

MINUTES
MICHIGAN STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WORKSHOP
May 28, 2009
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present: Ted B. Wahby, Chair
 Linda Miller Atkinson, Vice Chair
 Maureen Miller Brosnan, Commissioner
 Steven K. Girard, Commissioner
 Jerrold M. Jung, Commissioner
 James S. Scalici, Commissioner

Also Present: Jackie Shinn, Chief Deputy Director
 Frank E. Kelley, Commission Advisor
 Marneta Griffin, Commission Executive Assistant
 Jerry Jones, Commission Auditor, Office of Commission Audit
 Greg Johnson, Chief Operations Officer
 Mark VanPortFleet, Bureau Director, Highway Development
 Ed Timpf, Administrator, Financial Operations
 Susan Mortel, Bureau Director, Transportation Planning
 Tim Hoeffner, Administrator, Intermodal Policy
 Sharon Edgar, Administrator, Bureau of Passenger Transportation
 Bill Shreck, Director, Office of Communications
 Aarne Frobom, Legislative Specialist, Planning, Policy Division
 Bill Tansil, Administrator, Asset Management
 Denise Jackson, Administrator, Statewide Planning
 David Berridge, Manager, Transportation Planning

Excused: Kirk T. Steudle, Director

A list of those people who attended the workshop is attached to the official minutes.

Chair Wahby called the meeting to order at 10:25 a.m. in the Bureau of Aeronautics Auditorium in Lansing, Michigan.

MDOT REFORMS AND EFFICIENCIES

At the November Commission meeting, we were asked to review the TF2 report to identify efficiencies/reforms that MDOT could implement without new State Legislation. We completed the review and assessed the impacts/benefits/issues (pros and cons) of each possible reform. Several areas have been identified for possible implementation.

Denise Jackson introduced the members of the MDOT staff that will be presenting the six topics of discussion for the workshop.

Six Areas Under Review for Possible Implementation

Expanding the Asset Management Program – Bill Tansil

Bill Tansil commented that we believe this recommendation is a good thing; so much so that we have a couple of initiatives that we are currently performing. One of those initiatives is a strategic effort within the Bureau of Transportation Planning, and it spans off the entire department, in which we are training people in the area of asset management. We started talking to the different areas of the department and now we are into a process where we are putting together various videos about how you do asset management in different parts of the department. Susan Mortel is the sponsor for this activity and we branched out with teaching people in the construction, design, and facilities area on how to do asset management. We are expanding the scope; it's not just bridges and highways. If the processes and philosophy of asset management are good, why not expand it to other areas. Secondly, the other initiative is the Data Business Plan with the help of Ron Vibbert. This involves how to use our data most effectively.

The TF2 report recommendation is to expand the Asset Management Program to include all public roads, pavement, ancillary elements, and utility locations. Expanding the program to include ancillary elements such as drainage, lighting, and other features will extend the benefits of this program to other aspects of the roadway that are important to safety and to pavement condition. Expanding the program to all roads will have similar benefits. It will require time and much additional data will be needed before it can be fully implemented, but the potential exists through this program to ensure the very best use of invested funds. The benefits would include standardization of data, more accurate view of assets and condition, better use of scarce resources, better cost data/cost of doing business, facilitate funding allocation, more realistic replacement cycles and operations, facilitate federal Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) reporting, and more high quality data to support safety programs.

MDOT can do a lot without legislation. We can use our existing staff to perform a lot of the activities. We can implement through expanded operations, create ancillary features inventories, expand feature inspection and maintenance processes, and implement through maintenance management. We have 63 counties plus other agencies under contract to assist MDOT in much of the work. Expanding to all roadway agencies will require legislation. Where you can make your best impact on those local agencies is through the Asset Management Council.

The important ancillary elements are yet to be determined; different ancillary elements are important in different areas of the state. This is difficult inside of MDOT. It can be done within existing processes, if everyone's agreeable; however it is going to cost. There will be software changes that are needed, and hardware that will be needed.

Commissioner Jung asked how far back do we have history on pavement.

