



Puget Sound Regional Council

Coordinated Mobility and Accessibility Committee Agenda

Date: June 18, 2025 from 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Online Meeting Only: Use Zoom Connection Information Provided Below

1. Welcome and Introductions (9:30 a.m.) – Jean Kim, PSRC

2. Action: Approval of Meeting Summary May 21, 2025 (9:35 a.m.)

3. Discussion: Key Transportation Needs of Priority Populations (9:40 a.m.)* – Jean Kim & Erin Hogan, PSRC

PSRC staff will present a synthesized summary of transportation needs drawn from:

- May CMAC meeting discussions (see attached summary)
- [Mentimeter survey](#) feedback (please fill out by June 16th. Request sent on June 4th via email.)
- Coordinated Mobility Plan community engagement

The CMAC members are expected to provide feedback on the following questions:

- Are there any key transportation needs missing or underrepresented?
- Does the meeting summary accurately reflect what we heard in May and from community members?
- Do any of the listed needs require clarification or reframing? Do you generally agree with how the needs are framed?

4. Discussion: Desired Outcomes and Strategies (10:20 a.m.) – Jean Kim & Erin Hogan, PSRC

PSRC will guide the committee in exploring desired outcomes (what success looks like) and strategies (coordinated approaches the region will take to achieve those outcomes) aligned with confirmed transportation needs. The meeting summary includes a few initial ideas suggested by members in May, and the committee will continue to expand and develop strategies at the June meeting.

- What desired outcomes should we aim to achieve for each transportation need?
- What strategies could help the region reach the desired outcomes?
 - Shorter-term: What's most immediate or achievable in the next 4-6 years?
 - Longer-term: What's most important or feasible in the next 20-25 years?

- Are there any cross-cutting strategies or overlaps that could address multiple transportation needs?
- For each strategy, which agencies are responsible for implementing and measuring improvements over time?

5. Roundtable: Announcements and Updates from CMAC Members (11:20 a.m.)

Committee members, including representatives of mobility coalitions, provide brief updates on local/regional events and information on their programs.

6. Adjourn (11:30 a.m.)

7. Next Meeting: July 16, 2025, from 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

*Supporting materials attached

Zoom Connection:

- [Join the meeting](#)
- Listen by phone 1-888-475-4499
- Meeting ID: 848 4508 2947 Passcode: 478388

Other Formats:

- Sign language and communication material in alternate formats can be arranged given sufficient notice by calling (206) 464-7090 or TTY Relay 711.
- العربية | Arabic, 中文 | Chinese, Deutsch | German, Français | French, 한국어 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese, visit <https://www.psrc.org/contact-center/language-assistance>.



Puget Sound Regional Council

Coordinated Mobility and Accessibility Committee Meeting Summary

Date: May 21, 2025 from 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Location: Remote – Online Meeting Only (Zoom Meeting)

Welcome and Introductions

Jean Kim, PSRC, welcomed everyone at 9:30 a.m. and took a roll call of the membership in attendance.

Approval of Meeting Summary

The March 19, 2025 meeting summary was approved as presented.

Discussion: Coordinated Mobility Plan Engagement Updates

Jean Kim, PSRC, provided an overview of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Coordinated Mobility Plan, including related outreach activities to support the plan update. Erin Hogan, PSRC, followed with an update on ongoing engagement efforts to identify the transportation needs of priority populations. Then, they presented key findings from recent community engagement and other resources, highlighting the most pressing transportation needs across different communities: older adults, youth, people with disabilities, people with low incomes, and people with limited English proficiency. Various engagement activities and events related to the RTP and Coordinated Mobility Plan will continue throughout the summer and fall as part of the overall plan update process.

The presentation can be found on our website [here](#).

For more information, contact Jean Kim, PSRC, at JKim@psrc.org.

Discussion: Transportation Needs of Your Communities Breakout

PSRC staff facilitated a small group breakout session focused on the transportation needs of the communities represented by CMAC members. The first part of the discussion centered on identifying key transportation needs of priority populations. CMAC members had an opportunity to reflect on the needs previously shared by staff and provide feedback on any missing needs, additions, or themes they felt should be highlighted or prioritized in the Coordinated Mobility Plan.

In the second part of the breakout, the committee discussed how to effectively frame and address these transportation needs in the plan. Members also shared initial ideas on potential outcomes and strategies associated with the needs. PSRC will share notes from the breakout discussions and will follow up with a short survey before the June meeting to continue gathering input and refining needs/strategies.

