May 25 and 26, 2021: Wisconsin Non-Driver Advisory Committee

Meeting Summary

Contact: Ryan Spaight, WisDOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives

About the Event

Wisconsin Non-Driver Advisory Committee (WiNDAC) members met May 25 and 26, 2021 for the committee's third meeting. The two half-day sessions were conducted online. This was an open/public meeting; observers could view the proceedings via YouTube.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Further develop the non-driver case studies introduced in the November 2020 WiNDAC meeting
- Establish a shared understanding around how to create non-driver centered performance metrics
- Examine the State Urban Mass Transit Operating Assistance program and its six cost efficiency measures
- Generate and recommend non-driver centered performance metrics for consideration in the Urban Mass Transit Operating Assistance program

The meeting included several presentations related to performance measurement and public transit. Small group discussions invited participants to share solutions, ideas for performance improvement, and make recommendations that would improve how agencies and transit providers across the state measure progress when implementing changes to meet non-driver mobility needs.

Presentations, and materials from this event are on the WiNDAC website. Of the committee's 39 member organizations, 30 participated in the meeting. See Appendix A for attendance information.

Day 1: May 25th, 2021

- **Welcome and Opening Remarks**
  - WisDOT Secretary Craig Thompson

Secretary Thompson welcomed WiNDAC members and guests and thanked the three WiNDAC co-chairs for planning and organizing the meeting. He shared that the focus of the meeting would be performance measures, because performance measures are crucial for understanding progress and subsequently improving mobility options for non-drivers. He discussed the sizeable impact that previous WiNDAC meetings had on determining priorities for Governor Evers' 2021-2023 budget proposal. He said that while not all proposals may make it through the legislative process, it will be imperative to make the best use of every dollar available. The Secretary invited members and guests to continue sharing their insights and bringing their collaboration skills to the table for the two-day WiNDAC meeting.

- **Preview of Day 1**
  - Aileen Switzer, WisDOT

Aileen Switzer provided a preview of the first day of WiNDAC. She shared that the meeting will build on the work of the November 2020 meeting, including further developing the non-driver case studies. In addition to focusing on the needs of non-drivers and developing performance measures to better serve

them, she said this meeting would also focus on public transit and meeting the needs of all its users. She thanked the transit service providers in attendance for lending their insights to the meeting.

- **Presentation: Non-driver centered performance measures**
    - Tami Jackson, Wisconsin Board for People with Developmental Disabilities

Tami Jackson introduced the packet of meeting materials provided to attendees and provided context for the morning's activities. She demonstrated how to utilize a reference document that would assist with upcoming exercises and that provided a framework for developing non-driver centered performance measures.

- **Large Group Activity**
    - Denise Jess, Wisconsin Council of the Blind & Visually Impaired

Denise Jess explained that the next activities are designed with a two-fold purpose: to examine opportunities for sustainable systemic change and to think about how to measure the success of that change. She discussed the need to move beyond individual solutions that rely on the social and emotional networks of non-drivers and focus on systemic solutions that would work for multiple users. She modeled the upcoming small group exercise and provided suggestions for how to have a productive discussion.

- **Small Group Activity**

Attendees, along with WisDOT facilitators and notetakers, moved into small group breakout rooms. Using the framework modeled in the large group activity, the small groups were asked to discuss how the transportation system could improve for two non-drivers from the case studies and respond to five discussion questions designed to shift the discussion from the individual level to the systemic level. Discussion questions included:

1. *What values are we communicating when we decide how well a system/option should work for non-drivers or solve non-driver performance needs?*
2. *How do we measure whether daily lives of non-drivers are easier or harder when we make changes to transportation systems or options?*
3. *What needs to shift in the system to address any barriers to the proposed solutions?*
4. *At what level should these proposed performance metrics be implemented? Examples of potential implementation levels: service provider/local government/MPO/RPC/state agency. If you select the state agency level, specify which state agency.*
5. *What do these proposed performance metrics mean for my work?*

Following the small group activity, representatives from each group were asked to report out on the main themes and highlights from their discussions. See the *small group outcomes addendum,* starting on page 8 of this document, for a summary of small group activity outcomes.

