Minutes of the Fifth Meeting

THE RACINE COUNTY PUBLIC TRANSIT PLAN WORKGROUP

Date: January 21, 2013
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Place: Racine County Ives Grove Auditorium
14200 Washington Avenue
Sturtevant, WI 53177

Workgroup Members Present
Julie Anderson ...................................... Director, Racine County Department of Planning & Development
Raymond DeHahn ....................................................... Alderman, 7th District, City of Racine, and
Vice Chair, Transit and Parking Commission, City of Racine
Jonathan Delagrave ........................................... Director, Human Services Department, Racine County
Thomas Friedel ................................................................. City Administrator, City of Racine
Deborah Ganaway ...................................... Chair, Transit and Parking Commission, City of Racine, and
Executive Director, National Alliance on Mental Illness – Racine
Peter L. Hansen ........................................... Town Chair, Town of Yorkville, and
Chair, Racine County Board of Supervisors
Nancy Holmlund ......................................................... President, Racine Interfaith Coalition
Gordon Kacala ............................................................... Executive Director, Racine County Economic Development Corporation
James A. Ladwig ................................................................ Racine County Executive
James Majdoch ......................................................... Board Director, Village of Mt. Pleasant
Willie E. McDonald, Jr. ................................................ General Manager, Belle Urban System
Alice Oliver ............................................................... Manager, Racine County Workforce Development Center
Albert Stanek .............................................................. Manager, Parking and Transit Systems, City of Racine
Sarah Street .......................................................... Transportation Coordinator, Human Services Department, Racine County

Guests and Staff Present
Kenneth R. Yunker ....................................................... Executive Director, SEWRPC
Albert A. Beck .............................................................. Principal Planner, SEWRPC
Eric D. Lynde .............................................................. Senior Planner, SEWRPC
Kevin J. Muhs .............................................................. Planner, SEWRPC
Stephen Adams ....................................................... Public Involvement and Outreach Coordinator, SEWRPC

ROLL CALL

Ms. Anderson called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. She indicated that roll call would be taken through the circulation of a meeting sign-in sheet.

CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 8, 2012, MEETING

Ms. Anderson indicated that the first item on the agenda was the consideration and approval of the minutes for the previous meeting of the Workgroup held on November 8, 2012. Mr. Delagrave made a motion to approve the previous meeting’s minutes. Mr. DeHahn seconded the motion, and the Workgroup unanimously approved the minutes.

Ms. Anderson indicated that the next item on the agenda was the consideration of the revised draft of Chapter VI, “Transit Service Improvement Alternatives”, of SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 286, “Racine County Public Transit Plan: 2013-2017”, which had been distributed to the Workgroup. Mr. Lynde reviewed changes to the chapter, which had been made following the previous meeting. He indicated that the chapter presented a preliminary recommended alternative for the City of Racine Belle Urban System (BUS), and that the alternatives initially developed for the BUS were described in Appendix B of the report, which is referenced on Page 1 of the chapter and had been distributed to the Workgroup. He noted that text was added to the chapter on Pages 10-11 discussing uncertainty regarding the continuing availability of future Federal transit capital assistance, and that text was also added on Pages 25-26 to reflect the elimination of the Racine County Link, which is to occur at the end of January 2013. He also indicated that the most recent proposal for a Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee (KRM) commuter rail line had been summarized in Appendix C of the report, which is referenced on Page 46 of the chapter and had been distributed to the Workgroup. During Mr. Lynde’s review of the chapter, the following comment was raised and addressed:

1. Mr. DeHahn expressed support for extending commuter rail service to Racine. Ms. Holmlund agreed, and suggested that the plan should discuss the possibility of extending commuter rail to Racine. Mr. Ladwig indicated that it was highly unlikely that a commuter rail extension could be implemented during the five-year plan period. Mr. Yunker indicated that an authority created to construct and operate a KRM commuter rail line had been dissolved by the Wisconsin State Legislature and Governor and that Federal earmarks necessary to continue KRM commuter rail studies had been withdrawn. He noted that the Racine County public transit plan is a short-range plan, identifying actions to be implemented within the next one to five years. The appendix to the report discusses the commuter rail line and its current status.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kacala made a motion to approve the revised draft of Chapter VI, “Transit Service Improvement Alternatives,” Appendix B, “Initial Transit System Alternatives for the City of Racine Belle Urban System,” and Appendix C “Summary of Most recent Proposal for a Commuter Rail Line between Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee” of SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 286, “Racine County Public Transit Plan: 2013-2017,” as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Delagrave, and was carried unanimously by the Workgroup.

