INTERURBAN TRANSIT PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING

October 26, 2016 - 4:00 p.m.

*Rapid Central Station, 2nd floor Conference Room, 250 Grandville SW*

AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT

MINUTES

1. Minutes of September 28, 2016 Board Meeting

CONSENT AGENDA

Performance Oversight Committee
3. August 2016 Ridership and Productivity Report
4. August 2016 Paratransit Ridership Report
5. Security and Access Control Services Project
6. Purchase of 26 CNG Buses
7. Purchase of 12 Paratransit Cutaway Buses

Governance Committee
8. 2017 Meeting Schedule

REGULAR AGENDA

Governance Committee
9. Revision to Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO

CEO REPORT

10. CEO Monthly Report
CHAIR’S REPORT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS

EXECUTIVE SESSION – Collective Bargaining (if necessary)

ADJOURNMENT

Enclosures:
A. Minutes of 10-12-16 Governance Committee Meeting
B. Minutes of 10-19-16 Performance Oversight Committee Meeting
C. Minutes of 10-19-16 Strategic Planning Committee Meeting
D. Minutes of 10-18-16 Consumer Advisory Committee Meeting
E. Communications
MINUTES OF
INTERURBAN TRANSIT PARTNERSHIP BOARD
As Recorded on September 28, 2016

ATTENDANCE

Board Members Present: Charis Austin, David Bilardello, Rosalynn Bliss (via conference phone), Gary Carey, Tim Cochran, George Heartwell, Jack Hoffman, Barbara Holt (Chair), Mark Huizenga, Stephen Kepley, Terry Schweitzer, Amna Seibold, Paul Troost, Michael Verhulst

Board Members Absent: Randy Gelderloos

Staff Present: Michael Bulthuis, Robin Crothers, Judy DeVries, Mark Fedorowicz, Rod Gheering, Nancy Groendal, Alan Hartley, Meegan Joyce, Jennifer Kalczuk, Brian Pouget, Liz Schelling, Peter Varga, Conrad Venema, Scott Walsh, Mike Wieringa

Others Present: Alvin Hills, Kyama Kitavi, Asher Lockwood (student), Watchdog Miller (citizen), Grant Pecor (Clark Hill), Adelyn Van Tol (DAKC)

Commencing at 4:00 p.m. Ms. Holt called the regular meeting of the Interurban Transit Partnership Board to order.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Watchdog Miller commented that most of the Board Members live outside of the six city area. He believes that he should be given the CEO position and we need to put a stop at Marsh Ridge.

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the August 31, 2016 Board Meeting:

Ms. Holt asked for corrections to the August 31, 2016 minutes. None were offered. The minutes stand approved as written.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Hoffman, supported by Cochran, to approve Consent Agenda items 2-6. Motion passed unanimously.
REGULAR AGENDA

7. Additional Contribution to Administrative Defined Benefit Pension Plan:

Mr. Schweitzer reported that the budget anticipated utilizing $2,278,872 in preventive maintenance funds to pay for operating expenses. Through the end of July only $356,204 has been necessary to balance the financials. FY 2016 is providing an opportunity to eliminate a portion of unfunded liability in the administrative defined benefit pension plan. By utilizing an additional $1,125,761 in preventive maintenance funds (not eligible for state operating assistance), an additional $800,000 could be deposited in the pension portfolio.

Mr. Hartley noted that this deposit would eliminate approximately 50% of the estimated $1.6 million unfunded liability. While more preventive maintenance funds could be used, he is not recommending it at this time so that we maintain maximum flexibility in the operating and capital environments. In the operating environment we need to be mindful of unknowns that could surface during the year-end process. In the capital plan, the CNG fueling facility design has been revisited and will be re-bid in late October 2016. There is a possibility that additional monetary authorization (above the original $5.3 million) will be required from the Board.

Mr. Heartwell inquired why we are not making a recommendation to make an annual contribution to pay down the unfunded liability. Mr. Hartley noted that he has a $350,000 contribution budgeted in FY 2017 for the union unfunded liability and plans to bring an annual contribution recommendation to the Board.

Mayor Huizenga asked if there is an actuarial reason why we wouldn't want to split the contribution between the two plans. Mr. Hartley noted that he doesn't know if there is an actuarial reason but the administrative plan will impact our budget first since there are only six active participants remaining in that plan who could all potentially retire within the next five years. We have a longer period of time with the union unfunded liability given the number and age of the participants.

A motion was made by Schweitzer, supported by Austin, to approve the additional contribution to the Administrative Defined Benefit Pension Plan in the amount of $800,000. Motion passed unanimously.

8. Short Range Plan:

Mr. Venema reported that in 2010, The Rapid adopted the Transit Master Plan (TMP) that serves as the guiding document for the agency to the 2030 planning horizon. Many of the priorities identified in the TMP have already been accomplished through the passage of the May 2011 millage, subsequent service improvements in FY 2012-2013, and the implementation of the Silver Line in August 2014. However, there is a list of priorities in the TMP that have not been implemented. Based on the remaining priorities established in the TMP and subsequent public and Board input, the Rapid Short Range Plan serves as the agency's guiding document for services and capital projects through the 2016-2020 planning horizon.

The Short Range Plan is comprised of three sections. These sections are revenue and ridership forecasts, service priorities, and capital projects for fiscal years 2016-2020. The highlights of the Short Range Plan include the fact that all Rapid revenues and services will
remain stable, the Laker Line is anticipated to be completed in the spring of 2019, and all capital project priorities through 2020 will be fully funded.

He noted that the forecast for ridership shows an increase by 2020 due to various factors, including fuel and the Laker Line.

He noted that several assumptions determine the 5-year outlook. The three most significant assumptions in the Short Range Plan include a millage renewal in FY 2017, state operating assistance at 31.5% in FY 2017 and increasing to 33% in FY 2020, and stable service levels.

Mr. Hoffman noted that we have some significant projects with the Laker Line and the millage in FY 2017. He noted the importance of the six city partnership and the planning and leadership that was involved in the vision we created. The Short Range Plan is a positive part of the vision.

Mr. Hoffman noted that being able to operate the Laker Line without asking for an additional millage is a success in planning.

A motion was made by Hoffman, supported by Heartwell, to approve the 5-year Short Range Plan. Motion passed unanimously.


Ms. Holt discussed highlights of the FY 2016 Priorities and Work Plan and commended Mr. Varga on his leadership and accomplishments. The evaluation was very positive and provided examples of his ability to lead the agency and some major projects that are upcoming. The evaluation also discussed areas of improvement and items going forward.

She noted a change in the language regarding the wage compensation study. The language now states that “the CEO will complete a wage compensation study working with a Board subcommittee appointed by the Board Chair at key points in the process”.

Ms. Holt stated that the Governance Committee unanimously recommended approval of the CEO’s Report on the FY 2016 Priorities & Work Plan and his evaluation. The CEO contract covers a two-year period through September 30, 2018.

Mayor Huizenga expressed concerned about the perception of extending a contract to Mr. Varga while the Union has no contract. He suggested that the Board table this item until union negotiations have been settled.

Mr. Heartwell made a motion, supported by Mr. Hoffman, to approve the Report on FY 2016 Priorities & Work Plan/CEO Evaluation.

Ms. Holt asked Grant Pecor to talk about how Mr. Varga’s contract works. Mr. Pecor explained that Mr. Varga’s contract works as a rolling two-year contract that requires a notice of non-extension to avoid an automatic renewal. He noted that the purpose of this meeting is to set the compensation based upon the evaluation and that the renewal of the contract does not require Board action since the Board did not issue a notice of non-extension.
Mayor Huizenga asked if there is an automatic compensation adjustment as well. Mr. Pecor replied that the compensation adjustment is reviewed on an annual basis and is determined by the work plan created by Mr. Varga, which the Board approves.

Mr. Heartwell clarified that the Board would have to decide 60 days prior to the contract renewal date of October 1 if they wanted to change the contract renewal terms.

Mayor Seibold stated that if the Board wanted to change the contract term to one year, they would need to notify Mr. Varga before August of next year.

Ms. Holt noted that we are going to work with a consultant to determine if the governance structure of the Board is the most effective. The CEO contract could be part of this review process.

Mr. Carey supports Mayor Huizenga’s suggestion to table the item due to the perception it could have given the current situation with the union contract. He also questioned why the resolution was written to ask for Board approval of Mr. Varga’s contract when approval is not needed.

Mr. Varga noted that the resolution has been written this way for years and this is the first year we have not had a salary increase to approve. He noted that the Board is not authorizing the renewal but accepting the appraisal and any compensation change. He recommends changing the resolution to state that the Board accepts the appraisal and moving ahead in accordance with the contract and no salary compensation increase for FY 2017.

Mayor Bliss asked Mr. Pecor to explain the process and timeframe to change the evaluation approval and contract renewal process. Mr. Pecor explained that the easiest way is to mutually amend the contract to address your concerns. The parties involved can always voluntarily modify their agreement. If you are not able to mutually amend the contract, the Board would have to issue a notice of non-extension by August 1 of next year.

In response to a question from Mayor Huizenga, Ms. Holt stated that the Governance Committee performs Mr. Varga’s evaluation and recommends compensation.

Mr. Pecor indicated that compensation for the CEO is reviewed annually, however, Mr. Varga asked that he no receive an increase for FY 2017.

Mr. Heartwell made an amendment to the original motion to state, "... that the Rapid Board accepts the CEC evaluation dated September 6, 2016, with no salary increase for FY 2017 in accordance of the CEO’s request, along with the acceptance of the Report on the FY 2016 Priorities and Work Plan ...". Mr. Hoffman, who supported the original motion, concurred with the motion amendment. The amended motion passed unanimously.

10. **FY 2017 Priorities & Work Plan:**

Mr. Varga noted that the FY 2017 Priorities & Work Plan includes the revisions from Board members. It is an exciting time for The Rapid with the implementation of the smart card and the CNG projects. We have the funds to accomplish these projects and we have received a commitment from MDOT for the Laker Line project match funds and the federal money is in
the pipeline awaiting appropriations. He noted that he is encouraging staff to stay focused on the plan and future projects.

He noted that, as a request from Mayor Seibold, he will report any item that can be provided as a measurable in this manner.

Mayor Seibold would like to make a couple changes to the language regarding the governance structure review on page 5 of the FY 2017 Priorities & Work Plan. She would like it to include that he will assist with conducting a review of the governance structure with outside consultant assistance to ensure the Board is working at optimal levels and reaching desired outcomes. She would also like to include that he will create and conduct an employment engagement survey. She would like these items to be included so that we are able to measure them as accomplishments.

A motion was made by Hoffman, supported by Carey, to approve the FY 2017 Priorities & Work Plan with the amendments discussed. Motion passed unanimously.

CEO REPORT

11. CEO Monthly Report:

Mr. Varga noted that he assisted with the last governance restructure and will assist in this next endeavor. He noted that the Board retreat in January is a good opportunity to engage in various conversations about future work and planning, as well as at the May planning meeting.

CHAIR’S REPORT

No report.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS

No report.

EXECUTIVE SESSION - Collective Bargaining (if necessary)

No Executive Session was necessary at today’s meeting.

Board Member Comments

Mr. Cochran reported that the rezoning efforts by the City of Wyoming along Division Avenue are moving forward and they have ordinances in place. He expects that the corridor will be rezoned for transit oriented redevelopment by January 2017.

Mr. Schweitzer noted that the City of Kentwood is a little behind Wyoming but is moving in the same direction on the Division Avenue rezoning effort.