- **Rideshare Video Presentation**
    - Dana Shinners, WisDOT

Dana Shinners shared a video presentation that provided information about WisDOT's Rideshare program. Rideshare is a carpool matching service that is accessible from the WisDOT website. The video

presentation provided a short demo of the matching service and asked WiNDAC members to fill out a survey if they were interested in providing feedback about the Rideshare program.

- **Preview of Day 2 and Wrap Up**
    - Aileen Switzer WisDOT

Aileen Switzer thanked the committee members and guests for their participation and provided a preview of the second day; indicating that day two discussions will center around the Urban Mass Transit Operating Assistance program and creating supplemental non-driver centered metrics for the program.

Day 2: May 26th, 2021

- **Welcome and Review of Day 1**
    - WisDOT Assistant Deputy Secretary Joel Nilsestuen

Assistant Deputy Secretary Nilsestuen welcomed WiNDAC members and guests to the second day of the meeting. He provided a recap of the previous day's activities, including the key takeaways from small group discussions. He said that transit, bicycle, and pedestrian options should address equity issues, including promoting racial, economic, and environmental justice. The Assistant Deputy Secretary shared some key action items that emerged during day 1, including mapping current non-driver assets in Wisconsin, engaging various stakeholder groups, and establishing baseline metrics to measure progress for non-drivers. He also highlighted the need to consider non-driver needs during land use/development planning and for consistent communication about the benefits of a multimodal transportation system for all members of a community.

- **Presentation: Performance metrics**
    - Jackie Irving, WisDOT

Jackie Irving's presentation focused on the fundamentals of measuring performance and best practices. She began by defining what a performance metric is and discussed the reasons that an agency might measure performance, such as enabling better decision making, providing accountability, and identifying areas for improvement. She introduced the balanced scorecard, which facilitates examining multiple business areas at the same time and provided an example of what it might look like in a non-driver context. She shared best practices for the group to consider as they are creating metrics later in the day.

- **Presentation: Urban Mass Transit Operating Assistance program**
    - Ian Ritz, WisDOT

Ian Ritz started his presentation by providing an overview of transit service in Wisconsin, which includes over 70 public transit systems of various sizes and 130 specialized transit systems. He then focused on the Urban Mass Transit Operating Assistance program, which is the transit program with the most available state funding—nearly $113 million annually. Eligible program recipients of the operating assistance program are local governments, tribal nations, and transit commissions. He discussed the current performance measures for the operating assistance program, which are statutorily-required cost efficiency measures.

- **Large Group Activity**
    - Ryan Spaight, WisDOT

Ryan Spaight introduced a framework to assist with the upcoming small group activity and break down the generation of non-driver centered performance metrics into manageable pieces. The framework identified four system attributes important to non-drivers, including time, affordability, flexibility, and service parameters. After he explained the framework, he asked the group to complete a survey that had them identify which of the four identified system attributes they would like to work on in small groups.

- **Small Group Activity**

Attendees were sorted into small groups based on their responses to the large group survey and were placed into breakout rooms alongside WisDOT facilitators and notetakers. Small groups were asked to discuss six questions related to their chosen system attribute (time, affordability, flexibility, or service parameters), which ultimately led to the creation of supplemental non-driver centered performance measures for each group. Discussion questions varied by group and can be found in Appendix B. Following the small group activity, representatives from each group were asked to report out on the main themes of their discussion and talk about their non-driver centered performance metric recommendations. See the *small group outcomes addendum,* starting on page 8 of this document, for a summary of small group activity outcomes.

- **Round Robin**

During the round robin session, each committee member was called on and asked to share their main takeaways including what they found valuable from the WiNDAC meeting.

- **Connect 2050 Update**
    - Alex Gramovot, WisDOT

Alex Gramovot introduced WisDOT's long-range, multimodal, statewide plan, *Connect 2050*. He discussed the guiding principles of the plan and Connect 2050's eight goals. He closed by discussing next steps and provided a timeline for publishing the final plan.