For more information, contact Jean Kim, PSRC, at JKim@psrc.org.

Roundtable: Announcements and Updates from CMAC Members

- Daeveene May, PCCTC, Pierce County Human Services
- Ausha Potts, Pierce Transit
- Heather Clark, KCMC, Hopelink
- Scott Weinberger, King County Metro
- Brock Howell, SNOTRAC

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.

***Members and Alternates Present**

See attached attendance roster.

***Alternates, Guests and PSRC Staff Present**

Amy Biggs, Snoqualmie Valley Transportation; Don Vanney, City of Arlington; Dorene Cornwell; Heather Clark, Hopelink; Laura Loe, Hopelink

PSRC

Jean Kim, Gil Cerise, Erin Hogan, Nick Johnson, Casey Moreau, Katie Enders, Noah Boggess, Philip Harris

*All attendees were present via remote participation.

CMAC Attendance Roster

Item 2 - Att. A

(Members and Alternates represented)

Date: May 21, 2025 9:30am - 11:30am

Online/Remote Meeting Only

Representation	Name	Representation	Name
King County		Snohomish County	
King County Metro (1)	1 Scott Weinberger	Community Transit/Everett Transit (1)	Margaret Keckler, Community Transit
	Penny Lara (Alt.)		Jenny Hayslip, Everett Transit
KCMC (1)	1 Anny Smith	SNOTRAC (1)	1 Brock Howell
	1 Staci Sahoo, Hopelink (Alt.)		Amanda Dodd, Snotrac Board President (Alt.)
Seattle-King County Aging and Disability Services (1)	1 Dina Atieh	Snohomish County Long-Term Care and Aging (1)	1 Stefanie Novacek
	Suzy Miller (Alt.)		Michal Glauner (Alt.)
King County Persons with Disabilities/Advocacy Groups for Persons with Disabilities (1)	1 Aaron Morrow, KCMC	Snohomish County Persons with Disabilities/ Advocacy Groups for Persons with Disabilities (1)	1 Leigh Spruce, Arc of Snohomish County
	Dorene Cornwell, KCMC (Alt.)		Don Vanney, Arlington councilmember and disability advocate (Alt.)
Other People with Mobility and Accessibility Needs (1)	1 Phirun Lach, Sound Generations	Other People with Mobility and Accessibility Needs (1)	1 Melissa Johnson, Snow Goose Transit
Available county seat to be chosen by KCMC*	Amy Biggs, Snoqualmie Valley Transportation (Alt.)	Available county seat to be chosen by SNOTRAC*	Christina Robertson, Catholic Community Svcs Snohomish (Alt.)
Pierce County		Kitsap County	
Pierce Transit (1)	1 Ausha Potts	Kitsap Transit ^ (1)	Michael Bozarth
	Cherry Thomas (Alt.)		Jeff Vinecourt (Alt.)
Representative from PC Human Services (f/k/a PCCC) (1)	1 Daeveene May, Pierce County Human Services	KIRN ^ (1)	Kelly Schwab
	Jodie Moody, Catholic Community Services (Alt.)		VACANT (Alt.)
Pierce County Aging and Disability Resources (1)	1 Brian Guthrie	Kitsap County Dept. of Aging and Long-Term Care ^ (1)	VACANT
	VACANT (Alt.)		VACANT (Alt.)
Pierce County Persons with Disabilities/ Advocacy Groups for Persons with Disabilities (1)	Francie Peltier, PCCTC	Kitsap County Persons with Disabilities/ Advocacy Groups for Persons with Disabilities ^ (1)	VACANT
	Tara Zink, Pierce County, Human Svcs. Developmental Disabilities Dept (Alt.)		VACANT (Alt.)
Other People with Mobility and Accessibility Needs (1)	Steve Hutchins, Around the Sound	Other People with Mobility and Accessibility Needs (1)	VACANT
Available county seat to be chosen by PCCTC*	Penni Belcher, UWPC/South Sound 211 (Alt.)	Available county seat to be chosen by Kitsap Group* ^	VACANT (Alt.)
Regional Representation		Tribal Representation	
Paratransit Services/Hopelink (2)	Ann Kennedy, Paratransit Services	Muckleshoot Indian Tribe (1)	VACANT
	Christie Scheffer, Paratransit Services (Alt.)		VACANT (Alt.)
	Susan Carter, Hopelink	Puyallup Tribe of Indians (1)	VACANT
	Darryl Sierra, Hopelink (Alt.)		VACANT (Alt.)
Washington State Ferries (1)	VACANT	The Suquamish Tribe (1)	VACANT
	VACANT (Alt.)		VACANT (Alt.)
Sound Transit (1)	Beth Hamby	The Tulalip Tribes (1)	VACANT
	Brandy Arojo (Alt.)		VACANT (Alt.)
Puget Sound Educational Services District (1)	1 Jacque Mann	NON-VOTING/PARTNER MEMBERSHIP	
	Davina Miller-Leach (Alt.)	WSDOT Community Transportation Planner – King/Pierce (1)	1 Matthew Cramer
		WSDOT Community Transportation Planner – Kitsap (1)	Elizabeth Safsten
		WSDOT Community Transportation Planner – Snohomish (1)	1 Katie Stanford