Mayor Seibold believes that we need to reflect on what we want to accomplish and how we can help our leader and staff accomplish the goals. Keep the work plan present and periodically make sure we are accomplishing the goal of improving the transportation needs of our communities.
Ms. Holt commented that it is important that the Board members continue to work together to achieve the same goals. She thanked all the Board members for the work they do on the Board.

Mr. Hoffman hopes the Board can work together to get the millage passed and work through any issues.

Mayor Kepley thanked staff for all their work making the agency efficient.

**INFORMATION ITEM**

There was no discussion on the following information items.

A. Minutes of 9-14-’6 Governance Committee Meeting  
B. Minutes of 9-21-’6 Performance Oversight Committee Meeting  
C. Minutes of 9-21-’6 Strategic Planning Committee Meeting  
D. Minutes of 9-20-’6 Consumer Advisory Committee Meeting  
E. Communications

The meeting concluded at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Crothers, ITP Board Secretary
Date: October 14, 2016
To: ITP Board
From: Scott Walsh
Subject: MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

ACTION REQUESTED

Attached for your review and approval are the September 30, 2016 Combined Operating Statement and Grant Revenues & Expenditures Statements.
### Interurban Transit Partnership

**Combined Operating Statement**

**Month Ended 09/30/16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue &amp; Operating Assistance</th>
<th>Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Month To Date</th>
<th>Year To Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Percent Target=100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Passenger Fares

1. Passenger Fares - Linehaul
   - 6,550,749
2. Passenger Fares - Paratransit
   - 911,592
3. Passenger Fares - Other
   - 40,278
4. **Total Passenger Fares**
   - 7,502,619

#### Sale Of Transportation Services

5. CMM Contribution
   - 1,313,560
6. Dash Contract
   - 1,180,134
7. Grand Valley State University
   - 2,798,995
8. Employment Transportation (Van Pool)
   - 196,800
9. Township Services
   - 236,327
10. Other
    - 658,326
11. **Total Sale Of Transportation Services**
    - 6,384,142

#### Other Revenue & Support

12. State Operating
    - 11,759,498
13. Property Taxes
    - 14,738,672
14. Advertising
    - 150,000
15. Interest & Miscellaneous
    - 407,800
16. **Total Other Revenue & Support**
    - 27,055,970

17. **TOTAL REVENUE & OPERATING ASSISTANCE**
    - 40,942,731

#### Expenditures Route Service & Demand Response

18. Administrative Salaries
    - 3,562,985
19. Driver Wages
    - 12,122,918
20. Maintenance Wages
    - 4,018,052
21. **Total Labor**
    - 16,303,955

#### Fringe Benefits

22. PICA/Medicare Tax
    - 1,330,268
23. Pension
    - 1,497,711
24. Group Medical
    - 3,670,254
25. Unemployment Taxes
    - 107,400
26. Worker's Compensation
    - 540,000
27. Sick Leave
    - 141,981
28. Holiday
    - 374,815
29. Vacation
    - 934,203

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>12/31/15</th>
<th>12/31/15</th>
<th>12/31/15</th>
<th>12/31/15</th>
<th>12/31/15</th>
<th>12/31/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue &amp; Operating Assistance</td>
<td>6,550,749</td>
<td>6,550,749</td>
<td>6,143,113</td>
<td>407,636</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Passenger Fares - Linehaul</td>
<td>911,592</td>
<td>911,592</td>
<td>675,987</td>
<td>235,605</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Passenger Fares - Paratransit</td>
<td>40,278</td>
<td>40,278</td>
<td>36,278</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Passenger Fares - Other</td>
<td>7,502,619</td>
<td>7,502,619</td>
<td>6,855,378</td>
<td>647,241</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Of Transportation Services</td>
<td>1,313,560</td>
<td>1,313,560</td>
<td>1,086,876</td>
<td>226,684</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CMM Contribution</td>
<td>1,180,134</td>
<td>1,180,134</td>
<td>1,112,397</td>
<td>67,737</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dash Contract</td>
<td>2,798,995</td>
<td>2,798,995</td>
<td>2,564,812</td>
<td>234,183</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grand Valley State University</td>
<td>196,800</td>
<td>196,800</td>
<td>142,434</td>
<td>54,366</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employment Transportation (Van Pool)</td>
<td>236,327</td>
<td>236,327</td>
<td>451,041</td>
<td>214,714+</td>
<td>191%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Township Services</td>
<td>658,326</td>
<td>658,326</td>
<td>388,548</td>
<td>269,778</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other</td>
<td>6,384,142</td>
<td>6,384,142</td>
<td>5,746,108</td>
<td>638,034</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Sale Of Transportation Services</td>
<td>11,759,498</td>
<td>11,759,498</td>
<td>11,989,419</td>
<td>229,921+</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. State Operating</td>
<td>14,738,672</td>
<td>14,738,672</td>
<td>14,738,672</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Property Taxes</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>153,939</td>
<td>3,939+</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Advertising</td>
<td>407,800</td>
<td>407,800</td>
<td>358,843</td>
<td>48,957</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Interest &amp; Miscellaneous</td>
<td>27,055,970</td>
<td>27,055,970</td>
<td>27,240,873</td>
<td>184,903+</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Total Other Revenue &amp; Support</td>
<td>40,942,731</td>
<td>40,942,731</td>
<td>39,842,359</td>
<td>1,100,372+</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. TOTAL REVENUE &amp; OPERATING ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>16,303,955</td>
<td>16,303,955</td>
<td>16,058,226</td>
<td>245,729</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Adopted Budget</td>
<td>Amended Budget</td>
<td>Month To Date</td>
<td>Year To Date</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Bereavement</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>19,282</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>-129%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Uniforms</td>
<td>108,286</td>
<td>108,529</td>
<td>9,047</td>
<td>89,739</td>
<td>18,790</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Personal Days</td>
<td>309,671</td>
<td>309,671</td>
<td>34,132</td>
<td>305,772</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Fringe Benefits Distributed to Grants</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>21,801</td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Total Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>9,004,589</td>
<td>9,011,632</td>
<td>1,427,696</td>
<td>9,526,634</td>
<td>515,002</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Audit, Legal, and Consultant</td>
<td>240,250</td>
<td>528,825</td>
<td>44,924</td>
<td>423,398</td>
<td>105,427</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Contract Service: Janitor &amp; Bus Cleaning</td>
<td>1,255,174</td>
<td>1,231,429</td>
<td>104,413</td>
<td>1,005,119</td>
<td>226,310</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Contract Service: Other</td>
<td>892,709</td>
<td>894,424</td>
<td>41,451</td>
<td>795,258</td>
<td>99,166</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Total Services</td>
<td>2,388,133</td>
<td>2,654,678</td>
<td>190,788</td>
<td>2,223,775</td>
<td>430,903</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Fuel &amp; Lubricants</td>
<td>3,331,030</td>
<td>2,968,720</td>
<td>310,730</td>
<td>2,278,162</td>
<td>690,558</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Tires &amp; Tubes</td>
<td>38,800</td>
<td>38,863</td>
<td>10,217</td>
<td>31,237</td>
<td>7,563</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Office Supplies</td>
<td>49,943</td>
<td>51,018</td>
<td>3,815</td>
<td>41,893</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Printing</td>
<td>42,595</td>
<td>57,776</td>
<td>12,621</td>
<td>49,955</td>
<td>7,821</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Repair Parts</td>
<td>1,438,330</td>
<td>1,462,275</td>
<td>118,479</td>
<td>1,305,425</td>
<td>156,850</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Other Supplies</td>
<td>108,685</td>
<td>102,872</td>
<td>10,641</td>
<td>98,231</td>
<td>34,289</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Total Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>5,009,383</td>
<td>4,681,461</td>
<td>466,503</td>
<td>3,775,255</td>
<td>906,206</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Electronic Communications</td>
<td>97,054</td>
<td>99,804</td>
<td>9,522</td>
<td>96,050</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Gas Heat</td>
<td>257,100</td>
<td>257,100</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>134,175</td>
<td>122,925</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Electric</td>
<td>465,000</td>
<td>465,000</td>
<td>37,941</td>
<td>407,923</td>
<td>57,077</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Other</td>
<td>55,400</td>
<td>68,300</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>62,664</td>
<td>5,366</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Total Utilities</td>
<td>884,554</td>
<td>890,204</td>
<td>55,750</td>
<td>700,812</td>
<td>189,392</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casualty &amp; Liability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. PL &amp; PD Insurance</td>
<td>1,125,600</td>
<td>1,125,600</td>
<td>76,046</td>
<td>1,008,519</td>
<td>117,081</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Building &amp; Other Insurance</td>
<td>267,164</td>
<td>267,164</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>283,092</td>
<td>15,928</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Total Casualty &amp; Liability</td>
<td>1,392,764</td>
<td>1,392,764</td>
<td>76,314</td>
<td>1,291,611</td>
<td>101,153</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Interurban Transit Partnership

