

Green Mountain Transit Board of Commissioners August 20, 2019 - 7:30 a.m. 101 Queen City Road, Burlington VT 05401

The mission of GMT is to promote and operate safe, convenient, accessible, innovative, and sustainable public transportation services in northwest and central Vermont that reduce congestion and pollution, encourage transit oriented development, and enhance the quality of life for all.

7:30 a.m. 1. Open Meeting

7:31 a.m. 2. Adjustment of the Agenda

- 7:33 a.m. 3. Public Comment
- 7:35 a.m. 4. Consent Agenda*
 - May 21, 2019 Board Meeting Minutes
 - July 8, 2019 Special Board Meeting Minutes
 - July 16, 2019 Board Meeting Minutes
 - Check Register
 - GM Report
 - Finance Report
 - ADA and Broker Services Report
 - Maintenance Report
 - Marketing, Planning, Public Affairs Report
 - IT Support, Administrative Support, Training and HR Report
 - Ridership Reports
- 7:38 a.m. 5. State Grant Agreement Award
- 8:00 a.m. 6. Route 14 Service update
- 8:15 a.m. 7. ADA Telephone Survey
- 8:25 a.m. 8. Micro-transit Presentation
- 8:55 a.m. 9. GM Hiring Process



9:05 a.m. 10. Committee Reports

- Leadership Committee: September 9, 2019- 10:30 AM
- Strategy Committee: September 9, 2019- 8:30 AM
- Finance Committee: September 10, 2019- 8:30 AM
- Operations Committee: September 9, 2019- 9:30AM
- Commissioner Comments & Announcements

9:15 a.m. 11. Adjourn

Conference call in number: 802-540-2449 (guest ID# 11592)

Next GMT Board of Commissioners Meeting Date: September 17, 2019

NOTES:

- * Indicates an action agenda item.
- Persons with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in programs or activities are encouraged to contact Jamie Smith at 802-540-2468 at least 48 hours in advance so that proper arrangements can be made. Hearing disabled patrons can contact GMT through the Vermont Relay Service (711).
- Free transportation to and from GMT Board Meetings is available within the GMT service area. To make advance arrangements, please call GMT's Customer Service Representatives at 802-540-2468.
- Municipal Clerks: Please post this public meeting notice pursuant to Act 78 of the Acts of the 1979 Vermont Legislature. Thank you.



GMT Board Minutes

Date: May 21, 2019 Time: 7:30AM Place: **15 Industrial Parkway** Burlington, VT 05401

Present:

Tom Chittenden, Chair, South Burlington Bonnie Waninger, Vice Chair, Washington County Denis Barton, Secretary, Shelburne Paul Bohne, Treasurer, Essex Chapin Kaynor, Commissioner, Williston Amanda Holland, Alt. Commissioner, Grand Isle County John Sharrow, Commissioner, Milton Phil Pouech, Commissioner, Milton Phil Pouech, Commissioner, Hinesburg (via phone) Tasha Wallis, Commissioner, Lamoille County (via phone) Chapin Spencer, Commissioner, Burlington Catherine Dimitruk, Commissioner, Franklin County

Mark A. Sousa, General Manager Cari Whittemore, Executive Assistant Jamie Smith, Marketing and Public Affairs Manager Kimberly Wall, Grants Manager **Patricia Redalieu, Director of Human Resources** Deb Coppola, Senior Accountant

Members of the Public:

Ross McDonald, VTrans

Open Meeting – Chair Chittenden opened the meeting at 7:34 AM. A quorum of the Board was present.

Adjustment to the Agenda- None

Public Comment - None



Approval of the April 2019 Board Meeting Minutes - Commissioner Barton made a motion to approve April meeting minutes with changes to the Executive Session language and adding Commissioner Holland as present. Commissioner Bohne seconded the motion. All were in favor and the minutes were approved.

GM Update- Mr. Sousa stated that the Swiftly app implementation has been pushed to possibly mid-July. Token Transit app will launch June 17. Mr. Sousa stated that he and Mr. Kimball have met with a local solar panel company to gather information for adding panels to the maintenance portion of 15 Industrial Parkway. GMT is working with VEIC regarding the electric busses that will be delivered in August.

Financial Update – Kimberly Wall and Debbie Coppola- Ms. Wall and Ms. Coppola presented the financial documents. Ms. Coppola explained that the transit rate has gone from \$74 to \$70 per hour. Ms. Wall stated that currently the trend shows GMT would end the fiscal year in the area of \$70-\$72 per hour. There was much discussion and questions regarding the transit rate. Medicaid is not taken into effect, but GMT is not expecting a deficit. There were additional a conversations regarding the memo. Jamie Smith gave an overview of the advertisement budget. GMT's new Finance Director starts May 28, 2019.

Token Transit Memo*- Jamie Smith presented the Token Transit memo. At the April board meeting Commissioner Spencer mentioned he would like the memo as a voting item. Ms. Smith discussed GMT procurement policy. Token Transit app should launch with the June 17 fare increase. The contract with Token Transit is a one year pilot. Commissioner Bohne proposed a motion that GMT approve Token Transit's 1 year pilot software and subscription. Commissioner Sharrow seconded the Token Transit memo passed unanimously.

VTrans Update – Ross MacDonald- Mr. MacDonald gave an overview regarding where VTrans is with both the Token Transit and Swifly apps. VTrans have been testing the Swifly app with favorable results. Go VT will spend \$30,000.00 marketing these apps, in addition to what GMT will be spending.

Mr. MacDonald gave a grant overview and status.

Berlin facility- The UST storage tank is being removed. VTrans is working with GMT to install a 2 inch sewer line.



Hiring Practices at GMT – Trish Redalieu- Ms. Redalieu presented the GMT hiring process power point that was previously presented to the Operations committee. It was suggested that due to time constraints, suggestions would be brought to the separate committees.

Commissioner Spencer asked have we hired people by processes other than what we are seeing here? Ms. Redalieu said that yes, sometimes we circumvent or shorten the process. She goes on to explain an example regarding fully endorsed drivers. Commissioner Spencer followed-up by stating he would like the Board to fully understand the scope of when policy has shifted or changed in the past and what hirings (if any) we made that have been different than the process outlined to give a sense of the culture.

Board of Commissioners Terms- Chair Chittenden gave notice that he will be stepping down as the Chair but will continue to be a member of the board. Also, Commissioner Barton will be leaving.

Committee reports-

- Strategy Committee: Next scheduled meeting is June 10th at 8:30 am. Discussed looking forward to July and where the committee is with strategic goals and how to proceed for the remainder of the year.
- Operations Committee: Next scheduled meeting is June 10th @ 9:30 am. The PIP is in good shape went over the strategic goals and ADA metrics. Trying to find ways to measure the ADA program.
- Leadership Committee: Next scheduled meeting is June 10th @ 10:30 am. Basically the same as Strategy. Discussed looking forward to July and where the committee is with strategic goals and how to proceed for the remainder of the year.
- Finance Committee: Next scheduled meeting is June 11th @ 8:30 am. Thanked staff for doing a great job digging in.

Commissioner Comments and Announcements- Chapin Kaynor sat in on a round table with CCRPC. There were a lot of helpful comments addressing issues regarding rural transit.

Other Business - There was no other business.

Executive Session- Commissioner Waninger moved to find that premature general public knowledge of the General Manager's contract would clearly place GMT at a substantial disadvantage; Commissioner Bohne seconded. Motion carried.



Commissioner Waninger moved to enter Executive Session at 9:14 am; Commissioner Spencer seconded. Motion carried.

Commissioner Dimitruk moved to leave Executive Session at 9:45 am; Commissioner Spencer seconded. Motion carried.

Adjourn – Commissioner Dimitruk moved to adjourn; Commission Waninger seconded. Motion carried at 9:52 am.

Next GMT meeting date: June 18, 2019 @ 7:30 am at GMT 15 Industrial Parkway, Burlington, VT

Respectfully Submitted,

Denis Barton, Secretary



GMT Board Meeting Minutes -- DRAFT Monday, July 8, 2018 at 7:30 AM

CCRPC Offices 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202 Winooski, VT 05404

Staff Present: None.

Commissioners Present:

Tom Chittenden, Chair, South Burlington Bonnie Waninger, Vice Chair, Washington County Dan Currier, Washington County Alternate Paul Bohne, Treasurer, Essex (phone) Marti Powers, Essex Alternate Chapin Kaynor, Secretary, Williston John Sharrow, Milton Phil Pouech, Hinesburg (phone) Tasha Wallis, Lamoille County (phone) Chapin Spencer, Burlington Catherine Dimitruk, Franklin County Bob Buermann, Grand Isle County Lee Krohn, Shelburne Alternate Ray Coffey, Winooski Alternate

Others Present: Ed Adrian, attorney for GMT

Open Meeting: Chair Chittenden opened the meeting at 7:32 AM. A quorum of the board was present.

- 1. Agenda Review or Changes: None.
- 2. Public Comment: None.



3. Possible Executive Session to discuss Personnel Matter:

Commissioner Spencer moved to find executive session was required to discuss a personnel matter. Alternate Commissioner Coffey seconded. Passed unanimously. Commissioner Sharrow moved to enter executive session and to invite GMT attorney Ed Adrian to attend. Commissioner Buermann seconded. Passed unanimously. Executive Session entered at 7:40.

Commissioner Bohne and Alternate Commissioner Currier left the meeting during executive session.

Motion to exit executive session by Commissioner Sharrow, seconded by Commissioner Buermann. Passed unanimously. Executive Session exited at 9:32.

4. Possible Action by the Board Related to a Personnel Matter:

- A. Commissioner Chittenden moved to place the employee discussed in executive session on paid administrative leave pending outcome of a 3rd party investigation. Seconded by Alternate Commissioner Powers. Passed unanimously.
- B. Commissioner Dimitruk moved to authorize the chair to appoint an Acting General Manager for GMT. Alternate Commissioner Coffey seconded. Passed unanimously.
- C. Commissioner Sharrow moved to give GMT Attorney Ed Adrian authority to engage the services of an independent investigator to investigate a personnel matter. Seconded by Commissioner Buermann. Passed unanimously.

5. Adjourn: Commissioner Waninger moved to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Spencer. Passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:37 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chapin Kaynor, Secretary



GMT Board Minutes

Date: July, 16 2019 Time: 7:30AM Place: **19 Gregory Drive** South Burlington, VT

Present:

Tom Chittenden, Chair, South Burlington Bonnie Waninger, Vice Chair, Washington County Paul Bohne, Treasurer, Essex Chapin Kaynor, Commissioner, Williston John Sharrow, Commissioner, Milton Phil Pouech, Commissioner, Hinesburg (phone) Tasha Wallis, Commissioner, Lamoille County (phone) Chapin Spencer, Commissioner, Burlington Catherine Dimitruk, Commissioner, Franklin County Bob Buermann, Commissioner, Grand Isle County Ray Coffey, Commissioner, Winooski

Jon Moore, Acting General Manager Cari Whittemore, Executive Assistant Jamie Smith, Marketing and Public Affairs Manager Nicholas Foss, Director of Finance (phone) Deb Coppola, Senior Accountant Matthew Kimball, Capital Projects Manager Patricia Redalieu, Director of Human Resources

Open Meeting –Chair Chittenden opened the meeting at 7:34 AM. A quorum of the Board was present.

Adjustment to the Agenda- None

Public Comment- No Comment

 15 Industrial Parkway, Burlington, VT 05401 | T: 802-864-2282 F: 802-864-5564

 6088 VT Route 12, Berlin, VT 05602 | T: 802-223-7287 F: 802-223-6236

 375 Lake Road, Suite 5, St. Albans, VT 05478 | T: 802-527-2181 F: 802-527-5302



Route 14 New Service Planning & Implementation Process*- Mrs. Smith described the conversation with VTrans regarding VTrans and RCT. The Route 14 would begin approximately October 2019. This would be fare free, M-F round trip with RCT covering the morning and GMT would cover the afternoon. Ms. Smith asked to move forward with Public meetings and a VTrans fund 1 year pilot program. VTrans is committed to continue after 1 year with a possible fee. There was discussion regarding the viability of the route. The Board asked for additional information prior to approval. Commissioner Sharrow moved to table this conversation until next month. Commissioner Spencer seconded the motion. The motion to table the Route 14 Route discussion was approved and passed unanimously.

Nextgen Update- Ms. Smith proposed that GMT table the rural NextGen implementation because the Micro transit study changed the landscape of transportation for downtown Montpelier. Also, GMT would like to give Jen Wood an opportunity to get out and have conversations with public. GMT would like to double check on the cost saving efforts that they once felt would work and do an in-depth analysis. Commissioner Kaynor would like further reporting next month from staff regarding micro transit in Montpelier. Commissioner Sharrow proposed a motion to postpone the rural NextGen implementations until September. Commissioner Kaynor seconded the motion. Motion passes unanimously. Ms. Smith also gave an overview of the Urban NextGen implementation.

Queen City Road Roof Replacement Contract Award*- Mr. Kimball presented a memo regarding the useful life of the roof at 101 Queen City Road. He discussed his conversations with bidder firms. Commissioner Dimitruk proposed a motion to accept the bid from Monahan & Loughlin for \$641,000.00. Commissioner Buermann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

FY20 Capital Budget Amendment- Mr. Kimball discussed amendments for the Montpelier transit center budget. Mr. Kimball also stated that GMT was not given the grant money for an employee to staff the transit center. Commissioner Dimitruk proposed a motion to accept the amendments to the Capital Budget. Commissioner Bohne seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

State Grant Application Process & Update- Mr. Foss presented his memo and gave an update on the grant. He also gave a breakdown on the awards from VTrans.

Resolution for Check Signing Authority* Memo- Mr. Foss presented a resolution to temporarily remove Mark Sousa's check signing authority. Mr. Foss also presented a request to temporarily removed Mr. Sousa from the business credit card account. Commissioner Dimitruk proposed a motion to update the check signing policy as presented. Commissioner Waninger seconded the motion. Commissioner Dimitruk

 15 Industrial Parkway, Burlington, VT 05401 | T: 802-864-2282 F: 802-864-5564

 6088 VT Route 12, Berlin, VT 05602 | T: 802-223-7287 F: 802-223-6236

 375 Lake Road, Suite 5, St. Albans, VT 05478 | T: 802-527-2181 F: 802-527-5302



proposed a motion to update the business credit card account as presented. Commissioner Bohne seconded the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

Board Retreat Meeting Date & Topics- No specific individuals have been chosen to present. The retreat will potentially be pushed to September.

Committee Reports

- Leadership Committee: No updates. Next meeting TBD
- Strategy Committee: No updates. Next meeting TBD
- Finance Committee: Commissioner Bohne would like to hear from staff GMTSs initiative to keep the FY20 budget in line. Next meeting TBD
- Operations Committee: Next Meeting August 12, 2019, 9:30 a.m. Commissioner Sharrow will serve as Chair of Operations.
- Commissioner Comments & Announcements -none

Chair Chittenden proposed to add Jon Moore and Ed Adrian to the executive session to discuss three personnel matters. Commissioner Dimitruk moved to find that premature knowledge of the personnel matters would clearly place GMT at a substantial disadvantage. Commissioner Bohne seconded. The motion passes. Commissioner Waninger moved to enter executive session, inviting Jon Moore and Ed Adrian to receive legal advice. Commissioner Sharrow seconded the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

Jon Moore, Phil Pouech, and Tasha Wallis left the meeting during the executive session.

Motion to exit executive session was made by Paul Bohne, seconded by Catherine Dimitruk. Passed unanimously. Executive session exited at 10:07.

In open session...

Bonnie Waninger moved to authorize the chair to resolve a personnel matter based on discussion in executive session. Seconded by Bob Buermann. Passed unanimously.



John Sharrow moved to adjourn. Seconded by Bonnie Waninger. Passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 10:09 AM.

Next GMT Board of Commissioners Meeting Date: August 20, 2019

Respectfully Submitted,

Chapin Kaynor, Secretary

 15 Industrial Parkway, Burlington, VT 05401 | T: 802-864-2282 F: 802-864-5564

 6088 VT Route 12, Berlin, VT 05602 | T: 802-223-7287 F: 802-223-6236

 375 Lake Road, Suite 5, St. Albans, VT 05478 | T: 802-527-2181 F: 802-527-5302

Document Date	Vendor ID	Vendor Name	Document Number	Document Amount	
6/28/19	V10	Office of child Support	EFT000000014410	555.77	
6/28/19		ICMA		2,550.56	Retirement
6/28/19		Vt Dept Of Taxes		13,602.08	State Payroll Taxes
6/28/19		Charles Schwab		21,426.58	Retirement
6/28/19		IRS		98,868.70	Federal Payroll Taxes
7/1/19	V702	Lincoln National Life Insuranc	88850	11,781.30	Insurance
7/1/19	V1599	Miller, Holly & Bob 2017 Char	88851	955.09	Lease
7/1/19	V1368	Prime Middlebury LLC	88852	787.50	Lease
7/1/19	V904	SunTrust Equipment Finance	88853	46,442.51	Annual Bus Loan Payment
7/1/19	V1446	M T Wallets, LLC	EFT000000014411	2,800.00	Lease
7/5/19	V1423	Alling, Andrew	88854	46.40	
7/5/19	V1025	Alter, Charles	88855	187.34	Volunteer
7/5/19	V156	Anthony, Peter	88856	341.62	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1135	Blanchard, Thomas	88857	284.20	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1482	Cady, Duane	88858	183.86	Volunteer
7/5/19	V471	Constantine, Julia	88859	283.04	Volunteer
7/5/19	V629	Delano, Paula	88860	35.96	
7/5/19	V1573	Fairbanks, Dori	88861	368.30	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1084	Fisher, Allan	88862	65.54	
7/5/19	V1694	Hebda, Jerome	88863	34.80	
7/5/19	V1687	Houghton, Gregory	88864	854.92	Volunteer
7/5/19	V203	Ladd, Joyce	88865	311.46	Volunteer
7/5/19	V205	LeBlanc, Alice	88866	52.20	
7/5/19	V181	Owen, Helen	88867	1,885.58	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1719	Pelletier, Charles	88868	68.44	
7/5/19	V1720	Schmitt, Karlyn	88869	240.12	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1655	Sciria, Andrew	88870	434.42	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1733	Slack, Robert	88871	56.26	
7/5/19	V1699	Wade, Judith	88872	56.84	
7/5/19	V881	Wakefield, Richard	88873	275.50	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1595	Waller, Marlys	88874	58.00	
7/5/19	V1549	Ware, Michael	88875	89.90	
7/5/19	V944	Woodward, Patricia	88876	706.44	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1550	Adobe Systems Incorporated	88877	2,939.28	Marketing Software
7/5/19	V964	Campbell, Arthur	88878	192.31	DCAP Reimbursement
7/5/19	V1487	Chamberlin, Justin	88879	2,500.03	FSA Reimbursement
7/5/19	V129	Lawrence, Richard	88880	191.69	FSA Reimbursement
7/5/19	V1684	McNally, Mike	88881	190.00	Shoe Reimbursement
7/5/19	V290	Peterson Consulting, Inc.	88882	1,275.00	Capital Project Consulting
7/5/19	V915	Puzic, Aid	88883	65.00	
7/5/19	V1166	Sinanovic, Almir	88884	100.00	Shoe Reimbursement
7/5/19	V439	Takele, Desta	88885	357.00	FSA Reimbursement
7/5/19	V311	Teamsters Local 597	88886	7,638.00	Union Dues
7/5/19	V251	Wex Fleet Universal	88887	12,398.99	Fuel
7/5/19	V1723	Abare, Ronald	EFT000000014412	824.18	Volunteer
7/5/19	V153	Alburgh Taxi	EFT000000014413	1,937.65	Volunteer
7/5/19	V55	Boudreau, James	EFT000000014414	1,043.42	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1150	Bruley SR, Mark	EFT000000014415	1,529.46	Volunteer
7/5/19	V548	Burnor, David	EFT000000014416	422.24	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1291	Callan, Linda	EFT000000014417	177.48	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1675	Carkeet, David	EFT000000014418	38.28	
7/5/19	V1707	Chase, Betty	EFT000000014419	661.20	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1676	Croteau, William	EFT000000014420	809.10	Volunteer

7/5/19	V60	Farr, Delores	EFT00000014421	661.78	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1117	Hall, John	EFT000000014422	452.40	Volunteer
7/5/19	V170	Hertz, Kenneth	EFT000000014423	263.32	Volunteer
7/5/19	V67	Jewett, Sheryl	EFT000000014424	345.68	Volunteer
7/5/19	V174	Langlois, Paulette	EFT000000014425	1,622.84	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1420	Lawyer, Ronald	EFT000000014426	276.66	Volunteer
7/5/19	V70	LeClair, Raymond	EFT000000014427	730.80	Volunteer
7/5/19	V71	Lightholder, Stephen	EFT000000014428	261.58	Volunteer
7/5/19	V74	Markham, Laurel	EFT000000014429	528.38	Volunteer
7/5/19	V75	Martin, Ronald	EFT000000014430	714.56	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1018	Metivier, Shelli	EFT00000014431	765.60	Volunteer
7/5/19	V82	Parah, Donna	EFT000000014432	522.00	Volunteer
7/5/19	V83	Parah, Maurice	EFT00000014433	1,393.74	Volunteer
7/5/19	V86	Pike, Gail	EFT00000014434	1,582.24	Volunteer
7/5/19	V771	Sammons, Chandra	EFT00000014435	613.06	Volunteer
7/5/19	V89	Sayers, Gail	EFT000000014436	671.64	Volunteer
7/5/19	V741	Steiner, Timothy	EFT00000014437	62.06	
7/5/19	V93	Timm, Marta	EFT00000014438	815.48	Volunteer
7/5/19	V522	Turcotte, S Jeanette	EFT000000014439	162.40	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1725	Utton, Debra	EFT000000014440	787.64	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1623	Wells, Roy	EFT000000014441	208.22	Volunteer
7/5/19	V1182	Charissakis, John	EFT000000014442	125.00	FSA Reimbursement
7/5/19	V37	Meigs, Dale	EFT00000014443	100.00	Shoe Reimbursement
7/5/19	V38	Moore, Jon	EFT00000014444	192.31	DCAP Reimbursement
7/5/19	V17	Smith, Jamie L	EFT00000014445	192.30	DCAP Reimbursement
7/5/19	V39	Sweeney, Cecil	EFT00000014446	293.09	FSA Reimbursement
//5/19	V1626	Whiting, Jeremy	EF100000014447	192.31	DCAP Reimbursement

Document Date		Vendor ID	Vendor Name	Document Number	Document	Amount
	7/12/19	V10	Vermont Office of Ch	EFT000000014448	555.77	
	7/15/19	V1467	Charles Schwab	V1467 2019 0715	17,045.66	Retirement
	7/15/19	V265	ICMA	V265 2019 0715	1,301.28	Retirement
	7/15/19	V266	IRS - EFTPS	V266 2019 0715	94,407.24	Federal Payroll Taxes
	7/15/19	V364	Vermont Dept of Taxe	V364 2019 0715	12,716.03	State Payroll Taxes
	7/17/19	V1305	Allegiant Care	88889	#########	Insurance
	7/19/19	V854	S2Technology	88890	4.833.75	Software Help and Training Invoice
	7/19/19	V1025	Alter Charles	88891	109 62	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V156	Anthony Peter	88892	564 92	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V1099	Barnett Wendy	88893	1 053 28	Volunteer
	7/10/10	V1135	Blanchard Thomas	88894	25 52	Volunteen
	7/10/10	V1482	Cady Duane	88895	52.78	
	7/10/10	V1706	Cobb Evan	88896	15.66	
	7/10/10	V1700	Constantino Julia	88807	245.24	Voluntoor
	7/10/10	V471	Eairbanks Dori	00097	243.34	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V1575	FairDanks, Don	00030	224.40	Volunteen
	7/19/19	V1084	Fisher, Alian	88899	69.02	N 1 .
	7/19/19	V1516	Gagnon, Chaz	88900	132.48	Volunteer
	//19/19	V1687	Houghton, Gregory	88901	864.78	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V432	Jamieson, Mahlon Ric	88902	71.92	
	7/19/19	V1669	Kriss, Bonnie	88903	46.4	
	7/19/19	V203	Ladd, Joyce	88904	183.28	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V1704	Larrow, Michael	88905	60.48	
	7/19/19	V1718	Luke, Norma	88906	27.84	
	7/19/19	V1745	Mead, Brean	88907	194.04	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V605	Murphy, Sidney	88908	44.08	
	7/19/19	V181	Owen, Helen	88909	2,851.28	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V1138	Pease, Charles	88910	190.08	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V1719	Pelletier, Charles	88911	208.8	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V165	Sanborn, Raeline	88912	97.2	
	7/19/19	V1720	Schmitt, Karlyn	88913	70.76	
	7/19/19	V1655	Sciria, Andrew	88914	446.6	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V1747	Stetson, Nicole	88915	63.8	
	7/19/19	V1614	Vermont Ride Netwo	88916	701.75	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V881	Wakefield, Richard	88917	163.56	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V1595	Waller, Marlys	88918	305.08	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V1549	Ware, Michael	88919	38.28	
	7/19/19	V962	Williams, Kenneth	88920	104.4	Volunteer
	7/19/19	V1685	Barnes, Thomas	88921	263.22	FSA Reimbursement
	7/19/19	V964	Campbell, Arthur	88922	192.31	DCAP Reimbursement
	7/19/19	V1624	Carleton Victoria	88923	146.48	FSA Reimbursement
	7/19/19	V1487	Chamberlin Justin	88924	192 31	DCAP Reimbursement
	7/19/19	V354	Devarney Rodney	88925	1 100 00	Tool Allowance
	7/19/19	V114	Faiobi Adeleke	88926	1,100.00	Shoe Reimbursement
	7/10/10	V1/13	Holm Cody	88927	1 100 00	
	7/10/10	V1413 V1657	Kennedy Rachel	88928	1,100.00	Mileage Reimburgement
	7/10/10	V1057	Kennedy, Nacher	88020	1 244 62	Tool Allowance and Travel Peimburgement
	7/10/10	V350	Mabaa Jopathan	00929	244.03	Tool Allowance and Traver Reinbursement
	7/10/10	V430	Diantiar Stove	00930	1 100 00	Tool Allowance
	7/19/19	V1071	Planuer, Steve	00501	216.69	Niles as Deimburgement
	7/19/19	V1105	Posner, Joruan	00952	1 100 00	
	7/19/19	v 144	Tambon Michalas	00033	1,100.00	i oui Allowalice
	7/19/19	V 1000	Tampon, Nicholas	88934	100	Shoe Kelmbursement
	7/19/19	V1312	rambon, Phil	88935	100	Shoe Keimbursement
	//19/19	v2/9	ABC Bus Companies-	88936	4,289.72	5 Part Invoices
	//19/19	V1550	Adobe Systems Incorp	88937	23.66	
	7/19/19	V217	Airgas USA, LLC	88938	391.38	
	7/19/19	V332	Alliance Bus Group Ind	88939	201.05	
	7/19/19	V384	American General Life	88940	675	
	7/19/19	V214	AT&T Mobility	88941	74.64	