- **Closing Remarks**
    - WisDOT Deputy Secretary Paul Hammer

Deputy Secretary Hammer thanked attendees for a successful third meeting of WiNDAC. He said that the work of the committee over the past year had produced tangible results and shared his appreciation for WiNDAC's commitment to improving mobility options for non-drivers. He said that WisDOT is committed to performance management, which requires the department to constantly improve. He said the last two days of WiNDAC discussion have contributed significantly toward that improvement—especially as it relates to non-drivers. Deputy Secretary Hammer closed by thanking the three WiNDAC co-chairs, WisDOT staff, and the members and guests of WiNDAC.

Appendix A: Meeting Attendees

Members in attendance

Tami Jackson, Public Policy Analyst, Wisconsin Board for People with Developmental Disabilities (Committee Co-Chair)
Denise Jess, Executive Director, Wisconsin Council of the Blind & Visually Impaired (Committee Co-Chair)
Aileen Switzer, Administrator, Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives, Wisconsin DOT (Committee Co-Chair)
Tim Cornelius, Insurance Examiner, Office of the Commissioner of Insurance
Margaret McMahon, Policy Initiatives Advisor, Wisconsin Department of Children & Families
Iris Jacobson, Education Consultant, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Gerry Sieren, Veterans Program Supervisor, Wisconsin Department of Veterans Affairs
Brittany Howell (proxy), Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development
Tim Fiocchi, Chief of Staff, Sen. Jerry Petrowski's office, Wisconsin Senate
Representative Dave Considine, Wisconsin Assembly
Sam Otterson, Legislative Aide, Rep. Dave Considine's office, Wisconsin Assembly
Savanna Stevens, Legislative Aide, Rep. Dave Considine's office, Wisconsin Assembly
Gregg May, Transportation Policy Analyst, 1000 Friends of Wisconsin
Jennifer Jako, Director, Aging and Disability Resource Center of Barron, Rusk, and Washburn County
Lisa Pugh, Executive Director, The Arc Wisconsin
Barbara Beckert, Director of External Advocacy SE WI, Disability Rights Wisconsin
Mitch Batuzich, Transportation Planner, FHWA – Wisconsin Division
Grace Livingston, Tribal Benefits Specialist, Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council
Nick Musson, Transportation Specialist, Greater Wisconsin Agency on Aging Resources (GWAAR)
Dan Boehm, Managing Director, Milwaukee County Transit System
Karen Melasecca, Transit Manager, Namekagon Transit
Rishelle Eithun, Injury Prevention Program Manager, Safe Kids Wisconsin
Kevin Muhs, Executive Director, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)
Robert Schneider, Associate Professor, Department of Urban Planning, UW-Milwaukee
Holly Keenan, President, Wisconsin Association of Mobility Managers
Kirsten Finn, Executive Director, Wisconsin Bike Fed
Beth Swedeen, Executive Director, Wisconsin Board for People with Developmental Disabilities
Charles Vandenplas, The Wisconsin Council on Physical Disabilities
Tom Wagener, Chair, Wisconsin Public Transportation Association (WIPTA)
Matt Waltz, COO, Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership (WRTP/BIGSTEP)
Tom Winker, Director, District 6, Wisconsin Towns Association
Susan De Vos, Secretary/Treasurer, Wisconsin Transit Riders Alliance

Member organizations unable to attend

Wisconsin Professional Police Association (Jim Palmer, Executive Director)
Wisconsin Counties Association (Dave Ostness, County Board Supervisor)
Wisconsin Technology Council (Tom Still, President)
Wisconsin Department of Health Services (Lisa Sobczyk, Supervisor, Office for Physical Disabilities and Independent Living)
League of Wisconsin Municipalities (Jerry Deschane, Executive Director)
WCS - Community and Reintegration Services (Artis Landon, Administrator)
West Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (Lynn Nelson, Executive Director)
Wisconsin County Human Service Association (Katie Davis, Executive Director)
Wisconsin Economic Development Association (Michael Welsh, Director of Legislative Affairs & Communication)