**Combined Operating Statement**  
Month Ended 09/30/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Month To Date</th>
<th>Year To Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Target=100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Dues &amp; Subscriptions</td>
<td>72,753</td>
<td>70,458</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68,463</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Professional Development</td>
<td>69,425</td>
<td>67,320</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>39,006</td>
<td>28,314</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Marketing &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>143,800</td>
<td>56,067</td>
<td>120,912</td>
<td>22,888</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Community Outreach</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>149,600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Office Equipment</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>37,110</td>
<td>7,554</td>
<td>28,215</td>
<td>8,895</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Shop Tools</td>
<td>39,583</td>
<td>42,783</td>
<td>6,726</td>
<td>42,456</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>45,094</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>21,335</td>
<td>23,759</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>61. Total Other</strong></td>
<td>505,261</td>
<td>556,565</td>
<td>87,310</td>
<td>469,987</td>
<td>86,578</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Purchased Transportation</td>
<td>5,436,398</td>
<td>5,399,264</td>
<td>474,665</td>
<td>5,187,059</td>
<td>212,205</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Purchase Transp. - CMH</td>
<td>1,772,670</td>
<td>1,770,050</td>
<td>140,735</td>
<td>1,481,074</td>
<td>288,976</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Purchase Transp. - Other</td>
<td>249,545</td>
<td>340,753</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>263,102</td>
<td>77,651</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Purchase Transp. - Suburban Paratransit</td>
<td>274,351</td>
<td>220,277</td>
<td>14,977</td>
<td>201,373</td>
<td>18,904</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Transfer Out - Grant Budget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Operating Expenses - Capitalized</td>
<td>2,278,872- 2,278,872- 1,126,761- 1,336,549-</td>
<td>942,323-</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>68. TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,942,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,942,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,117,229</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,842,359</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,100,372</strong></td>
<td><strong>97%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Net Surplus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40,942,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,942,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,117,224</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,842,359</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,100,372</strong></td>
<td><strong>97%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Adopted Budget</td>
<td>Amended Budget</td>
<td>Month To Date</td>
<td>Year To Date</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Percent Target 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Federal Grant Assistance</td>
<td>22,480,054</td>
<td>22,480,054</td>
<td>3,763,312</td>
<td>10,636,499</td>
<td>11,843,555</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State Grant Assistance</td>
<td>6,059,894</td>
<td>6,059,894</td>
<td>1,000,374</td>
<td>2,853,163</td>
<td>3,206,731</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transfer In - Operating Budget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of Restricted Net Assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other Local</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Total Grant Revenue</td>
<td>28,539,948</td>
<td>28,539,948</td>
<td>4,763,686</td>
<td>13,489,662</td>
<td>15,050,286</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Administrative Salaries</td>
<td>41,357</td>
<td>41,357</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>40,046</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Driver Wages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Temporary Wages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fringe Benefit Distribution</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>21,801</td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Labor</td>
<td>66,357</td>
<td>66,357</td>
<td>5,054</td>
<td>61,847</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tires &amp; Tubes</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>244,511</td>
<td>55,489</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Office Supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Printing</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>7,613</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Total Material &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>305,500</td>
<td>308,500</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>252,124</td>
<td>56,376</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Purchased Transportation</td>
<td>785,066</td>
<td>785,066</td>
<td>65,422</td>
<td>785,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Specialized Services</td>
<td>463,289</td>
<td>463,289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>337,195</td>
<td>126,094</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Total Purchased Transportation</td>
<td>1,248,355</td>
<td>1,248,355</td>
<td>65,422</td>
<td>1,122,261</td>
<td>126,094</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dues &amp; Subscriptions</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Professional Development</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>9,165</td>
<td>15,835</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Total Other Expenses</td>
<td>41,775</td>
<td>38,775</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>9,540</td>
<td>29,235</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Office Lease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Transit Center Lease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Storage Space Lease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Total Leases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Rolling Stock</td>
<td>15,669,049</td>
<td>15,669,049</td>
<td>35,802</td>
<td>2,527,857</td>
<td>13,141,192</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Facilities</td>
<td>5,050,000</td>
<td>3,830,000</td>
<td>2,404,584</td>
<td>3,393,762</td>
<td>436,238</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Equipment</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>32,860</td>
<td>66,139</td>
<td>303,861</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Other</td>
<td>3,024,837</td>
<td>4,124,837</td>
<td>994,575</td>
<td>4,115,991</td>
<td>8,846</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Total Capital</td>
<td>24,193,886</td>
<td>23,993,886</td>
<td>3,467,821</td>
<td>10,103,749</td>
<td>13,890,137</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Planning Services</td>
<td>105,203</td>
<td>605,203</td>
<td>89,287</td>
<td>603,590</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Capitalized Operating</td>
<td>2,278,872</td>
<td>2,278,872</td>
<td>1,126,761</td>
<td>1,336,949</td>
<td>942,323</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Total Expenditures</td>
<td>28,539,948</td>
<td>28,539,948</td>
<td>4,763,686</td>
<td>13,489,660</td>
<td>15,050,288</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td>EMPLOYEE(s)</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$897.50</td>
<td>GTT Research Board</td>
<td>Venema</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$490.45</td>
<td>Airfare - APTA Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$849.00</td>
<td>OSHA 30 Training</td>
<td>Wierenga</td>
<td>local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,802.75</td>
<td>TSI Bus Safety System Training</td>
<td>Wierenga, Brown, Mlaker</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$458.73</td>
<td>CEATI Conference</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This total does not include incidental travel & meetings expenses such as mileage, parking, lunch meetings, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>FY 2016 Authorized</th>
<th>FY 2016 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Managers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors &amp; Admins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Svc./Marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Grants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Takers/Schedulers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Svc./Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Admin. Personnel</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Operators - Full Time</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Drivers - Part Time</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics - Fleet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics - Facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Union Personnel</strong></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td>404</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: October 5, 2016
To: ITP Board
From: Kevin Wisselink / Planning Department
Subject: AUGUST 2016 RIDERSHIP AND PRODUCTIVITY REPORT

ACTION REQUESTED
The Board is asked to accept the August 2016 Ridership and Productivity Report.

BACKGROUND
August 2016 saw The Rapid’s best month since January 2015, with a 7.6% ridership increase. This was largely due to 2 more GVSU fall semester service days and 2 more weekdays of service in August 2016. Additionally, there were 3 weekday Clean Air Action Days in August 2016 compared to 1 Saturday and 1 Sunday Clean Air Action Day in 2015; weekday Clean Air Action Days tend to have a higher impact on ridership resulting in a further increase in August 2016 ridership.

RIDERSHIP SUMMARY

August 2016 compared to August 2015

Total Ridership by Category:
- Routes 1 – 44 ridership (616,083) increased 0.2% (973)
- Contracted/Specialized Service ridership (127,351) increased 74.2% (54,260)
- Demand-Response ridership (30,812) decreased 0.7% (-216)
- Total Ridership (774,246) increased 7.6% (55,017)

Daily Averages:
- Average Weekday total ridership (29,180) increased 4.4% (1,227)
- Average Weekday evening ridership (5,087) increased 2.5% (125)
- Average Saturday ridership (12,060) decreased 13.7% (-1,914)
- Average Sunday ridership (6,011) decreased 4.0% (-251)

Fiscal Year 2016 compared to Fiscal Year 2015

Total Ridership by Category:
- Routes 1 – 44 ridership (7,212,374) decreased 6.7% (-521,968)
- Contracted/Specialized Service ridership (2,731,440) increased 3.4% (90,333)
- Demand-Response ridership (336,290) decreased 5.5% (-19,736)
- Total Ridership (10,280,104) decreased 4.2% (-451,371)

Daily Averages:
- Average Weekday total ridership (38,286) decreased 4.1% (-1,617)
- Average Weekday evening ridership (5,389) decreased 7.6% (-444)
- Average Saturday ridership (13,874) decreased 7.1% (-1,067)
- Average Sunday ridership (5,849) decreased 5.2% (-322)
ROUTE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY [Routes 1-44 Only]
August 2016 fixed-route system performance increased compared to August 2015 (contracted services not included). The fixed-route summary is as follows:

- Average passengers per hour (19.5) decreased 6.5% (-0.7 points)
- Average passengers per mile (1.58) decreased 7.2% (-0.9 points)
- Average farebox recovery percent (25.5%) increased 11.9% (1.4 points)
- Average daily passengers (19,866) increased 0.2% (0.1 points)
- Monthly system performance (79.8 points) decreased 0.2% (-0.2 points)
- FY 2016 system performance (87.3 points) decreased 5.7% (-5.3 points) compared to FY 2015

### Monthly Fixed-Route Point Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg Passengers per Hour per Route:</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Passengers per Mile per Route:</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Fare-box Recovery % per Route:</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Daily Fixed-Route Passengers:</td>
<td>19,866</td>
<td>19,825</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### August Total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg Passengers per Hour per Route:</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Passengers per Mile per Route:</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 16 of 23 (69.5%) fixed-routes performed within the average range (within one standard deviation of the system mean)
- The Silver Line and Route 9 – Alpine performed above standard (greater than 66.7% above the system mean)
- Route 1 – Division and Route 2 – Kalamazoo performed one standard deviation above the system mean
- Route 17 – Woodland/Airport performed one standard deviation below the system mean
- Route 19—Michigan South performed below standard (less than 66.7% below the system mean)

August 2016 Fixed Route Ridership Change: -7.2%
August 2016 Total Ridership Change: -6.0%

### Change in service days from August 2016 to August 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Service Weekdays</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Service Saturdays</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Service Sundays</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attached is a graphical summary of the system and individual fixed-route performance.
Fixed-Route Scoring Summary: August 2016 Compared to August 2015
Percent Change by Route: August 2016 Compared to August 2015
The Efficiency Score is an average of Farebox Recovery Rate, Passengers/Mile and Passengers/Hour.
Change in Ridership and Efficiency: FY 2015 to FY 2016

The Efficiency Score is an average of Farebox Recovery Rate, Passengers/Mile and Passengers/Hour.
## August 2016 Ridership Report

### Ridership by Fare Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Route Summary</th>
<th>August 2016</th>
<th>August 2015</th>
<th>Actual Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.75 Cash Fare</td>
<td>79,871</td>
<td>98,971</td>
<td>-17,100</td>
<td>-17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.75 Adult One-Ride Ticket</td>
<td>7,624</td>
<td>8,158</td>
<td>-534</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.35 Adult Ticket</td>
<td>34,362</td>
<td>40,008</td>
<td>-5,646</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.05 Student Ticket, Aquinas, Calvin and Kendall Tickets</td>
<td>26,882</td>
<td>26,934</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.85 Senior / Disabled Ticket and Cash</td>
<td>23,062</td>
<td>24,476</td>
<td>-1,414</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$47 Regular and $33 Reduced 31-Day Month Pass</td>
<td>120,734</td>
<td>128,185</td>
<td>-8,451</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.50 One-Day Pass</td>
<td>29,238</td>
<td>35,794</td>
<td>-6,556</td>
<td>-18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16.00 Seven-Day Pass</td>
<td>13,194</td>
<td>11,371</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum Health Employee Pass</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>6,855</td>
<td>-3,311</td>
<td>-48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free ADA</td>
<td>9,594</td>
<td>7,501</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU Students on Routes 1-44</td>
<td>11,866</td>
<td>12,393</td>
<td>-527</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Rides</td>
<td>111,753</td>
<td>60,153</td>
<td>51,600</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>85,107</td>
<td>86,296</td>
<td>-1,189</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Line</td>
<td>59,332</td>
<td>57,016</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Regular Route Ridership</strong></td>
<td><strong>616,083</strong></td>
<td><strong>615,110</strong></td>
<td><strong>973</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contracted/Specialized Services Summary

| DASH                                                | 19,457      | 16,541      | 2,916         | 17.9%    |
| GRCC Shuttle                                        | 5,782       | 1,990       | 3,792         | n/a      |
| GVSU Campus Connector                               | 54,927      | 30,377      | 24,550        | 80.6%    |
| DASH to the Hill                                    | 3,283       | 3,033       | 250           | 8.2%     |
| GVSU Off-Campus Shuttle                             | 14,732      | 6,065       | 8,667         | n/a      |
| GVSU South Campus Express                           | 25,025      | 9,839       | 15,186        | n/a      |
| FSU                                                 | 152         | 63          | 89            | n/a      |
| Vanpools                                            | 4,563       | 4,283       | 280           | -5.4%    |
| **Total Contracted Ridership**                      | **127,351** | **73,091**  | **54,260**    | **74.2%**|

### Demand Response Summary

| GOIBus (does not include PASS)                       | 30,122      | 30,231      | -109          | -0.4%    |
| PASS North Ridership (Including Transfers)          | 283         | 301         | -18           | -6.0%    |
| PASS SE Ridership (Including Transfers)             | 327         | 362         | -35           | -9.7%    |
| PASS SW Ridership (Including Transfers)             | 80          | 134         | -54           | -40.3%   |
| **Total Demand Response Ridership**                 | **30,312**  | **31,028**  | **-716**      | **-0.7%**|

### Service Days

| Total Service Weekdays                              | 23          | 21          | 2             | 0%       |
| Total Service Saturdays                              | 4           | 5           | -1            | 1%       |
| Total Service Sundays                                | 4           | 5           | -1            | 0%       |
| Total Holidays                                       | 0           | 0           | 0             | 0%       |
| **Total Service Days**                               | **31**      | **31**      | **0**         | **1%**   |

### Ridership by Day

| Total Weekday Fixed-Route Ridership                  | 354,146     | 482,824     | 71,678        | 15.8%    |
| Total Weekday Evening Fixed-Route Ridership         | 117,005     | 104,199     | 12,806        | 12.3%    |
| **Total Weekday and Weekday Evening Fixed-Route Ridership** | **471,151** | **587,023** | **75,878**    | **16.3%**|
| Total Saturday Fixed-Route Ridership                 | 48,241      | 68,673      | -20,432       | -30.0%   |
| Avg Weekday Daytime Fixed-Route Ridership           | 24,033      | 22,992      | 1,041         | 4.6%     |
| Avg Weekday Evening Fixed-Route Ridership           | 5,067       | 4,962       | 105           | 2.5%     |
| Avg Weekday and Weekday Evening Fixed-Route Ridership| 29,160      | 27,853      | 1,307         | 4.4%     |
| Avg Saturday Fixed-Route Ridership                  | 12,060      | 13,875      | -1,815        | -13.1%   |
| Avg Sunday Fixed-Route Ridership                    | 6,611       | 8,231       | -1,620        | -20.0%   |

| **Total Ridership**                                 | **774,246** | **719,229** | **55,017**    | **7.6%** |

