

**Minutes of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Citizen Advisory Committee**

February 18, 2009

Madison Municipal Building, Room LL-120

5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: F. Bartol, R. Ferrell, G. Hull, D. Phillips, J. Rider, T. Stoebig, E. Sundquist
Members Absent: S. Hiniker, J. Guo, C. Threinen, R. Williams, C. Wittke
Staff Present: B. Schaefer
Others Present: A. Matano

2. Approval of November 18 Meeting Minutes

Sundquist said his name was misspelled. Phillips moved, Stoebig seconded, to approve the November meeting minutes with the correction. Motion carried.

3. Presentation on 2008 Metro Transit On-Board Survey

Schaefer provided a power point presentation on the survey. He said the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) recommended that an on-board survey be conducted as part of the Transport 2020 Study to use in validating the transit component of the regional travel model. Metro has boarding data down to the bus stop level, but lacks transit trip origin-destination (O/D) data. FTA provided the City of Madison with a grant to conduct the study and perform associated model improvement work. The survey was conducted from February to April 2008, excluding the time UW-Madison was on spring break. In addition to providing data for improvements to the model for the Transport 2020 Study, the other purposes for the survey were to support ongoing transit route/operations planning, improve the understanding of bus riders, and receive feedback from them. Schaefer then reviewed the survey form and sampling plan. Surveying was conducted during the weekday a.m. peak and midday periods. The consultants did an excellent job in maximizing the recovery of the data and in geo-coding the origin/destination locations. Schaefer reviewed trip purpose data. Vehicle availability data was cross-tabulated with data on trip purpose and route category. He reviewed maps showing the concentrations of trip ends by trip purpose and O/D for trips to the UW campus and Far West side and from the South side. Schaefer said the consultants just revised the weighting of the surveyed trips to account for boarding location as well as the route. This improved the accuracy of the data and will result in some changes. For example, the initial weighting of trips resulted in an underestimation of trips from the CBD. He said trip length was also calculated with the average for all trips at 4.3 miles. Data was also shown for access mode to the bus, distance walked, transferring activity, bus use frequency, length of time using the bus, and method of payment. Schaefer next showed a series of slides comparing socio-economic data for passengers with the area population. He then showed trip purpose information for the UW campus routes and the concentrations of trip ends for those routes. Information was next provided on how passengers rated the quality and level of Metro mainline and campus service. Metro received very high satisfaction ratings overall. Safety was not a significant concern for most riders. Finally, Schaefer noted some trip and passenger characteristic trends dating back to 1991. For instance, the percentage of passengers with no auto available in their household has dropped significantly and correspondingly the percentage that had a vehicle available for their trip has increased. Also, the percentage of college/university trips has increased. Schaefer noted that the presentation was posted on the MPO website.

In response to a question from Bartol, Schaefer said the consultant would be preparing a final report on the survey, but it wouldn't include all of the maps and cross-tabulations MPO staff had prepared. Phillips asked if there was anything surprising or that stood out from the survey results. Schaefer said

he didn't think so, but some of the detailed information such as the O/D distribution would be helpful. Hull commented that it would be nice to know how long the trips were for persons who rated travel time on the bus as either good or bad. Schaefer said the distance could be calculated from the O/D data and cross-tabulated with the level of service ratings, but another factor is the travel time in relation to a comparable trip by car.

4. Review of Peer and Trend Analysis from Draft 2008 WisDOT Management Performance Audit of Metro Transit

Schaefer explained that state law requires all transit systems receiving state funding to undergo a management performance audit every five years. One aspect of the audit is a peer review and trend analysis. Two peer groups have been created for Metro Transit—one based upon service characteristics and another based upon population—because Metro provides so much more service than areas with a similar service area population. The population peer group is used only for per capita measures. The review looks at performance indicators in five areas: level of service; transit revenue; financial/general/administrative; transportation performance; and maintenance. Schaefer then reviewed some of the tables in the draft report. A much higher percentage of Metro's funding comes from local property taxes compared to peer systems, some of which have a dedicated funding source. The cost of providing Metro service is comparable to peer systems. Revenue per passenger is 22% lower with Metro ranking last due to discounted fares from the unlimited pass programs and lower fares for students, elderly, and disabled rides. However, because of Metro's high ridership its farebox recovery ratio is slightly above average. Metro's transportation effectiveness is much higher than peers with Metro ranking first in passengers per revenue hour. Metro also ranks first in efficiency measures that factor the percentage of operations costs versus total costs. The trends in the various indicators are mostly very positive. Overall, the report reflects very positively on Metro. The analysis shows that Metro is generally more cost efficient and cost effective compared to its peer systems.

5. Continued Discussion on the Charge of the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee and Interaction with the MPO Board

Schaefer said that the committee discussed the issue at the last meeting and staff prepared a draft revision of the outline of the committee purpose, membership, etc. He said one issue for discussion is whether the committee wants to appoint a Chair. The main purposes would be to run the meetings and provide reports to the Policy Board if the committee wants to do that. The consensus seemed to be that members didn't feel appointment of a Chair was necessary and would prefer staff to run the meetings. Members did think providing a report to the Policy Board on committee discussions and actions would be helpful. Sundquist asked if the report would be written or oral. Schaefer said it could be either. Hull said the most important thing was conveying the discussion to the Board. Schaefer suggested that the committee meeting minutes could be provided to the Board as part of the meeting packet when available. Stoebig stressed the importance of the committee voting where that was appropriate. Al Matano was present and said he came to hear the discussion on this issue and offer assistance in being a liaison to the Policy Board. He said he was willing to come to the committee meetings if members thought that would be helpful. Rider requested that the Policy Board minutes be included in committee meeting packets so members could see how the Board acted on issues that came before the committee.

6. Committee Member Reports

Item deferred.

7. Staff Reports and Announcements

Sundquist asked about the economic stimulus bill and how local projects would be selected. Schaefer said due to the tight time frame WisDOT is taking the lead in soliciting projects under the programs for local transportation projects and will coordinate with MPOs. The MPO will select the projects to be funded with STP Urban funds. Sundquist asked if non-roadway projects could be funded with STP-Urban funds. Schaefer said yes, but the MPO's role will be to score and rank the projects submitted for funding as is the case with the usual annual allocation. Sundquist was concerned because the WisDOT solicitation letter mentioned only roadway projects. Schaefer said the issue would be on the agenda for the committee's March meeting. Sundquist asked if that would be too late. Schaefer said no. A major TIP amendment will be required necessitating a 30-day comment period, so the MPO Board will probably not be able to act on that until its April 1 meeting. That should work because the legislation allows 180 days from the time funding is apportioned (which will occur within 3 weeks after signing of the bill) for the funding to be approved by FHWA and FTA.

Schaefer had Matano provide information on the scheduled public meetings hosted by the Transport 2020's Finance and Governance Subcommittee. Matano handed out a notice with information on the meetings and provided some background on the process and the reason for the meetings, which was primarily to get input from suburban residents some of whom have felt left out of the process. Schaefer mentioned that RTA enabling legislation for the Madison area, Southeast Wisconsin, and the Fox Valley area was included in the Governor's budget bill.

8. Next Meeting Dates

Wednesday, March 18, 2009

Wednesday, May 20, 2009

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer