

Alternative Transit Management Models

Agency and Service Delivery Options

January 6, 2017

City Manager's

Transit Stakeholder Advisory Group

Final Recommendations

To The City Manager



Alternative Transit Management Models
Agency and Service Delivery Options

Contents

Advisory Group Listing 3
Stakeholder Advisory Group Purpose 4
Stakeholder Advisory Group Recommendations..... 4

Attachment A

Recommendations Current Management Contract – Performance Indicators..... 8

Alternative Transit Management Models
Agency and Service Delivery Options

Advisory Group Listing

<u>Stakeholder Group</u>	<u>Representative</u>
City of Tucson Transit Task Force	Margot Garcia City of Tucson Transit Task Force, Chair mgarcia@vcu.edu
Friends of Streetcar	Steve Farley, Arizona State Representative Friends of Streetcar Representative sfarley@igc.org
Pima Association of Governments/Regional Public Transportation Authority	Jim Degrood PAG Transportation Services Director jdegrood@pagnet.org
Ratp Dev McDonald Transit (RDMT)	Steve Bethel General Manager, Sun Link Streetcar Steve.bethel@tucsonaz.gov
Southern Arizona Transit Advocates	Gene Caywood caywoodgm@juno.com
Teamsters Local 104	Kevin (K.T.) Thomas Business Agent, Teamsters Local 104 kevin.thomas@teamsterslocal104.com
Transdev	Katrina Heineking Regional Vice President, Transdev katrina.heineking@transdev.com
Tucson Bus Riders Union	Brian Flagg casamariatucson@yahoo.com
Tucson Metro Chamber	Robert Medler Vice President, Tucson Metro Chamber of Commerce rmedler@tucsonchamber.org
University of Arizona	David Heineking Executive Director, Parking and Transportation Services heinekin@email.arizona.edu

Alternative Transit Management Models Agency and Service Delivery Options

Stakeholder Advisory Group Purpose

In October 2015, Mayor and Council directed that the City Manager engage the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) and other relevant stakeholders to examine alternative actions and improvements to support the long-term sustainability of the transit system to meet the needs of the community.

Based on this direction, the City Manager invited members of the various transit stakeholder groups listed at the beginning of this report to discuss and provide advice on two key questions on alternative transit management models:

- What agency or institutional structure should be responsible for transit services in Tucson?
- What method the agency should use to deliver the transit services?

In addition to the key questions on alternative transit management models, the stakeholder advisory group was asked to provide input on the following questions related to the City's current transit management contract:

- What contract incentives might help the City avoid a future strike?
- What contract incentives might increase ridership and improve operations?

The City Manager will consider the stakeholder advisory group recommendations and then provide a report to Mayor and Council with initial recommendations on alternative management models. With Mayor and Council approval, the City Manager will then invite the public to comment on the initial recommendations prior to making any final recommendations on alternative management models to Mayor and Council.

Stakeholder Advisory Group Recommendations

The stakeholder advisory group met five times from September 2016 to November 2016 to review background information and options. Materials from these meetings are available at: <https://www.tucsonaz.gov/transit/city-managers-transit-stakeholder-group>. Based on these meetings, the stakeholder advisory group developed the following recommendations, which address funding, agency options, service delivery options and include other related recommendations, to the City Manager:

- *Funding.* The stakeholder group strongly recommends that dedicated transportation funding be addressed in the upcoming fiscal year budget. The funding could be used to support transportation services, such as local residential roadway maintenance, and transit services, and multi-modal transportation improvements such as sidewalks and bikeways. In addition, the portion of the funding revenue for transit services could be applied to any of the agency management options.

Alternative Transit Management Models Agency and Service Delivery Options

- *Agency Management Recommendations.* To provide the greatest opportunity for continued success of transit services in the Tucson region, the stakeholder advisory group supports and recommends the establishment of a regional transit authority. The authority's scope should include additional complementary connecting services, such parking management, bike share, car share and pedestrian programs, which allow riders to connect to/from transit to their final destinations.

More specifically, the stakeholder advisory group recommends the following:

- *Metropolitan Public Transit Authority (MPTA).* The stakeholder advisory group strongly recommends the City establish an MPTA. The MPTA legislation is the only existing state legislation which has the following combination of features:
 - Provides for a dedicated, viable and equitable funding source, property tax, to build and operate transit services.
 - Allows the City of Tucson to solely form the MPTA by approving a City ordinance.
 - Permits the agency to grow into a regional agency by allowing other interested local governmental agencies (cities, towns or Pima County) to join the MPTA at formation.
 - Calls for directly elected board members and has proportional board voting among its member agencies.
 - Provides service delivery flexibility in hiring transit agency employees or contracting out transit services.
 - Focuses the agency on a single purpose of providing transportation services.