### Ridership Summary

| Fixed-Route Ridership Month to Date                  | 610,093     | 615,110     | 5,017         | 0.2%     |
| Contracted/Specialized Service Ridership month to Date| 127,351     | 73,091      | 54,260        | 74.2%    |
| Demand Response Ridership month to Date             | 30,812      | 31,629      | -816          | -2.5%    |
| **Total Monthly Ridership**                         | **774,246** | **719,229** | **55,017**    | **7.6%** |

| **Total Monthly Ridership**                         | **774,246** | **719,229** | **55,017**    | **7.6%** |

### Ridership Summary

| Fixed-Route Ridership Year to Date                  | 7,212,374   | 7,734,342   | -521,968      | -6.7%    |
| Contracted/Specialized Service Ridership Year to Date| 2,761,440   | 2,641,107   | 120,333       | 4.6%     |
| Demand Response Ridership Year to Date             | 336,200     | 356,026     | -19,826       | -5.6%    |
| **Total Ridership Year to Date**                    | **10,280,104** | **10,731,476** | **-451,371** | **-4.2%** |

### Projected Annual Ridership

| **Projected Annual Ridership**                      | **71,961,308** | **603,124** | **-4.2%**    |
## August 2016 Productivity Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Route Services</th>
<th>Passengers Efficiency Score</th>
<th>Daily Passengers</th>
<th>Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Distance From Mean</th>
<th>Current Rank</th>
<th>FY 2014 Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Peak Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 - Silver Line</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - Kalamazoo</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - Division</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - East</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 - 29th</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 - Plainfield</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - Madison</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - Clyde Park</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Riverton</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 - Wealthy</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - East</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - North</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - West Central</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - Wyoming / Metro Health</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Burden</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 - East</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - West</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - Woodland / Airport</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Average (mean)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Below average routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above average routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Routes below standard deviation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Routes above standard deviation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total System Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of values comprising approximately 68% of the samples above and below the mean.

- Routes with scores greater than 65.7% above the mean
- Routes with scores between 1 standard deviation above the mean and 65.7% above the mean
- Routes with scores within 1 standard deviation above the mean
- Routes with scores between 1 standard deviation below the mean and 66.7% below the mean
- Routes with scores greater than 66.7% below the mean
DATE: October 5, 2016
TO: ITP Board
FROM: Meegan Joyce
SUBJECT: AUGUST 2016 PARATRANSIT RIDERSHIP REPORT

ACTION REQUESTED

Staff is requesting acceptance of the August 2016 Paratransit Ridership report.

BACKGROUND

Total monthly paratransit ridership for August 2016 (30,812) decreased 0.7% (216) from August 2015 (31,028).

ADA ridership (20,767) increased 1.5% (305), NDS ridership (88) decreased 22.1% (25), and PASS ridership (690) decreased 13.4% (107) from August 2015. Network 180 ridership (8,025) decreased 6.0% (509).

There were 725 trips in Cascade township in August 2016.

Average weekday ridership for GO!Bus/PASS service decreased 3.1% (28), average Saturday ridership decreased 5.6% (21), and average Sunday ridership decreased 7.3% (24) from August 2015.

On-time performance for August 2016 was 96.72% compared to 97.73% in 2015. On-time droo-off performance for August 2016 was 95.36% compared to 96.68% last year.

Average cost per GO!Bus/PASS trip decreased 1.1% ($0.28) from August 2015.
## AUGUST 2015 Paratransit Ridership and Operating Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips</td>
<td>20,767</td>
<td>20,462</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>-22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>-18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>(107)</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRACTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Includes ACSET and Goodwill Special</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIDELINK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>2,787</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips</td>
<td>22,767</td>
<td>22,494</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Saturday Ridership</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Sunday Ridership</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ambulatory Passengers</td>
<td>15,036</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Wheelchair Passengers</td>
<td>7,251</td>
<td>7,294</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - Shows</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations</td>
<td>5,036</td>
<td>4,937</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost per Trip</td>
<td>$24.45</td>
<td>$24.73</td>
<td>($0.28)</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riders per Hour</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents per 100,000 Miles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trip Denials</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NTD Travel Time (minutes)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NETWORK 180</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips</td>
<td>8,025</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>(509)</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Saturday Ridership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Sunday Ridership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PASSENGER TRIPS</strong></td>
<td>30,812</td>
<td>31,028</td>
<td>(216)</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paratransit Service Quality Statistics: network 180 Excluded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% of Trips</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Complaints</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Time Performance by customer call</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Late Trips (Less than 45 Minutes Late)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Missed Trips (Greater than 45 Minutes Late)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual On-Time Compliance</td>
<td>96.72%</td>
<td>97.73%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>-0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual ADA on-time drop-off for appointments</td>
<td>95.38%</td>
<td>96.68%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>-0.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: October 3, 2016

To: ITP Board

From: Michael Wieringa, Security Manager
       Mark Fedorowicz, Purchasing Manager

Subject: SECURITY AND ACCESS CONTROL SERVICES PROJECT

ACTION REQUESTED

Authorization to enter into a five-year, multi-phase agreement with Knight Watch Inc. to provide access control and security services.

BACKGROUND

The existing security system dates to the construction of the Rapid Central Station in 2004. Since that time, equipment has exceeded its useful life (many units more than 12 years old) and new technology, both hardware and software, has been introduced that the Rapid could take advantage of.

As part of our ongoing efforts to ensure safety and security across all our facilities, staff initiated a five-year multi-phase access control and security camera upgrade project with a single vendor to obtain consistency that can be maintained across the organization. Each phase will represent a specific task order and each task order will be presented to the Board either as an action item (if more than $100,000) or an Information Item.

PROJECT SCOPE

The overall purpose of the project is two-fold. First, staff is proposing to create a single, unified surveillance system that allows the systems throughout all of our facilities to work together. Second, staff seeks to replace antiquated cameras, equipment and software that are past replacement (e.g. Rapid Central Station and platform cameras are more than 12 years old) with updated technology.

The new cameras and software will allow us to better identify accidents and incidents that occur. Staff has identified more than 200 cameras that need to be replaced (valued at $258,000), as well as licenses ($65,000), servers ($50,000) and hardware and software ($75,000) and access control systems ($74,100) over the five-year duration of the contract.

The FTA recognizes the need for continuous improvement in our security processes and procedures by requiring a minimum of 1% of our capital grants be expended for security purposes annually. As a result, the Rapid is recommending a five-year, phased-in program to take advantage of annual federal funding to cover the cost of the project.

PROCUREMENT

The ITP elected to issue this procurement as a Request for Qualifications so that we could determine which vendor has the best understanding of our project, and the best equipment, service, staff and
pricing. That process included the costing of phase I of the project, which totals $84,606 and will include licenses, software, encoders, power supplies and other miscellaneous items.

The ITP received four proposals on the solicitation. Proposals were received from Motorola Solutions, Mid-State Security, Secur Alarm and Knight Watch. The proposals were evaluated and scored by the evaluation team, consisting of Mark Fedorowicz, Steve Clapp, Seth Horton (Progressive AE) and Mike Wieringa. After scoring was completed, offers of interviews were sent to Mid-State Security, Secur Alarm and Knight Watch. Motorola Solutions was removed from the process due to non-compliance with the scope of the project. After interviews, the evaluation team visited sites and conducted reference interviews from clients that are serviced by the finalists.

SCORING

A list of all scores as compiled by our evaluation team along with the pricing for the first phase of the project is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Price of Phase I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNIGHT WATCH</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$84,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE ALARM</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>$88,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-STATE SECURITY</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>$99,736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scoring above indicates that Knight Watch was the clear leader of the firms in the selection process. Knight Watch was also the lowest cost option for Phase I of the project in addition to being the most qualified.

During the vetting process, Spectrum Health Services informed us that due to the nature of their property, they have very high expectations in regards to security surveillance and access control and Knight Watch meets those expectations. Knight Watch also worked with the East Grand Rapids High School and was able to customize a security system to meet their needs.

FUNDING SOURCES

All funding is provided through FTA and MDOT capital assistance grants. There are no local funds required.
INTERURBAN TRANSIT PARTNERSHIP BOARD

RESOLUTION NO. _____

Fiscal Year 2017

Moved and supported to adopt the following resolution:

Approval to award and execute an agreement for access control and security services.

BE IT RESOLVED that the CEO is hereby authorized to award and execute a five-year agreement with Knight Watch to provide security and access control services, in accordance with the information presented to the ITP Board on October 26, 2016.

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, duly qualified and acting secretary of the Interurban Transit Partnership Board, certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the Interurban Transit Partnership Board.

Robin Crothers, ITP Board Secretary

Date
Date: October 3, 2016
To: ITP Board
From: Rod Ghearing, Manager of Grants and Capital Projects
Subject: PURCHASE OF 26 CNG BUSES

ACTION REQUESTED:

Staff is requesting Board approval to issue a purchase order to Gillig Corporation for the purchase of 26 CNG-fueled buses to replace buses that will have exceeded their useful life. This purchase will be made from the contract we entered into with Gillig in June, 2015. The price of each bus will be $489,464, for a total not to exceed $12,726,064.

BACKGROUND:

ITP entered into a contract for up to 106 40 foot CNG-fueled buses with Gillig Corporation in June, 2015. So far, we have purchased 28 vehicles from this contract. Our capital plan calls for the purchase of 26 buses to be delivered in 2018. The price shown above reflects a Producer Price Index (PPI) increase of 1.01% ($4,548) from that original contract date as well as an increase of $9,793 per bus to comply with new EPA emissions requirements for buses delivered after the start of 2018.

FUNDING:

Funding for the buses will be provided through FTA and MDOT capital assistance grants. No local money is required.
INTERURBAN TRANSIT PARTNERSHIP BOARD

RESOLUTION NO.______

Fiscal Year 2017

Moved and supported to adopt the following resolution:

Authorization to purchase 26 CNG-fueled buses.

BE IT RESOLVED that the CEO is hereby authorized to award and execute a purchase order with Gillig Corporation for 26 CNG-fueled, 40-foot buses in an amount not to exceed $12,726,064, in accordance with the information presented to the Board on October 26, 2016.

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, duly qualified and acting secretary of the Interurban Transit Partnership Board, certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the Interurban Transit Partnership Board.

______________________________
Robin Crothers, ITP Board Secretary

_____________________________________
Date
Date: October 20, 2016

To: ITP Board

From: Rod Ghearing, Manager of Grants and Capital Projects

Subject: PURCHASE OF 12 PARATRANSIT CUTAWAY BUSES

ACTION REQUESTED

Staff is requesting Board authorization to enter into contract with Hoekstra Transportation, Inc., for the purchase of 12 paratransit cutaway buses.

Authorization is requested for the procurement of 12 buses at a total cost not to exceed $1,020,048, as replacements for similar buses that will have exceeded their useful lifespan in accordance with FTA regulations; total cost per vehicle is $85,003.84. These vehicles will be propane fueled buses.