DISCUSSION OF DATES AND LOCATIONS FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS

Ms. Anderson indicated that the next item on the agenda was the discussion of dates and locations for public meetings. Mr. Yunker indicated that the Commission staff would suggest two public meetings—one in eastern Racine County and one in western Racine County—to obtain public comment on the proposed transit service improvement alternatives presented in Chapter VI. For the eastern meeting, he suggested that the transit center in downtown Racine would be an appropriate location, because it would provide easy access for passengers of the BUS. For the western meeting location, the Workgroup suggested the Commission staff explore several possible locations in the Burlington area. Following a discussion of possible dates, the Workgroup agreed that the Commission staff should attempt to schedule the public meetings on March 5 and 6, 2013.
Ms. Anderson then asked Mr. Lynde to review the materials that Commission staff had developed for the public meetings. Mr. Lynde drew the Workgroup’s attention to the preliminary draft of SEWRPC Newsletter 2 for the Racine County Public Transit Plan, entitled “Racine County Public Transit Plan: 2013-2017—Transit Service Improvement Alternatives,” which had been distributed to the Workgroup. He briefly reviewed the newsletter, which summarized the proposed transit service improvement alternatives presented in Chapter VI, and he noted that it would be distributed in advance of the public meetings to a mailing list maintained for the plan. He noted that preliminary drafts of the display boards to be used at the public meetings had been arranged around the room for review by the Workgroup (see Attachment 1 to these minutes). He then reviewed with the Workgroup a presentation prepared by Commission staff that would be given during the public meetings (see Attachment 2 to these minutes). During Mr. Lynde’s review of the newsletter and presentation, the following questions and comments were raised and addressed:

1. Mr. Stanek noted that the proper name for the transit center in downtown Racine is the Corinne Reid-Owens Transit Center, and that the street address should be 1421 State Street. Mr. Lynde indicated that this revision would be made to the newsletter.

2. Ms. Holmlund requested that notices for the public meetings clearly indicate the time that the presentation will be given. Mr. Lynde indicated that Commission staff had indicated in the newsletter a proposed time for the presentation of 5:30 p.m. at each meeting, and that this would also be clearly indicated on any other notices of the public meetings.

3. Mr. Stanek suggested that references to the annual operating assistance for the BUS provided by the City of Racine in the newsletter and presentation be revised to instead refer to the annual operating assistance provided by all local communities. Mr. Lynde indicated that these revisions would be made.

4. Mr. DeHahn expressed concern that reducing layover times under the alternative system for the BUS could cause additional deterioration to the BUS fleet. Mr. Lynde and Mr. McDonald indicated that the alternative system would actually decrease systemwide vehicle miles of travel, and that additional deterioration would not be expected.

5. Mr. Ladwig noted that the Racine County Link, which was to be eliminated at the end of January 2013, had not been successful in attracting ridership and that the County needs to be cautious when considering implementation of new transportation services.

6. Ms. Street suggested text be added to the newsletter and presentation to indicate that, in order for the County shuttle service under County Sub-alternative 1C to be eligible for Federal and State rural transit operating funds, vehicles would need to be purchased and used that are accessible to persons with disabilities, which may increase the operator’s costs. Mr. Lynde indicated that this text addition would be made.

7. Mr. Delagrave suggested text be added to the presentation to indicate that, in addition to the County, employers could also contribute to the privately-operated vanpool program under County Alternative 3 in order to reduce user fees. Mr. Lynde indicated that this text addition would be made.
8. Mr. Stanek expressed concern that a combined City/County paratransit service under County Sub-alternative 1B has the potential to increase necessary local and County operating assistance, and suggested text be added to the newsletter and presentation to note this concern. Mr. Lynde indicated that this text addition would be made.

9. Ms. Holmlund suggested that the order of the presentation be modified so the County alternatives are presented first at the public meeting in western Racine County, rather than presenting the City alternative first. Mr. Lynde indicated that this change would be made.

10. Mr. DeHahn stated that the recent 10 percent reduction in State transit funding caused Wisconsin Coach Lines, the private provider of the Milwaukee-Racine-Kenosha commuter bus service, to reduce its service in 2012, and without additional funding it would be difficult to increase the service’s frequency as proposed under Inter-County Alternative 1.

11. Mr. Stanek expressed concern with extending BUS Route No. 1 to UW-Parkside under Inter-County Sub-alternative 2A. He suggested that extending BUS Route No. 1 would require additional funding and could cause operational difficulties because the route would be longer than other BUS routes under the alternative system for the BUS. Mr. Yunker indicated that revisions would be made to the newsletter and presentation to identify these potential issues and that Sub-alternative 2A could be re-ordered as Sub-alternative 2B, with the sub-alternative for a City shuttle service between the proposed southwest transfer point at Regency Mall and UW-Parkside becoming Sub-alternative 2A.

12. Mr. Stanek requested that text be added to the presentation to describe the need to address capacity issues at the Ives Grove park-ride lot at STH 20 and IH 94 and the difficulties BUS Route No. 20 has experienced maneuvering in the lot. Mr. Yunker indicated that this text addition would be made.

[Secretary’s Note: Following the meeting, Commission staff inserted a slide on park-ride lot needs to the presentation following the last slide for the County alternatives (see Attachment 3 to these minutes).]

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Workgroup, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth R. Yunker
Recording Secretary
Introduction to the Racine County Public Transit Plan

The purpose of this effort is to prepare a short-range, 5-year plan for public transit in Racine County. The plan will include advisory recommendations for transit service for both the City of Racine and Racine County through 2017.

The following display boards present three sets of transit service improvement alternatives:

- A preliminary recommended alternative for the City’s Belle Urban System (BUS).
- Three transit service alternatives that could be considered by Racine County.
- Four alternatives for improving transit service between Racine County and surrounding counties.