*This is suggested to be a representative from a transportation provider or other special needs populations listed in coordinated plan including seniors, low income, youth, veterans, and limited

** Representative is chosen by local Tribal Transportation Planning Organizations (TTPO)

^Role does not include WSDOT Consolidated Grant Voting

as of 1/2025

May 21, 2025, CMAC Breakout Discussion Summary & Meeting Notes

The following summary reflects feedback sought from the May CMAC meeting. PSRC shared a list of transportation needs derived from the current Coordinated Mobility Plan, and the CMAC members were asked to provide guidance on how well they reflect the current needs of the communities they represent. Some members also shared possible strategies to address these needs. To help cross-check, staff categorized the needs using mobility gap types typically used in Coordinated Mobility Plan development, described below:

Gap Types	Description
Spatial	Where service is not available
Temporal	When service is not available
Institutional	Coordination, rules, or funding barriers
Infrastructure	Infrastructure connectivity or safety issues
Awareness	People do not know about the available transportation services
Affordability*	The service fee or cost of service is too expensive
Service Quality*	Service is unreliable or inconvenient

* Refers to new gap types not typically articulated in past Coordinated Mobility Plan development processes.

Part 1. Key Transportation Needs

ADA Paratransit Service Improvements

[Institutional, Service Quality* Gaps]

- More reliable and flexible ADA paratransit service aligned with the fixed-route transit experience.
- Reduced wait times and improved availability, especially in underserved areas.
- Simplified eligibility review and renewal process across different agencies.
- Better coordination for intercounty transfers, including seamless scheduling and trip planning.
- Availability of same-day paratransit option for immediate travel needs.
- Improved driver training, particularly for serving riders with intellectual or developmental disabilities.
- Simplified and consistent fare/payment systems (e.g., ORCA cards, exact change issues).

Possible Strategies Suggested at the Meeting:

- Strengthen regional coordination among transit agencies through interlocal agreements and shared service planning.
- Improve driver training in customer service and disability awareness.

Transit Service Improvements

[Spatial, Temporal, Institutional, Service Quality* Gaps]

- More seamless, efficient, and consistent transit service across counties.
- Shorter travel and transfer times.
- Standardized or interoperable scheduling tools (e.g., Trapeze, Via) across agencies.
- Service hours and coverage based on priority populations' needs.
- More amenities at transfer points for riders during long waits.

Possible Strategies Suggested at the Meeting:

- Pilot programs to test solutions for cross-county trips, especially to high-demand destinations.
- Implement shared scheduling and dispatch tools to streamline transfers and improve efficiency.
- Enhance rider experience with improved amenities, like restrooms or weather protection, and lighting, at transfer points.

Note: although **Temporal Gaps**, such as limited service during early mornings, evenings, and weekends, were not explicitly raised during the meeting, PSRC recognizes that these non-peak service limitations remain a significant transportation need for many communities. These gaps will be included in the final list of identified transportation needs.

Access to Healthcare and Essential Services [Spatial Gap]

- Reliable and timely transportation for medical appointments, especially in areas without reliable transit service.
- Emphasis on wellbeing activities, including mental and emotional care as essential trip purposes.

Possible Strategies Suggested at the Meeting:

- Partner with healthcare providers to align transportation schedules with appointment times.

ADA-Accessible and Safe Infrastructure (e.g., Sidewalks) [Infrastructure Gap]

- Safe and accessible walking and rolling environments, especially near transit stops and in areas with a higher share of older adults, youth, and people with disabilities.
- Need for age- and ability-friendly infrastructure
- Connected infrastructure to safely reach transit stops or stations.