BACKGROUND

The primary use of these vehicles will continue to be for paratransit services, operated under contract by MV Transit. These buses are rated for 7 years or 200,000 miles and have the passenger body mounted on a commercial truck chassis giving them a larger passenger compartment and generally a longer useful life than a van.

These vehicles have four wheelchair securement areas along with six passenger seats. Two of the seats are flip seats and allow one or two fewer wheelchair securement areas and thus more seating of ambulatory passengers as needed. This allows for more efficient passenger scheduling. These vehicles continue to offer easier accessibility and passenger movement within the vehicle, provided by wider aisles and doors. They are outfitted with 33” wide lift platforms to accommodate wider wheelchairs, which are becoming more commonplace.

PROCUREMENT

The vehicles are being purchased through a State of Michigan contract for transit buses. The buses were procured through a competitive Invitation for Bids process which complied with FTA procurement mandates for acquiring rolling stock. A cost analysis determined that these vehicles are competitively priced and fall below what we could expect to pay if we chose to compete our own contract for 12 buses.

FUNDING SOURCES

Funding for the buses will be provided through FTA and MDOT capital assistance grants. No local money is required.
INTERURBAN TRANSIT PARTNERSHIP BOARD

RESOLUTION NO.______

Fiscal Year 2017

Moved and supported to adopt the following resolution:

Authorization to purchase 12 paratransit cutaway buses.

BE IT RESOLVED that the CEO is hereby authorized to award and execute an agreement with Hoekstra Transportation, Inc., through the State of Michigan contract, for the purchase of twelve (12) El Dorado Aerotech 22’ paratransit cutaway buses in an amount not to exceed $1,020,047, in accordance with the information presented to the Board on October 26, 2016.

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, duly qualified and acting secretary of the Interurban Transit Partnership Board, certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the Interurban Transit Partnership Board.

______________________________
Robin Crothers, ITP Board Secretary

____________________________________
Date
# 2017 MEETING SCHEDULE

**Location:** Board Room, 300 Ellsworth Ave SW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>Governance Committee Wednesday 4:00pm</th>
<th>Performance Oversight Committee Wednesday 8:00am</th>
<th>Strategic Planning Committee Wednesday 4:00pm</th>
<th>ITP Board Wednesday 4:00pm</th>
<th><strong>SPECIAL MEETINGS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>January 11</td>
<td>January 18</td>
<td>January 18</td>
<td>January 25</td>
<td>Board Retreat Mon., Jan. 23 12:00-4:00pm Location TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>February 8</td>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>February 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>March 22</td>
<td>March 22</td>
<td>March 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>April 12</td>
<td>April 19</td>
<td>April 19</td>
<td>April 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>May 24</td>
<td>Board Planning Mtg., Wed. May 24, 2:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>June 7</td>
<td>June 21</td>
<td>June 21</td>
<td>June 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>August 2</td>
<td>August 16</td>
<td>August 16</td>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>Board Budget Mtg., Wed. Aug. 2, 8:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>Sept. 13</td>
<td>Sept. 20</td>
<td>Sept. 20</td>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>October 11</td>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>October 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>November 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>December 6</td>
<td>December 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ANNUAL MTG. December 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR SENIORS & PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES** will meet on Tuesdays @ 3:00 p.m. in the Board Room on the following dates:

**MEETING LOCATION:**
All meetings are held in the Board Room at 300 Ellsworth Avenue SW, Grand Rapids MI 49503, unless noted otherwise.

10-26-16
Date: October 4, 2016

To: ITP Board

From: Barb Holt, Chair

Subject: REVISION TO BOARD PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF THE CEO

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval is requested for the revised Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO to include a 360 review.

BACKGROUND

The CEO evaluation approved at the September 28, 2016 Board meeting included a revision to the CEO’s contract for a 360 review. The “Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO” are referenced in the CEO’s contract and lay out the process for the annual evaluation. The 360 review has been included in the procedures as a method to be used by the Board to evaluate the CEO.
INTERURBAN TRANSIT PARTNERSHIP BOARD

RESOLUTION NO._______

FY 2017

Move and supported to adopt the following resolution:

Approval of the revised Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO.

BE IT RESOLVED that the ITP Board hereby approves the revised Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO to include a 360 review, in accordance with the information presented to the Board on October 26, 2016.

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, duly qualified and acting secretary of the Rapid Board, certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the Rapid Board.

Robin Crothers, Rapid Board Secretary

Date
Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO

In accordance with the contract, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is required to submit an annual work plan to the Board for its review, modification, and approval. This has to be done prior to October 1 of each year and then, upon approval by the Board, the work plan will form the basis of the CEO’s annual performance review. Furthermore, the agreement stipulates that the CEO shall be advised of the amount of each year’s (compensation) increase not less than 60 days prior to October 1 of each year. This means that prior to August 2 of each year, the Governance Committee must conclude its work and provide an appraisal and a recommendation for compensation to the Board at their July meeting. If there is no July meeting in any given year, then by mutual agreement, the Board and the CEO can agree to have the final appraisal recommendation approved at the August Board meeting, to be effective October 1. To effect these requirements, the following schedule must be met:

- The CEO must provide to the ITP Board a “work plan” by September 1 of each year for the upcoming fiscal year.
- At the September Board meeting, the Board adopts the work plan as amended.
- March through June, the Governance Committee reviews the work plan for the current fiscal year.
- The CEO will provide a “report on the work plan” at the June Board meeting.
- The Governance Committee shall conduct a 360 review of the CEO prior to their July meeting.
- In July, the Governance Committee will review the report and the 360 results, meet with the CEO, and agree on the appraisal and compensation, which will be finalized with a second meeting with the CEO. The Governance Committee will make a recommendation at their July or August meeting, as noted above.
- At the August Board meeting, the Board approves the report on the work plan, the appraisal of the CEO, and a compensation package effective October 1 of each year.

If the Board fails to adhere to this schedule, at a minimum, the CEO will receive the average compensation increase given to administrative staff in any given year. If the CEO fails to adhere to this schedule, he/she is not obligated to receive any compensation increase.

February 23, 2005 (orig.)
Revised 6-5-07, 10-1-10, 10-26-16
MINUTES OF
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
October 12, 2016

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members Present: George Heartwell, Jack Hoffman, Barbara Holt (Chair), Terry Schweitzer, Amna Seibold

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Robin Crothers, Peter Varga (CEO)

Others Present: Watchdog Miller

Ms. Holt called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Miller stated he made a rough estimate of 11,000 riders per day. We need 11,000 airport quality ear protectors since we are destroying their hearing. He complained that the communication from Grand Rapids City Commissioners has not been addressed by The Rapid. If the July meeting was canceled, how is the CEO’s work plan presented on September 28? He was concerned that the buses don’t go places that people need to go.

1. Minutes of September 14, 2016 Governance Committee Meeting:

Ms. Holt asked for corrections to the minutes. None were offered. The minutes stand approved as written.

2. CEO Professional Development Report for September 2016:

A motion was made by Heartwell, supported by Schweitzer, to accept the CEO professional development report for September 2016.

Ms. Schweitzer mentioned that the expenses for the APTA Annual Meeting seemed high. Mr. Varga responded that the amount on the report shows all expenses for the Annual Meeting, including registration, airfare, hotel and meals.

Motion passed unanimously.
3. **Revision to Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO:**

Ms. Holt stated that the CEO’s evaluation included the addition of a 360 review into his employment contract. The process for evaluation is detailed in the "Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO", which is referenced in his contract. A bullet has been added to the procedures that gives the Governance Committee the option of doing a 360 review.

Mayor Seibold believes a 360 review would be useful during the next year.

A motion was made by Seibold, supported by Heartwell, to recommend approval of the revision to the Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO to include a 360 review (Regular agenda).

Mr. Hoffman asked about the process that was held for the CEO’s last evaluation. He noted that the July Governance Committee meeting that is scheduled for that purpose did not occur.

Ms. Holt commented that the July meeting was canceled and the meeting was rescheduled in August.

Discussion was held regarding the CEO’s contract. Mayor Seibold explained that the contract states that notice of non-renewal or any other changes, such as a one-year contract instead of the two-year, needs to be given to the CEO 60 days prior to October 1.

Mr. Varga informed the Committee that this 60-day notice clause has been in his contract for the past 19 years. This year there were some instances of non-compliance with the contract, but he was willing to cooperate with the process. Typically there is a salary increase associated with the evaluation each year which would trigger an action by the Board to formally approve the contract renewal as this constitutes a change to the contract. Since he requested that he receive no salary increase for FY 2017 and there was no notice of any change in the contract term within the timeline, the contract renewal was automatic and did not need Board approval.

Mayor Seibold indicated that the Governance Committee and the Board as a whole needs be aware of what is in the CEO’s contract.

Motion passed unanimously.

4. **2017 Meeting Schedule:**

Ms. Crothers stated that the meeting schedule has been set up similar to past years. She noted that meetings are not necessarily on the second, third and fourth Wednesdays due to the CEO’s schedule with conferences, etc. She also noted the three special meetings – the Board retreat, planning meeting and budget meeting.

Discussion was held regarding the July Governance Committee meeting which is scheduled for the purpose of evaluating the CEO. The timing for this meeting may be changed at some point, but the Committee decided to leave it as is for now.

A motion was made by Seibold, supported by Schweitzer, to recommend approval of the 2017 Meeting Schedule (Consent agenda). Motion passed unanimously.
5. **October 26, 2016 Board Agenda:**

Mr. Varga reviewed the October 26, 2016 Board agenda.

**Performance Oversight Committee:**

**Monthly Financial Statements for September 2016** — Preventive Maintenance funds in the amount of $800,000 were booked for the administrative pension liability by 9-30-16. We have a balance of Preventive Maintenance of $942,323.

In response to a question from Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Varga stated that there is a short list of items that are not eligible for state match and pension liability is on that list.

**August 2016 Ridership and Productivity Report** — Total ridership for August 2016 increased 7.6% compared to August 2015. There were two extra weekdays in August 2016 and three Clean Air Action Days. The average weekday total ridership increased 4.4%. Total ridership year-to-date decreased 5.1%.

**August 2016 Paratransit Ridership Report** — Total monthly paratransit ridership for August 2016 decreased 0.7% from August 2015. ADA ridership increased 1.5%. There were two extra weekdays in August 2016.

**Access Control and Security Cameras Project** — The existing security system dates back to the construction of Rapid Central Station in 2004, with equipment being added as needed. The equipment has exceeded its useful life and new technology for hardware and software have been introduced that could better serve the Rapid’s needs. Staff recommends a five-year contract for a multi-phase project with a single vendor to obtain consistency throughout the organization. Each phase will be presented to the Board as an action item or an information item depending on the cost. The initial phase totals $84,606. A request for qualifications process was followed in selecting the recommended vendor.

The FTA requires that we spend up to one percent of our federal formula funds on security each year.

**Purchase of 26 CNG Buses** — These are replacement buses will be purchased under The Rapid’s existing multi-year contract with the Gillig Corporation. The cost per bus is $484,414, for a total of $12,594,764. Approximately one-half of the buses being replaced by the CNG buses have met their 12-year life cycle, while the other half will meet the mileage cap prior to 12 years by the time of replacement. Delivery is nearly two years out so the CNG fueling facility will be up and running by the time these buses arrive.

**Purchase of 12 Paratransit Cutaway Buses** — These buses will be purchased from Hoekstra Transportation Inc. through the State of Michigan contract. The cost is approximately $85,000 per bus. They are propane fueled vehicles and are replacing older vehicles that have met their useful life of seven years or 200,000 miles. There are four wheelchair securement areas and six passenger seats on these buses.