Guests in attendance

Becca Smith, Janesville Transit
Joy Neilson-Loomis, Ozaukee and Washington County Transit
Patrick Daoust, Bay Area Rural Transit
Adam Lorentz, La Crosse Municipal Transit

WisDOT staff in attendance

Craig Thompson, Secretary, Wisconsin DOT
Paul Hammer, Deputy Secretary, Wisconsin DOT
Joel Nilsestuen, Assistant Deputy Secretary, Wisconsin DOT
Ryan Spaight, Wisconsin DOT Strategic Initiatives Team
Hannah Brown, Wisconsin DOT Strategic Initiatives Team
Brad Basten, Wisconsin DOT Strategic Initiatives Team
June Coleman, Director, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Performance Improvement, Research and Strategic Initiatives
Matt Umhoefer, Wisconsin DOT Strategic Initiatives Team
Travis Houle, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Transit, Local Roads, Railroads and Harbors
Rodney Saunders, Jr., Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives
Rudy King, Wisconsin DOT Office of Public Affairs
Mark Knickelbine, Wisconsin DOT Office of Public Affairs
Kaleb Vander Wiele, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives
Chuck Wade, Director, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Planning and Economic Development
Katie Patterson, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Transit, Local Roads, Railroads and Harbors
Ian Ritz, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Transit, Local Roads, Railroads and Harbors
Ethan Severson, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Performance Improvement, Research and Strategic Initiatives
Andrew Schwartz, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Budget
Jen Murray, Director, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Transit, Local Roads, Railroads and Harbors
Jackie Irving, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Performance Improvement, Research and Strategic Initiatives
Alex Gramovot, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Planning and Economic Development
Dana Shinners, Wisconsin DOT Southeast Region
Andrew Levy, Wisconsin DOT Southeast Region
Diane Gurtner, Wisconsin DOT Bureau of Performance Improvement, Research and Strategic Initiatives

Appendix B: May 26th, 2021 Discussion Questions

Groups 1 & 5	Groups 2 & 6	Groups 3 & 7	Groups 4 & 8
Time	**Affordability**	**Flexibility**	**Service Parameters**
How should a system perform for non-drivers?	How should a system perform for non-drivers?	How should a system perform for non-drivers?	How should a system perform for non-drivers?
What is an acceptable amount of time to spend in transit relative to the time a direct trip could be completed?	What is an acceptable service fee?	What should happen if the non-driver is 20 minutes late to the scheduled ride?	What is an acceptable average distance for the non-driver to travel to reach the service area?
Should the onus to trip plan be solely on the non-driver? How can other actors alleviate some of this planning burden?	What is an acceptable transfer fee?	What should happen if the non-driver needs to make a trip outside of regular service hours?	To what extent should transit facilitate multijurisdictional travel?
As a group, generate additional metric(s) that your group believes could fill an existing performance metric gap related to time.	As a group, generate additional metric(s) that your group believes could fill an existing performance metric gap related to affordability.	As a group, generate additional metric(s) that your group believes could fill an existing performance metric gap related to flexibility.	As a group, generate additional metric(s) that your group believes could fill an existing performance metric gap related to service parameters.
At what level (e.g. service provider/state), should these metric(s) be implemented?	At what level (e.g. service provider/state), should these metric(s) be implemented?	At what level (e.g. service provider/state), should these metric(s) be implemented?	At what level (e.g. service provider/state), should these metric(s) be implemented?
For the additional metric(s) that your group identified, what are some ways to gather data to evaluate the new metric(s)?	For the additional metric(s) that your group identified, what are some ways to gather data to evaluate the new metric(s)?	For the additional metric(s) that your group identified, what are some ways to gather data to evaluate the new metric(s)?	For the additional metric(s) that your group identified, what are some ways to gather data to evaluate the new metric(s)?

