



**Southwest Transportation Collaborative
Board Meeting**

Meeting Held: March 21, 2013

Metropolitan Building
201 S. Iowa St
Dodgeville, WI 53533

ATTENDEES

NAME	Organization	E-MAIL
RoAnn Warden	Green County Health Department	rwarden@greencountywi.org
David Scribbins	Transit Advocate, Richland County	revdscribbs@hotmail.com
Patty Kemerling	Southwest Family Care Alliance	pkemerling@familycarealliance.org
Cheryl Hartman	Iowa County Victim Witness Coordinator	Cheryl.hartman@da.wi.gov
Larry Bierke	City of Platteville	citymanager@platteville.org
Troy Maggied	Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	t.maggied@swwrpc.org
Victoria Solomon	Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	v.solomon@swwrpc.org
Ashley Ashley Nedeau-Owen	Southwestern Wisconsin Community Action Program	a.nedeau-owen@swcap.org

- 1) Project Update and Housekeeping
 - a. Introductions. Troy noted that Shane Schuhmacher with Lafayette County will not be on the Board due to a lack of time.
 - b. Update on student board member.
 - i. Victoria has contacted UW-Platteville regarding the opportunity for a student to be a board member. She will continue to work with UW-Platteville to identify a student for this.
 - c. The Southwest Transit Team (SWTT) will be conducting a survey of riders and the general public to determine rider needs and better understand rider perspectives. The surveys will be administered by county ADRC transit members. Victoria has worked with James Winters with SWWRPC to ensure that questions that would be relevant to the Southwest Transportation Collaborative are included in the survey.

- 2) Discussion on provider selection and potential conflict of interest
 - a. All the transit providers in the region were invited via snail mail to participate. Victoria followed up with calls to each provider. Seven providers submitted applications.
 - b. The Board will choose 5 providers to be part of the project and rank the remaining 2 providers. If the budget allows, staff will work to allow 6 or 7 providers to be part of the initial project.
 - c. Southwest Opportunities Center and Southwestern Wisconsin Community Action Program both submitted applications. To avoid the perception of conflict of interest, Victoria asked Ashley to step out

during the transit provider selection discussion. Audrey Johnston, a program Board member from Southwest Opportunities Center, would also have been asked to remove herself from the discussion if she had been present.

- d. RoAnn asked if any applications were submitted after the deadline. None did. Victoria noted that several providers she talked with were interested in the project but were not prepared to be part of it at this time. They want to watch the program and perhaps participate in the future.

3) Review and selection of provider applications

- a. Time given to review applications. It was noted that Southwest Opportunities Center would still need to receive permission from their Board to be part of this program. However, when submitting the application Audrey Johnston had informed Victoria that she does not see that as an issue.
- b. Review of program goals
 - i. Create a coordinated regional transit network that enhances the performance of the existing system and rider experience
 - ii. Gather data and create a coordinated network of providers
- c. Discussion of budget
 - i. The providers selected for participation this year will receive data terminal hardware for their vehicles, such as iPads or smartphones, dispatching software, and staff training. In the future additional providers will need to purchase the hardware and software to participate.
- d. The Board developed the following list of criteria which was used to establish objectivity and structure the provider selection discussion:
 - i. Geography
 - ii. Fee structure
 - iii. Capacity – the number of vehicles and the number of drivers.
 1. Victoria noted that at least one of the providers needs to have wheelchair accessibility. Each of the submitted applications are wheelchair accessible so that should not be a problem
 - iv. Existing ridership
 - v. Service hours
- e. Victoria reiterated the requirements laid out in the grant regarding the transit providers. The grant does not require that the providers be chosen by a board. The only requirement is that the network be wheelchair accessible.
- f. Discussion
 - i. UW Platteville
 1. Discussion on how a data terminal in the shuttles would help expand their ridership and contribute to this program. Board members noted that expanding the current ridership is more about increased marketing to the community than through the other system.
 2. The Board unanimously decided to rank UW Platteville as the 7th transit provider.
 3. Reasons the UW Platteville Shuttle was not selected for the project:
 - a. The shuttle runs on a fixed route, so the one-call dispatching system won't be of much assistance
 - b. The project would not be the most effective way to increase ridership
 - ii. Top Hat
 1. Use in Platteville and Grant County – this would make for some redundancy in the geography covered by selected providers
 2. Fees for the 5 counties is greater, the city controls rates for shared ride
 3. Overlap in two applications from one provider – should both applications be selected?
 4. Shared ride looking to expand hours of operations, and therefore trips, in September