7/19/19 V399	Axle Tech Internationa	88942	58.7	
7/19/19 V1334	Background Investigat	88943	259	
7/19/19 V1610	Bolduc Auto Salvage,	88944	225	
7/19/19 V284	Brenntag Lubricants N	88945	7,084.56	6 Part Invoice
7/19/19 V1126	Burlington Code Enfoi	88946	275.48	
7/19/19 V224	Burlington Communic	88947	1,616.65	3 Radio Repair and maintance Invoices
7/19/19 V226	Burlington Public Worl	88948	2,355.80	3 Water Bills
7/19/19 V227	Burlington Telecom	88949	2,695.67	IT Invoice
7/19/19 V69	C.E Wendel Electric	88950	1,538.53	Replaced Lights In Berlin
7/19/19 V1369	Capitol City Auto Mar	88951	293.17	
7/19/19 V481	Capitol Steel & Supply	88952	1,960.40	Replaced Grates in Stowe
7/19/19 V851	Champlain Medical	88953	320	
7/19/19 V293	Charlebois, R.R Inc.	88954	3,882.78	Part and Towing Invoices
7/19/19 V220	Class C Solutions Grou	88955	1.317.32	2 Part Invoices
7/19/19 V1357	CleanPro, Inc	88956	599.46	
7/19/19 V1240	ClearChoiceMD	88957	95	
7/19/19 V600	Cody Chevrolet	88958	1.863.32	23 Part and Credit Invoices
7/19/19 V236	Colonial Supplementa	88959	34 95	
7/19/19 V390	Commons Associates	88960	750	
7/19/19 V928	Conway Office Solutio	88961	157 58	
7/19/19 V238	Crystal Bock Bottled M	88962	212 17	
7/10/10 1/230	Cummins Northeast I	88963	2 / 5 2 5 7	5 Part Invoices
7/19/19 V12/6	Da Capo Publishing dl	88964	1 850 00	Marketing Invoice
7/19/19 1/240	Danform Shoes	88965	1,050.00	Warketing invoice
7/10/10 \/242		88966	401.5	
7/10/10 \/250	Eichor Auto Parts	88967	2 2 4 2 0 2 0	28 Part Invoices
7/10/10 1/252	FlootWayo Partners	88968	2,249.30	Padia Papaatar Invoices
7/19/19 1225	File Wave Partners, L	00900	5,042.00	Radio Repeater invoices
7/19/19 01347	Foley Distributing Corp	00909	554.70	
7/19/19 V394	Formula Ford Inc.	88970	011.84	
7/19/19 1/99	Gauthier Trucking Cor	00971	304.14	
7/19/19 V250	Genare	00972	2,519.30	3 Bus Ticket Invoices
7/19/19 V257	Gillig Corp.	88973	7,321.13	7 Part Invoices
7/19/19 V258		88974	39.9	
7/19/19 V259	Grainger	88975	119.48	
7/19/19 V260	Green Mountain Kenv	88976	2,381.25	20 Part and Credit Invoices
7/19/19 V261	Green Mountain Powe	88977	1,581.92	
7/19/19 V262	Hall Communication,	88978	1,254.00	Recruitment Invoice
7/19/19 V263	Heritage Ford	88979	166.4	
7/19/19 V1744	Hine Bros. Inc.	88980	1,293.12	Part Invoice
7/19/19 V264	IBF Solutions, Inc.	88981	510.52	
7/19/19 V1204	Interstate Batteries	88982	376.28	
7/19/19 V1749	IR Analyzers Vector M	88983	700	
7/19/19 V1748	Jeffery Shupert	88984	1,840.00	New Bus Inspections
7/19/19 V646	Keystone	88985	1,100.00	Part Invoice
7/19/19 V328	Kirk's Automotive Inc.	88986	4,078.43	7 Part Invoices
7/19/19 V1509	Lawson Products, Inc	88987	297.51	
7/19/19 V473	Limoge & Sons Garag	88988	315	
7/19/19 V268	Loomis	88989	208.27	
7/19/19 V1191	Lucky's Trailer Sales Ir	88990	1,234.05	8 Part Invoices
7/19/19 V1455	Mag & Sons Clothing	88991	760.88	
7/19/19 V1618	Management Safegu	88992	300	
7/19/19 V275	McNeil Leddy & Shea	88993	166.5	
7/19/19 V1068	Midwest Bus Corpora	88994	334.25	
7/19/19 V278	Mohawk Mfg. & Supp	88995	1,710.61	2 Part Invoices
7/19/19 V1709	Monaghan Safar Ducl	88996	13,700.00	Legal Fees
7/19/19 V280	Mutual of Omaha Insu	88997	28.4	
7/19/19 V792	Myers Container Serv	88998	134.45	
7/19/19 V283	Neopart LLC	88999	25.98	
7/19/19 V996	New England Air Syst	89000	442	
· · ·	5 - 5 - 5		=	

7/19/19	V1645	Norris, Inc.	89001	19,490.60	Final Security Invoice Burlington
7/19/19	V950	Northern ToyotaLift	89002	1,537.87	3 Part Invoices
7/19/19	V223	O'Reilly Auto Enterpris	89003	32.8	
7/19/19	V863	P & P Septic Service, I	89004	360	
7/19/19	V1484	Parsons Environment	89005	24.31	
7/19/19	V545	Pitney Bowes - Leasin	89006	75	
7/19/19	V291	Prevost Parts	89007	580.26	
7/19/19	V200	Roto-Rooter	89008	850	
7/19/19	V296	Rouse Tire Sales	89009	6,467.70	9 Tire Invoices
7/19/19	V297	Safety-Kleen Systems	89010	109.3	
7/19/19	V299	SB Collins, Inc.	89011	3,761.25	Fuel
7/19/19	V686	Shearer Chevrolet	89012	1.699.31	4 Part Invoices
7/19/19	V637	Snap-on Equipment	89013	232	
7/19/19	V301	Sovernet	89014	1.075.65	IT Invoice
7/19/19	V1678	Tera Office Solutions	89015	313 15	
7/19/19	V734	Thermo King Northea	89016	1 984 95	3 Part Invoices
7/19/19	V273	Transit Holding Inc	89017	8 574 68	11 Part Invoices
7/19/19	V1030	UniFirst Corporation	89018	1 157 98	
7/19/19	V315	United Parcel Service	89019	12.06	
7/10/10	V33/	Vanasse Hangen Brus	89020	1 033 78	2 Professional Service Invoices
7/10/10	V525		89020	1,033.70	2 Holessional Service involces
7/10/10	V 555	VAS TOOIS, LLC	09021	27.0	
7/10/10	V070 V201	Veriton Wireless	09022	096.60	
7/19/19	V 3 9 1	Verizon Wireless	09023	70.74	
7/19/19	V410	Vermont lafermention	80024	79.74	
7/19/19	V 1459	Vermont Information	69025 80026	240	Morte Crow Invoice
7/19/19	V305		09020	2,500.00	work Crew invoice
7/19/19	V892	VOX AM/ FM, LLC	89027	800	Final Dama Inc.
7/19/19	V496	Weston, Don Excavat	89028	38,230.94	
7/19/19	V352	Wiemann-Lamphere	89029	8,529.04	5 Consulting Invoices
7/19/19	V454	World Publications	89030	106.3	
7/19/19	V796	Yipes Auto Accessorie	89031	563.7	
7/19/19	V1080	Young, Michael	89032	/3.99	
7/19/19	V361	Vermont, State of - A	89033	75	
7/19/19	V814	Nelle, Jordan	89034	2,750.00	2 Consulting Invoices
7/19/19	V1723	Abare, Ronald	EFT000000014449	608.42	Volunteer
7/19/19	V153	Alburgh Taxi	EFT000000014450	1,328.50	Volunteer
7/19/19	V55	Boudreau, James	EFT000000014451	819.54	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1150	Bruley SR, Mark	EFT000000014452	1,469.72	Volunteer
7/19/19	V548	Burnor, David	EFT000000014453	343.94	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1291	Callan, Linda	EFT000000014454	437.9	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1675	Carkeet, David	EFT000000014455	179.8	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1707	Chase, Betty	EFT000000014456	527.8	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1676	Croteau, William	EFT000000014457	1,291.66	Volunteer
7/19/19	V60	Farr, Delores	EFT000000014458	781.26	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1117	Hall, John	EFT000000014459	493	Volunteer
7/19/19	V67	Jewett, Sheryl	EFT000000014460	386.28	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1420	Lawyer, Ronald	EFT000000014461	636.84	Volunteer
7/19/19	V70	LeClair, Raymond	EFT000000014462	794.6	Volunteer
7/19/19	V71	Lightholder, Stephen	EFT000000014463	98.6	
7/19/19	V74	Markham, Laurel	EFT000000014464	637.42	Volunteer
7/19/19	V75	Martin, Ronald	EFT000000014465	790.54	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1018	Metivier, Shelli	EFT000000014466	612.48	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1570	Murphy Sandra	EFT000000014467	1,000.50	Volunteer
7/19/19	V82	Parah, Donna	EFT000000014468	537.66	Volunteer
7/19/19	V83	Parah, Maurice	EFT000000014469	800.98	Volunteer
7/19/19	V86	Pike, Gail	EFT000000014470	778.36	Volunteer
7/19/19	V771	Sammons, Chandra	EFT000000014471	443.7	Volunteer
7/19/19	V89	Sayers, Gail	EFT000000014472	897.26	Volunteer
7/19/19	V93	Timm, Marta	EFT000000014473	789.38	Volunteer
		-			

7/19/19	V522	Turcotte, S Jeanette	EFT000000014474	214.02	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1725	Utton, Debra	EFT000000014475	622.92	Volunteer
7/19/19	V1623	Wells, Roy	EFT000000014476	326.54	Volunteer
7/19/19	V14	Bruce, Judith	EFT000000014477	176.85	FSA Reimbursement
7/19/19	V104	Chagnon, Robert	EFT000000014478	1,100.00	Tool Allowance
7/19/19	V1182	Charissakis, John	EFT000000014479	15	
7/19/19	V29	Hirsch, Alain	EFT000000014480	180.98	FSA Reimbursement
7/19/19	V34	Maple, Walter	EFT000000014481	1,100.00	Tool Allowance
7/19/19	V35	McDonald, Pam	EFT000000014482	75	
7/19/19	V38	Moore, Jon	EFT000000014483	192.31	DCAP Reimbursement
7/19/19	V747	Nassau II, Jason	EFT000000014484	898.91	FSA Reimbursement
7/19/19	V17	Smith, Jamie L	EFT000000014485	192.3	DCAP Reimbursement
7/19/19	V1474	Whitaker, Cheryl	EFT000000014486	1,269.90	FSA and Travel Reimbursement
7/19/19	V1626	Whiting, Jeremy	EFT000000014487	192.31	DCAP Reimbursement

Document	Date
----------	------

ment Date		Vendor ID	Vendor Name	Document Number	Document Amount	
	7/24/19	V468	Vermont Departme	89038	92	
	7/26/19	V316	Able Paint, Glass & F	89039	51.26	
	7/26/19	V415	Amazon	89040	2,250.14	18 Office Supply and IT Invoices
	7/26/19	V219	Aubuchon C/O Blue	89041	147.5	
	7/26/19	V1334	Background Investig	89042	115	
	7/26/19	V872	Bellwether Craftsme	89043	300	
	7/26/19	V284	Brenntag Lubricants	89044	448.25	
	7/26/19	V225	Burlington Electric D	89045	959.63	
	7/26/19	V228	C.I.D.E.R., Inc.	89046	18,746.29	E & D And Medicaid
	7/26/19	V293	Charlebois, R.R Inc.	89047	1,304.93	2 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V220	Class C Solutions Gr	89048	21	
	7/26/19	V1240	ClearChoiceMD	89049	665	
	7/26/19	V239	Cummins Northeast	89050	4,359.85	2 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V241	D & W Diesel, Inc.	89051	3,257.43	5 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V401	Dell Business Credit	89052	6,244.64	3 Computer Invoices
	7/26/19	V246	Duffy Waste & Recy	89053	59.5	
	7/26/19	V321	Empire Janitorial Su	89054	60.42	
	7/26/19	V403	Firetech Sprinkler Cc	89055	290	
	7/26/19	V250	Fisher Auto Parts	89056	1,870.36	11 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V252	FleetPride, Inc	89057	77.76	
	7/26/19	V1347	Foley Distributing Cc	89058	604.49	
	7/26/19	V256	Genfare	89059	1,485.85	Bus Tickets
	7/26/19	V257	Gillig Corp.	89060	8,740.40	6 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V1129	Global Montello Gro	89061	32,842.00	Fuel
	7/26/19	V258	Gordon Stamp & En	89062	14.51	
	7/26/19	V259	Grainger	89063	904	
	7/26/19	V260	Green Mountain Ker	89064	777.9	
	7/26/19	V261	Green Mountain Po	89065	164.06	
	7/26/19	V263	Heritage Ford	89066	1,107.65	4 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V1744	Hine Bros. Inc.	89067	347.15	
	7/26/19	V328	Kirk's Automotive In	89068	244.21	
	7/26/19	V1191	Lucky's Trailer Sales	89069	2,176.88	2 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V276	Metalworks	89070	58.5	
	7/26/19	V1750	Midas Auto Service	89071	105.5	
	7/26/19	V329	Minuteman Press	89072	63.86	
	7/26/19	V278	Mohawk Mfg. & Sur	89073	2,474.84	2 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V792	Mvers Container Se	89074	268.9	
	7/26/19	V996	New England Air Sy:	89075	1,784.00	Furnace Work Berlin
	7/26/19	V223	O'Reilly Auto Enterp	89076	1,140.93	3 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V660	Panurgy, Vermont Ir	89077	260	
	7/26/19	V289	People's United Busi	89078	9,955.82	4 Business Credit Cards
	7/26/19	V291	Prevost Parts	89079	420.29	
	7/26/19	V518	Queen City Steel	89080	127	
	7/26/19	V200	Roto-Rooter	89081	775	
	7/26/19	V296	Rouse Tire Sales	89082	926.36	
	7/26/19	V297	Safety-Kleen Systen	89083	405.43	
	7/26/19	V299	SB Collins, Inc.	89084	60.41	
	7/26/19	V686	Shearer Chevrolet	89085	5.143.56	4 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V273	Transit Holding. Inc	89086	14.417.44	15 Part Invoices
	7/26/19	V718	Transit Resource Ce	89087	900	-
	7/26/19	V1030	UniFirst Corporation	89088	352.24	
	7/26/19	V876	Vehicle Maintenanc	89089	27 87	
	7/26/19	V391	Verizon Wireless	89090	4.197.08	3 IT BILLS
	,				,	