May 25 and 26, 2021: Wisconsin Non-Driver Advisory Committee

Small Group Outcomes Addendum

About this Addendum

In the May 2021 WiNDAC meeting, there were two small group activities. Committee members and guests were divided into seven groups; each group had four to six discussants and two WisDOT staff members, who took notes or facilitated the discussion. This addendum summarizes the small group discussions. The content of this addendum is based on the notes taken during the sessions and on the report-out period, during which discussants shared highlights from their discussion.

Key Takeaways and Recommendations

Recommendations to the State

- WiNDAC members said that the state's role is to facilitate transit across municipal boundaries. Some ways to do that: provide information for all public systems and ensure that all public system route information is available on a platform accessible to users (e.g. Google Maps).
- If income-based fares are established, the state was asked to identify the needs of non-drivers—likely using poverty guidelines. But there is also a need to factor in differences in cost of living across municipalities.
- The state should assist with ArcGIS plotting of service areas and routes. Mapping current resources in the state (e.g., service areas and routes) was an important requested outcome that would help service providers identify latent need and ultimately facilitate service improvements. Spatial mapping of services could also assist transit users in understanding their trip options—especially for multijurisdictional travel, which can be difficult to navigate.
- The state should incentivize private participation/partnership with transit. Consider a tax incentive.
- The state should create a system (perhaps a mobile application) to provide public transit service information to users; for example, the mobile application could alert them of delays.
- WisDOT should write an informational brief about how emerging technology could pave the way for unique fare structures.
- WisDOT should perform a study related to multijurisdictional travel in Wisconsin—where it is working, where there is room for improvement.

Service Improvement Recommendations

- Service providers should conduct travel training to help users learn how to use the transit system. They should also assist for planning longer trips that cross boundaries (local, county, state) to get users to where they want to go.
- Include the needs of non-drivers in land use and development planning. When a business park or a new housing development is approved, connectivity with transit systems and other non-driver modes need to be part of the planning and approval process.
- The service provider should 'market' their services. For example, technology can be made easier and customer service emphasized.
- Groups shared that increased collaboration and coordination between agencies is important. They noted that a host of agencies and entities have a role in measuring performance and improving the system—from federal to state, to local, including stakeholders and private businesses.

Data Recommendations

- Rather than requiring new data collection from service providers/local public agencies, consider whether it is viable to use existing National Transit Database data to assemble new service metrics.
- Coordinate with regional entities (MPOs/RPCs) to help track how service does or does not cross municipal boundaries.
- There is a need for different performance metrics to serve rural, mid-sized and urban areas. A one-size-fits-all approach is not recommended.
- Significant data asks of local systems/service providers have potential for administrative burden, particularly for smaller systems. Consider resources available to local systems/service providers before creating a new data requirement.
- Some performance metric data is only available through a survey of riders, which has feasibility challenges.

Performance Metric Recommendations

- Groups shared that performance metrics need to be based on the fundamental values for how our transportation system meets the needs of non-drivers.
- There is a need to establish baseline system-wide measurements to better understand how the system is currently performing for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit modes.
- Groups generally emphasized performance measures that center user experience, with the goal of improving non-driver mobility.
- Pedestrians are a part of the safety MAPSS metrics but not measured explicitly. Needs of pedestrians should be balanced in what the state measures.

Takeaways from Values-Based Discussion Questions

- The length of time a passenger spends on a bus is easily measured, but it doesn't capture additional time commitments of the non-driver; for example, trip planning, travel time to the pick-up area/bus stop, and time spent waiting for the transit vehicle.
    - These other variables are much harder for a service provider/local public agency to measure; they would require a case study or survey, for example.
- There are key time-related differences between service models: ridesharing vs demand response vs fixed-route; these models may require different performance measures.
- Reliability and timeliness of service are critical for non-drivers.
- Affordability is relative and depends on the user—their frequency of transit usage, financial resources, and many other factors.
- There is a need to balance transit costs around the income of the individual, but there are feasibility challenges, such as gathering income information and whether a transit system can be fiscally solvent while offering reduced fares. There are also public acceptance challenges; for example, people may feel like it is fair for some individuals to pay less money for the same trip.
- People who use services are those who have the ability to use them. People are already making choices based on affordability (i.e. limiting trips). Some local systems don't have a good mechanism to determine what the optimal cost of a trip is.
- Amenities should be factored into the cost of a trip.
- State and local governments should work together for data collection.
- The system needs to be striving toward independent mobility, where transit has the same flexibilities as personal vehicle ownership.
- Real-time dynamic communication between the user and the transit system is critical. A back-up protocol should exist for users with complex situations.