Mr. Tansil replied that we have many, many year. Our PASER activities have been going on for 5-7 years. Our sufficiency goes back in the 1960's but not sure how many years we've been doing distress and those activities.

Commissioner Jung stated that it was mentioned getting information from other counties and other people they sub-contract with and asked if it is put into their contract that they want to perform maintenance on MDOT assets.

Mr. Tansil replied that he assumes we would have to do that.

Commissioner Jung asked if it were being done now.

Mr. Tansil replied that it is not being done now. We have just opened up conversations with our maintenance people. Our current people can do it right now; there's nothing to prevent us from doing it if we get management to agree that this is the way to go. There will be some training required because this is something a little bit different. There will need to be some quality control and quality assurance involved. You have to have people do exactly what you ask them to do; they have to know exactly how to use their equipment, when to use it, etc.

Commissioner Jung stated that there has been a lot of talk today about process improvement and asked if MDOT uses any formalized process like Six Sigma.

Mr. Frierson responded that the department has a formalized process conducting process improvements, which includes identifying the current process, reaching consensus on the desired improved process and outlining action steps necessary to implement the improved process.

Commissioner Scalici asked, regarding the GPS technology and sending information back and forth, for an example of information from the field that could be sent back.

Mr. Tansil replied that one initiative would be the Guardrail Program. For example, I could be in the office and you in the field. We could be talking to each other through our computers with the GPS. I could tell you that a certain guardrail has been damaged in an accident and no longer exists. You could enter it with your GPS unit in the field, send that information back to the office and it goes into the database. You'd have computer rights to do it; someone else could go out there and look at it but they couldn't make the changes. This allows us to work on the same guardrail but be in two different locations.

Commissioner Scalici asked if this information was part of the backup now.

Mr. Tansil replied no, it's paper; it's a lot more cumbersome the way it's done now. Even if you don't send it back to the office, you put it in a computer so that later on you can download it.

Creating Corridor Authorities – Aarne Frobom

There are about three ideas contained within the phrase "corridor authorities": community organizations and associations of businesses, development and improvement associations, and heritage-route organizations. In general, we figure this phrase to mean working with a voluntary association of persons (individuals, businesses, or units of government) interested in contributing to a particular highway corridor.

Voluntary associations are sections of the local community that have gone one step beyond talking with MDOT, and have organized itself into a formal association with the aim of

improving the community along one of our roads. An example of this would be the 8 Mile Boulevard Association which has been formed to cover the entire territory between I-275 and I-94 along what we call M-102. This association has enrolled all 13 of the local governments, all 3 county governments, and 160 individual business members along the route. Director Steudle sits on the board of the organization along with a variety of representatives from those institutions. This is a good example for one of the benefits of dealing with corridor associations. Michigan has a multiplicity of local governmental units especially in suburban territory around our big cities. These voluntary associations can provide a forum for raising issues, talking about problems and resolving them along the routes that our state trunklines travel as they go through these multitudes of local government. This association has made some substantial contributions to the M-102 route. They planted 27 gardens, improved 200 bus stops, installed 11 decorative signs, making grants to their business members for facade improvements, promoting code enforcements to try to prevent blight along the corridor, and they are conducting voluntary clean-up along the route. A voluntary association can make the kind of improvements that is hard for MDOT to justify doing from its budget or which can provide real returns for the local property owners along the route. It keeps the organization and financing for those kinds of improvements down at the local level where it can do the most good. Other examples of voluntary associations are: South Gratiot Association along M-3 south of Mt. Clemens, and the Telegraph Tomorrow Association downriver in the city of Taylor.

Another class of association that we are working with more and more are focused on heritage routes—scenic and tourism oriented in rural areas. One vivid example is the Automotive Heritage Trail starting in downtown Detroit and working its way up Woodward Avenue, focusing on the historic sights associated with growth of the auto industry in that territory. In the coming years we expect a lot of results from these associations that are aimed at turning Michigan's roads into a merchantable tourism asset all by themselves. We'd like to see Michigan's highway system become a tourism draw by itself and we're counting on these associations to do a lot of the work with us for that.

