered system (3 comments)
- Don't trust TransLink to assess what is needed
- TransLink should service all areas equally
- Prices should reflect quality of services
- Support more efficient system

K. FARES SHOULD BE SET SO THAT TAKING TRANSIT IS A COST COMPETITIVE ALTERNATIVE TO DRIVING




Figure 11 Responses to "FARES SHOULD BE SET SO THAT TAKING TRANSIT IS A COST COMPETITIVE ALTERNATIVE TO DRIVING."

Additional Comments

- Wait times, travel time, convenience are opportunity costs and should be taken into account as well as fares (6 comments)
- Taking transit should be cheaper, more convenient than driving (3 comments)
- Increase options for seniors to move safely
- Car sharing is cheaper than transit
- Define cost competitive, it is not just money
- Fairness, equity, choice
- Benefits of transit also include clean air and less congestion

L. FARES SHOULD BE THE SAME FOR ALL CUSTOMERS AND ALL TRIPS




Figure 12 Responses to "FARES SHOULD BE SET SO THAT TAKING TRANSIT IS A COST COMPETITIVE ALTERNATIVE TO DRIVING."

Additional Comments

- Differentiate most users, some groups should pay less (ex. students, low income, seniors, people with disabilities) (5 comments)
- Single fare for HandyDART
- One price is equitable
- System should take into account the needs of different users

M. FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR PEOPLE WHO USE TRANSIT FREQUENTLY AND HIGHER FOR PEOPLE WHO USE TRANSIT OCCASIONALLY




Figure 13 Responses to "FARES SHOULD BE LOWER FOR PEOPLE WHO USE TRANSIT FREQUENTLY AND HIGHER FOR PEOPLE WHO USE TRANSIT OCCASIONALLY."

Additional Comments

- Everyday users should pay less
- Those who have no other choice should pay less
- Seniors sometimes need to travel for health appointments, infrequently
- Some are unable to pay large upfront costs for discounted price (i.e. for monthly pass)
- Cheaper fares encourage trials by new customers
- BC UPass is good for encouraging ridership
- Depends on the degree of difference in pricing

N. FARES SHOULD BE LOWER IN AREAS WITH INFREQUENT SERVICE AND HIGHER IN AREAS WITH FREQUENT SERVICE




Figure 14 Responses to "FARES SHOULD BE LOWER IN AREAS WITH INFREQUENT SERVICE AND HIGHER IN AREAS WITH FREQUENT SERVICE."

Additional Comments

- Would shift which services would be used, areas of growth (3 comments)
- Less useful services should be cheaper
- Need more technical information on this issue

EXERCISE 2

In Exercise 2, forum participants were asked to provide feedback on a set of “possible objectives of the future fare system.” Groups were asked to read and consider 11 possible objectives. They were then given four sticky dots and asked to vote for the four objectives they considered the most important.

Afterwards, the top four objectives for each group were discussed. Forum participants were also given a space to write other additional objectives.

Below is a summary of comments for each objective. The overall ranking for objectives was calculated by tallying votes from all participants. There were a total of 85 participants across forums and meetings.




Figure 15 Stakeholders' selection of top four priorities for future fare structure

SUMMARY OF EXERCISE 2 RESULTS

When given a set of 11 priorities for TransLink’s future fare structure and asked to rank their top four, forum participants listed their top priorities were affordability for those with less ability to pay, ease of use, affordability for families and frequency of use.

1. Make fares lower for people with less ability to pay (e.g. children, youth, low-income) (91%).
2. Make it easy to understand and predict how much you will pay (66%).
3. Provide more fare product options to make transit more affordable for families to travel together (61%).
4. Make fares lower for people who use transit frequently (47%).

The priority that received the lowest level of support from forum participants was “Make fares lower for services that cost less to build and operate” (1%).

Below is a summary of the rankings and key comments for each of the 11 priorities. Comments are taken directly from the worksheets in exercise 2.

1. Makes fares lower for shorter trips

Overall ranking: 6 (27 forum participants (31%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- Current system is unfair when it comes to short trips across zone boundaries (4 comments).
- Shorter trips by distance/time should pay less (3 comments).
- Lower fares for shorter distances could discourage short bike or walk trips.

