Transit

Challenges & Opportunities
in Metro Milwaukee
Recent Transit Research

Getting to Work:
Opportunities and obstacles to improving transit to suburban Milwaukee job hubs

Picking Up the Pace:
An analysis of best practices for improving bus speed and their potential applicability to Milwaukee

The Last Mile:
Connecting workers to places of employment
Getting to Work 2013
Common Transit Challenges

Transit travel time is prohibitive
  • Brookfield, Oak Creek

“Last mile” problem
  • Oak Creek, New Berlin

Bus service attempted before but eliminated
  • New Berlin, Franklin

Service not designed for reverse commuters
  • Menomonee Falls, Mequon
Picking up the Pace – 2015
Increased Stop Spacing

1,589 stops less than $\frac{1}{4}$ mile apart

30%
Bus-Only Shoulders

Minneapolis-St. Paul
300+ miles
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
BRT Running Ways
BRT Stations
BRT Vehicles
BRT
Fare Collection
BRT
Case Studies

Cleveland’s HealthLine
East-West Corridor

17 routes
East-West BRT

- East-West BRT proposed by County Executive and currently in advanced planning phase

- Controversy over dedicated lanes – consensus reached for dedicated lanes on roughly ½ of the 9-mile route
Current Strategies

- MCTS Shuttle Routes
- Shared-Ride Taxi Services
- Bublr Bike Share
- Private Shuttles
## MCTS Shuttle Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Route Name</th>
<th>Passengers per Bus Hour (Sept 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Oak Creek Shuttle</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Park Place - Bradley Woods Shuttle</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Brown Deer Shuttle</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCTS System Average</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ozaukee County
Shared-Ride Taxi Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>74,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>79,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>90,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>96,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>110,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>108,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>116,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(estimated)
Strategies in Other Metro Areas

• Flexible Transit Services
  • Ride-Hailing
  • Micro-Transit
  • Bike Share
  • Employer Shuttles
Flexible Transit Services

Typical Features
• 14-passenger mini-buses
• Lower-density, 4-10 sq. mile areas

Common Models
• Route deviation
• Demand-responsive connector
Flexible Transit Services

Englewood, CO
Ride-Hailing Partnerships

Typical features
• On-demand service
• Often in lower-density areas
• Serve designated transit stops

Possible Models
• Marketing partnerships
• Mobile app integration
• Subsidized rides
Ride-Hailing

Pinellas County, FL
# Flexible Transit & Ride-Hailing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Name &amp; Location</th>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Total Operational Budget</th>
<th>Avg. Public Subsidy/Trip</th>
<th>Typical Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call-n-Ride (Denver suburbs)</td>
<td>Flexible Transit</td>
<td>$400,000-$750,000 per area (2015)</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*West Salem Connector (Salem, OR)</td>
<td>Flexible Transit</td>
<td>$255,000 (first year)</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Prime (Minneapolis suburbs)</td>
<td>Flexible Transit</td>
<td>$480,000 (2016)</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OmniLink (Washington D.C. suburbs)</td>
<td>Flexible Transit</td>
<td>$8 million for six routes (annual)</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Direct Connect (Pinellas County, FL)</td>
<td>Ride-Hailing</td>
<td>$140,000 (first year)</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Go Centennial (Denver suburb)</td>
<td>Ride-Hailing</td>
<td>$400,000 (first year)</td>
<td>$6-7</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dash on Demand (Itasca, IL)</td>
<td>Ride-Hailing</td>
<td>$90-120,000 (first year)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pilot program

Note: Data for Denver RTD only includes the five Call-n-Ride areas with flexible bus routes
Last Mile Recommendations

• Build on shared-ride taxi and bicycle services and amenities.

• Develop an official mobile application with robust capabilities.

• Pilot a flexible transit or on-demand transportation service in one or two lower-density areas.
Last Mile Recommendations

- Consider benefits of first mile/last mile strategies for broader populations of transit users and transit system.

- If bus rapid transit (BRT) services are developed, co-locate first mile/last mile services near BRT stations.

- Cultivate intergovernmental cooperation and private sector involvement.
Last Mile developments

• Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors requested report from MCTS addressing PPF findings.

• MCTS and Bublr Bikes launched new “Buslr” pass that allows users to swipe the same card for both systems.

• Pilot a flexible transit or on-demand transportation service in one or two lower-density areas.
MCTS Operations

Projected Expenditures
- 2017: $144.2
- 2018: $140.0
- 2019: $136.0
- 2020: $142.0
- 2021: $148.0

Projected Revenues
- 2017: $131.8
- 2018: $128.0
- 2019: $124.0
- 2020: $120.0
- 2021: $116.0

Projected Tax Levy
- 2017: $12.4
- 2018: $14.0
- 2019: $15.6
- 2020: $17.2
- 2021: $18.8

The graph shows the projected expenditures, revenues, and tax levy for the years 2017 to 2021.
Local Capital Spending for MCTS Bus Replacements (in millions)

- 2017: $12.6
- 2018: $13.0
- 2019: $13.5
- 2020: $14.0
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