Comments and questions regarding these alternatives are highly encouraged. Following consideration and incorporation of comments, a final short-range plan will be prepared with recommendations for transit service improvements.

Who is preparing the plan?
The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) is developing the plan in a joint effort with Racine County and the City of Racine. SEWRPC staff works with staff from the BUS, the Racine County Department of Human Services, and the Racine County Department of Planning and Development.

City of Racine Belle Urban System (BUS)
The BUS operates 8 regular bus routes (shown on Map 1), several peak-hour routes, and paratransit service for persons with disabilities that are unable to use the regular BUS routes.

- Service hours for regular routes
  - Weekdays: 5:10 a.m. to 10:10 p.m.
  - Saturdays: 5:40 a.m. to 6:40 p.m.
  - Sundays: 9:40 a.m. to 6:40 p.m.
- Service frequency
  - Every 30 min. during weekday peak periods.
  - Every 30 to 60 min. during weekday off-peak periods/weekends.
- Fares
  - Adult cash fare (ages 18-64): $2.00
  - Youth fare (ages 6-17): $1.50
  - Seniors and disabled persons: $1.00
- Dial-A-Ride Transport (DART)
  - Operated by the BUS, DART provides door-to-door service to persons with disabilities who are prevented from using fixed route bus service.
  - Fulfills Federal mandate for providing paratransit service within 3/4 mile of fixed-route service.
  - Available during same hours as fixed-route service.
  - Fare: $3.00

Racine County Transit Plan Workgroup

The Racine County Public Transit Plan is being developed under the guidance of a Workgroup formed specifically for this study.

- Representatives invited to participate in the Workgroup from all units of government in Racine County and a wide variety of agencies and populations with an interest in transportation in the County.
- The Workgroup has approved the transit service improvement alternatives being presented for public comment at this meeting.
- The Workgroup will propose to Racine County and the City of Racine a recommended public transit plan for the next five years for their consideration.

Agencies and Organizations Invited to Participate in Workgroup

Transit Service Providers
- First Transit, Inc.
- Racine Belle Urban System

Racine County Government
- County Executive’s Office
- Health and Human Development Committee
- Human Services Department
- Department of Planning and Development
- Workforce Development Center

City of Racine Government
- Mayor’s Office
- Department of City Development
- Transportation Department
- Transit and Parking Commission

Other Government
- City of Burlington
- Village of Cedarburg
- Village of Mt. Pleasant
- Village of Rochester
- Village of Sturtevant
- Village of Union Grove
- Village of Waterford
- Village of West Point
- Town of Burlington
- Town of Dover
- Town of Norway
- Town of Raymond
- Town of Waterford
- Town of Yorkville
- Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Educational Institutions with Student Transportation Needs
- Burlington Area School District
- Racine Unified School District
- Union Grove High School District
- Waterford Union High School District

Business Organizations
- Racine Area Manufacturers and Commerce
- Greater Union Grove Area Chamber of Commerce
- Waterford Area Chamber of Commerce
- Burlington Chamber of Commerce
- Racine County Economic Development Corporation

Non-Profit Organizations
- Alliance on Mental Illness of Racine County
- American Red Cross
- Careers Industries, Inc.
- First Choice Pre-Apprentice Jobs Training
- Hispanic Roundtable
- Love, Inc.
- Racine County Opportunity Center
- Racine Hispanic Business and Professionals Organization
- Racine Interfaith Coalition
- Rock Island Public Library
- Urban League of Racine and Kenosha

Map 1

Existing Belle Urban System Routes
Belle Urban System  
Challenges and Issues

The City’s geography poses a significant challenge to designing the BUS.

- **Uneven development pattern:** Downtown Racine is located north and east of the City’s geographic center. Over the years, new development has spread south and west, influenced by the Root River.

- **Difficult to design bus routes with near-equal lengths between the downtown transit center (TC) and the routes’ outlying endpoints.**

- **Current “pulse” schedule system implemented in 2002 was designed so most routes run on 90-min. round-trip schedules: 15 min. from the TC to the northern endpoint and 15 min. back to the TC; then 30 min. from the TC to the southern endpoint and 30 min. back to the TC. This results in several issues:**
  - **Confusing midday schedule:** Between 9:30 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., the bus routes alternate between 30- and 60-min. service frequencies.
  - **Long layover times on evenings/weekends:** During evenings/weekends, the routes’ 90-min. round-trip schedules are stretched to 120 min., with buses waiting over 20 min. at route endpoints on many routes.

- **Other issues were identified in an evaluation of the system and through public comments, including:**
  - Circular design of Route 86 makes travel to some destinations on that route very inconvenient.
  - Some routes need to be updated to more efficiently serve existing residential and commercial development.

Belle Urban System  
Preliminary Recommended Alternative

Map 2 shows the proposed BUS routes under the Workgroup’s preliminary recommended alternative for the City of Racine.

- Alternative system is “financially-constrained”, keeping the City’s share of annual operating assistance at about $1.0 to $1.1 million.

- Proposed changes would make the BUS more efficient by combining and realigning poor-performing routes.