Associations with revenue-raising powers can make serious capital contributions beyond what a voluntary association might make. There are three categories of these that are currently available under Michigan law: Special Assessment Districts, Downtown Development Associations, and Tax-Increment Finance Authorities (TIFA's). Special Assessment Districts: individual property owners can form these within their local government assuming voluntary contributions, kind of in the nature of a property tax to pay for mutually beneficial improvements. Very often these include things like street-lighting and other improvements associated with roads. Downtown Development Associations (DDA's): involve the voluntary assumption of a tax assessment to pay for improvements; usually focused on traditional downtown. Tax-Increment Finance Authorities (TIFA's): local governments use these to devote the increased property tax revenue within a certain boundary to financing public improvements. These are little bit beyond what you'd call a voluntary association and they enable local governments, if they wish, to for-go the tax revenues from improvements in the property value.

TIFA's and most of the other classes of financing authorities are seldom oriented towards corridors, which tend to be focused within geographic boundaries typically around a downtown area or some other area that local government wants to redevelop. There have been a couple changes to state law in the last few years that are of interest because they focus not on downtowns, but on corridors. One of these was the Corridor Improvement Authority Act of

2005 which was aimed at extending the benefits of DDA's to aging commercial strips located along highway routes. This Act was amended rather heavily last year and it now extends the TIFA's to corridor authorities. This could enable a local government that chose to do that (use the TIFA or DDA approach) to a commercial area located along some distance over one of MDOT's routes. The Clinton Township DDA is focused on M-3 on Gratiot Avenue just south of Mt. Clemens. They have contributed \$170,000 to landscaping along M-3. In the future we will probably find that these corridor authorities aren't just for road projects anymore. Late last year the state legislature passed a package of bills that will enable the installation of a street railway by a non-profit corporation along the southern few miles of Woodward Avenue in the city of Detroit. One feature of that package is a bill that enables that street railway to receive its operating subsidy from a TIFA aimed at a financing and transit system. If the city of Detroit chooses to go along with that, that will be organized jointly by the department, the city and the non-profit street railway. Probably within a few years we will see what's called the M-1 Rail Project financed by a corridor based TIFA. We look forward to working the voluntary associations, DDA's and TIFA's all around the state on our projects in years to come.

Commissioner Brosnan asked what it is that under the TF2 recommendation that we will be doing differently than what we were doing before—where do we go from here.

Mr. Frobom replied that one of the lessons of the TF2 process was that a lot of things that sound like innovations are things that we have tried a while back. You might say that the Corridor Authorities really go back as far as the Lincoln Highway Association and the Dixie Highway Association. It may not be a case of doing things differently, but what we look forward to is drawing on the Corridor Authority Act of 2005 and 2008 to invite local units of government to contribute both organization and real capital to increase value on our projects. It's more of an incremental change; not a reform. We like to think that we've been trying to adjust and suit our projects to the communities in which they're located.

Commissioner Brosnan asked if he saw us taking more of a leadership role when we go in and are doing a project in an area where a community might benefit from the 2005 improved legislation for Corridor Improvement Authorities. The role she's seen in the past is that we have supported a community's efforts in that regard but haven't necessarily been the one that has pushed them to explore that or to get involved.

Mr. Frobom replied that he doesn't know if we'd actively pushed for the creation of something like this, but what we would do is try to act as a catalyst and foster it, and make sure that if there is a natural emphasis among the community to voluntarily come together to make this kind of contribution, that they have all the help that they need.

Expanding the Usage of Value Engineering – Mark VanPortFleet

It is important to understand that value engineering (VE) does not necessarily mean that every project gets reduced. Value has a couple different meanings, one of which may mean you get more products, and that's not necessarily at a lesser price. Value engineering is a known and accepted methodology, a process that assures quality, reliability and performance, and is an effort to improve value and optimize the life-cycle cost of a facility. Value engineering is not a cost cutting process that reduces project scope/quality. The reason for doing VE is to improve project quality, reduce project costs, foster innovation, eliminate unnecessary and costly design elements, and to ensure efficient investments in our national highway system (NHS) projects.