Possible Strategies Suggested at the Meeting:

- Improve sidewalks, crossings, and lighting near key transit stops.

- Prioritize infrastructure improvements in areas with high need.
- Incorporate universal (age- and ability-friendly) design principles into planning.

Rider Education and Raising Awareness [Awareness Gap]

- Continued investment in rider education and travel training to help support priority populations.
- Clear and accessible communication to help users navigate complex services, especially new or infrequent riders.

Possible Strategies Suggested at the Meeting:

- Promote travel navigation tools like One Call/One Click, and ensure they are easy to use across different languages and abilities.
- Develop accessible rider education programs, including travel training, and offer rider support to assist with trip planning.

Affordability and Payment Options [Affordability*, Institutional Gaps]

- More affordable and manageable transportation costs are needed
- More simplified, flexible payment systems, especially for paratransit riders.

Possible Strategies Suggested at the Meeting:

- Coordinate reduced fare programs between different agencies, making them easier to understand and apply for.
- Offer multiple payment options, including a cashless system on ADA paratransit.

Transportation Options in Rural Areas [Spatial, Temporal Gaps]

- In rural areas, transit service does not exist or is very limited.
- There is a need for more service coverage and availability of transit to improve access to health and essential services.
- More consistent transit service planning for rural communities that better reflects rural mobility needs.

Possible Strategies Suggested at the Meeting:

- Develop transit agency plans for rural and lower-growth areas that reflect community needs.

Service Funding and Sustainability [Institutional Gap]

- More sustainable, long-term funding is needed to support the operation of transit and specialized transportation, especially programs like NEMT and Medicaid transportation.
- Growing demand for services is outpacing provider capacity

Possible Strategies Suggested at the Meeting:

- Explore diverse funding sources, including local partnerships and grants.

Part 2. Suggestions for Plan Structure & Data Presentation

Highlighting Needs

- Storytelling: Emphasize real-world user stories, particularly from priority and rural populations. Use real-life experiences to make the case.
- Regional coordination should be highlighted.
- Show how improvements, including new service types like on-demand, for priority populations benefit everyone.
- Prioritize a living document approach (e.g., dashboard vs. static report).

Categorization Approaches

- By priority populations (e.g., older adults, youth, people with disabilities).
- By geography (e.g., urban vs. rural needs).
By mobility service/infrastructure type (e.g., public transit fixed-route, public transit on-demand, active transportation, specialized transportation, etc).

Meeting Notes

Question 1. Which transportation needs shared in PSRC's presentation resonate most with the community you represent? What are the biggest challenges?

ADA Paratransit Service Needs

- There is separate paperwork for all counties; additional issues arise when riders are not in paratransit service areas.
- ADA paratransit should be more aligned with the fixed-route experience—reliable, timely, and user-friendly.
- There's a need to move toward same-day paratransit service.
- Long wait times and limited availability for DART service, especially in areas like Marysville and Arlington.
- Scheduling challenges for DART (e.g., Mill Creek to Everett Mall trip delayed due to routing/transfers).
- Cross-county travel between DART and Access services remains difficult.
- Regional needs often minimize the lived experiences of paratransit users, including long travel and wait times and transfers in locations lacking weather protection (e.g., rain, smoke).
- As advocate for paratransit – better coordination between paratransit providers, intercounty transfers – need for more seamless transfers; ex: Bay Area paratransit brokers received grant from MTC to evaluate paratransit transfer experience/improve coordination; we have a need in our region for better coordination (another participant

+1, need to get paratransit brokers to the table and have honest conversation about transfer issues; difficulty getting key players to the table)

- Need for driver training to better serve riders with intellectual disabilities—especially around communication.
- We need to do a better job telling these stories—not just listing them as bullet points.
- As an advocate for paratransit, there's a strong need for better coordination between providers, especially for intercounty transfers.
- For example, in the Bay Area, paratransit brokers received a grant from MTC to evaluate and improve transfer coordination. We have a similar need in our region.
- Same-day transportation options for people with disabilities remain a high priority but are not widely available.
- Ensure to highlight the need for driver training.

Transit Service Needs

- Cross-county regional coordination is a huge barrier.
- Coordination between agencies is often difficult and inefficient.
- This issue is felt from all sides—jurisdictions, transit providers, and support organizations.
- There's a need for services to operate at the times and places people need them, addressing limited service hours and coverage.
- Transit isn't currently competing effectively with personal vehicles for a variety of reasons.