- Resulting in a more understandable midday schedule and significantly reduced layover times during evenings and weekends.

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO BUS ROUTES**

- **Primary changes to route alignments include:** (note: legs of Route Nos. 1 through 5 are labeled based on whether they are north or south of the TC):  
  - Remove Route 1N loop on South St., Charles St., and Carlton Dr., and modify the route to serve Horlick High School and Rapids Plaza.
  - Modify Route 3N to serve St. Mary’s hospital.
  - Modify Route 4N to serve downtown.
  - Convert Route 86 from one-way loop to two-way out-and-back route (Route 6).
  - Establish a southwest transfer point at Regency Mall for transfers between Routes 4S, 6, 7, and 27.

- **Route lengths would be equalized** so each regular route takes 30 min. to get from the TC to its endpoint, then 30 min. back to the TC.

  - This allows more uniform service frequencies: every 30 min. during peak periods and every 60 min. during off-peak periods/weekends (note: Route 6 would be an exception, running every 60 min. all day).

  - Buses on all routes would meet at the TC so passengers would not need to wait to transfer to another route.

  - Alternative system does not include changes to Route 27 because it was recently changed (fall 2012). BUS staff intends to monitor route’s performance and decide whether to change or expand the route (for example, by adding Saturday service).

**Map 2  
Belle Urban System Routes Under the Preliminary Recommended Alternative**

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND COSTS**

Overall, the transit system’s annual revenue hours would be slightly reduced:

- Existing system: 81,200 annual revenue hours (2012 budget)
- Alternative system: 77,000 annual revenue hours (2013 through 2017)

Ridership is assumed to modestly increase by 1% per year:

- Existing system: 1.06 million revenue passengers (2012 budget)
- Alternative system: 1.11 million revenue passengers (by 2017)

Compared to continuing with existing service levels, the alternative system would save about $340,000 in total operating costs and $150,000 in required local operating assistance in its first full year.

**CAPITAL NEEDS**

The alternative system does not require any additional capital investment over the existing system. Over the 5-year planning period, the following significant capital investments are planned:

- Maintain its existing fleet of 35 heavy-duty buses by replacing 14 buses in 2013, three buses in 2016, and three buses in 2017.
- Replace seven existing paratransit buses (in service since 2009) with new paratransit buses.
- Lease/purchase land at Regency Mall for a small transfer facility.
- Make various repairs, renovations, and upgrades to BUS facilities.

Over the 5 years, 80% of these capital costs could be funded by a total of about $8.8 million in Federal funds, with the City of Racine providing a local share of $2.2 million.
Belle Urban System
Preliminary Recommended Alternative

OPTIONS IF OPERATING FUNDING LEVELS CHANGE

The preliminary recommended alternative was developed assuming a relatively flat total operating budget for the system, keeping local funding at about the year 2012 funding level. However, funding levels could change during the next five years.

Should additional funding become available, the map to the right shows some improvements the City could consider beyond the proposed changes in the alternative system.

>>An increase of about $1.0 million in net operating assistance would be needed to implement all options.

Should the City need to decrease local funding for the system, here are some service reductions (and a fare increase) that the City could consider:

- Eliminate Route 2N/2S on Saturdays
- Eliminate Route 1S after 6:30 p.m. on weeknights
- Eliminate Route 1S on Saturdays and/or Sundays
- Increase cash fares by $0.25 (12.5%).

>>Savings of about $400,000 in net operating assistance for all options.

Racine County
Transportation Services

The Racine County Human Services Department currently provides the following transportation services:

- Demand-response transportation
- Door-to-door, advance reservation
- Eligibility: seniors and persons with disabilities outside the City’s DART paratransit service area, and seniors within the DART service area.
- Service hours: weekdays from 5:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
- Fare: $2.50 per one-way trip

Shuttling People Around Racine County (SPARC) program

- Flexible route (can deviate a short distance off the route) in the Burlington area.
- Eligibility: designed for seniors, but no formal eligibility restrictions.
- Service hours: weekdays from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
- Fare: $2 per one-way trip ($3 round-trip; $5 for a day pass)

The County contracts with First Transit to operate the demand-response service and with Kenson Enterprises to operate the SPARC program.

Racine County Transit Alternatives -
Alternative 1 (Expand/Coordinate)

Three potential ways to better coordinate and expand access to existing transportation services were developed under Alternative 1 (County could choose to implement any or all):

- Sub-alternative 1A: Expand eligibility of County demand-response service
  - West of IH 94, eligibility for the County’s demand-response service—currently limited to seniors and disabled persons—would be expanded to anyone who receives assistance from County agencies (except Medicaid non-emergency transportation).
  - Ridership would more than double, requiring significantly more service hours and resulting in total annual operating expenses increasing by 2.5 times by 2017.
  - Service would not be eligible for Federal and State transit operating funds, so higher levels of State Section 85.21 and County funding would be needed.