**Strategic Planning Committee:**

No action items.
Governance Committee:

Revision to Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO and 2017 Meeting Schedule were recommended for Board approval by the Governance Committee earlier in this agenda.

Information

Compensation Study – Mr. Varga explained that an RFP was issued to conduct a compensation study of the administrative staff. Four proposals were received. The evaluation team selected Gallagher Benefit Services at a cost of $52,000. The study will be paid for with grant funds. A Board subcommittee will be involved in the study process. This is not a Board action item due to the cost.

Walker Latent Demand Study – We will use planning grants to fund a study in Walker. An RFP was issued to conduct a Walker Transit Needs Assessment. Two proposals were received. The evaluation team selected AECOM at a cost of $49,997. Planning grant funds will be used to pay for this work. This is not a Board action item due to the cost.

6. Executive Session – Collective Bargaining (if necessary)

Executive Session on collective bargaining was not held since there was nothing new to report.

Chair's Report:

Ms. Holt reported on her meeting with Grand Rapids Commissioners David Allen, Senita Lenear and Joseph Jones. This meeting resulted from a letter sent by these commissions regarding various aspects of Rapid services including Route 19, GVSU, budget issues, and shelters/benches in our system. She stated that the meeting went well and she felt that the commissioners understood the issues. Going forward, we will track ridership on Route 19, provide information on reported late service on Route 50 GVSU, look into making the budget easier to access/understand on the website, and do an analysis of shelters/benches in Grand Rapids Ward 3. A report on these issues will be provided to the commissioners.

Ms. Holt noted that she offered that the Grand Rapids delegation on the Rapid Board could meet with the Grand Rapids Commission during the year if that is deemed to be beneficial.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Robin Crothers, Board Secretary
MINUTES OF
PERFORMANCE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
October 19, 2016

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members Present: Gary Carey, Tim Cochran, Randy Gelderloos, Barb Holt, Mark Huizenga, Terry Schweitzer (Chair)

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Robin Crothers, Mark Fedorowicz, Rod Ghearing, Alan Hartley, Meegan Joyce, Jennifer Kalczuk, Linda Medina, Brian Pouget, Peter Varga (CEO), Scott Walsh, Kevin Wisselink

Others Present: Asher Lockwood, Watchdog Miller

Mr. Schweitzer called the meeting to order at 8:01 a.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Watchdog Miller stated that buses are too loud. The Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO have been doctored. The Governance Committee is 80% from outside Grand Rapids. The July Governance Committee meeting was canceled and then rescheduled in August and was posted for the wrong time so he was three hours late for the meeting. Even though Mr. Varga didn’t want a salary hike, his compensation package is already $300,000 a year.

COMMITTEE ITEMS:

1. Minutes of September 21, 2016 Performance Oversight Committee Meeting:

   Mr. Schweitzer asked for corrections to the minutes. None were offered. The minutes stand approved as written.

2. Monthly Financial Statements for September 2016:

   Mr. Walsh stated that the September statements reflect the additional contribution for the administrative Defined Benefit Plan. Capitalized operating is a little less than $1 million under budget. This is year end and there is a lot of work to do in the audit process. He does not expect anything unusual as a result of the audit. This has been a good budget year.

   In response to a question from Mr. Schweitzer, Mr. Hartley confirmed that grant funds for major projects will be carried over.
A motion was made by Holt, supported by Cochran, to recommend approval of the Monthly Financial Statements for September 2016 (Consent agenda). Motion passed unanimously.

3. **August 2016 Ridership and Productivity Report**

Mr. Wisselink reported that total ridership for August 2016 increased 7.6% compared to August 2015. There several factors that contribute to this increase, including two more GVSU fall semester service days, two more weekdays of service, and three weekday Clean Air Action Days. However, taking these factors out of the picture, the underlying numbers are fairly consistent with the numbers we have been experiencing over the past several months.

Mr. Schweitzer noted that Route 9 has moved up the list for productivity. Mr. Wisselink indicated that Routes 2, 4 and 9 have been the top performers and their position tends to vary. He mentioned that Route 28 is moving up as well since the addition of the Cascade Township service started in January 2015.

Mr. Schweitzer asked if there is any information on the Route 28 extension to Cascade Township. Mr. Wisselink responded that the township had a public meeting in July, which he attended. The feedback was very positive, especially from area businesses. A written report was provided by the township regarding the public meeting. Mr. Schweitzer asked for that report to be provided to the Board.

Ms. Holt asked how the Route 19 realignment was doing. Mr. Wisselink stated that September was the first full month of service for the realignment. It was implemented at the end of August 2016. Ridership will build over time.

Ms. Holt inquired about any public education regarding the realignment. Mr. Wisselink responded that there were notices at bus stops.

In response to a question from Mr. Carey, Mr. Wisselink commented that he does not know of anything in particular that would cause the spike in Route 9.

A motion was made by Holt, supported by Carey, to recommend acceptance of the August 2016 Ridership and Productivity Report (Consent agenda). Motion passed unanimously.

4. **August 2016 Paratransit Ridership Report**

Ms. Joyce reported that total monthly paratransit ridership for August 2016 decreased 0.7% from August 2015. ADA ridership increased 1.5%, NDS decreased 22.1%, PASS decreased 13.4%, and Network 180 decreased 6.0%. Related to the Route 28 extension, there were 725 paratransit trips in Cascade Township in August 2016. On-time performance for August 2016 was 96.72% (97.73% in August 2015) and on-time drop-off performance was 95.36% (95.68% August 2015).

Ms. Joyce mentioned that in our last federal Triennial Review, we were told that we need to keep track of drop-off times as well as pick-up times, which she is now doing. For now, she noted that she has assigned the same standard to drop-offs as for pick-ups. This will be reviewed in January 2017.

Mr. Schweitzer asked how our numbers compare nationally. Ms. Joyce explained that FTA does not require any particular standard and allows that to be a local decision. She is not
aware of how we compare to other systems for these standards. Mr. Pouget indicated that FTA tends to look at over 90% in general. Trip length is also monitored.

Mr. Hartley commented that during our last Triennial Review earlier this year, FTA looked in-depth at our Special Services Department and they got very high marks.

A motion was made by Cochran, supported by Holt, to recommend acceptance of the August 2016 Paratransit Ridership Report (Consent agenda). Motion passed unanimously.

5. Security and Access Control Services Project:

Mr. Fedorowicz reported that staff requests authorization to enter into a five-year contract with Knight Watch to provide security and access control services for The Rapid's facilities.

The existing security system dates back to the construction of Rapid Central Station in 2004. Since that time, equipment has exceeded its useful life and new technology has been introduced. The goal was to work with a single vendor to obtain consistency that can be maintained across the organization. Each phase will be presented to the Board either as an action item or an information item, depending on whether the cost is over or under $100,000.

He noted that in order to maintain continuous improvement, the FTA requires that recipients of federal funding spend a minimum of 1% of their formula funds each year on security.

A Request for Qualifications was issued and four proposals were received. The evaluation team advanced three of the four vendors to the interview phase. Several references were checked thoroughly. The recommended firm had excellent references from East Grand Rapids Public Schools and Spectrum Health. Knight Watch was deemed to be the most qualified and provided the lowest cost for the first phase of the project, which will include licenses, software, encoders, power supplies and other miscellaneous items at a cost of $84,606.

Mr. Carey asked what happens after the five-year contract. Mr. Pouget stated that we will evaluate whether we want to recommend continuing with Knight Watch or choose a new vendor. This process will be ongoing in order to keep up with the most current technology. Over the five-year contract, the cost will be approximately $550,000.

Mr. Fedorowicz noted that we want to work with software that has an open structure so that we can incorporate other items over time.

Mr. Hartley mentioned that the 1% federal requirement would be approximately $92,000 for The Rapid.

In response to a question from Mr. Gelderloos, Mr. Fedorowicz responded that we will use Knight Watch for all aspects of security for our facilities, however, FTA does require a cost analysis for each phase.

Mr. Schweitzer asked about the cameras on the buses. Mr. Pouget stated that they are working well. In a previous Board item, we purchased some additional, upgraded storage for the video. He also noted that cameras on our buses have assisted law enforcement on several occasions. Mr. Hartley commented that the cameras help with unfounded slip and fall claims as well.
A motion was made by Carey, supported by Huizenga, to recommend approval to enter into a five-year contract with Knight Watch Inc. for security and access control services (Consent agenda). Motion passed unanimously.

6. Purchase of 26 CNG Buses:

Mr. Ghearing stated that this is the second group of CNG buses being purchased from Gillig. We currently have 28 CNG buses on order, with the first prototype arriving late in November 2016.

Mr. Ghearing noted that the delivery cost was inadvertently left out of the price. The cost per bus should be $489,464, for a total not to exceed $12,726,064.

The price reflects an increase per bus to comply with new EPA emissions requirements for buses delivered after the start of 2018.

In response to a question from Ms. Holt, Mr. Ghearing stated that all states follow the same EPA requirements, except he believes there is something a bit different in the state of California.

Mr. Varga commented that the first group of 28 and this group of 26 CNG buses represents one-third of our fleet.

Mayor Huizenga asked if security on the buses counts toward the FTA requirement. Mr. Ghearing responded that it can if we need it to attain the goal.

A motion was made by Carey, supported by Holt, to recommend approval to purchase 26 CNG buses from Gillig at a cost not to exceed $12,726,064 (Consent agenda). Motion passed unanimously.

7. Purchase of 12 Paratransit Cutaway Buses:

Mr. Ghearing requested authorization to enter into a contract with Hoekstra Transportation Inc. for the purchase of 12 paratransit cutaway buses. These vehicles are propane fueled. The cost per vehicle is $85,003, for a total cost not to exceed $1,020,047.

He noted that the vendor has devised a method to mount to AC unit under the bus instead of on top, which helps with height clearance issues for the vehicle. There is no extra charge for this change.

In response to a question from Mayor Huizenga, Mr. Ghearing stated that propane is preferred for these smaller cutaway vehicles. We get a $0.50/gallon federal rebate for operating with propane. These vehicles turn over much more quickly than the large buses, so we can evaluate alternative fuels at any point.

A motion was made by Holt, supported by Carey, to recommend approval to purchase 12 paratransit cutaway buses from Hoekstra Transportation Inc. at a cost not to exceed $1,020,047 (Consent agenda). Motion passed unanimously.
8. **Revision to Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO:**

Ms. Holt reported that the CEO's evaluation that was approved at the September 2016 Board meeting included adding a 360 review. The procedures have been revised to accommodate this item.

Mayor Huizenga noted that the procedures say that "The Governance Committee may conduct a 360 review . . . ". He felt that it should say "shall" instead of "may". Ms. Holt agreed to this change.

Mr. Varga stated that a 360 review is for the benefit of the person being reviewed and he is looking forward to it. He agreed to it when Mayor Bliss first suggested it.

Mayor Huizenga expressed concern also that the procedures say that it is the Governance Committee that performs the 360 review. He stated that the full Board should be involved. Ms. Holt commented that the full Board will be involved and indicated that this will likely be reviewed when the Board gets into their governance review.

9. **2017 Meeting Schedule:**

Ms. Crothers explained that meetings for 2017 have been set according to the same general schedule as previous years. She noted that meetings are mostly set on the second, third and fourth Wednesdays, however, that is not the case with some months due to working around conferences and other issues for the CEO. There are three special meetings again in 2017, with the first being the Board Retreat in January.

