

MINUTES
SHORELINE METRO TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (TDP) REVIEW
COMMITTEE

May 13, 2020

(Conducted via Teleconference using Skype)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Angie Buechel (RCS Empowers)
 Brett Edgerle (Village of Kohler)
 Matt Halada (WisDOT Northeast Region, Green Bay)
 Derek Muench (Shoreline Metro Director)
 Edward Procek (Shoreline Metro Driver)
 Mayor Mike Vandersteen (City of Sheboygan/Sheboygan Transit
 Commission)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Ryan Zinkel (Sheboygan Transit Commission)

BLRPC STAFF PRESENT: Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo

1. Chairperson Derek Muench called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

Committee members and staff introduced themselves for the benefit of everyone participating in the teleconference.

Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo noted that committee members may be asked to do roll call votes during the meeting in cases where there is not a unanimous vote. Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo also requested that committee members identify themselves when speaking in order to facilitate the taking of minutes.

2. Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo projected the agenda for those who had the ability to view it via the shared screen capability of Skype. The agenda was also e-mailed (and in some cases mailed) to committee members a week ahead of the meeting.

Moved by Edward Procek and seconded by Brett Edgerle that the committee approve the agenda for the May 13, 2020, meeting of the Shoreline Metro TDP Review Committee. Motion carried, with all voting aye on a voice vote.

3. Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo projected the minutes of the April 15, 2020, meeting for those who had the ability to view it via the shared screen capability of Skype. The minutes were also e-mailed (and in some cases mailed) to committee members a week ahead of the meeting.

Moved by Edward Procek and seconded by Brett Edgerle that the committee approve the minutes of the April 15, 2020, meeting of the Shoreline Metro TDP Review Committee. Motion carried, with all voting aye on a voice vote.

4. Chairperson Derek Muench asked if there was any public input; none was received.

5. Committee members reviewed preliminary portions of draft Chapter 9 (Alternatives Analysis).

Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo projected preliminary portions of draft Chapter 9 and Table 9.1 (Impacts of the Alternate Configurations for Shoreline Metro) for those who had the ability to view these items via the shared screen capability of Skype. These items were also e-mailed to committee members a day before the meeting (May 12, 2020). Draft Chapter 9 was reviewed as follows:

Introduction

The introduction portion of draft Chapter 9 was reviewed first. There were no questions or comments regarding the introduction.

Alternative A: Continuation of Status Quo Fixed-Route Transit Service

This alternative would maintain existing fixed-route transit service throughout the area with no changes. Several assumptions were made in the development of this alternative, including: (1) there would be no changes to existing fixed-route service throughout the service area, including route miles and service hours; (2) there would be no changes in fares; (3) revenue miles, revenue hours and ridership are from the fixed-route component of the National Transit Database (NTD) report for Shoreline Metro in 2018; (4) revenues and expenses account for fixed-route and ADA paratransit services (no county paratransit services were included); (5) “other non-subsidy revenues” exclude parking utility revenues; (6) the federal, state and local shares financing transit service under this alternative were proportioned to fixed-route plus ADA paratransit service, with the combined federal and state share being 53.9 percent of expenses; (7) the costs per passenger, revenue mile and revenue hour all excluded ADA paratransit expenses (covered fixed-route operations only); (8) the numbers of passengers per revenue mile and revenue hour are for fixed-route operations only; and (9) the farebox revenue per passenger involved fixed-route (non-ADA) revenue divided by fixed-route ridership. Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo noted that several of the assumptions under this alternative applied to all of the alternatives examined in this chapter.

The route structure was indicated on Map 3.1 of this TDP, and represents the existing route structure. Table 7.2 of this TDP indicates individual 2018 costs by route for this “no change” alternative. Table 9.1 indicates the service, ridership and financial implications of this alternative in the base year of 2018.

The impacts of this baseline alternative (Table 9.1) were reviewed with committee members. This included: revenue miles (536,426); revenue hours (38,611); and ridership (599,714). Performance measure statistics included: cost per passenger (\$4.84); cost per revenue mile (\$5.41); cost per revenue hour (\$75.19); passengers per revenue mile (1.12), passengers per revenue hour (15.53); and farebox revenue per passenger (\$0.67). The expenses and revenue

sources for this alternative were also reviewed.

The only question regarding this alternative came from Edward Procek, who asked if the balances listed in Table 9.1 were positive (meaning no deficits); Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo responded affirmatively.