2. Makes fares lower in areas with infrequent service

Overall ranking: 10 (5 forum participants (6%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- Infrequent service encourages car use, but lower fares could counterbalance.

3. Fares should be the same for all customers and all trips

Overall ranking: 9 (7 forum participants (8%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- User groups have diverse needs and specialty fare products should accommodate that.
- Define “family” when considering family passes.

4. Makes fares lower for people with less ability to pay (e.g. children, youth, low-income)

Overall ranking: 1 (79 forum participants (91%) chose this objective as one of their top four). All participants in the forums ranked this objective as one of their top four.

Key comments from forum participants included:

- Take into account mobility, accessibility, inclusion, ability to pay (5 comments)

- Transit must be considered a public service and accessible to all financially and physically (4 comments).
- Partnerships with government and organizations that work with low-income groups (3 comments).
- Need to acquire data and determine how costs for different groups affect ridership.
- Support the user groups who have no other option but to use the transit system (3 comments)
- Support HandyDART (2 comments).
- Make fares lower for lower-income, since ticketing is a waste of resources if people are unable to pay.
- Some groups are unable to pay and access cheaper transit (i.e. monthly passes).
- Access to lower fares helps people transition into higher income opportunities.
- Support mobility of seniors and those with disabilities by lowering fares.
- High school students would become more familiar with transit use if transit were cheaper for them.

5. Provide more fare options to make transit more affordable for families to travel together

Overall ranking: 3 (53 forum participants (61%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- Provide options to make transit convenient and affordable for families (4 comments).
- What is the definition of “family”? There are different types of families. “Groups” would be easier to understand and more flexible.
- Liked the program where families could travel with up to four people on Sundays and holidays.
- Incentive to drive cars is high, it is cheaper and more convenient when there are larger families.

6. Provide more fare options for different lengths of time

Overall ranking: 7 (15 forum participants (17%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- What is meant by different lengths of time?
- Incentivise transit for variety of groups: tourists, temporary needs, part-time workers.
- Compass card reward program.
- Transfer times are important as some trips take longer than 90 minutes in one direction.
- Week-long or multi-day fares.

7. Makes fares lower for people who use transit frequently

Overall ranking: 4 (41 forum participants (47%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- Monthly passes from day purchased rather than calendar month.
- Concern that single use ticket prices could go up.
- Some cannot afford monthly passes, don’t have a choice.
- This provides incentive for people to use transit more, provide better value for frequent travellers.
- Support for week-long or multi-day fares.

8. Makes fares lower at less busy times

Overall ranking: 5 (35 forum participants (40%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- This could reduce/manage congestion.
- Penalizes those who do not have a choice with work schedules.

9. Makes fares lower for services that cost less to build and operate

Overall ranking: 11 (4 forum participant (5%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- If there is no choice but to take the higher costing option, it is unfair.
- Capital costs should not affect fares.
- Creates a 2-tiered system.
- Creates trade-off between capital costs and ridership.

10. Makes fares lower for slower and less direct services

Overall ranking: 8 (9 forum participants (10%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- Bus and SkyTrain should not be priced the same.
- Could improve system in isolated areas.
- Does not make the system more equitable.
- Creates 2-tiered system.
- Public system should not be elitist.
- Flat fare instead.

11. Make it easy to understand and predict how much you'll pay

Overall ranking: 2 (57 forum participants (66%) chose this objective as one of their top four).

Key comments from forum participants included:

- Ensure the costs are predictable and all users understand what they're paying for.
- Change affects some people more than others.
- Compass card system is complicated and confusing for many
- Travel transfer time needs to be given.
- Real time bus arrival information is useful.
- Non-native English speakers may be confused with the system.
- Easy to understand reduces barrier to use the system.

Additional Objectives

In the meeting with the User Advisory Committee, an additional objective was provided as an option. The objective statement was "Makes fares more consistent across the whole transit system including conventional and Access Transit." Two participants chose this objective as one of their top four.