10. **Report on New Purchase Contracts for September 2016:**

Mr. Fedorowicz reported on three contracts executed in September 2016 between $25,000 and $100,000. Appropriate procurement rules are applied to these procurements.

- A contract with KOOI Industrial Painting for $96,600 to repaint part of the wash rack that is rusting.
- A contract with Gallagher Benefit Services in the amount of $52,000 to conduct a compensation and job classification study for administrative staff.
- A contract with AECOM in the amount of $49,997 to conduct a latent demand study for portions of the City of Walker.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 a.m.

Robin Crothers, Board Secretary
MINUTES OF
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
October 19, 2016

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members Present: Charis Austin, David Bilardello, Rosalynn Bliss, Jack Hoffman (Chair), Stephen Kepley, Paul Troost, Mike Verhulst

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Michael Bulthuis, Robin Crothers, Mark Fedorowicz, Rod Ghearing, Alan Hartley, Meegan Joyce, Jennifer Kalczuk, Brian Pouget, Peter Varga (CEO), Scott Walsh, Mike Wiernga, Kevin Wisselink

Others Present: Asher Lockwood (student)

Mr. Hoffman called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments.

COMMITTEE ITEMS:

1. Minutes of September 21, 2016 Strategic Planning Committee Meeting:

   Mr. Hoffman asked for corrections to the minutes. None were offered. The minutes stand approved as written.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

2. Monthly Financial Statements for September 2016:

   Mr. Walsh reported that the September 2016 statements reflect $800,000 contribution to the administrative Defined Benefit pension plan liability and the associated capitalized operating impact. We are just under $1 million ahead of budget. This has been a good budget year. He mentioned that this is year end and there is a lot to do in the audit process, however, he does not expect anything out of the ordinary.
3. **August 2016 Ridership and Productivity Report:**

Mr. Wisselink stated that total ridership for August 2016 is up 7.6% compared to August 2015. This increase is largely due to two more GVSU fall semester service days and two more weekdays of service in August 2016, along with three weekday Clean Air Action Days compared to two weekend days last August. He mentioned that the underlying numbers are very similar to what they have been over the last several months.

Mr. Wisselink informed the Committee that total ridership year-to-date in the item in their packet is incorrect. The total ridership should be 10.28 million, which is a 4.2% decreased compared to the same time last year.

In response to a question from Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Wisselink stated that Contracted ridership is up due to the two additional fall semester service days for GVSU.

4. **August 2016 Paratransit Ridership Report:**

Ms. Joyce stated that total monthly paratransit ridership for August 2016 decreased 3.7% compared to August 2015. ADA ridership increased 1.5%, NDS decreased 22.1%, PASS decreased 13.4% and Network 180 decreased 6.0%. There were 725 paratransit ADA trips in Cascade Township in August 2016.

On-time performance was 96.72% and on-time drop-off performance was 95.36%. Both were down slightly from last year. We have not tracked drop-offs in the past. Ms. Joyce noted that during our recent FTA Triennial Review, we were informed that we need to keep track of drop-off times as well as pick-up times.

The average cost per trip decreased 1.1%.

5. **Security and Access Control Services Project:**

Mr. Fedorowicz reported on a five-year, multi-phase contract with Knight Watch Inc. to provide access control and security services. He noted that the Performance Oversight Committee recommended Board approval on the Consent agenda at their meeting this morning.

Mr. Fedorowicz stated that the existing security system dates back to the construction of Rapid Central Station in 2004. This equipment has exceeded its useful life and new technology has been introduced that could benefit The Rapid. Staff proposes to create a single, unified surveillance system that allows continuity throughout all of The Rapid’s facilities to work together. Antiquated cameras, equipment software can be updated with new technology.

He mentioned that the FTA recognizes the need for continuous improvement in security processes and procedures and requires a minimum of 1% of annual federal formula funds to be spent for security purposes.

A Request for Qualifications was issued and four proposals were received. Three of those proposals were moved into the interview phase of the procurement. An extensive review of references was conducted as part of the evaluation process. The evaluation team recommended Knight Watch as the most qualified firm. We received excellent references from East Grand Rapids Public Schools and Spectrum Health who contract with Knight Watch.
The first phase will include licenses, software, encoders, power supplies and other miscellaneous items for a total of $84,606. Each phase of this five-year contract will come to the Board as an action item or an information item, depending on whether it is over/under $100,000 in cost. A cost analysis will be done for each phase.

Mayor Kepley asked about the type of equipment we have now and if we would use our own servers or the cloud. Mr. Pouget responded that we have a combination of analog and digital and want to go to all digital equipment. We will be using our own servers.

In response to a question from Mayor Kepley, Mr. Fedorowicz stated that Knight Watch has been in business for over 20 years.

Mr. Bilardello inquired about cameras in the first phase. Mr. Fedorowicz noted that there will be a mix of cameras and other items, which will be true for remaining phases as well.

Mayor Kepley expressed his interest in learning more about our security system and that perhaps something could be provided to the full Board. Mr. Pouget suggested that a meeting with our Security Manager and/or a tour would be useful to learn more detail. He noted that this would probably occur sometime after the first phase of the project.

6. **Purchase of 26 CNG Buses:**

Mr. Ghearing reported on the request for authorization to purchase 26 CNG buses from our current contract with Gillig Corporation. This is the second group of CNG buses to be purchased. He noted that the price included in the Board item is incorrect. The delivery cost of $5,050 per bus was inadvertently omitted from the price we were given. Including the delivery cost, the cost per bus is $489,464 for a total cost not to exceed $12,726,064.

Mr. Ghearing stated that the price of the buses includes an additional charge per bus to comply with new EPA emissions requirements for buses delivered after the start of 2018.

Mr. Varga mentioned that this second group of CNG buses represents about one-third of our fleet.

7. **Purchase of 12 Paratransit Cutaway Buses:**

Mr. Ghearing reported on authorization to purchase 12 paratransit cutaway buses from Hoekstra Transportation, through the State of Michigan contract. The cost per bus is $85,003, for a total not to exceed of $1,020,047. These are propane fueled buses.

Mr. Ghearing stated that we receive a $0.50 per gallon federal rebate for using propane fuel. Ms. Joyce stated that MV Transportation is currently paying $0.98 per gallon.

It was noted by Mr. Ghearing that Hoekstra has found a way to install the AC unit under the bus instead of on top which helps with overhead clearance issues.

Mr. Bilardello has questions regarding fueling and maintenance of paratransit vehicles. Ms. Joyce stated that MV Transportation fuels the propane and gasoline vehicles and they also do the maintenance at their location.
8. **Revision to Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO:**

Mr. Varga stated that this item is a revision to the Board Procedures for Evaluation of the CEO to include a 360 review. At the Performance Oversight Committee meeting, a request was made to change “The Governance Committee may conduct at 360 . . .” to “shall conduct”. Mr. Varga noted that he agreed to this change.

In response to a question from Mayor Bliss, Mr. Varga confirmed that the Governance Committee will choose someone to do the 360 review.

9. **2017 Meeting Schedule:**

Ms. Crothers reviewed the meeting schedule. Meetings have been scheduled generally the same as past years. Meetings are not necessary the second, third and fourth Wednesdays due to working around conflicts with conferences or other issues for the CEO. There are three special meetings again next year, with the first being the Board Retreat in January 2017.

Mr. Bilardello asked if committee assignments rotated or if he should assume he will stay on the same committee. Mr. Varga responded that committee assignments can change, which typically happens due to scheduling issues. Board members could also request a change in committee assignment by contacting the Board Chair.

Mr. Varga noted that the August 2017 Governance Committee meeting was scheduled at 9:00 a.m. instead of 4:00 p.m. due to the 8:00 a.m. budget meeting. This would prevent Governance Committee members from having to come to The Rapid twice in one day.

Mayor Bliss inquired if this schedule could change through the governance process that the Board is planning to go through. Mr. Varga stated that it could.

Mr. Hoffman mentioned that the July Governance Committee meeting date may be changed at some point due to conflicts during the month of July, but that can be dealt with at a later date.

**CEO Comments:**

Mr. Varga informed the Committee of the purchases between $25,000-$100,000 for the month of September 2016. This information typically goes just to the Performance Oversight Committee, but he wanted to review them with the other committees since there are two Board requested studies on the list.

- **Compensation Study** – An RFP was issued for the Compensation and Job Classification Study for The Rapid’s administrative employees. Three firms provided responsive proposals. The evaluation team decided that Gallagher Benefit Services was the most qualified. Their cost was $52,000.

- **Walker Latent Demand Study** – An RFP was issued for the Walker Latent Demand Study. Two firms provided responsive proposals. The evaluation team decided that AECOM was the most qualified. Their cost was $49,997. AECOM submitted the lowest cost proposal.

- One other item was on that report. KOOL Industrial Painting will do some painting work around the wash rack due to excessive rusting at a cost of $96,600. This was the lowest responsive and responsible bidder.
Mr. Hartley responded to a question about the Compensation Study committee. He indicated that the committee composed of Board members Kepley, Troost, Verhulst and Holt, along with Rapid staff Hartley, Pouget, and Groendal, will have a kick-off meeting with Gallagher once the contract has been signed. Nancy Groendal, HR Manager, will be the lead on this project.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:28 p.m.

Robin Crothers, Board Secretary
Consumer Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes  
October 18, 2016  

Attendance  

Committee Members Present  
Joe Sibley  
Mary Kinnane  
Sister Jean Reimer  
Laura Kelling  
Steve Burke  

Rapid Staff  
Kevin Wisselink  
Meegan Joyce  
Laura Madison  
MV  
Al Klepadlo  

Absent  
Anne Larson  
Toni Moore  
Karen DeLoof  

Steve called the meeting to order.  

1) Introductions  

ACTION ITEMS  

2) Minutes of September 20, 2016 meeting (attached)  

Mary moved to accept the minutes from the September 20, 2016 meetings, David supported the motion. Motion passed.  

3) Changes to By-Laws  

Meegan reported that proxy votes were not allowed for The Rapid Board therefore would not be allowed in this committee. In response to the question of if there was a minimum number members required for this committee to operate, it was found that there is not but that the current recommendation of 10-12 positions would remain this committee’s goal. The only changes to the By-Laws are changing reference from ITP to The Rapid and that the committee that oversees this committee has been changed from Service Planning to the Strategic Planning Committee.  

David moved to accept the changes to the By-Laws. The motion was second by Mary. Motion passed.
INFORMATION ITEMS

4) **August 2016 Paratransit Ridership & Productivity Reports (attached)**

    ADA ridership increased 1.5%, all other services decreased with overall ridership decreasing 0.7% August 2016 comparing to August 2015. There were 725 Cascade Township rides. On-time pick up was 96.72 %, on-time drop off was 95.36%. Cost per trip decreased 1.1% ($0.28) comparing August 2016 to August 2015.

5) **August 2016 fixed Route Productivity Reports (attached)**

    Overall ridership in Routes 1 - 44 showed a 0.2% increase comparing August 2016 to August 2015. Contracted Ridership increased by 74.2%. Total ridership increased by 7.6%, for the same time comparison, this was due to 2 more GVSU semester days and 2 more weekdays in the month. Kevin said Clean Air Action days also played a role in the increased ridership.

6) **Coordinated Transportation Plan**

    This committee was asked to look over and make suggestions and corrects to the Coordinated Transportation Plan. It was reported that there were no dramatic changes planned at this time.

7) **Strategic Planning Committee draft agenda for October 19, 2016 (attached)**

    Access Control and Security Cameras Project – Meegan reported that security wants all the systems to be on the same program for ease of use and continuity in software/hardware.