Access to Healthcare and Essential Services

- Better access to healthcare and essential services is a major need.
- Access to Health & Wellbeing program – major need for population we served; medical chaperones for certain appointments (some people don't have someone to chaperone / attend appointment with them); access to standard primary care appointments – timely pickup and drop-off (communication breakdowns impact reliability)
- The Access to Health & Wellbeing program is vital for the population served.
- Medical chaperones are needed for some appointments, as many people don't have someone to attend with them.
- Timely pickup and drop-off for standard primary care appointments is important—communication breakdowns impact reliability.

ADA-Accessible and Safe Infrastructure

- Sidewalk accessibility is a major concern—especially for youth and wheelchair users.
- Some jurisdictions (e.g., Maple Valley) still lack basic transit services. There's a need to build stronger relationships and identify ways to serve these areas.

- A broader focus on age- and ability-friendly communities is needed—not just accessible infrastructure but services and systems that fully support people of all ages and abilities.

Rider Education and Raising Awareness

- Need for education on available services is a work in progress.
- Tools like Find a Ride and King County Metro's upcoming platform are seen as helpful.
- There's a desire to connect different transportation tools to make it easier for users.
- Rider education is essential—first-time users are often intimidated by the complexity of the transit system.
- Easy access to information is needed to help people understand available options and how to navigate them.

Question 2. Are there any transportation challenges your community experiences that were NOT reflected in the presentation?

Transportation Needs in Rural Areas

- In rural areas, such as Pierce to South King County, shorter travel times and fewer transfers resonate strongly (limited service, limited hours).
- In rural areas with no transit options, people often rely on family members to drive them to appointments or to a transit hub to complete their trip.
- Medicare rides for those who live too far away or don't qualify for paratransit were cut from 36 to 18 rides per year—not enough to meet needs. Still heavily reliant on family members. 36–24 rides should be considered a bare minimum under Medicaid contracts.
- There is a need to connect with rideshare options to help bridge these rural mobility gaps.
- In urban areas, transit challenges often involve convenience and the deterrent effect of multiple transfers. But in rural areas, it can be an existential issue—whether transit service exists at all.
- Transit agency plans, especially those focused on growing dense urban areas, often feel disconnected from PSRC's Coordinated Mobility Plan. Agencies are not planning for rural mobility needs or using the CMP as a guide.
- Highlight rural transportation issues.

Medical Transportation and Funding Sustainability Concerns

- There is a lack of resources to provide the services that are needed.
- Fear of further cuts to Medicaid is widespread.

- These rides may be provided by private companies (e.g., Safe Ride Transportation, NEMT providers). Uber/Lyft options may not be suitable for those needing wheelchair access.
- As the population ages, these challenges are expected to increase—particularly with funding cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

Complex Payment Systems—Related to ADA Paratransit

- There are differences in fare across paratransit services (e.g., \$2.50 for DART, \$1.75 for King County Access) and riders must often have exact change.
- It's difficult for some paratransit riders to use or renew ORCA cards.

Safety, Comfort, and Perception

- Safety and comfort are key concerns, especially for older adults.
- There are nuances in what "safety" means to different riders, and this should be better understood and addressed.

Capacity and Outreach—Related Needs

- Transportation providers don't currently have the capacity to meet growing demand.
 - Increased outreach raises awareness, but it also increases the number of users, which can strain resources.
 - Some organizations are hesitant to do outreach for this reason.
- Every time there is outreach, more people become aware of services, but service providers aren't always able to absorb the increased demand.

Question 3. Is there any transportation need you want to make sure the region highlights or prioritizes in the Coordinated Mobility Plan?

Cross-County and Cross-Agency Coordination for Transit and ADA Paratransit

- Better regional coordination is very important – service provider coordination; acknowledge progress with One-Call/One-Click, but better capturing EVERY service option (like the NEMT trips); still a big gap on intercounty trips
- Cross-County Coordination: Trapeze works well for fixed-route scheduling, but maybe not as helpful for scheduling inter-county trips; next step would be getting some funding to have this conversation and identify solutions
- PT doesn't use Trapeze but still use similar scheduling software (through Via & MTM); coordination on transfer sites, timing. Ideally, there would be a tool that we all used to coordinate trips – systems don't quite work together seamlessly & that impacts the customer experience; customers should be at the table to discuss the experience, down to the hand-to-hand. California Transportation Commission grant to MTC was how Bay Area funded troubleshooting.