Alternative B: Elimination of Transfers

This alternative would eliminate transfers for a variety of reasons. One of these would be to encourage use of the day pass (along with the monthly pass and other payment methods that no longer involve depositing money or tokens in the farebox or giving the driver a paper transfer slip) as the preferred method of payment for trips. This would allow for a “cleaner” way to utilize transit in the era of COVID-19. Several assumptions were made in the development of this alternative, including: (1) increasing the fixed-route cash fare from \$1.75 to \$2.00; (2) increasing the ADA cash fare from \$3.50 to \$4.00; (3) increasing the elderly and disabled half fare from 85 cents to \$1.00; (4) tokens would be eliminated as a fare media option (this would mainly impact adults who currently use tokens); (5) riders would now need to pay every time they boarded a bus, even if changing buses at the downtown transfer point or elsewhere (additional fares could be avoided through use of a day pass, monthly pass, or by being a student or employee of the Sheboygan Area School District); (6) revenue miles and revenue hours would remain unchanged from Alternative A; (7) a fare elasticity of -0.43 was applied to the portions of the fixed-route ridership that utilize cash fares, and fixed-route “ridership” would also decrease due to the elimination of transfers under this alternative (the total amount of decrease in fixed-route ridership would be just over 1.2 percent, but fixed-route farebox revenues would increase by 4.1 percent under this alternative); (8) ADA ridership would decrease by about 6.1 percent due to the ADA cash fare increasing by 14.3 percent, but ADA paratransit farebox revenues would increase by 7.3 percent; and (9) other non-subsidy revenues, federal and state funding, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, and local governmental funding for Shoreline Metro would all remain unchanged under this alternative.

The impacts of Alternative B (Table 9.1) were reviewed with committee members. Revenue miles and revenue hours were unchanged from the baseline. Ridership was estimated to be 592,238. Performance measure statistics included: cost per passenger (\$4.90); cost per revenue mile (unchanged from the baseline at \$5.41); cost per revenue hour (unchanged from the baseline at \$75.19); passengers per revenue mile (1.10), passengers per revenue hour (15.34); and farebox revenue per passenger (\$0.71). The expenses and revenue sources for this alternative were also reviewed.

Committee members had no questions or comments concerning Alternative B.

Alternative C: Service Day from 5:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. and Having Routes Leave at the Top (:00) and Bottom (:30) of the Hour

This alternative was proposed for several reasons. First, it has been difficult for Shoreline Metro to get everyone to work at “first shift” jobs by 6:00 a.m. the way things are currently set up. Leaving at the top and at the bottom of the hour also makes sense for many employers in the

Sheboygan area. Later evening transit service does not serve many passengers at this point. The City of Sheboygan's new industrial park would also be better served by these changes. Several assumptions were made in the development of this alternative, including: (1) service hours being from 5:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday on numbered City of Sheboygan routes, with service provided every half hour from 5:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and service provided hourly (with alternating North and South Shuttles) from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.; (2) Route 20 North running at the following times on weekdays: 5:30 a.m., 6:30 a.m. (Kohler Special half hour run), 7:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m., and 7:00 p.m., and Route 20 South running at the following times on weekdays: 9:00 a.m., 1:00 p.m., 3:30 p.m., and 6:00 p.m., with this route being an hour in length; (3) Route 40 running every half hour from 12:00 noon to 8:00 p.m. on weekdays between mid-June and Labor Day weekend; (4) service hours being from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on Saturdays on numbered City of Sheboygan routes, with service provided hourly (leaving at the bottom of the hour on the "north" routes, and leaving at the top of the hour on the "south" routes), and with alternating North and South Shuttles provided throughout the service day; (5) Route 20 North running at the following times on Saturdays: 9:00 a.m., 12:00 noon, and 3:00 p.m., and Route 20 South running at the following times on Saturdays: 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m., with all of these trips being one hour in length; (6) Route 40 running every half hour from 12:00 noon to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays between mid-June and Labor Day weekend; (7) adjustments to the service day led to a decrease in revenue miles of between 1.3 and 1.4 percent, as well as a decrease in revenue hours of just over 1.6 percent; (8) fixed-route ridership is projected to decrease by about 0.8 percent; (9) total expenses were \$3,356,052, or a 1.2 percent decrease over the baseline; (10) farebox revenues were projected to decrease in proportion to the decrease in fixed-route ridership, but ADA revenues (and ridership) were projected to remain stable; (11) other non-subsidy revenues were projected to remain unchanged from the baseline; (12) the federal and state shares decreased in proportion to the decreased overall expenses; (13) the HUD subsidy remained unchanged from the baseline; and (14) the local share remained unchanged from the baseline.

The impacts of Alternative C (Table 9.1) were reviewed with committee members. This included: revenue miles (529,175); revenue hours (37,978); and ridership (594,796). Performance measure statistics included: cost per passenger (\$4.82); cost per revenue mile (\$5.42); cost per revenue hour (\$75.53); passengers per revenue mile (1.12, unchanged from the baseline), passengers per revenue hour (15.66); and farebox revenue per passenger (\$0.67, unchanged from the baseline). The expenses and revenue sources for this alternative were also reviewed.

As far as comments regarding Alternative C were concerned, Derek Muench suggested modifying this alternative somewhat so that Route 40 would leave at 15 and 45 minutes after the hour; Route 40 could operate from 12:15 p.m. to 8:15 p.m. on weekdays, as well as from 11:45 a.m. to 5:45 p.m. on Saturdays. These changes were suggested for Route 40 due to capacity issues for buses at the transfer point. In addition Derek Muench suggested adding North and South Shuttle trips under Alternative C that would leave the transfer point at 8:00 p.m. (although it was also stated that similar early morning shuttles would not be needed under this alternative).