- Local systems should track demographic information about their users to better serve their needs.
- The transportation system should be as reliable, frequent, and safe for non-drivers as it is for drivers.

May 25, 2021 (Day 1): Non-Driver Centered Performance Metrics—Case Study Activity

The day 1 small group activity asked participants to create non-driver centered performance metrics and discuss one of two non-driver case studies. The below is the resulting list of measures:

Group 1

- Average ride time
- Times ride is available per day
- Number of connections (walk, transit, transfer, transit, walk or door to door)
- Cost of ride over time (paired with income, inflation, and absolute)
- Availability of times (first bus last bus, weekends)
- Type of fare (pass vs. cash) cash may indicate less income overall, unable to purchase a $50 pass (even if the "per ride" cost is less)
- Are the route or transit systems changes capturing new destinations? Are changes restricting pervious destinations?

Group 2

- Number of complete trips – number of complete trips available (not just point A to point B, but point A, to B, to C, back to his house) - this allows a focus on the person's full needs and not just individual/specific needs for trips. Example: could go to the bank, grocery store, and medical appointment instead of just one of those.
- Community health needs assessments – have data in these to address transportation.
- Track rides that are turned down/not able to be filled. Tracking how these changes would be important (from the transit provider perspective)
- Tracking key destinations in a region (extends beyond town limits, to account for key destinations that may be in other neighboring towns) and ensuring they are served by transit options
- Cost of providing the service v. the economic benefit to a more involved community (more individuals being able to go to the store/go to the doctor/get to work/etc.)
- Instead of how much a ride costs, how much the ride contributes to the community (example cost of getting a rider to a job but what is the benefit to that community by doing that)
- Measures around volunteer drivers and vehicles on the road

Group 3

- Number of appointments made vs. scheduled (medical or ride-share appts.)
- User survey (quality of life, stress)
- Medical facility polling (observations of patient situations)
- Frequency of utilization (of ride share services), utilization %
- Denied rides (service denial to user), justification. Destinations not served/service not available
- Case study reviews, audit & sampling.
- Life cycle analysis/changing medical conditions of users
- Leveraging data generated by on-demand care share services provides (Lyft, etc.)

Group 4

- Requirement to identify job clusters, points of interest, community locations, medical centers to determine important destinations for planning processes
- Incorporate transportation barriers/costs of patients under Medicaid managed card health systems' performance measures
- Estimate and forecast driving/non-driving populations at state and local levels
- Actual and expected volunteer drivers as a share of local need; volunteer trips and miles driven; number of requests that are met and unmet

Group 5

- Employment rates. Measure what employers are saying about their difficulties about recruitment. How many people can be hired and ride the shuttle to maintain the costs?
- Measure ridership
- For a paratransit solution, number of requests or rides can be measured
- Partner with organizations that have county behavioral health programs that provide employment support. We can find ways about how to develop or use metrics from these programs
- Measure employment retention. Has the number of employees who are non-drivers been retained and able to keep their employment?

Group 6

- Flexible schedule metric: How many employers adopt flexible schedules? How many employees take advantage? Measure long-term employee retention levels vs. retention for average employee
- Employer Vanpool/Carpool metrics: How many PPPs? How successful are they? What type of resources are they deploying (i.e. # of vehicles, $ amounts applied to program at federal/state/employer level)
- Shared-ride taxi systems metrics: growth trends…# of areas they are available, % of population within x miles of the service, how inclusive are these options? (availability to different user groups such as people experiencing disabilities, seniors), create a resource map that shows what is available where – what is current awareness? What is the baseline and what targets can be set for future goals?
- Bike/Ped infrastructure metrics: Develop Bike/Ped counts for all communities, type and miles of bike/ped facilities, comparison of miles for vehicles vs. bike/ped facilities, livability index that takes land use into consideration