- Getting Uber/Lyft rideshare services and Yellow Cab to the table; paratransit can't fit all needs, neither can NEMT with funding cuts – want to consider ALL options that a person might consider; transit
- Intercounty coordination should be one of the top 3 (lots of confusion) – we have a large region & need to be aware as the population ages (+1 from another participant)
- Cross-county services & interagency coordination should be highlighted
- ADA Paratransit: Interlocal agreement (hosted by ST) recently updated – outlines the terms of coordination, honoring eligibility across service areas. Need for improved coordination between transit agencies and human service providers. ransit needs to be in direct dialogue on local needs that human service providers know about.
- Highlight Cross-county medical (be more specific, mental+emotional care too) -- ensure these are highlighted/prioritized.
- Emphasize the need for better coordination, and address the benefits of new technologies too.
- Start with a pilot or test different processes for the transfer, identify incremental steps.
- (potential strategy) Starting small – where there are a few destinations that are popular among cross-county trips.
- Another participant emphasized the need to get paratransit brokers to the table for honest conversations about transfer issues, though it's been difficult to engage key players.

Access to Healthcare and Essential Services

- Access to healthcare & essential services should also be a high priority (but also access to activities that support wellbeing).
- Need for same-day transportation for medical care (ride-hailing option is costly)
- On-demand services, like Zip shuttle, are available, more accessible/affordable
- Access to healthcare should be prioritized.
Need for same-day transportation for medical care (ride-hailing option is costly)

Affordability

- Improved awareness of the benefits a person has access to.
- Think about affordability. Senior who must live in a retirement/rehabilitation facility in a cheaper, suburban location. But, transit is less available, not only is the person living there reliant on less available transit service, but family/friends who rely on transit have more difficulty visiting.
- Affordability (for frequent paratransit users, the cost of \$1.75 can be a barrier)
- On-demand services, like Zip shuttle, are available, more accessible/affordable

- The high cost of owning a personal vehicle remains a major barrier, especially for people with low incomes—many are stuck in poverty, which feeds into the unaffordability of car ownership.

Other Comments

- Needs and challenges should highlight broader issues -- not just transportation, but also social infrastructure. Examples include people who may live/work near transit but have to cross a dangerous street to access their transit stop, who have to walk on a narrow shoulder of the road.
- Improving transit service broadly, safety, accessibility, travel training education.
- Hard to choose because all of the transportation needs listed are very important.

Question 4. How should we address regional mobility needs in the plan?

- How should we highlight the key mobility needs?

Storytelling and Lived Experience

- Small focus groups / bringing everyone to the table – listen to stories and extrapolate what the needs are (specific challenges).
- Storytelling is important, especially for rural areas, various needs of a senior who needs transportation, different scenarios.
- Think of it as building a case for why we need to rethink how we do this; how can we think outside the box?
- PSRC should highlight the recent wins of the Legislature – in particular, around transit agencies needing to include people with lived experience using the transit system on their boards/governing institutions. This connection between people with lived experience using the system and those who administer the system is key.

Other Comments

- Can tie back to KCMC mobility subgroup – linking needs to funding
- Be simple!
- How should we categorize the needs? By different populations or geography?

By Different Priority Population Groups

- Need to categorize by priority populations, interest in a rural vs urban distinction, and consideration of tribal transportation needs.
- Interest in highlighting the shared needs between different priority population groups.
- Can we show how these priorities stack up against everyone else? Improvements for our priority populations would benefit everyone.

- Helpful to have things separated by population, knowing that people fall into more than one group; highlighting particular intersectionality areas could be helpful.

By Different Geography or Context

- Context matters, and mobility challenges don't always fit in places where there are the most people/density and the lowest cost per operating hour. Coordinated Mobility Plan and transit agencies need to recognize the different contexts and that even two places that are both rural have different mobility challenges.
- Highlighting differences by geography is helpful when there are differences between counties, but don't need to always summarize separately.

Other Comments

- Interagency coordination: getting the right people in the room, PSRC could facilitate; Sound Transit can also play a regional facilitation role; create agreements between partners; the three mobility coalitions can also play a convening role
- Also, increased coordination between mobility coalitions to ensure consistent messaging and data collection—PSRC could potentially work to create a consistent survey approach; more in-person interactions are needed.
- Data is used in so many ways, there is no perfect answer.
Would be nice for it not to be a static report – a dashboard approach would be great.