The current requirements are: projects with a project estimate of \$25 million or greater (includes preliminary engineering, construction engineering, ROW costs, and must look at corridors), and bridge projects of \$20 million or more.

We do value engineering at various times: during the planning stages (value planning; helps determine feasible alternative), during the design phase (based on more detailed engineering and the best time for savings), and during construction (VECP—value engineering change proposal (after a project is let; disadvantage for the department because we have to share the savings with the contractor). The opportunities for savings with VE occur early in the process—more so than later. The savings go directly to the department or the owner and the cost of change goes up after you let a project.

We are looking to conduct VE for projects greater than \$10 million, projects with complexity, with more than 1 alternative, with ROW concerns, with compressed schedules, with expensive geotechnical or environmental mitigation, projects that can use state of the art engineering, projects with a significant local input or controversy, and projects with complicated maintenance of traffic requirements.

Commissioner Brosnan commented she did not realize that VE was a federal requirement. She thought in the past that what we were doing was something that we brought to the table every time because we simply wanted to do it and we thought it was a better process. She further commented that she likes the proposed additional VE opportunities and the criteria that are established. She then asked who determines, based on the criteria, when we engage in a VE project.

Mr. VanPortFleet replied that that is something we have yet to work through. Typically when we're going to do something like that we will establish the criteria—it may be a decision making body of some kind that chooses which one are right for it or not. It's not that we've never done a VE on a less than \$25 million project, but we certainly have concepts in our department that fit the VE principles.

Commissioner Brosnan commented that the criterion needs to highlight a little bit more on the timing aspect of VE in order to reap most of the benefits of it.

Mr. VanPortFleet replied that we do focus on that. Sometimes the challenges of our program change. We fit it in when we can fit it in.

Creating Reversible (Bi-Directional) Lanes – David Berridge

Reversible lanes are lanes on a roadway segment which can be operated in either direction to accommodate peak traffic demand. Lanes are added during the peak-hour flow in one direction and reduced in the opposing direction where demand is less. Lanes are operated in a balanced flow during off peaks. The purpose of reversible lanes is to gain capacity without constructing additional facilities. The benefits of reversible roadway operations is that they help maximize capacity on existing roads and equals increased efficiency, they preserve land and existing developments, reduce costs of facility construction, provide for quicker implementation than facility expansion, and are used in construction zones to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion.

The conditions for reversible travel lane implementation are when traffic volumes are at or near capacity, there are predictable patterns of high demand and/or congestion, there are limited right-of-way (or ability to acquire) for construction of additional lanes, there are ratios of primary directional volume to secondary direction approximately 2:1 or greater.

MDOT has had some experience with reversible lanes. They were primarily used in construction zones along I-75. The operating plan for the I-75 corridor created three lanes northbound from Wednesday noon to Saturday noon (to accommodate directional peaks in recreational traffic heading north on the weekend), and three lanes southbound from Saturday noon to Wednesday noon (to accommodate the weekend flow coming home). This has been used on three segments of I-75 reconstruction.

We evaluated the MDOT system for candidate projects to locate congested roadway segments and to identify peak-hour flow with high directionality ratios. In the Grand Rapids area we found several congested areas without high directional peak-hour flow ratios; in the Lansing area we found high directional peak-hour flow ratios without congestion; in the metropolitan Detroit area we found many congested areas but only two with high directional peak-hour flow ratios greater than 80% (a portion of Woodward Avenue (M-1) in Pontiac, and a portion of the I-96/I-275/M-5 interchange in Farmington Hills).

The future use of reversible lanes in Michigan are from perspective of freeway reconstruction projects, consideration during project feasibility studies as a capacity improvement alternative, and where application on other portions of the trunkline system appear limited.

Commissioner Jung commented that he read that Michigan, Detroit in particular, is one of the most de-centralized urban areas anywhere in the nation. The statistics showed that you only get 70% of your workplace activity within 10 miles of the central business district and in Detroit it's only 40%. This has implications for, not only bi-directional lanes but for a lot of other mass transit type oriented initiatives.