    Purchase 26 CNG Buses – Equipment has been received but was in storage until it can be installed.

    Purchase of 12 Paratransit Cutaway Buses – replacement vehicles.

    2017 Meeting Schedule – Meegan will email to this committee when it has been approved.

8) **Strategic Planning Committee Minutes for September 21, 2016 meeting (attached)**

    There were no questions or comments.

9) **New Business**

    **GO!Bus Tickets at Meijer**

    David asked if he could approach the Meijer on 28th Street and Kalamazoo about carrying GO!Bus tickets. Meegan said she would talk to Ticket Sales and see if there was something in the sales agreements that would indicate the stores can sell whatever tickets they want to.
MV

Al MV had two new classes going and he hoped to hire 12 new drivers but things were going smoothly at this time. He reported that the satisfaction survey MV had asked staff to complete had been completed by 60 people which was better than his goal of the mid 50’s.

10) Old Business

There were no questions or comments.

11) Public Comments

No questions or comments.

Next Board Meeting: October 26, 2016
Next CAC Meeting: December 6, 2016
communications
September 29, 2016

Peter Varga  
The Rapid  
300 Ellsworth Ave SW  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

Dear Peter,

On behalf of the West Michigan Policy Forum, thank you for your outstanding contribution of $5,000 to support the conference as well as the pursuit of the policy priorities discussed. This event brought business and community leaders from across the state to identify the critical needs of Michigan and to set our priorities moving forward. It is with your support that we were able to make this event a reality and so successful. Over 500 attendees gathered to learn from numerous experts in their respective fields on best practices, critical needs and policy issues impacting business growth.

Because of your engagement, we have identified and have consensus on our most important business concerns including tax policy, municipal finance, poverty, housing, education, criminal justice reform empowerment and more. With this information, we can now work together to meet our goals with a united force and ensure a favorable environment for business investment.

Again, we thank you for your support of the West Michigan Policy Forum and your investment in the business community at large.

Sincerely,

Jim Dunlap  
Chairperson  

Doug DeVos  
Immediate Past Chair  

Matthew Haworth  
Conference Co-Chair  

John Kennedy  
Conference Co-Chair  

Marge Potter  
Conference Co-Chair  

Jeff Connolly  
Conference Co-Chair  

Larry Hines  
Conference Co-Chair  

Johnny Brann, Jr.  
Conference Co-Chair
How autonomous vehicles fit into future public transit in West Michigan

GRAND RAPIDS, MI – Peter Varga imagines a not-so-distant future in which driverless vehicles expand the possibilities of public transit in West Michigan.

The Rapid CEO's vision is of a world with less downtown traffic and parking congestion, and more people having access to bus services.

And if recent conversations among community leaders are any indication, those autonomous vehicles could provide public transit solutions sooner than once thought.

During the last few weeks, Kentwood Mayor Stephen Kepley sat in on at least three meetings in which driverless vehicles were a major topic of discussion.

"Like a roller coaster ride, it's a lot of fun but it can be unnerving as well," said Kepley, Kentwood's former city engineer, who is weighing the potential for driverless transit.

"Michigan is the automotive leader and we need to answer these questions. I'm probably 50-50 excitement and worry. But if you have autonomous cars, you have an enormous paradigm shift on how we live in the United States."

Throughout each discussion, Kepley and others in attendance weighed concerns over safety, logistics and the economic effects of driverless vehicles being added to the public transportation equation. Those were balanced by the potential for declines in traffic levels, car crashes, pollution and parking congestion.
But when it comes to driverless public transit, just how close are we in West Michigan?

Kepley walked away from a Michigan Municipal League national conference earlier this month with the understanding such vehicles could have widespread use over the next decade.

"It'll probably be five years before these questions get addressed and solved, and maybe in 10 years (they're) commonplace," he said. "I don't know, but personally I would love to get more information on how the technology works."

TESTING GROUNDS

Since the early 1970s, automated guideway transit systems throughout the world -- like the Detroit People Mover -- have provided rides in urban, airport and hospital settings without the need for a human driver.

What community leaders like Varca, Kepley and Grand Rapids Mayor Rosalynn Bliss are watching now are places making strides with these driverless passenger cars and small shuttle vehicles that don't require guided, railed routes.

Washington D.C. is one example. The nation's capital has been the testing site for Arizona-based startup Local Motors, which began running trials with an autonomous vehicle on private roads this summer.

The 12-passenger shuttle -- named Olli -- reaches a top speed of 12 mph. Its range limit is 32 miles.

Related: Autonomous vehicles coming 'Much sooner than any of us thought'

Meanwhile, Uber has launched self-driving cars in Pittsburgh, taking to public roads with supervising humans in the driver seat. The vehicle is built with seven traffic-light detecting cameras, 20 spinning lasers and a 360-degree map of the surrounding environment.

"That's a conversation we have a lot," Bliss said during a Sept. 22 panel focused on public transit. "We're all learning from cities who are trying them ... These conversations are going on in every city."

Overseas, cities in Asia, Australia and Europe have also begun trials with driverless cars, shuttles and buses. Those vehicles vary, with max speeds from 12 to 42 mph.

"Folks like Google and Ford and auto manufacturers, they're talking about it from shared ride purposes, so we're hearing about it," Varga said. "When you see Uber and Lyft experimenting with it, it's being taken more seriously. We're probably ahead of what people thought.

"Time will work out those (concerns). You can bet auto manufacturers will figure out how they work and then we will have to see how we can use them to help get people around."

BRINGING DRIVERLESS TECH TO WEST MICHIGAN

The Rapid, a public transportation service that provides millions of rides throughout East Grand Rapids, Grand Rapids, Grandville, Kentwood, Walker and Wyoming annually, is also watching those test runs.

While Varga predicts driverless tuses won't hit public roads until around 2035, he said the use of autonomous cars and smaller passenger buses between now and then should benefit public transit services like The Rapid.

Driverless vehicles could help solve the "first or last mile problem." It's a nod to how public transit riders sometimes have difficulty getting from bus stations to their home or place of employment.

"Regarding buses, there's probably an advantage over time here in looking at how the autonomous cars can support public transit," Varga said. "I can see situations in which people use these vehicles to get to a bus Rapid transit station so they don't have to park their vehicles downtown."

Varga's vision includes driverless vehicles that drop riders off at bus stations downtown before parking themselves, returning home, or heading to pick up the next rider in the case of ride sharing.

"The industry is looking at anything that deals with shared mobility," he said. "The other thing is ride sharing systems like Uber. We're looking at all of that and how it can help in public transit."
In September, the state Senate unanimously approved legislation that would allow autonomous vehicles to be driven on roads in Michigan for any reason. The four-bill package was then unanimously approved by the House communications and technology committee, sending it to the House floor.

Previous legislation passed in 2013 allowed driverless vehicles to be on Michigan roads during test runs.

"Gov. (Rick) Snyder talked about the state continuing to be a leader for the auto industry and how we need to be leaders with autonomous vehicles," Kepley said following the recent 2016 West Michigan Policy Forum. "If it's going to work, it's going to be because of leadership in Michigan."

RAPID RIDERS WEIGH IN

Ruth Rocky doesn't have a vehicle and that's the way she prefers it. Rather than spend money on a car, gas and insurance, the 85-year-old Grand Rapids resident spends a fraction to take the bus.

But asked about a future with autonomous public transit, Rocky said she'll pass. In her experience, having a human driver has proven helpful for more than simply getting from point A to point B.

"Sometimes you need the driver to explain things," she said. "One time, a man had a heart attack and a driverless bus wouldn't know to stop and help."

While a handful of riders shared concerns about the safety, accountability and loss of jobs tied to autonomous vehicles joining the public transit conversation, others were optimistic.

"I could go for that," said 67-year-old Walt Lechtanski of White Cloud. "I've heard about those cars on the radio. They say it's safer and could cause less crashes."
Would you trust driverless public transit? Riders weigh in

By Justin P. Hicks
jhicks3@mlive.com

Would you trust driverless vehicles as part of the public transit system?

The topic of driverless vehicles joining the rest of us on Michigan's public roads in the not-too-distant future is becoming more popular among community leaders.

With cities in the United States and around the world already testing these autonomous vehicles, their role in public transit is gathering interest from some—and criticism from others.

Here are some responses from frequenters of The Rapid, who were asked Monday afternoon about a future in which driverless buses would move people around the Grand Rapids area.

I've seen the movie 'I, Robot' and all that. No way.

GANYA BROWN, 16,
OF GRAND RAPIDS

Brown gets a ride to Union High School each day but uses the bus to get back to her Grand Rapids home. Unlike her classmates, she would give driverless vehicles a chance.

"I could go for it. I've heard about those cars on the radio. They say it's safer and could cause less crashes."

YVONNA DAVIS, 16,
OF GRAND RAPIDS

Davis takes the bus to and from Union High School on weekdays. She has watched enough science fiction films to rule out autonomous vehicles.

"I wouldn't get on one."

WALT LECHTANSKI, 67,
OF WHITE CLOUD

Lechtanski switches between biking and taking the bus to get himself around while shopping and visiting relatives.

"I've seen the movie 'I, Robot' and all that. No way."

KATIE MERCER, 20,
OF WALKER

Mercer uses the Rapid's services daily to get to school. She said the bus is "very important" for her commuting, but she doesn't know how they'd react to autonomous buses.

"I'm not sure if it would be good or bad. Maybe they'd use them after they're tested, but not right away."

RUTH ROCKY, 66,
OF GRAND RAPIDS

Rocky doesn't own a car, and that's the way she prefers it. By taking the Rapid's bus whenever she needs it, she saves a lot of money.

"I don't want a driverless bus. Sometimes, you need the driver to explain things. One time, a man had a heart attack, and a driverless bus wouldn't know to stop and help."

DAVID GARDNER, 23,
OF GRAND RAPIDS

Gardner currently takes the bus to work everyday. He said he doubts it would work off of public transit for a while, but he decided to give it another shot Monday while his moped needed repairs.

"Buses save people money, and they're helpful for people who don't know how to drive or can't afford gas. But as long as they show up on time."

MIKE UPTON, 60,
OF ADA TOWNSHIP

Whether it's getting to veterans services or grabbing a bite to eat, Upton said the bus is "very important" in terms of getting him around Grand Rapids. He often will combine bus and bike rides as his primary means of transportation.

"I won't be doing driverless vehicles. It would (anger me). Look at Meijer getting rid of its tellers, and you don't need people working at gas stations anymore. We're losing jobs because of computers."

JAYE WILLIAMS, 70,
OF GRAND RAPIDS

Williams said he doesn't know what a driverless bus is, but that doesn't mean he's against it. He supports the Rapid's services as is.

"I don't need a driverless bus. I'm not sure how they'd do it, but I think it's a good idea."

GABRIEL HERMOSO, 16,
OF GRAND RAPIDS

Hermoso uses the bus to get home from school most afternoons while his mother is working. He has mixed feelings about an autonomous public transportation service.

"I would try to see how it works first. Sometimes, technology can't be trusted."

Smith uses the bus to get around for his daily routine, but he doesn't like the thought of a future with driverless vehicles.

"No, I'm not interested in that. I'd walk or bike."

JORJA JANKOWSKI, 55,
OF GRAND RAPIDS

Jankowski said she has been taking the bus to get around Grand Rapids for months. Waiting for a ride to Eastown on Monday, she said "Why not?" to trying a driverless bus.

CHARLES SMITH, 26,