7/26/19	V335	Vermont Departme	89091	2,853.20	Quarterly Unemployment
7/26/19	V361	Vermont, State of -	89092	160	
7/26/19	V1683	VHV Company	89093	349.52	
7/26/19	V336	W.B Mason Co., Inc.	89094	1,156.00	Office Supply Invoice
7/26/19	V251	Wex Fleet Universal	89095	11,398.44	Fuel
7/26/19	V454	World Publications	89096	106.3	



To:GMT Board of Commissioners JonFrom:Moore, Interim General ManagerDate:August 20, 2019RE:General Manager Report

Fleet Electrification: There are multiple exciting activities that staff has been engaged in regarding the expansion of electric vehicles in the GMT fleet portfolio including the following:

- Planning for the arrival of the Proterra Electric buses:
 - Staff had a phone call with Proterra on 7/31 to discuss scheduling on-site maintenance and driver trainings for the new buses.
 - Staff is scheduling a meeting with key stakeholders to schedule a press event for the arrival of the new buses.
 - Staff has worked with BED to right size the transformer for the electric bus charging stations. The original plans would only provide enough power for two charging stations. The new sized transformer will allow GMT to add an additional four future charging stations.
- Staff had a meeting with Vtrans and VEIC to discuss the NoLo grant award Vtrans received on GMT's behalf for the purchase of up to two small electric vehicles to be used for service in Washington County.
- Staff will be submitting a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the below grant opportunity:

VEIC, on behalf of the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation, is seeking qualifications from prospective Project Partners for an electric school and transit bus pilot program, funded by the Volkswagen Environmental Mitigation Trust (EMT). Transit agencies, schools districts and supervisory unions in Vermont are invited and encouraged to apply. Selected Partner Partners will replace up to two diesel buses (with engine model years 2009 or older) with electric buses, to be deployed in their transportation service fleet. The cost to the selected Project Partners will be no more than the cost of a new diesel replacement bus. The incremental cost of the electric buses and all charging infrastructure will be covered by the EMT. See the full Request for Qualifications <u>here</u>. Responses are due by August 16th at 5:00 pm.

VEIC will work closely with interested partners through the application process and will support the selected transit partner with procurement and deployment throughout the project, Once Requests for Qualifications are reviewed, eligible



applicants will be invited to reply to a Request for Proposals, through which Project Partners will be selected.

Micro-transit: I attended the Micro-transit Working Group on 7/24. Microtransit is an exciting new service delivery model that provides ridesharing-like (i.e Uber) service with public transit vehicles. There is strong support for a pilot project in Montpelier from Vtrans and various local stakeholders. Vtrans is submitting a grant application for which GMT has submitted a Letter of Support.

Under the pilot project the Montpelier Circulator, Montpelier Hospital Hill and Capital Shuttle routes would be eliminated and service within Montpelier in a roughly seven mile service "bubble" would be provided by on-demand service supported through a passenger app and call center. Any ADA, E&D or Nonemergency medical trip (NEMT) that started <u>and</u> ended within this service area would also be provided through the Micro-transit service creating a more convenient service model and hopefully creating economies of scale.

Vtrans will be providing a presentation on Micro-transit, and the results of an operations simulation performed by VIA who is a leading company in the industry in regards to Micro-transit.

<u>CCRPC Meeting</u>: I attended the Chittenden Country Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) Board meeting on July 17th of which GMT is an Exofficio member. I also met with GMT and CCRPC staff on 7/26 to discuss FTA required Performance Based Planning & Programming that GMT is required to develop and that the CCRPC is required to approve. These metrics will be directly related to GMT's Transit Asset Management (TAM) Program that I will be presenting at the September CCRPC Board meeting for formal approval.

Montpelier Transit Center: In advance of an anticipated 10/1 start of service date from the Montpelier Transit Center a draft Operating Agreement between GMT and the City of Montpelier was discussed on 7/25 with the City Manager and Assistant Manager. This agreement is now being reviewed by GMT's and the city's attorney's.

GMT and the city as well as GMT and Vtrans have had recent discussions on possible funding sources for a full-time GMT Customer Service Representative based at the Transit Center.



To: GMT Board of Commissioners

From: Nick Foss, Director of Finance Kim Wall, Grants Manager Debbie Coppola, Senior Accountant Matt Kimball, Capital Projects Manager

Date: August 9, 2019

RE: Finance/Grants/Capital Projects

The Finance and Grants Department is steadily working through its busy season. With both FY19 expenses and May grant billing completed during the month, the department remains focused on the end of year close-out process. In addition, the Grants Department has started the long and arduous task of reconciling every single grant that touches GMT, in order to complete its final billing. This is certainly a heavy responsibility, so thank you Kim and Cheryl for your hard work on this! Lastly, both Finance and Grants continue to collaborate with our auditors to ensure a timely and effective audit, which is scheduled for the second week of October.

The State Operating Grant was executed during July. As a result, we received the first installment of the FY20 state grant prepayment funding for Urban and Rural state operating, and Rural 5311. I've now started developing the FY20 Budget Adjustment, which I plan to present to the Board in November.

During July, I along with Grants Staff attended the FTA's Triennial Review Training in Boston. The training proved to be valuable, and will prepare the department with the tools necessary to work towards providing a clean audit during our upcoming Triennial in FFY21. It also highlighted some areas of GMT's operations that we can focus on to mitigate any possible risk where a finding could conceivably occur. Again, my apologies to the Board for missing last month's meeting as a result.

Speaking of the FTA, our name change has finally gone through in their system. This certainly was the culprit for what was an unusually long period before we could apply for our grant funds. Either way, I know both myself and the Grants Department are happy that this process has been completed.

In other news, Staff is preparing to submit a response to a VEIC Electric Bus Pilot Program request for qualifications. This project is funded by the Volkswagen Environmental Mitigation Trust and will fund the incremental costs of electric buses. Successful applicants will be invited to respond to a subsequent Request for Proposals.

To conclude, I would like to recognize our I.T. Manager David for facilitating the setup required to hold our Great Plains training last week for both Finance & Grants and Human Resources Staff. A great deal went into making that training happen, so I wanted to express my gratitude for that. As a reminder, Great Plains is our accounting software, which we also use for payroll and Human Resources.



Financial Summary

Attached are the May 31, 2019 financials for your review. The June Financials are not fully closed, however expenses have all been recorded. As previously mentioned, Staff is working on the final grant billing, which is expected to be done by the end of August, or early September.

The May financials currently show a total surplus of \$13.8K, with \$1.5K for Urban and \$12.3K for Rural. The year-to-date Rural transit rate remains elevated at \$72.10, and we project it will end the year in the \$72 range. As a reminder, the break-even rate was calculated at \$70 earlier in the year, however the hope is that Medicaid PMPW payments will make up the shortfall.

The expenses for the month ending June 30, 2019 have been posted and closed, but should still be treated as preliminary. For June the benchmark for spending is 100% of budget; the benchmark for May is 92%. The following are explanations for specific areas of interest.

Revenues were reviewed based on the activity through May 31st.....

- Federal Urban operating grant is at 97.6% of the budgeted amount; as a reminder this grant is the last grant we bill since it basically allows us to break even. This is the big indicator for the Urban system, so long as this percentage is at or below benchmark that is good. If it starts to creep above the benchmark that would indicate we will dip into our carryover balances at a higher amount than is already budgeted.
- Other State Grants are at 41.8% of the budgeted amount. This category is all other state grants; the largest in this section is the mobility management grant which is billed based on expenses. For the Rural system, we had anticipated launching the complementary paratransit program in January, but that implementation has been delayed.
- Both Passenger Revenues and Paratransit Passenger Fares are under budget for the Urban system; however Rural Passenger Revenues remain over the targeted benchmark. Staff attributes this increase for Rural Passenger Revenues to moving away from the GFI fare boxes to manual fare boxes. In contrast, on the Urban side, a majority of the fare boxes are old and often break down for periods of time causing a loss in fares. This could be one of the reasons for the variance in budget-to-actual. On the Urban Paratransit Passenger Fares side, I must be honest, I am unsure as to what went into the rationale for a 27% increase over the prior year actual. After analyzing both of these revenue line items this year, it is unlikely we will meet the budget projections. The budget projections for both average \$197.3K per month, year-to-date we are averaging \$191.5K.



• The **warranty revenue** has already exceeded the anticipated budget amount. Upon review of the detail this is labor reimbursement we received from insurance proceeds.



 Advertising revenue continues to track below budget targets at 71% and 54% for Urban and Rural respectively. Based on the recent activity, we are currently not expecting this revenue will meet budget expectations

Advertising revenue (cont'd)

	Budget FY19	Monthly Average Earned to date	Average needed in June to meet Budget
Urban	200,000	12,968	57,355
Rural	50,000	2,464	22,900

- **Miscellaneous Revenue** is down this year. We complete the PM's on the Essex vans, and this is where that revenue is recorded. The records show that Essex has been bringing in the vehicles for regular checks.
- **Purchase of services** for our Rural services revenues are down this year. It is not likely that the category of "special trips" will meet the estimated revenue projections. Without an in depth review, it is likely this decrease is related to the Medicaid increase of trips.

Expenses were reviewed based on the activity through June 30, 2019. The benchmark of 100% was used for review and analysis.....

- \star
- **Unemployment tax** spent is at 76.4% of the combined budget. The Urban system has gone over budget by 20% (\$4,026), while the Rural system ended the year significantly under budget. Since we are a reimbursable employer, this is an expense that is difficult to predict from year to year. On the Urban side this is largely due to just 2 past employees.
- **Rural Health Insurance** is over budget by 17% (\$70,553). After analyzing the budget and general ledger, it was found that the assumptions used in deriving the budget proved incorrect in the mix of coverage types (*i.e. single, 2-Person, and Family*).
- **Rural Communications** is over budget by 23% (\$6,689) and Urban Communications is under budget by 25% (\$14,409). The Urban side benefited from earlier cancellation of tablets, which resulted from the RouteMatch fixed-route contract termination. In addition, the Rural side saw an increase in the number of buses and volunteers who use tablets for the On Demand Service.
- Legal fees ended up 45.5% (\$12,739) over budget due to unforeseen circumstances.



- **Insurance** ended the year 8.5% (\$110,829) over budget, combined for both Urban and Rural. This is the result of wages being underestimated for workers comp insurance during the FY19 budget build.
- **Consulting Fees** are over budget for the year due to services at the State House.
- **Background Checks** came in over budget on the Rural side. This directly correlates to hiring and is hard to predict year to year.
- **Uniforms** are showing under budget on the Rural side and this should result in some much needed savings for FY19.

Vehicle/Building Maintenance – This section continues to be an area of concern. The condition of our fleet resulted in higher maintenance costs throughout FY19. In total the Urban system ended the year under budget, however the Rural system ended the year 23% (\$161,785) over budget.



Parts Expense for both systems exceeded budgeted figures. The Urban and Rural
 system ended the year \$149.6K and \$96.7K over budget respectively. Some commentary as to what is driving these budget variances are:

- We had anticipated the arrival of new cutaways much sooner than June of this year, which impacted maintenance of the vehicles and budgets.
- In the Rural system we did 4 transmission replacements, and 4 cutaways were out of commission.
- An engine was replaced in a cutaway over the summer, each replacement is approximately \$20K.
- The new mini-vans received and now in service should help to alleviate the current pressures.
- **Tires expense** for the <u>Rural system closed-out the year 27% (\$6,685) over budget.</u> The Urban system ended the year 52% (\$47,167) under benchmark, which we believe resulted from an additional set of tires included in each of our new bus purchases.
- **Cleaning expense** for the Rural system finished the year over budget by 57% (\$4,113). This is due to the VT Offender Program which does landscaping and shelter snow removal being left out of the budget during development. This appears to be an oversight and will be captured in FY20.
- **Fuel costs** finished under budget by 13.4% (\$138,873) and 11.7% (\$38.938) over budget for Urban and Rural respectively. Unfortunately, a large percentage of the Rural fleet must fill at the pump in Berlin, and the entire fleet in St. Albans, which is cost prohibitive.
- **Debt Service/Capital Reserve**, this is the account where the annual lease payment is recorded; there will not be any more activity in this account for the fiscal year.