Mr. Berridge agreed that that was true; not only in the Detroit metropolitan area but it's true of all the metropolitan areas in Michigan.

Commissioner Brosnan commented that this topic appears to have great potential for efficiencies that would be visible to motorists. Out of all the things that TF2 recommended, and we were looking at, this is the one that stands out where people might view it as something new and different. Each time she used the I-75 bi-directional lanes she was impressed with how smart it was. She understands why they don't exist but wishes there were more opportunities to use it.

Implementing Ramp Management (Metering) – David Berridge

Ramp management is the application of control devices, such as traffic signals, signing, and gates to regulate the number of vehicles entering or leaving the freeway in order to achieve operational objectives. It is truly a traffic management strategy employed to balance freeway demand and capacity. The purpose of ramp metering is that it maintains optimum freeway operation by reducing incidents that produce traffic delays, maintains efficient use of the freeway system, protects the investment in freeway construction, and keeps them operating at or near capacity.

A 3-minute video of a rice demonstration, commissioned by Doug MacDonald of the Washington State Department of Transportation, was shown that illustrated how traffic congestion occurs on the freeway, how to better explain it to the public, and to show what we can do to improve things.

Ramp management goals, objectives and strategies should be consistent with regional transportation goals and objectives and must support the mission and vision of the agency. Ramp management is generally implemented to address safety (studies around the nation have revealed crash rate reductions of 15–50%), mobility (increases in average travel speeds from 8%-173%; increases in traffic volumes from 14%-74%; and decreases in travel times from 37%-52%), quality of life, environmental effects (direct correlation between improved traffic operations and environmental improvements; reduced stop-and-go conditions and higher operating speeds reduce pollutants released to the environment; and an increase in travel speed also improves fuel efficiency, leading to reduced fuel consumption and cost savings), and motorist perceptions and satisfaction.

Ramp management strategies that are available to the department include ramp closures (temporary, intermittent or permanent), ramp metering (controlling the rate of vehicle entry through the use of traffic signals on the entrance ramps), special use treatments (preferential treatment to a specific vehicle class such as multi-occupant or transit vehicles), and ramp terminal treatments (signal timings, added lanes, and roundabouts to improve existing conditions and maximize other management strategies).

We have had some experience in Michigan with ramp metering. It started in the Metro Region in November 1982 (six ramp meters installed on eastbound I-94). Ramp meters were generally retro-fitted into the existing ramp system without significant geometric modifications. During the mid 1980s the number was increased to 28 and ultimately the system was expanded in 1995 to more than 60 locations on I-94 and I-75.

Ramp meters were removed in the early 2000s primarily due to lack of compliance and enforcement, lack of queuing space for vehicles, lack of acceleration distance on the ramps, lack of alternate routes, freeway access inequity between areas with metering and those areas without metering, studies showed freeway congestion started in the suburbs while ramp metering was implemented in the urban core, and only impacted minor flows without a strategy to meter freeway to freeway movements.

Ramp metering can be used on freeway segments where entering traffic compromises efficient free flow operations, on ramps with proper geometrics for storage, acceleration, enforcement and maintenance pullouts and preferential lanes (where applicable), and segments where alternate routes are available to service the traffic diverted by ramp metering.

We found a couple candidate locations through our evaluation of what we've seen so far. We are currently doing a planning study on US-23 from I-96 to M-14 (funding for additional lanes not available in the foreseeable future; ramp improvements at existing interchanges could improve freeway operations; opportunity for designing ramp metering into the project; metered ramp flows would further improve freeway operations during peak periods), and on I-96 from US-23 to I-275.

Commissioner Brosnan asked if we have found that metering works better in conjunction with our changeable copy signs.

Mr. Berridge replied that he wasn't sure. Changeable message signs really were generally targeted more towards the main-line traffic as opposed to the traffic that is on the surface streets getting on to the freeway.

Commissioner Brosnan asked if we looked at doing the high-volume vehicle lanes; she's seeing them used more regularly in other communities close to metropolitan areas.