Given the sensitivity to increased property taxes, the stakeholder advisory group recommends that when the MPTA starts to receive funding from property taxes the City proportionately reduce its property taxes until such time as when the MPTA board members are elected and have determined the appropriate MPTA property tax funding level. In the long term, the MPTA property tax funding could substitute for the City's General Fund transit investment, which would allow the City to use the funding to address other needs or to improve transit services.

The MPTA, as a public utility, is subject to Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) oversight. Specific regulations related to ACC oversight of an MPTA have not been defined. In addition, the state MPTA legislation, which was written in 1970 requires updating, such as enabling the MPTA to provide federally required paratransit (Sun Van) services and other complementary connecting services (e.g. parking management, bike share, car share, pedestrian programs).

Alternative Transit Management Models Agency and Service Delivery Options

The stakeholder advisory group also recommends that the City develop an MPTA transition plan, which addresses issues related to the MPTA implementation such as the authority's service area, organizational structure recommendations, the transfer of major transit assets, service delivery options, federal grant recipient status, the ACC role and regulations, potential property tax impact, the City's maintenance of effort, the interim extension of the City's management contract and provides an initial service and financing plan. The development of the transition plan should include the stakeholder advisory group involvement and review process.

The above recommendations reflect the stakeholder advisory group's preference for the following agency features:

- An independent transit agency
- An agency governing board elected by voters
- Proportional voting on the transit governing board for member agencies
- A dedicated funding source for transit
- The ability for the agency to hire employees or contract services

The stakeholder advisory group does not recommend that the joint powers, RTA or the City of Tucson agency management models be pursued at this time.

- *Service Delivery and Current Management Contract Recommendations.* The stakeholder advisory group recommends that the agency managing transit services should have the flexibility to pursue the following service delivery options:
 - Agency Performed (agency employees hired)
 - Service (O&M) Contract
 - Management Contract
 - Delegated Management or Public/Private Operating Partnership Contract
 - Non-profit subsidiary of the MPTA

With regard to public/private partnerships (P3), the stakeholder advisory group strongly recommends that P3 opportunities be explored for high capacity improvements such as streetcar extensions and bus rapid lines.

As the City pursues the establishment of a regional transit authority, the stakeholder advisory group recommends that the City extend its management contract by modifying its performance indicators to include incentives for ridership, customer satisfaction and maintenance as provided in Attachment A.

Alternative Transit Management Models Agency and Service Delivery Options

- *Related Recommendations.* In addition to the above agency and service delivery option recommendations, the stakeholder advisory group supports the following related recommendations:
 - The City Manager is encouraged to facilitate the exchange of information and communication between the Sun Tran management and labor union prior to the start of upcoming labor negotiations. Once labor negotiations start, a federal mediator should be brought in early into the process.
 - The City should engage stakeholders in updating its transit marketing plan and commit additional resources toward the implementation of the expanded marketing plan.
 - If needed, pursue state legislative changes to refine agency legislation or service delivery options

Alternative Transit Management Models Agency and Service Delivery Options

Recommendations Current Management Contract – Performance Indicators

The stakeholder advisory group also reviewed potential contract performance modifications the existing Sun Tran management contract. Recommendations to the performance indicators are shown as follows:

- *Performance Indicators.* Overall, contract performance indicators should be established and tracked using the following guidelines:
 - The contractor should have the ability to largely control the performance indicator.
 - The indicator should be easily tracked and analyzed.
 - Performance goals for each indicator should be realistic and achievable.
 - Incentives for exceeding performance goals should be balanced with disincentives for not achieving goals.
 - The City or an independent third party should periodically verify the contractor’s performance source data to ensure the integrity of the process.

The following potential performance indicators were developed for evaluating the management of Sun Tran services. Comparable performance indicators with goals and incentives would need to be developed for Sun Van and Sun Link.

- *Increasing Ridership.* Based on national research utilizing quantitative analysis, transit ridership is most influenced by the availability of transit service, the frequency of the transit service and the safety of transit system¹. National customer surveys show that people most value frequent and reliable transit with reduced travel times².

Based on this research and taking into account factors which can be largely controlled by the contractor, the following potential performance indicators would encourage the management contractor to focus on increasing ridership by ensuring on-time performance (service reliability) and reducing preventable accidents (safety):

- Monthly On-time Performance

On-time Performance %	Incentive	Disincentive
>94.00%	\$500	N/A
92.00% - 94.00%	\$250	N/A
91.00% - 91.99%	Goal	Goal

¹ *Investigating the Determining Factors for Transit Travel Demand by Bus Mode in US Metropolitan Statistical Areas*, Mineta Transportation Institute, May 2015

² *Who’s On Board 2016: What Today’s Riders Teach Us About Transit That Works*, TransitCenter

Alternative Transit Management Models Agency and Service Delivery Options

On-time Performance %	Incentive	Disincentive
88.00% - 90.99%	N/A	-\$500

- Monthly Preventable Accidents

Accidents/Injuries per 100,000 Miles	Incentive	Disincentive
<0.30	\$500	N/A
0.30 – 0.44	\$250	N/A
0.45 – 0.54	\$100	N/A
0.55 – 0.60	Goal	Goal
0.61 – 0.70	N/A	-\$250
>0.70	N/A	-\$500