The following is an update of the ongoing capital projects Staff continue to work on:



☆ Passenger Shelters:

 Working with Enseicom to schedule installation of a glass shelter at the Larkin Terrace property. Coordinating with contractor for the installation of a shelter near Harrington Ave in Shelburne. Also coordinating on the removal of a post and beam shelter from Williston Village. Will work with Planning over the summer to identify bus stops that are in need of upgraded amenities.

☆ Industrial Parkway Driveway Ramp:

• Planting plan completed for tree planting along the berm. Will look into completing this work in spring 2020.

☆ GMTA Facility Renovation:

- Continuing to work with VTrans to secure all of the required permits along Route 12 for the sewer project. Working with VTrans and Wiemann-Lamphere to update the budget estimate for the sewer project.
- Preparing bid documents for release.
- Working with Wiemann-Lamphere to advance construction of an aboveground fuel tank.

* Electric Bus Buy/Charging Station Installation:

- Continuing to work with Proterra on key build items as they come up during production. The buses are on schedule for delivery in fall 2019.
- Continuing to work with Wiemann-Lamphere and Burlington Electric to prepare construction documents for the installation of two chargers for the vehicles as well as electrical infrastructure improvements. Working with Wiemann-Lamphere on the design to install a pad-mounted transformer to support additional chargers for future expansion of electric fleet. Working to have electricians lined up by the end of the month for the installation of the charging stations.

☆ 31 Queen City Park Road (Formerly 1 Industrial Parkway)

 Working with Wiemann-Lamphere on the scope of renovations to the building at 31 Queen City Park Road. Design is nearly complete for the up-fitting of the Southern garage section to create a new body shop work area and maintenance storage area. Project will also include improvements to the building envelope to improve energy efficiency. Staff is also looking into renovating the office area of the building if it is established that there is sufficient funding in the grant to support it.

☆ Cutaway Bus Buy:

 Five additional cutaways were received in July and the remaining buses are expected to be delivered this month. Continuing to work with Maintenance to complete all of the paperwork requirements and get the new buses into service.

☆ Montpelier Transit Center:

- Working with GMT Staff and City of Montpelier to develop the Operating Agreement for GMT's operation of the Transit Center.
- Design of the security system has been completed and specification and bid documents are near completion as well. An RFQ is anticipated to be released to qualified installers during the first week of August.
- Working with Staff on the purchase of IT and furniture for the transit center.

☆ 101 Queen City Park Road Roof Replacement:

Chittenden County Transportation Authority Statement of Net Assets As of 5/31/2019

	5/31/2019	6/30/2018	Changes CY over PY
ASSETS			
Current Assets:			
Cash and Investments	\$1,551,610.09	\$1,232,473.42	\$319,136.67
Receivables:	. , ,	. , ,	. ,
Grant	95,274.90	1,624,955.96	(1,529,681.06)
Other	2,981,958.61	812,795.94	2,169,162.67
Deferred Cost Pool	(445,784.19)	(267,262.71)	(178,521.48)
Inventories	663,325.02	662,975.56	349.46
Prepaid Expenses	440,207.19	428,693.93	11,513.26
Total Current Assets	5,286,591.62	4,494,632.10	791,959.52
Noncurrent Assets:			
Land, Structures And			
Equipment - net of accumulated depreciation	28,146,016.95	30,628,967.23	(2,482,950.28)
TOTAL ASSETS	33,432,608.57	35,123,599.33	(1,690,990.76)
LIABILITIES AND FUND EQUITY			
Current Liabilities:			
Accounts Payable	499,008.88	619,168.46	(120,159.58)
Accrued Payroll Expenses	182,826.84	182,826.84	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Other Accrued Expenses	69,007.48	109,975.72	(40,968.24)
Deferred Revenue	772,587.35	48,635.00	723,952.35
Total Current Liabilities	1,523,430.55	960,606.02	562,824.53
Long-Term Liabilities:			
Accrued Compensated Absences	922,145.59	836,688.73	85,456.86
Total Long-Term Liabilities	922,145.59	836,688.73	85,456.86
Total Liabilities	2,445,576.14	1,797,294.75	648,281.39
Fund Equity:			
Invested in capital assets, net of related debt	30,628,967.23	30,628,967.23	
Restricted	957,675.08	957,675.08	
Unrestricted	1,739,609.27	212,656.51	1,526,952.76
Current Year Change in Net Assets	(2,339,219.15)	1,527,005.76	(3,866,224.91)
Total Fund Equity	30,987,032.43	33,326,304.58	(2,339,272.15)
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND FUND EQUITY	33,432,608.57	35,123,599.33	(1,690,990.76)

Rural 118		404,186.97		1,120,971.64 828,000.00	1,000,446.15	37,750.73	784,622.79	18,333.33	4,194,311.61	01 800 72	91,8U9.22		4,200.00 38 000 00	3,522.93	118.57	7,932.00	1,373,890.31	135,437.60	1 (14 040 (2	1,654,910.63	5,849,222.24	836,549.44	1,303,612.22 127 790 55	2,267,942.21	173,112.56	11,731.91	601,766.10	15 024.08	90,755.44	949,444.14		14,805.68	9,197.02 1 005 35	4,905.25 2 064 58		29,648.60	20,283.53	327.90	325,252.87 00 105 00	DD.CDT.C	410,710.43
Urban PYTD 20	2,089,740.40 575,582.26	76,129.24	2,646,051.99	2,234,478.00		16,322.33	2,358,044.38	161,608.32	10,157,956.92	1 080 053 10	ET.2CU,USE,L	90,350.00	01,334.00 343 608 20	868.21	8,499.11	11,824.40		42,328.49	5,310.00	2,544,234.60	12,702,191.52	1,499,606.92	3,668,647.12 780.051.10	5,948,305.23	459,802.00	14,915.18	1,525,306.36	241,541.49 47 064 00	229,620.80	2,513,249.92		39,295.06	16,210.68	20.220,12 1 699 50	00.000	43,855.41	44,785.90	10,153.33 760.040.05	7 2 1 E 00	1,243.00	958,343.75
Combined	91.67% 91.67%	94.78%	97.61%	99.07% 90.86%	100.04%	41.78%	98.29% 0.00%	0.00%	94.90%	7098 D8	03.00%	80.09%	97.30%	366.97%	35.36%	6.31%	96.17%	61.09%	82.96%	90.10%	93.68%	89.80%	94.00% 84 64%	91.84%	92.88%	75.69%	94.58%	87.49% 70%	92.67%	92.91%		82.59%	70.00%	79.99% %7.63%	0.00%	78.06%	78.44%	95.98%	98./4% 04 DE%	94.03% 118.42%	94.14%
Rural Iget Variance	0.00% 0.00%	96.21%	00.0 %20.00	99.01% 89.21%	100.04%	51.05%	97.41% 0.00%	0.00%	95.72%	20 20 20	91.64%	0.00%	24.2U% 28.75%	460.23%	0.00%	10.10%	96.17%	54.40%	165.91%	92.73%	94.72%	79.56%	95.79% 77 43%	89.58%	92.83%	35.28%	106.70%	83.10%	92.69%	96.48%		//./U%	95.34%	%20.0c %25 DC	0.00%	106.03%	73.26%	00.00%	97.U/%	94.U5% 111.35%	92.69%
Urban Bud	91.67% 91.67%	88.56%	97.61%	0.00% 91.67%	0.00%	33.04%	98.58% 0 00%	0.00%	94.55%	7067 08	03.42%	80.09%	71.32% 95.67%	56.10%	34.75%	0.00%	0.00%	82.47%	0.00%	88.00%	93.16%	95.98%	93.18% ee.0e%	92.87%	92.91%	120.13%	91.63%	88.6U%	92.67%	91.86%	2000 10	85.00%	67.94%	88.01% 50 87%	0.00%	64.49%	80.82%	107.49%	99.49% 04.05%	94.03% 125.48%	94.79%
Combined ic 2018)	\$2,300,970.00 637.765.00	518,386.00	3,062,532.00	т, тби, иси. и 3, 347, 786.00	1,117,698.00	153,000.00	3,608,806.00		15,926,943.00	2 277 AEA OO	2,3//,404.00	115,000.00 250.000.00	387 106 00	5,200.00	19,000.00	8,000.00	2,047,728.00	183,844.00	4,000.00	5,397,332.00	21,324,275.00	2,585,565.00	6,165,241.00 1 1 20 419 00	9,871,225.00	735,148.00	42,000.00	2,171,888.00	353,116.00 F0 000 00	320,968.00	3,682,120.00		65,340.00	30,400.00	37,8/1.UU		88,176.00	181,484.00	28,000.00	1,308,907.00	12.000.00	1,786,928.00
Rural GET (Approved De		421,725.00		1,100,000.00	1,117,698.00	74,250.00	878,500.00		4,772,173.00	124 954 00	124,934.UU		00,000,0c	4,000.00		5,000.00	2,047,728.00	140,000.00	2,000.00	2,398,682.00	7,170,855.00	973,620.00	1,932,897.00 186 224 00	3,092,841.00	216,602.00	22,000.00	426,165.00	78,000,000	75,074.00	838,976.00		21,600.00	12,000.00	2 500 00		28,816.00	57,164.00	3,000.00	402,456.00	6.000.00	552,894.00
Urban FY19#2 BUD	2,300,970.00 637.765.00	96,661.00	3,062,532.00	2,247,786.00		78,750.00	2,730,306.00		11,154,770.00	, 757 EOD OD	00.00C,2C2,2	115,000.00 200 000 00	362 106 00	1,200.00	19,000.00	3,000.00		43,844.00	2,000.00	2,998,650.00	14,153,420.00	1,611,945.00	4,232,344.00 034 005 00	6,778,384.00	518,546.00	20,000.00	1,745,723.00	281,981.00 31 000 00	245,894.00	2,843,144.00		43,/40.00	18,400.00	27,838.00 3 500 00		59,360.00	124,320.00	25,000.00	906,451.00 10/25 00	6.000.00	1,234,034.00
Combined ate	\$2,109,222.61 584.619.75	491,326.55	2,989,256.00	т, тоб, эбэ. 50 3,041,801.38	1,118,115.69	63,922.59	3,547,248.91		15,114,502.78	2 136 116 87	7,130,410.6/	92,105.00 160 745 51	103,/40. 353 599 99	19,082.40	6,717.79	504.99	1,969,218.81	112,315.03	3,318.26	4,863,024.65	19,977,527.43	2,321,750.12	5,795,437.28 040 222 22	9,065,509.73	682,831.66	31,787.96	2,054,231.01	308,933.66 AF 80F 27	297,446.65	3,421,126.31		53,965.03	23,941.81	30,294.50 3 1 7 3 8 7	10.011 (0	68,834.35	142,352.58	26,873.00	1,292,471.45 76 100 00	20,100.00 14.210.00	1,682,166.54
Rural t Fiscal Year To Da		405,720.56		ц, тоб, эбэ. 30 981, 330.38	1,118,115.69	37,904.91	855,708.92		4,567,769.76	177 JEN 70	F/.407	00 001 26	7 188 60	18,409.18	116.03	504.99	1,969,218.81	76,155.86	3,318.26	2,224,266.52	6,792,036.28	774,652.75	1,851,589.86 111,770,25	2,770,521.96	201,071.04	7,762.10	454,700.38	59,112.14 17 710 41	69,585.12	809,449.19		16,/83.95	11,441.13 5 525 20	1 0285.20	01.010(1	30,554.65	41,876.77		390,628,095 00,020 5	6.681.00	512,477.05
Urban Curren	2,109,222.61 584.619.75	85,605.99	2,989,256.00	2,060,471.00		26,017.68	2,691,539.99		10,546,733.02	2 014 152 08	Z'N 14' 10Z.UQ	92,105.00	346 411 39	673.22	6,601.76			36,159.17		2,638,758.13	13,185,491.15	1,547,097.37	3,943,847.42 804.047.08	6,294,987.77	481,760.62	24,025.86	1,599,530.63	249,821.52 20 575 05	227,861.53	2,611,677.12		37,181.08	12,500.68	24,668.3U 2 AG5 57	0.001	38,279.70	100,475.81	26,873.00	901,816.35 10 07 0 01	16,270.00 7.529.00	1,169,689.49

Green Mountain Transit Authority Budget v. Actual Report For the Eleven Months Ending Friday, May 31, 2019

Ĕ
Ž
E
SEI S

FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL REVENUE

Total Federal, State and Local Revenues Federal Rural Operating Grant State Regular Subsidy Operating Grant E&D Grants and Local Match Other State Grants Municpal Member Assessments Municipal Paratransit Assessments Federal Urban Formula Grant Local Operating Assistance Capital Reserve Revenue Fund Balance Reserves Other Federal Grants