Mr. Berridge replied that part of the US-23 corridor analysis is taking a look at potential third lanes with a high occupancy vehicle requirement to it. Another place that was under consideration was the expansion of I-75 from 8 Mile to 59.

Commissioner Brosnan then suggested, as we look at the I-96 corridor from US-23 to I-275, that we might want to consider expanding that and going further east on I-96. There is a considerable amount of back-up from Merriman all the way down to Telegraph and those on and off ramps are a mile apart; it's easy to bounce from one to the other and use Inkster (which is Middlebelt) or something like that if people were pointed in that direction during high-peak times.

Commissioner Jung commented that they could use some metering after the games at the Palace. I think it's the State Police that completely shuts down the Lapeer Road entrance on I-75 and I assume it's so they don't have a back-up when people enter the freeway. If you had intermittent entrance onto the freeway, you would get people home a lot more quickly without the congestion.

Supporting Increase Local Transportation Agency Role as Mobility Managers – Sharon Edgar

The Mobility Management (MM) recommendation within the TF2 was to “develop and adopt policies, programs and funding incentives that support local transportation agencies to increase their role as mobility managers”. We are focusing on this as it relates to transit agencies. MM is many things: a shift to a customer-based transit paradigm; an approach to service development and management that focuses on individualized customer markets and provides a variety of services tailored to meet the needs of those markets. It is a responsibility for establishing a coordinated service delivery network to achieve connectivity for customers and efficiency for taxpayers; design and management of the transportation infrastructure so that the services developed can perform effectively and efficiently.

MM compares to traditional transit in that traditional transit focuses on planning, building and operating a physical system (a fixed route system). With MM they are focusing not so much on a physical system, as the needs of individual markets and riders and providing services that meet those needs; you have multiple services and providers. The transit agency is sort of a gatekeeper to those services and providers. In some cases it's their own services, in some cases it's other services.

As a mobility manager, a transit agency ensures that people have the transportation services they need. In other words MM broadens the role of the local transit agency to that of coordinator of transit services, regardless of the source. In simplest terms a transit agency is a travel agent,

either by brokering services (arranging for rides) and/or serving as a one-stop source of information. MM is an efficiency because it increases access to existing services (more transportation options without new services), the technology involved can reduce operating costs, and is a necessary response to the federal maze of funding. MM started to be talked about a lot more after a 2003 General Accounting Office Report to congress that talked about transportation to the transportation-disadvantaged (low income, elderly and persons with disabilities). They identified 62 different federal programs that provide support for transportation; 23 of which aren't even in the USDOT, they are in the Department of Health and Human Services—73% of the money is in the DHHS compared to 13% in the USDOT. This shows that there are a multitude of federal programs supporting passenger mobility.

How does a Transit Agency become a Mobility Manager? They have staff resources that are dedicated to coordinating with human service agencies and other service providers. They are collecting and managing information about all the available services (serving as source of information to the riding public, arranging for passenger trips from multiple sources). You become a Mobility Manager through the increased use of ITS technologies to coordinate among multiple service providers (computer assisted dispatching) and to provide customers with real-time information. Increased fare coordination is a key component of MM so that you can have seamless transfers from one provider to another, or perhaps even a single fare medium used by several service providers.

MM is happening now within Michigan. There are two new federal programs in SAFETEA-LU (Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom). Both are fairly small programs which are believed to be more work than beneficial. JARC is aimed at access to jobs for low income individuals; New Freedom is focused on providing access to jobs, job training and education for persons with disabilities. Both of them provide money for operations and capital, and MM is an eligible expense in both of these. The FTA was trying, through these programs, to encourage transit to get involved in MM.

Some agencies have taken advantage of that opportunity and have added MM to their cadre of services:

Washtenaw County (Peoples Express, WAVE, AATA)

Jointly funded MM program (operated by Peoples Express, started July 2008 using federal funds); the mobility manager is working on creating a web-based transportation and human service agency database, hiring transportation coordinators, coordinating the schedules of 10 transportation providers to cover gaps in the area where services are not currently available.