Group 8

- Compare travel times (private auto vs. other options)
- Number of rides (taxi, shared ride)
- Number of successful connections
- Measure access (GIS data, etc.) before and after solutions implemented
- Cost per ride (by distance)
- Percentage of income spent on transportation (compare to those with cars)
- Amount of time spent on transportation (compare to those with cars)
- Number of employees attracted by subsidized transportation
- Workdays missed / on-time arrival (due to transportation issues)
- Rate of turnover / retention
- Employee satisfaction

- Measure amount of incentives paid out for biking to work
- Number of subscribers / wellness participation
- Quality of bike fleet / geographic location of bike shares
- Number of transactions
- Miles of protected bike lanes (and percentage of ride vs non-protected)
- Bike crash data
- Number of people served/number of applications (YWCA)
- How long people keep the vehicles (YWCA)
- Location of community cars
- Profitability of service
- Miles driven/number of trips/number of stops per trip

May 26, 2021 (Day 2): Urban Mass Transit Operating Assistance Program: Performance Metric Recommendations

The day 2 small group activity asked participants to generate and recommend non-driver centered performance metrics for consideration in the Urban Mass Transit Operating Assistance program. The below is the resulting list of measures. **Note: bolded text indicates an item the group reported out or otherwise emphasized.**

Group Topic	Recommended Performance Metric	Level of Implementation
Time	**Ride length (including getting to the stop)** • **Passenger counter** • **Paratransit has door-to-door time**	**Local role: initial data gathering** **State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis**
Time	Trip frequency	Local role: initial data gathering State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis
Affordability	Amount of time it takes to board, including taking payment	-
Affordability	Non-driver perception of appropriate transit fees	-
Affordability	Cost per mile	-
Affordability	**Fare as a proportion of income**	**-**
Flexibility	**Net increase in number of routes/service hours**	**Local role: initial data gathering** **State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis**
Flexibility	Number of on-time rides delivered	Local role: initial data gathering State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis
Flexibility	**Ratio of trip time in personal vehicle vs public/paratransit**	**Local role: initial data gathering** **State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis**
Flexibility	Change in lead-time needed for scheduling & rescheduling	Local role: initial data gathering State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis
Flexibility	**Improvement of communication system (mobile apps, phone calls, etc.)**	**Survey of non-drivers and current non-users**
Flexibility	**Numbers of locations from which transit service is accessible**	**Local role: initial data gathering** **State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis**
Flexibility	Number and type of requests for accommodation	Local role: initial data gathering State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis
Flexibility	Number of service denials and reason for denial	Local role: initial data gathering

		State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis
Service Parameters	**Ratio of denied rides to rides provided**	**Local role: Report data** **Regional role: capture interaction between adjacent services** **State role: compare service providers, statewide analysis**
Service Parameters	**Number of denied rides, including justification**	**Local role: Report data** **Regional role: capture interaction between adjacent services** **State role: compare service providers, statewide analysis**
Time	Travel time reliability	-
Time	**Number of delayed trips**	**-**
Time	**Average time required to plan a trip**	-
Affordability	Ratio of fare price to ridership	Local role: initial data gathering State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis
Affordability	**Percent of users using cash fare by income level**	**Local role: initial data gathering** **State role: synthesis, comparison, analysis**
Service Parameters	**Distance between bus stops (e.g., half mile, quarter mile)**	**Local**
Service Parameters	**Frequency of the service (peak hour vs all day)**	**Local**
Service Parameters	Geographic reach of the service	State, federal
Service Parameters	Connectivity of the service	State, MPOs, RPCs
Service Parameters	Number of riders	Local
Service Parameters	Percentage of the population served by current trip frequency	MPOs, RPCs
Service Parameters	Access to schools and government offices/services; reflect overlap of destination access and hours of service (locational density and diversity of land use)	MPOs, RPCs, Local