OPERATING REVENUE

Miscellaneous Revenue Sales Of Equipment Medicaid Purchase Of Svc Paratransit Passenger Fares **Operating Revenue** Purchase of Service Warranty Revenue Advertising Revenue Passenger Revenue Planning Revenue Interest Earnings

Total Revenue

EXPENSES

SALARIES AND WAGES Other Wages

Driver/Operator Wages Vehicle Repair Wages Salaries and Wages

PERSONNEL TAXES AND BENEFITS

Personnel Taxes and Benefits Other Employee Benefits Employee Development Payroll Taxes (FICA/MC) Unemployment Tax Exp Medical Insurance/HRA Pension Plan Expenses

GENERAL AND ADMIN EXPENSES Admin Supplies and Expenses Recruiting Expenses General and Admin Expenses **Dues and Subscriptions** Computer Service Exp **Travel and Meetings Board Development** Communications Audit Fees Consulting Fees Legal Fees Insurance

OPERATIONS EXPENSES

	Currer	t Fiscal Year To Da	te	FY19#2 BUI	DGET (Approved De	ec 2018)	BL	udget Variance		PYTD 2)18 11 200
Background Checks	1,278.00	10,827.00	12,105.00	1,900.00	8,325.00	10,225.00	67.26% 0.00%	130.05%	118.39%	2,262.30	11,268
Drug & Alchol Testing	316.00	93.00	409.00				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	651.00 - 222 22	589
DOT Testing	5,918.00	5,743.26	11,661.26	5,850.00	7,920.00	13,770.00	101.16%	72.52%	84.69%	7,922.00	5,625
Employment Recruitement Program	400.00		400.00	800.00	400.00	1,200.00	50.00%	0.00%	33.33%	1,800.00	
Driver's Unitorms	22,795.08	10,940.96	33,736.04	22,546.00	20,170.00	42,716.00	101.10%	54.24%	78.98%	19,784.94	8,794
Satety Expense	566.08		566.08	2,300.00	1,700.00	4,000.00	24.61%	0.00%	14.15%	936.53	
Bus Rodeo							0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
Misc. Operating Exp	2,693.22		2,693.22	7,100.00	2,675.00	9,775.00	37.93%	0.00%	27.55%	3,250.47	1,181
Operations Expenses	33,900.38	21,604.22	09.072,10	40,496.00	41,190.00	81,686.00	83.88%	<i>61.02%</i>	/5.2/%	30,607.24	21,451.
PLANNING EXPENSES											
Other Planning Expenses		9,027.06	9,027.06		25,000.00	25,000.00	0.00%	36.11%	36.11%		75,453
MPO Planning Expenses	82,009.82		82,009.82	100,000.00		100,000.00	82.01%	0.00%	82.01%	146,259.18	
Planning Expenses	82,009.82	9,027.06	91,036.88	100,000.00	25,000.00	125,000.00	82.01%	36.11%	72.83%	146,259.18	75,453.
VEHICLE/BUILDING MAINTENANCE EXP (15 Industria	al)										
Parts Expense - Non-Revenue Vehicles	6,927.35	707.29	7,634.64	7,000.00	4,500.00	11,500.00	98.96%	15.72%	66.39%	6,547.64	1,169
Parts Expense - Revenue Vehicles	545,775.52	277,512.26	823,287.78	408,394.00	190,000.00	598,394.00	133.64%	146.06%	137.58%	564,188.32	338,240
Tires	38,038.43	30,816.13	68,854.56	90,000,06	25,000.00	115,000.00	42.26%	123.26%	59.87%	65,176.91	33,465
Facility Maintenance	68,789.27	68,903.59	137,692.86	70,000.00	57,200.00	127,200.00	98.27%	120.46%	108.25%	87,375.08	60,765
Passenger Facility Expenses	23,297.71		23,297.71	34,452.00		34,452.00	67.62%	0.00%	67.62% 0.00%	26,018.52	
Security Expenses		JO 1 12 01	שר רנט ור		00 006 5		0.00% 26.41%	0.00%	%00.0 %03%	12 500 00	1000
Creaning Laperiae Repeater Fees	18.306.25	15,354,00	33,660,25	20,000.00	16.200.00	37,800.00	30.41 <i>%</i> 84.75%	94.78%	40.02 <i>%</i> 89.05%	73,490.00	17,55(
Light. Heat and Water	159.309.17	56.821.78	216.130.95	153.000.00	55.000.00	208.000.00	104.12%	103.31%	103.91%	152.089.51	51.25
Fuel - Vehicles	829,396.98	333,612.52	1,163,009.50	1,036,308.00	333,235.00	1,369,543.00	80.03%	100.11%	84.92%	761,900.13	350,15
Maintenance Tools/Supplies/Uniforms	74,514.58	13,475.63	87,990.21	88,975.00	15,944.00	104,919.00	83.75%	84.52%	83.86%	78,048.15	16,30
Misc Maint Expenses and fees	4,032.38	924.60	4,956.98	6,000.00	2,000.00	8,000.00	67.21%	46.23%	61.96%	5,023.68	1,205
Vehicle/Building Maintenance Exp	1,789,506.94	808,841.86	2,598,348.80	1,973,729.00	706,279.00	2,680,008.00	90.67%	114.52%	96.95%	1,782,357.94	882,936
CONTRACTOR EXPENSES											
ADA/SSTA Paratransit	1,129,552.79		1,129,552.79	1,215,055.00		1,215,055.00	92.96%	0.00%	92.96%	1,080,026.91	
Partner Local Share				19,833.00		19,833.00	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9,916.50	
Functional Assessment Costs	7,579.89		7,579.89	8,500.00		8,500.00	89.18%	0.00%	89.18%	7,301.40	
Volunteer Drivers		491,565.92	491,565.92		520,000.00	520,000.00	0.00%	94.53%	94.53%		469,509
Other Transportation (incl Cabs)	10,010.40	808,211.66	818,222.06	14,021.00	800,000.00	814,021.00	71.40%	101.03%	100.52%	10,281.30	691,167
Contractor Expenses	1,147,143.08	1,299,777.58	2,446,920.66	1,257,409.00	1,320,000.00	2,577,409.00	91.23%	98.47%	94.94%	1,107,526.11	1,160,677
MARKETING EXPENSE											
Bus Tickets/Fare Media	13,495.83	1,498.44	14,994.27	20,000.00	2,400.00	22,400.00	67.48%	62.44%	66.94%	18,025.45	2,062
Marketing Expense	25,863.76	27,609.77	53,473.53	52,000.00	42,340.00	94,340.00	49.74%	65.21%	56.68%	18,677.41	21,92
Public Information	13,727.15	10,615.91	24,343.06	29,000.00	19,500.00	48,500.00	47.34%	54.44%	50.19%	12,986.08	11,918
Marketing Expense	53,086.74	39,724.12	92,810.86	101,000.00	64,240.00	165,240.00	52.56%	61.84%	56.17%	49,688.94	35,903
OTHER EXPENSES											
Allowance for Doubtful Accounts							0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
Uebt Service/Capital Reserve Rond Interact	40,444.01		40,444.01	00.000,02		00.000,05	92.89%	%00.0 %00.0	92.89%	40,442.51	
Capital Match	86.372.00	192.898.75	279.270.75	94.224.00	210.435.00	304.659.00	91.67%	91.67%	91.67%	161.608.33	18.33
Other Expenses	132,814.51	192,898.75	325,713.26	144,224.00	210,435.00	354,659.00	92.09%	91.67%	91.84%	208,050.84	18,333
TOTAL EXPENSES	13.314.881.85	6.470.321.79	19.785.203.64	14.472.420.00	6.851.855.00	21.324.275.00	92.00%	94.43%	92.78%	12.750.389.15	5.828.858
Current Year Deferred Costs ALLOCATIONS BETWEEN PROGRAMS	(178,521.48) 309,421.69	(309,421.69)	(178,521.48)	319,000.00	(319,000.00)		0.00% 97.00%	0.00% 97.00%	0.00% 0.00%	(232,337.34) 280,534.97	(280,534
Balance Of Operating Budget	1,509.51	12,292.80	13,802.31	0.00	0.00		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00	260,170.
Capital Revenue											
Federal Revenue	728,033.52	194,161.77	922,195.29				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4,953,739.42	122,71
State Revenue	87,263.97	24,292.90	111,556.87				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	645,144.62	12,26

Green Mountain Transit Authority Budget v. Actual Report For the Eleven Months Ending Friday, May 31, 2019

Green Mountain Transit Authority Budget v. Actual Report For the Eleven Months Ending Friday, May 31, 2019

Urban Rural PYTD 2018	3,735.60 0.01	5,598,884.05 138,715.20	5,720,782.82 59,128.00	324,670.83 71,522.51	42,958.32 36,730.95	156,622.41 88,013.27	6,245,034.38 255,394.71	(646,150.33) (116,679.51	5,727,346.45 137,479.60	(7 AFE 20A 73) (F&E F00 78	3,271,952.22 (448,120.18	2,625,801.89 (824,970.58
Combined	0.00% 0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Rural 3udget Variance	0.00% 0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Urban	%00.0 %00.0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	00.00%	0.00%
Rural Combined GET (Approved Dec 2018)		0.00					0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00
Urban FY19#2 BUD		0.00					0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00
Combined ate	279,270.75	1,313,022.91	204,310.85	370,009.67	42,871.50	565,955.07	1,183,147.09	129,875.82	676,033.45	13 158 083 73)	(2,482,950.28)	(2,339,272.15)
Rural nt Fiscal Year To D	192,898.75	411,353.42	201,500.00	25,951.34		22,850.47	250,301.81	161,051.61	201,831.62	(516,607,07)	(314,861.35)	(141,516.94)
Urban Currei	86,372.00	901,669.49	2,810.85	344,058.33	42,871.50	543,104.60	932,845.28	(31,175.79)	474,201.83	(72) 200 76)	168,088.93)	l97,755.21)

Paratransit Lease Revenue Local Match Revenue **Total Capital Revenue**

Capital Expenses

Vehicles Maintenance Parts and Equipment Passenger Amenities Facility Repairs and Improvements **Total Capital Expenses**

Balance of Capital Budget

Transfer of Purchases to Fixed Assets Deferred Costs Depreciation Expense Subtotal

Current Change in Net Assets



- To: GMT Finance Committee
- From: Nick Foss, Director of Finance Jon Moore, Interim General Manager Kim Wall, Grants Manager
- Date: August 9, 2019
- RE: FY20 Budget Assumptions

	Es	timates*	Proje	ected	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Notes
Admin Positions Savings through					
Attrition	\$95,000	\$31,000	\$145,655	\$100,449	See Admin Savings section
Use of Extra 5307 Funds Above One					Covered by increase in Urban Formula
Year Allocation	\$200,000		\$200,000		Grant
Increase Ridership/Fare Increase to					
\$1.50 Urban Only	\$120,000		\$161,600		Per Steve Falbel study
Increased Urban Assessments by 1%	\$25 , 000		\$25,000		Accomplished in FY20 2 buses dropped from capital budget
NextGen Implementations and 5307					(\$50K) each in LCM savings; \$21,745 in
Funds/Efficiency Savings	\$214,000		\$121,745		additional 5307 Funds
Additional Contributions from					Seasonal service added into VTRANS
Partners/VTRANS/Efficiency Savings		\$180,070		\$180,070	grant
Total :	\$654,000	\$211,070	\$654,000	\$280,519	
		Less: Estimates	(\$654,000)	(\$211,070)	
		Total:	\$0	\$69,449	

*Estimate figures from Board Memo dated 2/1/2019

On February 1, 2019 the GMT Board of Commissioners was provided a memo regarding required savings to balance the FY20 Budget. That memo is included in today's Finance Committee packet as a reference in our discussions.

One point that should not be forgotten is that this exercise has been carried out without taking into account the coming FY20 Budget Adjustment. Finance & Grants are already aware of increases in such expense line items, such as Insurance, Legal Expenses, and Medical Insurance that will need to be adjusted. Therefore, until the FY20 Budget Adjustment is



completed these savings should not be viewed as possible surpluses, as they could likely be offset by increased expenses.

Admin Position Savings through Attrition

This line item includes savings to be generated through attrition of positions within the organization. As a result of recent turnover, both myself, as well as the Interim General Manager have had a chance to take a holistic view of GMT. We believe that we can reduce headcount by 3 positions (1 Admin/1 Part-Time Maintenance/1 Broker Services) without affecting operations. In addition, a position in Finance & Grants has been promoted, and as a result will be moved to a more advantageous funding profile. Lastly, savings have been identified by utilizing our grant funding more efficiently.

Use of Extra 5307 Funds above One Year Allocation

For FY20, GMT received an increase in its Urban Formula Grant (5307) of just over \$293K above the original estimate. This increase was the result of a higher *Small Transit Intensive Cities* (STIC) factor funding amount. These additional funds will be used to cover this line item, which originally was to come from GMT's legacy federal grants.

Increase Ridership/Fare Increase to \$1.50 Urban Only

This figure has been increased to \$161.6K per the FY20 Urban Fare Increase Proposal provided by our consultant Steve Falbel.