- Sub-alternative 1B: Combined City/County paratransit service
  - East of IH 94, the City DART paratransit and County demand-response services would be combined into a single service for seniors and disabled persons, with service hours mirroring those of the BUS feed-route service.
  - If City DART paratransit operates service (may also be possible for County to operate), DART’s higher unit operating costs would likely negate any ridership increases and efficiencies gained by having only one operator. An additional seven DART paratransit vehicles would also need to be purchased to serve demand.
  - As this would be a very complex task, a first step may be to establish an integrated call center, providing a single point of contact for information on both existing services.

- Sub-alternative 1C: County shuttle service operated as public transit
  - Existing County SPARC shuttle service would be continued, refined as needed (by modifying or dropping routes, or trying new routes), and operated as public transit.
  - If operated as public transit, the shuttle service would qualify for Federal and State transit operating funds. Limiting County share of total operating expenses and allowing County to set aside some State Section 85.21 funding to purchase vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2017 Estimates</th>
<th>Sub-Alt. 1A</th>
<th>Sub-Alt. 1B</th>
<th>Sub-Alt. 1C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Ridership</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$304,100</td>
<td>$977,100</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>42,200</td>
<td>257,100</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Public Assistance</td>
<td>$261,900</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/State Transit Operating Assistance</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>505,300</td>
<td>96,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Section 85.21 Funding</td>
<td>218,200</td>
<td>178,900</td>
<td>41,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Funds</td>
<td>43,700</td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td>8,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racine County Transit Alternatives -
Alternative 2 (Public Shared-Ride Taxi)

This option would replace the County’s demand-response service—currently limited to seniors and disabled persons—with a shared-ride taxi program that anyone could use.

WHAT IS SHARED-RIDE TAXI?

Shared-ride taxi is a curb-to-curb or door-to-door transit service open to the general public. Shared-ride taxi is usually provided using small vehicles, such as automobiles, vans, or small buses. As the term indicates, passengers share a vehicle for at least part of their trip. Dispatch handles service requests like a conventional taxicab service. Good examples of county-run shared-ride taxi services in southeastern Wisconsin are the Ozaukee County DART and Washington Counties.

Operating Characteristics

- One day advance reservation
- Service area: same as existing (any trips with one trip end west of IH 94, including out-of-county medical trips)
- Service hours: Weekdays from 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Saturdays from 5:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
- Fares (distance-based): $4.00 to $7.75 (student and senior/disabled discounts)

- Ridership would more than triple, requiring significantly more service hours and resulting in total annual operating expenses nearly quadrupling by 2017.

- Shared-ride taxi would be a public transit service, so it would be eligible for Federal and State rural transit operating funds, reducing the initial amount of State Section 85.21 and County funding needed.

- However, as ridership, service levels, and the associated operating costs increase, the needed State Section 85.21 and County funding would return to about existing levels by 2017.

- A shared-ride taxi program may eventually require a much higher County contribution than the existing service as demand increases beyond 2017.

- Based on the experiences of the public shared-ride taxi systems in Ozaukee and Washington Counties, which began in 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2017 Estimates</th>
<th>Alt. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Ridership</td>
<td>21,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$443,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Public Assistance</td>
<td>$353,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/State Transit Operating Assistance</td>
<td>259,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Section 85.21 Funding</td>
<td>78,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Funds</td>
<td>15,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Racine County Transit Alternatives -
Alternative 3 (Vanpools)

Two ways to form a vanpool program were evaluated in which volunteer drivers would provide group transportation for long work-trip commutes (over 15 miles each way) starting or ending in the County.

- **Sub-alternative 3A**: County-run vanpool program
  - Administered by County staff.
  - County would purchase five mini-vans over four years using Federal transit capital assistance funds which could cover 80% of the vehicle costs.
  - Fees would be designed to cover both operating costs and the County's share of the costs to purchase or replace vans.
  - Fees (per vanpool):
    - Monthly fee: $150
    - Mileage fee: about $0.55 per mile

- **Sub-alternative 3B**: Privately-run vanpool program
  - Administered by a private vanpool operator, which would provide vans, using fees charged to the vanpool users to cover their own costs.
  - Monthly user fees would be significantly higher than a County-run program because Federal assistance would not be used to purchase vehicles.
  - To reduce user fees, the County could contribute funding or partner with employers willing to contribute funding to cover part of the cost of the service.

### Vanpools

**WHAT IS A VANPOOL?**

- Vanpools are for workers with long commutes who cannot use public transportation or find it inconvenient to do so. They consist of groups of 5 to 15 people commuting together to and from work. Each member contributes to the cost of operating the van. One member would volunteer to drive, usually in exchange for reduced monthly fees. Typically, the vans are owned by a third party, such as a government agency, an employer, or a private vanpool operator.

- Vanpools are most useful to a narrowly-defined market:
  - Workers whose commutes are longer than 15 miles;
  - Workers who share a single employer or who work in an area with a concentrated group of employers with similar shift start- and-end-times;
  - Workers who live near each other or who can travel to a common departure point (such as a park-and-ride lot).

### Racine County Transit Alternatives -
Which Services Can the County Afford?

Based on cost estimates for the County alternatives, there may be enough funding from the existing County levy (about $62,000 in 2011), the County’s State Section 85.21 allocation (projected $436,000 in 2017), and Federal transit funding sources to adequately fund a number of the alternatives which were identified.