Shiawassee Area Transit Authority

Started in April 2008 using federal funds; the new mobility manager coordinates and administers “New Freedom” operations, created a resource list to provide referrals through local agencies; uses volunteer drivers for the program.

Blue Water Area Transportation Commission

Started in October 2007 using federal funding; has two part-time staff positions (54 hours/week); they answer questions on what transportation is available (BWATC's directly operated service as well as the service of 10 non-profit agencies that operate under BWATC); they use the voucher program with the nine authorized agencies for JARC and the five authorized agencies for New Freedom.

Suburban Mobility Authority for Regional Transportation (SMART) (Community Partnerships Program)

SMART has been recognized nationally for the way it does business and is also an example of MM where they actually provide financial assistance to have local community service within their group of services. They have partnerships with 73 local communities that operate over 240 small buses. SMART provides community forums, coordinated dispatching, joint capital purchasing. SMART Community Partnership examples are with the Mt. Clemens Community Transportation and the Birmingham Area Senior Coordinating Council where these are very local services, they're focused either on citizens or the general public, but they are actually part of the broader SMART system.

MM could be more widespread but we have not actively tried to track every place it's going on. We know about the ones mentioned because they've started up recently with the federal funding and also because the SMART example has been used widely in the national literature. It really is a paradigm shift. As individuals and as organizations, when we see a problem the simplest approach is to provide the service yourself, and in some cases, the network of providers may on the surface look like duplication. It is certainly not a "one size fits all" solution—what MM means for an agency is going to be different from agency to agency depending on the other resources within their community, the level of human service involvement and their capacity. In the Human Services area they may not want to be "coordinated". They are focused on their specific clients and transportation is a secondary, not primary, activity—they may not want to be part of the transportation system.

This can be done without legislation with technical assistance, pilot projects, start-up or ongoing funding, or try to achieve it through your existing CTF financial assistance. We are working on some of this right now. In the area of technical assistance we have the two SAFETEA-LU programs (New Freedom and JARC), but also in SAFETEA-LU with the requirement in order to access those program you had to have a local Transit-Human Services Coordination Plan. In terms of pilot projects we have the two federal programs being used in Shiawassee, Blue Water, and Washtenaw County. As we watch those develop we can see how we can use these as pilots and provide assistance to others. Those programs also provided start-up or ongoing funding. In terms of existing CTF financial assistance, it is an eligible expense for state operating assistance.

What more could be done? Very aggressive MDOT technical assistance, MDOT funded and documented pilot projects, talk about State start-up or ongoing funding, and continue to try to encourage the use of the existing CTF financial assistance (this would be tied with aggressive technical assistance). In all of these cases it's not such a legislative fix as it is a resource fix, both in terms of staff resources and the financial resources of incentives. In neither case do those exist in the current situation.

Commissioner Jung commented that he thinks public transit is a very important function; he's not for roads and against public transit. Between the feds and the state we are spending about \$800 million on public transit in Michigan. It is absolutely appalling how poorly we are serving the population in Michigan. He has an airline background and has made a hobby out of counting the number of people on buses. An airline company wouldn't be in business long if they had a 2 or 3% load factor; airlines are flying with an 80% load factor. He has seen city of Detroit buses running right behind SMART buses up Woodward Avenue. He's heard it costs more to collect

the fares on some of the bus-lines than they actually take in in revenue. If that's the case, why even collect fares. One of the great ideas expressed in the presentation was the fare coordination. We should utilize the private services out there. He's been at Metro Airport at midnight and couldn't get a taxi—after having waited two hours. An idea could be to take the licensed taxi's, maybe MDOT approve, and make them part of the fare coordination issue. Now instead of people waiting in the rain for a bus that will hopefully come in an hour with one or two other people on it, you can call a taxi company. This will save the state money and provide them better service.

Ms. Jackson concluded the workshop and offered to provide the Commissioners, through the Director, updates to show where the department is within each one of these topic areas. She asked them to provide feedback through Mr. Kelley if this is something they are interested in having.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chair Wahby declared the workshop adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Frank E. Kelley
Commission Advisor