FY20 Urban Fare Increase Proposal Current Local Base Fare Structure Net Revenue Change by Rider Group Scenario 1 (\$2 base/\$40 pass) Scenario 2 (\$1.50 base/\$50 pass) Sceanrio 3 (\$1.50 base/\$40 pass) LINK & Commuter (base increasing by \$1.00) \$1.25 Cash riders \$184,000 \$151,000 \$137,500 \$60,000

	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.				
	Total Change	\$279,300	\$267,000	\$161,600	\$155,250
\$0.90	Unlimited Access	\$189,000	\$63,000	\$63,000	\$36,000
\$12.00	10-ride ticket riders	\$19,000	\$45,000	\$46,300	\$48,250
	Cash to pass switchers	-\$48,500	\$8,000	-\$21,000	\$0
\$50.00	Monthy pass riders	-\$64,200	\$0	-\$64,200	\$11,000
\$1.25	Cashriders	\$184,000	\$151,000	\$137,500	\$60,000

50% discount for eligible discount fare boardings

Increased Urban Assessments by 1%

This increase in assessments was carried out in FY20.

NextGen Implementations and 5307 Funds/Efficiency Savings

\$100K in this line item will be covered by Next Gen changes that allowed GMT to reduce its capital bus purchases by two buses, which in turn saved Local Capital Match Funds. The



remaining \$21,745 will come from the additional Urban Formula Grant Funds (5307) GMT received for FY20.

Additional Contributions from Partners/VTRANS/Efficiency Savings

The proposal of cutting seasonal service in FY20 was not approved, which resulted in an increase in funds by VTRANS to provide the service.



- TO: GMT Board of Commissioners
- FR: Michelle Daley, Director of Finance
- DT: February 6, 2019
- RE: FY20 Operating & Capital Budget

This memo accompanies the proposed Capital and Operating Budgets for GMT for the fiscal year ending 6/30/2020. GMT presents a balanced budget for the Board of Commissioners to approve.

The Board and Finance Committee have met several times since the first proposed budget was presented. At the January special meeting with the Board and Committee we were provided with the direction that there would not be any service eliminations based on a financial reason only.

The operating budget presented for approval, includes all services operating in FY19. In addition to the following assumptions:

	Urban	Rural
Administrative position savings through attrition	(95,0000)	(31,000)
Increase ridership/Fare Increase to \$1.50 urban only	(120,000)	
Increased Urban Assessments by 1%	(25,000)	
NextGen Implementations and 5307 funds/efficiency savings	(214,000)	
Additional Contributions from partners/VTRANs/efficiency savings		(180,070)
Use of extra Federal 5307 Operating above years allocation	(200,000)	

Staff will be working in the next few months to prepare for the upcoming grant application process with VTRANs so we can provide them with the funding requirements for FY20. This process begins in early April, the executed grant is received late June, early July. This doesn't provide the Authority a lot of time to make adjustments if our request is not fully granted.

The capital budget presented is primarily funding vehicle replacements. In the urban capital budget are the two electric vehicles anticipated for delivery in September 2019. As well as 2 big bus replacements and 10 vehicle replacements for SSTA operations.

The rural capital budget presented contains 10 vehicle replacements as well as the renovations for the Berlin facility and furnishing the Montpelier Transit Center that is expected to open in early Fall of 2019.

<u>Staff is requesting that the board approve the operating budget of \$21,588,978 and the capital budget of \$9,465,032 for Fiscal Year 2020.</u>

ADA Ridership Report (by Town) : FY19 TotalRides

is 100%	of FY 19 YTD	pared to	FY18	101%		125%		117%		28%		6%		100%		141%		98%		103%			
comparison	Total %	FY18 com	Rides	14,444		1,466		3,708		242		3,137		12,597		1,150		5,551		42,295			
Benchmark for c	T	<u> </u>	otal FY19 YTD R	14,589		1,832		4,343		67		3,027		12,546		1,621		5,413		43,446 4		1,114,349.60	25.65
			June 1	1,211	8.90%	128	-10.49%	361	11.42%	0	-100.00%	227	-1.30%	1,100	15.30%	131	3.15%	417	-12.94%	3,575	5.18%	\$ 971.26 \$	25.17 \$
			May	1,262	1.12%	144	-0.69%	368	6.67%	2	-96.67%	219	-23.43%	1,192	23.01%	149	34.23%	507	-7.99%	3,843	3.45%	97,647.96 \$	25.41 \$
			April	1,214	0.08%	167	8.44%	381	33.22%	-	-65.22%	262	5.22%	1,140	9.62%	155	47.62%	568	25.39%	3,895	10.56%	99,348.42 \$	25.51 \$
			March	1,216	1.59%	160	5.26%	387	11.85%	5	-78.26%	269	-12.09%	1,263	18.93%	150	48.51%	539	6.10%	3,989	7.96%	101,692.79 \$	25.49 \$
			February	1,103	-9.52%	151	51.00%	357	12.62%	1	-96.43%	217	-18.42%	1,021	13.19%	156	100.00%	431	-8.88%	3,437	1.60%	\$ 22,760.93	25.53 \$
			January	1,181	0.08%	147	-2.00%	366	21.19%	5	-82.76%	266	-13.07%	1,007	-7.02%	133	12.71%	402	-12.80%	3,507	-3.36%	\$ 90,112.57 \$	\$ 25.70 \$
			December	1,260	11.21%	175	76.77%	330	4.10%	1	-88.89%	239	5.75%	686	-10.50%	112	12.00%	370	-16.29%	3,476	1.31%	\$ 89,573.66	\$ 25.77
			November	1,193	0.59%	159	59.00%	379	26.33%	0	-100.00%	231	-7.60%	1,050	-7.24%	108	42.11%	416	-7.14%	3,536	0.91%	91,261.37	25.81
			October	1,411	10.67%	195	82.24%	343	8.20%	0	-100.00%	291	11.49%	1,132	-5.98%	120	93.55%	440	0.23%	3,932	7.11%	\$ 200.93	25.92 \$
			September	1,167	-0.26%	171	76.29%	314	12.95%	2	-50.00%	260	13.54%	995	-8.80%	127	69.33%	369	-17.82%	3,405	0.35%	88,349.47 \$	25.95 \$
			August	1,290	4.96%	129	25.24%	396	37.50%	7	-22.22%	298	7.97%	886	-18.86%	155	53.47%	462	1.32%	3,623	1.94%	\$ 93,074.61 \$	\$ 25.69 \$
nm prior year			July	1,081	-15.68%	106	-8.62%	361	25.35%	44	388.89%	248	-1.59%	771	-19.94%	125	30.21%	492	25.51%	3,228	-5.00%	\$ 83,655.63	\$ 25.92 \$
% increase/(decrease) fro			CITY/TOWN	BURLINGTON		COLCHESTER		ESSEX		OTHER		SHELBURNE		SO. BURLINGTON		WILLISTON		MINOOSKI		TOTAL		Cost to Members	Cost/Trip


Month:	July 2019	
Urban Data	Data	Notes
Miles Operated:	172.717	Revenue Vehicles
Major Road Calls:	8	Failure prevented a vehicle from completing or starting a scheduled revenue trip
Major Road Calls/100,000 Miles:	4.65	
Minor Road Calls:	6	Vehicle physically able to continue in revenue service without creating a safety concern (i.e. fare box, HVAC)
Total Road Calls/100,000 Miles:	8.23	
"C" PM's Completed:	26	"C" PM is a major inspection consisting of a PM checklist, brake inspection, chassis grease and engine oil change, preformed every 6,000 miles
"C" PM On-time %	100%	Within 10% of the scheduled mileage per the FTA
Active Fleet Avg. Age	7.80 years	Transit buses have a 12 year life expectancy
Rural Data		Notes
Miles Operated:	82,260	Revenue Vehicles
Major Road Calls:	2	Failure prevented a vehicle from completing or starting a scheduled revenue trip
Major Road Calls/100,000 Miles:	0.24	
Minor Road Calls:	1	Vehicle physically able to continue in revenue service without creating a safety concern (i.e. fare box, HVAC)
Total Road Calls/100,000 Miles:	0.36	
"C" PM's Completed:	16	"C" PM is a major inspection consisting of a PM checklist, brake inspection, chassis grease and engine oil change, preformed every 6,000 miles
"C" PM On-time %	88%	Within 10% of the scheduled mileage per the FTA
Cut-away Active Fleet Avg. Age	4.27 years	Cut-away buses have a 5 year life expectancy

15 Industrial Parkway, Burlington, VT 05401 | T: 802-864-2282 F: 802-864-5564 6088 VT Route 12, Berlin, VT 05602 | T: 802-223-7287 F: 802-223-6236 375 Lake Road, Suite 5, St. Albans, VT 05478 | T: 802-527-2181 F: 802-527-5302



To: GMT Board of Commissioners From: Jamie L. Smith, Director of Marketing and Planning Date: August 12, 2019 Re: Marketing, Public Affairs, and Planning Report

- **Passenger Letter/Passenger Appreciation Day:** In an effort to speak directly with passengers, following the implementation of urban NextGen, we developed a "Letter to Our Passengers" piece. The first letter, which was urban focused, is the first of many of this type of direct communication we hope to implement in FY20.
- Updated Bus Map and Guide: The Urban BM&G is at the printer. It features a slightly updated schedule format to help passengers wayfind easier. It also has schedule improvements and corrections that were missing in the June guide.
- Website work: We are meeting with our web developer to talk about a site "refresh". The goal is to make a more unified place to find schedules, fare information, service alerts, etc.
- NextGen Rural: As we continue to explore microtransit, we have been speaking internally about NextGen changes that can be made to coincide with the opening of the MTC and the October bus map and guide.
- **CATMA:** We have met recently with CATMA to discuss the upcoming semester. Marketing and Planning staff are helping develop maps, and student information pieces for incoming students.
- **Recruitment campaign:** Marketing staff is assisting the HR Department in their upcoming seasonal recruitment efforts. We are hopeful that we can help explore some new outreach channels and hopefully tap into a pool of eligible operators.
- **Photo bank:** GMT is procuring a photographer for an upcoming photo shoot. This will help refresh our photo stock of the bus fleet, etc for use in

15 Industrial Parkway, Burlington, VT 05401 | **T:** 802-864-2282 **F:** 802-864-5564 **6088 VT Route 12, Berlin, VT 05602** | **T:** 802-223-7287 **F:** 802-223-6236 **375 Lake Road, Suite 5, St. Albans, VT 05478** | **T:** 802-527-2181 **F:** 802-527-5302



ads, the bus map and guide, and other marketing.

- Outreach Activities:
 - Waldorf School: Planning staff met with the Lake Champlain Waldorf School to talk about the upcoming school year. As you may know, they lost direct service as part of the new service structure. We will update as conversations continue.
 - CVMC: Staff met with CVMC to discuss some service to a clinic location in South Barre. They mentioned that they have a temporary, short term solution, to transport passengers to/from the passengers until transit service is available. Again, we will continue to update as this conversation progresses.
 - Darn Tough/VTrans: VTrans invited GMT to participate in a discussion with Darn Tough Socks. The mill is looking for more service options for their employees, including improved transit service, van pools, etc. There has been other interest in improved services to Norwich, Mayo Healthcare, and Sodexo.



RE:	IT Support, Administrative Support, Training, and HR
Date:	August 20, 2019
From:	Trish Redalieu, Director of Human Resources
То:	GMT Board of Commissioners

Stephen Kaplowitz, Maya Pokhrel, Kym Ketchum, Okun Anthony, and Abdoul Saibou, fulltime bus Operators in Burlington, have joined the GMT team. A warm welcome to all!

GMT hosted a nationwide training conducted by the USDOT Transit Safety Institute: Instructors Course for Transit Trainers. This five-day course was funded by VTrans. There were 19 attendees – many from Vermont transit agencies, as well as two GMT employees: Jon Mabee, Operations Supervisor – Burlington, and Mark Stupik, Operations Supervisor – Berlin. The focus of the course was developing presentation skills and facilitating methods and adult learning styles for teaching bus operators.

Members of the Finance team attended a Triennial Workshop in Boston MA. The workshop is designed to assist grantees in preparing for the Triennial Review by reviewing all statutory and program requirements.

Shawn Kilburn, Master Mechanic was scheduled to attend the second in a four-part MCI training series on the HVAC system in Louisville, KY. However due to a flight cancellation, this training was re-scheduled for September.

HR has begun seasonal bus operator recruiting. As we expand our recruiting efforts in the coming months, including a social media strategy, newspapers ads, seasonal job websites, a bus with a banner strategically placed in locations near ski areas, etc., we are hopeful to be well-placed for the upcoming ski season.