In addition to the above performance indicators, the management contractor would be expected to:

- Identify ways to increase the number of routes in the frequent transit network system.
- Identify ways to reduce travel time.
- Annual Ridership Incentive

Increase Ridership from Baseline Budget	Incentive	Disincentive
For each 1% above Goal (10% maximum)	\$10,000	N/A
Baseline - Ridership forecast included in Annual Budget	Goal	Goal

In addition to the above performance indicators, the management contractor would be expected to update the marketing plan to achieve ridership goals.

- *Customer Satisfaction.* An important element of increasing ridership is ensuring that riders who use the transit service are content with the services and intend to continue using the service. Staff is suggesting that there be two potential performance indicators related to customer satisfaction. The first indicator, number of valid complaints, which indicates the level of dissatisfaction with the services, is currently tracked and monitored. A second indicator of customer satisfaction based on rider surveys is not yet

Alternative Transit Management Models Agency and Service Delivery Options

available and would need to be developed in order to establish performance goals.

- Number of Valid Complaints (Monthly)

Complaints per 100,000 Boardings*	Incentive	Disincentive
<1.25	\$500	N/A
1.25 – 1.74	\$250	N/A
1.75 – 2.25	Goal	Goal
2.26 – 3.00	N/A	-\$250
>3.00	N/A	-\$500

**Please note, this performance measure tracks complaints per 100,000 boardings, not revenue miles.*

- Rider Satisfaction Surveys (Future Indicator)
 - Statically valid rider surveys could annually conducted to determine percent of satisfied (contented vs discontented) riders and areas of improvement.
 - Based on the results of the first survey, performance standards with incentives and disincentives shall be developed.
- *Maintenance.* Fundamental to the operations and reliability of the transit system is the proper maintenance of transit assets. Under the Sun Tran/Sun Van Management contract, the contractor is directly responsible to the proper maintenance of the fleet and to a lesser extent, the operations and maintenance facilities, and transit centers. The responsibility of bus stop maintenance is under a contract with Advision.

Given the above, staff is suggesting two potential performance indicators related to maintenance. From a rider's perspective, the lack of maintenance is most notable when buses have broken down while in service. A potential performance indicator for revenue miles between road calls. A second performance indicator, on-time performance of preventative maintenance, is currently in the management contract and is important to ensure the long-term longevity of transit assets.

- Monthly Revenue Miles Between Road Calls

Revenue Miles Between Road Calls	Incentive	Disincentive
>15,000	\$500	N/A
13,000 – 14,999	\$250	N/A
11,000 – 12,999	Goal	Goal

Alternative Transit Management Models
Agency and Service Delivery Options

Revenue Miles Between Road Calls	Incentive	Disincentive
10,000 – 10,999	N/A	-\$250
<10,000	N/A	-\$500

- On-time performance, Preventative Maintenance Plans

On-time Performance %	Incentive	Disincentive
100%	\$500	N/A
98.00% - 99.99%	\$250	N/A
95.00% - 97.99%	Goal	Goal
90.00% - 94.99%	N/A	-\$250
<89.99%	N/A	-\$500

Additional information regarding Sun Tran's preventative maintenance plan is provided in Attachment B.

- Asset Management Plan On-time Performance (future indicator)
 - Transit Asset Management Plan is in the process of being developed, which will address life-cycle maintenance of transit assets.
 - Once approved by FTA, the plan can serve as performance standards can be developed.
- *Overall Contract Performance.* Sun Tran currently tracks S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, timely) goals for continual improvement in the Monthly Compliance Report (MCR). Of the nine SMART goals, four goals (Valid Customer Complaints per 100,000 Boardings, On-Time Performance, Preventable Accidents and Annual Ridership) are included as contract performance indicators as described above. The remaining S.M.A.R.T. goals are:

Performance Measures	FY17 S.M.A.R.T. Goals
Work Related Injuries	<74 injuries (FY16, <77)
SunGO Usage	Increase usage to 11,100,00 (FY16, 7,967,677)
Employee Turnover	8.69% Turnover Rate (FY16, 9.87%)
Unrecovered Warranty	Reduce by \$74,649 (FY16 Unrecovered Warranty amount, \$149,298)
Citations	<12 citations (FY16, 10 citations)

Alternative Transit Management Models Agency and Service Delivery Options

The five remaining S.M.A.R.T. goals could be incorporated into one overall annual contract performance indicator with the following incentives and disincentives:

Annual S.M.A.R.T. Goals Achieved	Incentive	Disincentive
5	\$6,000	N/A
4	\$3,000	N/A
3	Goal	Goal
1-2	N/A	-\$3000
0	N/A	-\$6000