Other key ideas from forum participants:

- Transfer window is not enough for longer connections and less mobile groups.
- Fares should be the same for all trips.
- Make transit cost competitive with driving.
- Make fares different for standing and sitting passengers.
- Make transit data driven.
- Create more fare options.
- Park and ride options.
- Integrate transit fares with other travel charges i.e. tolls.
- Explore idea of public transit being a free service.
- Work more with users who are dependent on transit due to disability and low-income status.
- Base fares on income.
- Work with other transportation partners (ex. ferries) to provide integration between modes.
- Special fares during events.
- HandyDART should cost the same as conventional transit.
- Make fares free for all people with disabilities and seniors.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Below are key comments from forum participants that were included in discussion notes from Exercise 1 and 2, but were not a part of the exercise questions. Comments from individual meetings are also included.

Process

- Fare Review process should have been completed by an external review group.
- Note the language used in the review process; users are more than just customers.
- Some of these questions are big policy questions.
- Work with organizations to disseminate information for those without internet or are unable to access.
- Issues do not resonate with Bowen Island Residents, focus on integration of transit needed.
- Explicitly focus on values of affordability, accessibility, equity, and inclusion.

Transit issues

- Include HandyDART as a service with bus pass.
- Bus access is very restricted for persons with wheelchairs, seniors, parents with strollers, etc.
- HandyDART costs too much, especially for those who use conventional transit too.
- Allow well behaved animals on the bus.
- Less reliable/less frequent services make users feel overcharged when paying the same price as those with frequent service.
- When competing with cars/car sharing, must take into account fare pricing as well as wait times, convenience.
- Better integrate conventional and access transit system.
- All door access on all busses.
- Access to information other than online due to access and/or inability to find the information.

- Work with organizations to communicate information.
- Make it easier for organizations to buy transit passes and distribute.
- Make it easier to understand cost between driving and taking transit.
- Transit is key to reducing isolation of senior and other less-mobile groups.
- Increase time transfer window.
- Make fare system easier to understand.
- Simplify bulk purchasing process of transit tickets.

Compass Card

- Online payments require credit cards, which not all people have access to, especially those with low-income.
- Transfer time is hard to keep track of since it is no longer printed.
- Hard to understand the Compass Card system.


Other

- “Pay it forward” idea to purchase a fare for another person.
- HandyDART trips, incentivize by allowing split fares if pick up and drop off are at same location.
- Pick up slack in limitations of provincial programs.
- Create more transport partnerships (ex. partner with ICBC to discount insurance when buying full year transit).
- Poor integration of fare prices and products between HandyDART and conventional transit for Access Transit customers.
- Fairness & equity concerns that different disabilities pay different fare prices (i.e., free for CNIB members, concession rates for HandyCard holders, adult rates for HandyDART trips).
- TaxiSavers should be cheaper and taxis should be better integrated into the system.
- Former HandyDART zones were complicated and burdensome.


FEEDBACK FORMS

Forum participants were asked to provide additional comments via a feedback form after the event. We received 79 completed and returned forms. Below is a summary of the responses.


1. How useful was the information provided today?




2. How clear/easy to understand was the information provided?



3. How useful were the exercises and discussions at the small tables?



4. Overall, how worthwhile do you feel it was to attend this forum?



Other comments

Comments that were related to fare issues were incorporated into the general comments section. Below are comments specific to each of the stakeholder forums and individual meetings.

Surrey

Overall, forum participants noted that the forum was well organized, and enjoyable. One person felt it was too much information for the time allocated and another said that some questions were too ambiguous. Another participant highlighted that the stakeholder groups were not diverse enough and that TransLink should try to gather a broader spectrum of participants in future.

Coquitlam

Responses from this forum emphasized that there should be more inclusive review efforts with HandyDART, disabled and senior services. One person thought some questions were confusing. Another would like to have seen more seniors groups invited.

Vancouver

Participants from this forum left generally positive reviews of the session, noting that it was a useful exercise and effective format. Some felt that questions were too ambiguous and the session should have been longer. One participant noted that stakeholders should have been more involved in the development of options presented.

Multiple respondents would like to see more focus on how HandyDART and disabled users would be taken into consideration. Other feedback included the challenge of discussing transit fares without discussing revenue streams and finances. Participants also noted that they would have liked to see an option to support free transit/transit as a public service.

Individual Meetings

There were no additional comments provided on the feedback forms by participants in the individual meetings.