- **For example, the County could implement the following three initiatives (while maintaining its existing eligibility-limited demand-response transportation service west of IH 94):**
  - **Sub-alternative 1B**: Combine City/County paratransit east of IH 94
  - **Sub-alternative 1C**: Continue/refine shuttle service and operate as public transit
  - **Alternative 3**: Vanpools

However, some of the alternatives would require an increase in funding, specifically alternatives which would replace and expand the existing eligibility-limited demand-response service west of IH 94:

- **Sub-alternative 1A**: Expand eligibility of demand-response transportation service west of IH 94 to all clients of County Human Services
  - Would require significant increase in County funding by 2017 because Sub-alternative 1A would not be eligible for Federal and State transit operating funds.

- **Alternative 2**: Shared-ride taxi program (expand eligibility to general public) west of IH 94
  - Would not likely increase County funding by 2017, because Alternative 2 would be eligible for Federal and State transit operating funds, but could significantly increase County funding beyond 2017 as demand increases.

### Existing Transportation Services between Racine County and Surrounding Counties

Wisconsin Coach Lines (WCL) currently operates a commuter bus route between the Cities of Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee.

- **WCL commuter bus service characteristics**
  - Seven round-trips on weekdays between 5:15 a.m. and 10:30 p.m. (focused on the morning and afternoon peak periods)
  - Six round-trips on Saturdays and Sundays between 8:15 a.m. and 10:37 p.m.
  - Adult cash fare (distance-based): $2.00 - 4.25
  - Began serving UW-Parkside on two weekday round-trips in September 2012.

UW-Parkside, located in Kenosha County, currently operates a campus shuttle for its students and staff.

- **Includes two round-trips between the campus and the McDonald’s at Taylor Ave. and Meachem Rd. in the City of Racine (the endpoint of BUS Route 1).**
- **Service is offered on weekdays between 7:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (only when class is in session).**
- **Fares**: Free for UW-Parkside students and employees
Inter-County Transit Alternative 1 - Increase Milwaukee-Racine-Kenosha Service

- Proposed changes:
  - Increased weekday service frequency from 7 to 10 round-trips:
    - Northbound one-way trips: 1 more morning, 2 more afternoon
    - Southbound one-way trips: 1 more midday, 2 more evening
  - Slight route alignment change to serve Gateway Technical College campus in Racine.
  - Integration of route with existing BUS routes:
    - Add route to BUS and KAT route maps.
  - Establish consistent charges for transfers between route and BUS and KAT systems.
  - Provide information on route anywhere information about BUS and KAT systems is displayed.
  - Proposed increase in service frequency may not be feasible at this time given need for increased local funding.
  - Should still consider integration of route with BUS and KAT systems to promote coordination between commuter and local transit services.

Inter-County Transit Alternative 2 - Local Public Transit to UW-Parkside

Under this alternative, the City of Racine would operate local public transit service between the City of Racine and the UW-Parkside campus in Kenosha County.

- Sub-alternative 2A: Extend proposed BUS Route 1 to serve UW-Parkside
  - City would extend BUS Route 1 by 3.5 miles (one-way) to provide frequent local bus service to UW-Parkside’s Tallent Hall, permitting transfers to/from Kenosha Area Transit (KAT) Route 1, which already serves UW-Parkside.
  - 15.5 round-trips between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays when classes are in session (every 30 min. during peak, and every 60 min. during off-peak).
  - Sub-alternative 2B: City-operated shuttle between Regency Mall and UW-Parkside
    - BUS paratransit vehicle would be used to operate between Tallent Hall and proposed southwest transfer point at Regency Mall.
    - Six round-trips between 7:30 a.m. and 9:10 p.m. on weekdays when classes are in session (two hours), meeting BUS routes at transit “pulse” transfer times.
  - Sub-alternative 2C: Extend and increase existing UW-Parkside shuttle service
    - University would enhance existing campus shuttle, extending shuttle by 1.2 miles (one-way) and adding one midday round-trip.
    - Would provide additional access to BUS routes for students and staff, but would not serve individuals who need to continue on to the KAT system due to its limited frequency.
    - University would operate so operating costs would most likely be funded by University’s operating budget or student fees.

Inter-County Transit Alternative 3 - Racine-Kenosha Express Bus

Under this alternative, the Cities of Racine and Kenosha would jointly establish and contract for an express bus service between the two Cities. The service would address an identified unmet need for frequent and convenient transit service connecting the Cities of Racine and Kenosha.

- Express bus service characteristics:
  - Limited-stop public transit service provided with large, urban buses. Stops spaced about every 1/4 mile to 1 mile along route.
  - Would serve major public higher education institutions, including UW-Parkside and Gateway Technical College campuses in Racine and Kenosha.
  - 16 round-trips between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays (every 30 min. in peak, and every 60 min. in offpeak).
  - Travel time (entire route): 60 min. each way.
  - Adult cash fare: $2.25 each way.
  - Saturdays could be considered if weekday service experiences high ridership.

- Funding sources:
  - Operating revenues.
  - Federal and State urban transit operating assistance funds.
  - Local matching funds from Cities of Racine and Kenosha.