5. After discussion and review of these issues, it was determined that both Top Hat applications will be accepted for the program.
 - iii. Southwest Opportunities Center
 1. Only provides rides to and from homes and their facilities
 - a. Their services are pre-vocational services, educational facility, etc. Bussing is provided for their services
 2. Reasons Southwest Opportunities Center was not selected for the project:
 - a. Their services are not expanded to the broader public
 - b. The fleet dedicated to their operations has a fixed ridership and their vans sit during the day.
 - c. For them to serve the broader public it will take time and money, most likely beyond the project timeline for this year.
 3. After discussion the Board decided that Southwest Opportunities Center will not be part of the pilot program. If, after working with the five selected providers, there is room in the budget to work with Southwest Opportunities Center, staff will work to include them in the project.
 - iv. This discussion means that the selected providers are: Top Hat (Platteville Shared Ride Taxi), Top Hat (Access Transit), Country View Transport, LIFT, and Al's Trucking Co.
- 4) Presentation of Transit Exec software
 - a. Transit Exec is one of the software options that Victoria is researching as a potential software option for the program. It is the software that LIFT currently uses and Ashley recommends.
 - b. Transit Exec is a robust web-based system that tracks data and facilitates route dispatching. It allows for multiple users and user roles, protecting data. It provides fully customizable reports and exporting of reports. The software cost is \$0.10 per ride and it was developed in Milwaukee.
 - 5) Discuss draft marketing plan
 - a. Victoria presented the draft of the marketing plan. This will be a draft until we receive transit provider feedback, but parts of the plan will start to be implemented. For example, Victoria has been collecting transit provider contact information to facilitate monthly updates on the program.
 - b. Reminder that one of the functions of the Board is to be transit advocates.
 - c. Recommendation - identify ADRCs as card distributors as well. Though they are included as social service agencies, identify them separately. Each of the ADRCs are part of the Southwest Transit Team (SWTT). They understand that they'll be asked to distribute cards and market the system.
 - d. Please let Victoria know of any additional ideas or changes to this document. A large part of project success relies on people talking about this and generating interest and excitement.
 - e. The Board recommended incorporating Ashley's Twitter account on the marketing plan.
 - 6) Discuss data collection
 - a. Discussion of potential transit provider survey
 - i. At the February meeting, Franco recommended conducting a transit provider survey. This is not part of the grant or directly within the project scope but could provide beneficial information. A survey of providers could compliment the SWTT survey of riders and potential riders.
 - ii. Potential survey questions:
 1. Current level of services
 2. Are providers getting requests for rides that they cannot meet?
 3. Provider perspectives on barriers to expanding service
 4. Why did the providers we anticipated to apply not apply to be part of the program?

- iii. Information from a provider survey can inform future project decisions as the Board plans for program sustainability.
 - iv. Information could also provide guidance as to how this program can expand
 - v. The survey could also inform the Board as to why did those we expected to apply not apply?
 - b. SWWRPC will look at labor and resources before we fully commit to conduction this survey. It may be possible to combine these efforts with SWTT. There is a benefit here, but we need to proceed once our work load is reviewed.
 - c. Potential data to be collected through card usage
 - 1. Coding demographic information on riders (for grants and other funding)
 - 2. Unique passenger count
 - 3. Mode of payment
 - 4. Frequency of use
 - 5. Where they live
 - 6. Where they are going
- 7) Next meeting – 10-12pm on Thursday, April 18th in the rear conference room, Metropolitan Building, 201 S. Iowa Street, Dodgeville, WI

Recorded by Troy Maggied on 3/21/13