Alternative D: Demand Response Service During Weeknights and Saturdays

This alternative would replace fixed-route transit service with demand-response paratransit service on weekdays after 5:45 p.m. and all day on Saturdays. Several assumptions were made in the development of this alternative, including: (1) 9.0 percent of weekday riders (50,959 riders) utilized transit at night (after 5:45 p.m.), and there were 33,506 Saturday riders; (2) the rate of 2.72 passengers per hour was used to develop the portion of service hours attributable to weeknight and Saturday demand response service; (3) the rate of 4.71 miles per passenger trip was used to develop the portion of route miles attributable to weeknight and Saturday demand response service; (4) the fare assumptions listed for Alternative B would also apply to this alternative on all days and times of service; (5) the ADA ridership and revenue impacts under this alternative are expected to be similar to Alternative B, but other impacts to ADA ridership or revenue could not be measured; (6) total expenses were 3.2 percent above the baseline; (7) due to a loss in fixed-route system service hours of over 21.6 percent, the advertising portion of other non-subsidy revenues was reduced accordingly, leaving a decrease in such revenues of just over \$7,000 when compared to the baseline; (8) the federal and state shares increased in proportion to the decreased overall expenses; (9) the HUD subsidy remained unchanged from the baseline; and (10) the local share remained unchanged from the baseline.

The impacts of Alternative D (Table 9.1) were reviewed with committee members. This included: revenue miles (814,889); revenue hours (60,922); and ridership (592,238, similar to Alternative B). Performance measure statistics included: cost per passenger (\$5.09); cost per revenue mile (\$3.70); cost per revenue hour (\$49.43); passengers per revenue mile (0.73), passengers per revenue hour (9.72); and farebox revenue per passenger (\$0.71). The expenses and revenue sources for this alternative were also reviewed.

As far as comments regarding Alternative D were concerned, Derek Muench thought that this alternative could be “explored around the edges.” Derek Muench added that Green Bay Metro was looking at a similar alternative in terms of “microtransit,” and that certain services could be “right sized.” Derek Muench commented that Shoreline Metro is trying out a form of this alternative informally on Saturdays during the COVID-19 situation; at this time, two buses are used for paratransit on Saturdays. Derek Muench also noted that the “safer at home” order has meant that there has been less demand for transit service on Saturdays. Finally, Derek Muench discussed Janesville Transit’s experience with service similar to this alternative on weeknights.

Alternative E: Restructuring/Minor Changes to Existing Routes

This alternative was not analyzed due to a lack of information that was needed to develop assumptions or evaluate its impacts. Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo commented that once more direction is provided, this alternative will be evaluated. Such direction could involve gathering a working group within this committee to work on potential route adjustments that could then be taken back to develop this alternative.

As far as comments regarding Alternative E were concerned, Derek Muench commented that Shoreline Metro and the City of Sheboygan were in challenging times, adding that he was not looking at making any substantive changes to routes at this time. Derek Muench stated that

cleaning buses and transit facilities, applying for, receiving, and implementing funding from the CARES Act, and potentially reducing the local governmental share provided to Shoreline Metro's operations were the priorities at this time. Derek Muench noted that returning to "normal" will take a while. Finally, Derek Muench indicated that Shoreline Metro was looking into adding mobile fare payment options.

Other Considerations

Restoration of 30 minute service on Saturdays was not generally advanced as an alternative. However, 30 minute service may be considered for busier routes (such as Routes 10 North and 10 South) in the future.

Service to outlying communities that currently do not receive service (such as the Town of Sheboygan) was not advanced as an alternative at this time, but will be considered if Shoreline Metro and outlying communities reach an agreement regarding service.

There were no questions or comments regarding other considerations.

Selection, Approval and Implementation of the Final "Preferred" Alternative

This was not discussed at the meeting, but will be discussed at a future meeting.

6. Discussion then briefly turned to the boarding and alighting analysis that will occur in the near future.

Derek Muench commented that he hoped to get this effort going soon, but needed to get the drivers acclimated to having tablets onboard the buses. This effort could be underway by mid-summer. Jeffrey Agee-Aguayo stated that he was ready to prepare a chapter of the TDP summarizing information from these counts once the data become available.

7. The next meeting of the Shoreline Metro TDP Review Committee is scheduled for **Wednesday, June 17, 2020, at 2:30 p.m.** It is likely that this meeting will be conducted via teleconference (using Go to Meeting). The main agenda item at this meeting will be continued review of the Alternatives Analysis chapter of the TDP.

Angie Buechel asked to be excused from the June 17th meeting.

8. **Moved** by Edward Procek and seconded by Matt Halada that the meeting of the Shoreline Metro TDP Review Committee be adjourned. Motion carried, with all voting aye on a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

Recording secretary,

Jeffrey C. Agee-Aguayo