- Capital needs:
  - Four buses would need to be purchased at a total cost of about $1.7 million.
  - Federal transportation grants could fund 80 percent, with Cities of Racine and Kenosha needing to provide remaining 20 percent.

- Cities of Racine and Kenosha would need to reach agreement on how to provide needed local operating and capital funding.
  - Agreement would also need to address bus maintenance.

- Year 2017 Estimates (after 4 years of operation) Alt. 3
  - Annual Ridership: 62,600
  - Operating Expenses: $802,600
  - Operating Revenues: 139,600
  - Required Public Assistance: $603,000
  - Federal/State Transit Operating Assistance: 405,300
  - Other/Local Match: 257,700

Inter-County Transit Alternative 4 - Burlington-Milwaukee Commuter Bus

Under this alternative, Racine County would establish and contract for a commuter bus service between the City of Burlington and the Milwaukee central business district. The service would address an identified unmet need for transportation between western Racine County and Milwaukee.

- Commuter bus service characteristics:
  - Limited-stop public transit service focused on providing work commute trips. Stops spaced about every 3 to 5 miles along route.
  - Would serve three park-and-ride lots in Burlington, Waterford, and Franklin. Waterford lot would need to be constructed.
  - Two round-trips on weekdays (inbound from Burlington to Milwaukee in morning and outbound in reverse direction in afternoon).
  - Travel time (entire route): 72 min. each way.
  - Adult cash fare: $3.25 each way.

- Funding sources:
  - Operating revenues.
  - Federal and State rural transit operating assistance funds.
  - Local matching funds from Racine County.

- Possible “demonstration” funding:
  - County may also be able to obtain Federal Highway Administration Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) grant funding to fund about 80 percent of total cost to operate service for its first three years.
  - Passenger revenues may be enough to provide needed 20 percent local matching funds during those first three years.

- Year 2017 Estimates (after 4 years of operation) Alt. 4
  - Annual Ridership: 20,500
  - Operating Expenses: $229,800
  - Operating Revenues: 56,600
  - Required Public Assistance: $173,000
  - Federal/State Transit Operating Assistance: 134,300
  - Other/Local Match: 38,700
RACINE COUNTY PUBLIC TRANSIT PLAN: 2013-2017

Short-range, five-year plan for public transit in Racine County
- Will include advisory recommendations for transit service for both the City and County through 2017
- Prepared by SEWRPC
  - Joint effort with City and County
- Guided by an Advisory Workgroup

Background

Outline of Presentation
- Review of existing transit services
- Transit service improvement alternatives
  - City of Racine Alternative
  - Racine County Alternatives
  - Inter-County Alternatives
- Next Steps

Existing Transit Services

City of Racine Belle Urban System
- Eight regular bus routes and several peak-hour routes
- Dial-A-Ride Transport (DART)
  - Federally-mandated
  - For individuals with disabilities who cannot use the fixed-route service

Outline of Presentation

Existing Transit Services
Racine County Transportation Services
- Racine County Human Services Department provides two transportation services:
  - Demand-response transportation to seniors and disabled persons outside the DART service area, and to seniors within the DART service area.
  - Burlington area shuttle service through the Shuttling People Around Racine County (SPARC) program.
- Primary funding sources:
  - County funds
  - State Section 85.21 specialized transportation assistance funds

Inter-County Transportation Services
- Milwaukee-Racine-Kenosha commuter bus route
  - Operated by Wisconsin Coach Lines (WCL).
- UW-Parkside campus shuttle
  - Two round-trips between campus and the City of Racine.

City of Racine Alternative
- Preliminary Recommended Alternative for the Belle Urban System (BUS)
  - Alternative system is “financially constrained”
    - Limits City of Racine annual contribution to $1.0 to $1.1 million
  - Would address several operational issues
    - Confusing midday schedule
    - Long layover times on evenings and weekends
    - Inconvenient travel on Route 86 one-way loop
    - Route updates needed to more efficiently serve development

City of Racine Alternative (continued)
- Route changes
  - Poor-performing routes would be combined and realigned.
- Equal route lengths
  - 30 minutes from the Transit Center to the route endpoint, then 30 minutes back to the Transit Center.
Alternative system would save about $340,000 in total operating costs in its first full year

Moderate ridership increases are assumed (1% per year)

No additional capital investment required over existing system

City of Racine Alternative

Funding levels could change during the next five years.

Options are presented in case additional funding becomes available or funding levels decrease.

City has more flexibility under alternative system to change routes based on performance.

Three alternatives for transit service in Racine County were developed:

1. Expand/Coordinate Existing Services
2. Public Shared-Ride Taxi
3. Vanpools

Alternative 1: Expand/Coordinate Existing Services

Sub-alternative 1A: West of IH 94, expand eligibility for County demand-response service

Sub-alternative 1B: East of IH 94, combine the City DART paratransit and County demand response services

Sub-alternative 1C: Continue/refine shuttle service and operate service as public transit
Racine County Alternative 1 (continued)

Summary of Conclusions
- Sub-alt. 1A (Expand eligibility to all clients of County Human Services):
  - More service needed, resulting in increased costs
  - Not eligible for Federal/State transit operating assistance
- Sub-alt. 1B (Combined City/County paratransit east of IH 94):
  - May not save money
  - Complex undertaking
- Sub-alt. 1C (Shuttles operated as transit open to the general public):
  - Eligible for Federal/State transit operating assistance

Racine County Alternative 2

Alternative 2:
Public Shared-Ride Taxi West of IH 94
- Would replace eligibility-limited County demand-response service with shared-ride taxi program open to general public
- Would be provided using small vehicles
- Would be similar to programs in Ozaukee and Washington Counties

Racine County Alternative 2 (continued)

Summary of Conclusions
- Alternative 2:
  - A shared-ride taxi program would significantly increase operating costs
  - Eligible for Federal and State rural transit operating funds
    - Reduces initial amount of State Section 85.21 and County funding needed
  - Demand likely to increase beyond 2017
    - May eventually need much higher County funding

Racine County Alternative 3

Alternative 3:
Vanpools for Commuter Trips
- Sub-alternative 3A: County-run vanpool program
  - Administered by County staff, with County purchasing vans
- Sub-alternative 3B: Privately-run vanpool program
  - Administered by private operator, which would provide vans
Summary of Conclusions

- Privately-run vanpool would not require investment from the County
- However, user fees would be significantly higher for a privately-run vanpool
  - To reduce user fees, County could contribute funding to the privately-run program

Racine County Alternatives (continued)

- County may be able to adequately fund a number of alternatives
  - For example, three initiatives could be implemented (while maintaining the existing eligibility-limited demand-response service west of IH 94):
    - Sub-alt. 1B: Combine City/County paratransit east of IH 94
    - Sub-alt. 1C: Operate shuttle service as public transit
    - Alt. 3: Vanpools
  - All three together would not likely require an increase in County funding

Summary of Conclusions (continued)

- Alternatives that would replace and expand the existing eligibility-limited demand-response service west of IH 94 would likely require an increase in funding:
  - Sub-alternative 1A (expand eligibility to all clients of County Human Services) would require a significant increase in County funding by 2017
  - Alternative 2 (shared-ride taxi program open to the general public) would not likely increase County funding by 2017, but could significantly increase County funding beyond 2017

Inter-County Alternatives

- Four alternatives for transit service between Racine County and surrounding counties were developed
  1. Increased Commuter Bus Frequency
  2. Local Public Transit to UW-Parkside
  3. Kenosha-Racine Express Bus
  4. Burlington-Milwaukee Commuter Bus
**Inter-County Alternative 1**

**Alternative 1:**
Increase Milwaukee-Racine-Kenosha Commuter Bus Service Frequency
- Increase weekday round-trips from 7 to 10
- Route change to serve Gateway Technical College in Racine

**Summary of Conclusions**
- Would need to significantly increase local funding
- Whether or not service is increased, BUS and WCL should consider steps to integrate two services
  - Would promote coordination between commuter and local transit services, making them easier to use and more attractive.

---

**Inter-County Alternative 2**

**Alternative 2:**
Provide Improved Transit Service to UW-Parkside
- Sub-alternative 2A: Extend proposed BUS Route 1
- Sub-alternative 2B: BUS shuttle route
- Sub-alternative 2C: Extend and increase existing campus shuttle

**Summary of Conclusions**
- Sub-alternatives 2A and 2B (City-provided services):
  - Extending BUS Route 1 would provide more desirable service
  - Shuttle would be more affordable
- Sub-alternative 2C:
  - Additional access to BUS routes
  - Would not serve individuals who need to continue on to KAT
### Inter-County Alternative 3

**Alternative 3:**
Establish Express Bus Service Between Racine and Kenosha
- Would be jointly established by Cities of Racine and Kenosha
- Would serve colleges and universities
- 16 weekday round-trips

### Inter-County Alternative 3 (continued)

**Summary of Conclusions**
- Would be eligible for Federal and State urban transit operating funds
  - Cities would provide local matching funds
- Annual operating expenses in 2017 would be about $800,000
  - Local funds of about $260,000
- Four buses would need to be purchased
  - Federal capital grants could fund 80 percent

### Inter-County Alternative 4

**Alternative 4:**
Establish Commuter Bus Service Between Burlington and Milwaukee
- Would be established by Racine County
- Two weekday round-trips
- Would serve three park-ride lots

### Inter-County Alternative 4 (continued)

**Summary of Conclusions**
- Would be eligible for Federal and State rural transit operating funds
  - County would provide local matching funds
- Annual operating expenses in 2017 would be about $230,000
  - Local funds of about $39,000
- Could also obtain FHWA CMAQ funding
  - Could fund 80 percent of operating expenses for first three years
Next Steps

- Obtain public input on alternatives
  - Comments accepted through ____________
- Prepare final recommended plan
  - Recommended transit service improvements for Racine County over next five years
- Present final plan to City and County for their consideration
Existing Ives Grove park-ride lot (Hwy 20 and IH 94) experiencing capacity problems

- Lot reportedly exceeding capacity at times
- BUS Route 20 has difficulty maneuvering in lot due to illegally parked cars when lot is over-capacity
- City and County currently working with WisDOT to address capacity issues (possible expansion on adjacent County-owned land)