FY20 GMT Urban Ridership by Month

	Number of Service Days													FY20 YTD	EV19 YTD			FY18 YTD		
	Saturday	4 -	5	4,	4 -	S.	4,	4 -	5.	4,	4 -	5	4 -	4 -	4 ,			S i		
	Sunday Week dav	4	4	د 20	4	4	د 12	4	4 20	د 22	4	د 20	4 22	4	د 21			د 20		
	School Days	0	5	20	22	16	15	20	15	19	17	20	10	0	0	Difference (]	FY19-FY18)	0	Difference (1	Y19-FY17)
#	Route Name	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	FY20 YTD	FY19 YTD	riders	%	FY18 YTD	riders	%
1&7	REDLINE	53,632		4										53,632	51,417	2,215	4.31%	48,861	4,771	9.76%
2 & 6	BLUELINE	56,798												56,798	52,511	4,287	8.16%	53,935	-53,935	-100.00%
10	ORANGE LINE	2,247												2,247	1,435	812	56.59%	1,618	629	38.88%
5 & 9	GREENLINE	19,118												19,118	17,939	1,179	6.57%	17,516	-17,516	-100.00%
4	SILVERLOOP	994												994	1,544	-550	-35.62%	1,207	-213	-17.65%
8	GOLDLOOP	3,470												3,470	4,202	-732	-17.42%	4,638	-1,168	-25.18%
11 & 12	PURPLE LINE	15,399												15,399	22,062	-6,663	-30.20%	21,298	-21,298	-100.00%
3	Lakeside Commuter	72												72	283	-211	-74.56%	127	-55	-43.31%
16	Hanna ford's	200												200	210	-10	-4.76%	108	92	85.19%
19	Price Chopper #1	310												310	157	153	97.45%	200	110	55.00%
20	Price Chopper #2	256												256	103	153	148.54%	98	158	161.22%
21	School Trippers	,												0	37	-37	-100.00%	0	0	%00.0
18	Sunday Service	,	'	,										0	735	-735	-100.00%	495	-495	-100.00%
26	Other	2,700												2,700	4,286	-1,586	-37.00%	7,856	-5,156	-65.63%
56	Milton Commuter	1,534												1,534	1,558	-24	-1.54%	1,120	414	36.96%
76	Middlebury Link	967												967	1,321	-354	-26.80%	1,010	-43	-4.26%
86	Montpelier Link	9,784												9,784	10,015	-231	-2.31%	8,545	1,239	14.50%
96	St. Albans Link	1,408												1,408	1,231	177	14.38%	1,172	236	20.14%
46	116 Commuter	346												346	353	<i>L</i> -	-1.98%	277	69	24.91%
36	Jeffersonville Commuter	966												966	580	386	66.55%	716	250	34.92%
97	Barre LINK	419												419	0	419	NA	0	419	NA
	SUBTOTAL	315,148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315,148	315,908	-760	-0.24%	312,407	2,741	0.88%
	Local Commuter	300,143 2,846	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	300,143 2,846	156,921 2,491	143,222 355	91.27% 14.25%	157,957 2,113	142,186 733	90.02% 34.69%
	LINK	12,159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,159	12,567	-408	-3.25%	10,727	1,432	13.35%

FY 20 Urban Ridership

FY20 GMT Rural Ridership by	Month
FY20 GMT Rural Ridership	à
FY20 GMT Rural	Ridership
FY20 GMT	Rural
FY 20	GMT
	FY 20

Dave
onion o
odum
Z

L	Number of Service Days		_	_										FY 20 YTD	FY19 YTD			FY18 YTD		
	Saturday	y 4	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4			5		
L	Sunday	y 4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	5			5		
·	Weekday	y 23	22	21	23	21	22	23	20	22	22	21	22	23	21			20		
<u> </u>	School Days	s 0												0	0			0		
1															lia	ference (FY 20-F	(61 X	Diffe	rence (FY20-FY	(18)
F	Route Name	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	FY20 YTD	FY19 YTD	Riders	%	FY18 YTD	Riders	%
⊢	City Route Mid-day	2,237												2,237	2,013	224	11.1%	19	2,218	11673.7%
F	Barre Hospital Hill	3,044												3,044	2,824	220	7.8%	2,337	707	30.3%
⊢	Montpelier Hospital Hill	2,307												2,307	2,084	223	10.7%	1,725	582	33.7%
	Waterbury Commuter	877												877	830	47	5.7%	945	(89)	-7.2%
-	US 2 Commuter	689												689	595	94	15.8%	617	72	11.7%
F	Hannaford Shopping Special	119												119	193	(74)	-38.3%	207	(88)	-42.5%
-	Northfield Shuttle	42												42	48	(9)	-12.5%	81	(39)	-48.1%
-	Capital Shuttle	0	0	0	0	0	0							0	532	(532)	-100.0%	0	0	0.0%
-	City Commuter	3,472												3,472	3,170	302	9.5%	2,886	586	20.3%
	Plainfield Shuttle	28												28	44	(16)	-36.4%	35	(2)	-20.0%
\vdash	Hospital Hill Demand Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	(95)	-100.0%	106	(106)	-100.0%
	Montpelier Circulator	1,238												1,238	1,061	177	16.7%	1,392	(154)	-11.1%
-	North field Commuter	540												540	613	(73)	-11.9%	529	11	2.1%
	Route 100 Commuter	460												460	586	(126)	-21.5%	568	(108)	-19.0%
-	Mountain Road Shuttle	0	0	0	0									0	0	0		0	0	
	Morrisville Loop	279												279	3.59	(80)	-22.3%	340	(61)	-17.9%
-	Morrisville Shopping Shuttle	215												215	257	(42)	-16.3%	218	(3)	-1.4%
-	Tuesday Shopping Shuttle (FGI)	06												06	73	17	23.3%	52	38	73.1%
⊢	St.Albans DT Shuttle	2,222												2,222	1,940	282	14.5%	1,838	384	20.9%
-	Alburg-Georgia Commuter	529												529	592	(63)	-10.6%	467	62	13.3%
⊢	Richford-St.Albans Commuter	683												683	574	109	19.0%	488	195	40.0%
	Valley Floor	0	0	0	0									0	0	0		0	0	
-	Valley Evening Service	0	0	0	0									0	0	0		0	0	
	Mount Ellen	0	0	0	0									0	0	0		0	0	
-	Mountain Condos	0	0	0	0									0	0	0		0	0	
	Access Road	0	0	0	0									0	0	0		0	0	
	Special Services	1,834												1,834	1472	362	24.6%	2,384	(550)	-23.1%
	SUBTOTAL	20,905	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,905	19,955	950	4.8%	17,234	3,671	21.3%
_																				
<u> </u>	Route Name	ýnf	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	FY 20 YTD	Dif	ference (FY 20-F	(61 X	Diffe	rence (FY20-FY	(18)
4	Canital District	15.547	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15.547	15.304	243	1.6%	12.005	3.542	29.5%

FY20 State Grant - Urban Operating Funding Award

	FY19 Grant			Award vs	
State Operating	(midyear)	FY20 Request	FY20 Award	Reqest	FY20 vs FY19
State Operating (including Waterbury Link					
Match)	\$2,254,786	\$2,528,220	\$2,262,192	(\$266,028)	\$7,406

	FY19 Grant			Award vs	
Preventive Maintenance	(midyear)	FY20 Request	FY20 Award	Reqest	FY20 vs FY19
PM	\$1,613,684	\$1,730,000	\$1,613,684	(\$116,316)	0\$

	FY19 Grant			Award vs	
FY12 CMAQ	(midyear)	FY20 Request	FY20 Award	Reqest	FY20 vs FY19
CMAQ Rt 116 Commuter	\$63,393	\$72,850	\$72,850	0\$	\$9,457
CMAQ Montpelier (4pm)	\$28,500	\$36,417	\$36,417	(0\$)	\$7,917
CMAQ Route 2	\$710,229	\$809,043	\$809,043	0\$	\$98,814
CMAQ Milton	\$165,000	\$172,184	\$172,184	0\$	\$7,184
CMAQ Rt 15 6:45 pm & 7:45 pm	\$35,000	\$31,905	\$31,905	(0\$)	(\$3,095)
CMAQ Total	\$1,002,122	\$1,122,399	\$1,122,399	0\$	\$120,277

	FY19 Grant			Award vs	
New CMAQ	(midyear)	FY20 Request	FY20 Award	Reqest	FY20 vs FY19
CMAQ for new Barre Link Route	\$29,624	\$109,842	\$109,842	0\$	\$80,218
State Match for Barre Link Route	\$7,406	\$27,460	\$27,461	ţ1	\$20,055
Total	\$37,030	\$137,302	\$137,303	ţ1	\$100,273

	FY19 Grant			Award vs	
Other Funding	(midyear)	FY20 Request	FY20 Award	Reqest	FY20 vs FY19
5307 flexed from 5311	\$229,993	\$236,893	\$230,000	(\$6,893)	\$7
5307 flexed from 5311 for Waterbury					
CMAQ Replacement	\$0	\$63,517	\$63,517	(\$0)	\$63,517
5310 Mobility Management	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	0\$	\$0
Mobility Management Match	\$8,750	\$8,750		(\$8,750)	(\$8,750)
Total	\$308,743	\$379,160	\$363,517	(\$15,643)	\$54,774

Overal Total

\$282,730
(\$397,986)
\$5,499,095
\$5,897,081
\$5,216,365

FY20 State Grant - Rural Operating Funding Award

	FY19 Grant			Award vs	FY20 vs
Funding Type	(midyear)	FY20 Request	FY20 Award	Request	FY19
State Operating	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	0\$	0\$
5311 Operations	\$600,000	\$700,000	\$700,000	0\$	\$100,000
5311 Admin	\$580,000	\$540,000	\$514,000	(\$26,000)	(\$66,000)
5311 PM	\$550,000	\$834,000	\$750,000	(\$84,000)	\$200,000
CMAQ - US 2 Commuter & Stowe Expansion	\$214,000	\$258,000	\$258,000	0\$	\$44,000
CMAQ - Hardwick	\$4' 1 44	\$77,744	\$78,000	\$256	\$73,856
CMAQ Match - Hardwick	\$1,036	\$19,436	\$19,500	¢9\$	\$18,464
CMAQ - MTC	0\$	\$76,317	\$39,680	(\$36,637)	\$39,680
5311 RTAP	\$18,000	\$25,000	\$18,000	(\$7,000)	\$0
Planning	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	0\$	\$0
Mobility Management	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	0\$	\$0
Mobility Management Match	\$6,250	\$6,250	\$0	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)
Subtotal	\$3,148,430	\$3,711,748	\$3,552,180	(\$159,568)	\$403,750

E&D - Wash, FGI, CC (Rural)	\$1,140,000	\$1,174,200	\$1,180,000	\$5,800	\$40,000
E&D - Chittenden County (State)	\$101,784	\$104,838	\$101,784	(\$3,054)	\$0
FY18 E&D Makeup		\$37,500	\$35,602	(\$1,898)	\$35,602
Total E&D	\$1,241,784	\$1,316,538	\$1,317,386	\$848	\$75,602

Overall Total

\$4,390,214 \$

\$5,028,285 \$4,869,566 <mark>(\$158,719)</mark> \$479,352



To: GMT Board of Commissioners From: Jamie L. Smith, Director of Marketing and Planning Date: August 12, 2019 Re: Route 14 Commuter

GMT met with RCT, VTrans, CVRPC, and LCPC to discuss the outcome of the July GMT Board Meeting and the decision to hold off on moving forward with the new route. At that time, we agreed that RCT would operate both legs of the new Route 14 Commuter.

GMT staff is in support of this decision. This presents a unique situation where another provider will operate service in GMT's service area. In order to recognize and prevent any unintended consequences, GMT Planning and Outreach staff has asked to be involved in conversations regarding local match, etc.

This is a discussion item at this time, unless the board has any questions regarding this matter.

2019 ADA Customer Service Survey

Introduction

Between April and June, 2019, a survey was conducted as an update to previous surveys of ADA riders, most recently completed in 2015 and 2017. The purpose of the survey was to collect information about how clients perceive the ADA paratransit service provided by Special Services Transportation Agency (SSTA), under contract to Green Mountain Transit.

On Tuesday of each week, SSTA provided a roster of the previous week's trips from which potential survey respondents were randomly selected. The selection process filtered out anyone who had already been interviewed.

During the survey period, approximately 224 customers of the paratransit service were contacted. There was no answer for 85 persons contacted, and in a few cases (10), the number listed was incorrect. Only nine customers answered the phone but were too busy or uninterested in taking the survey. Some customers asked to be called-back at a later date but most customers completed the survey within two weeks of their most recent SSTA trip.

As was the case during the last round of surveys, responses were overwhelmingly positive. One respondent said "I'd like to thank them so much because it really helps us senior citizens." Another said "Haven't had one unpleasant driver. Thankful for the program." Specific responses are discussed below.

Many of the negative comments related to the scheduling system, both dealing with some of the reservation agents and with the routing and reliability of the trips. The automated messages were the focus of the most negative feedback, primarily because the time estimates for the van arrival are often inaccurate; for example, an automated call would say the van is arriving in 20 minutes, but it arrives in only 3 minutes. Many riders complained about circuitous routing of the vans and that their trips took a long time, sometimes passing right by their destination to accomplish another pick-up.

Survey participation was

predominantly female, representing 91 of the responses compared to 29 males. Respondents' median age was 66 years old and 17 percent use a wheelchair while 83 percent are ambulatory.

Eight municipalities were represented in the survey, as illustrated by the figure to the right. The previous survey did not include respondents from Milton.



Survey Results by Question

Question I: When you contact SSTA to make a reservation do you: place the call yourself, have someone else call on your behalf, or have a subscription trip? Question I: When you contact SSTA to make a reservation do you: place the

Most of the respondents, 82 percent, made ride reservations themselves, while 15 percent indicated someone else made reservations on their behalf. Only three percent reported having a subscription ride arranged. All respondents answered this question.

Question 2: (If answer to question I was "self") When you call, is the SSTA reservation agent prompt and pleasant? Y/N

Of those who made reservations themselves, 81 percent said that when they called, the agent was prompt and pleasant. This result is lower than previous surveys (86 percent in 2017, 94 percent in 2015). Respondents



indicated some agents are "great" and "extremely courteous" while other agents come off as "abrasive" or are "hard to understand because they speak too quickly or quietly."

Question 2b: Are you ever placed on hold? Y/N

Fifty-one respondents (43 percent) said they had been placed on hold during the reservation process.

Question 2b1: If yes, how often does that happen, rarely, sometimes, or frequently?

Of those 51 respondents, most (28) indicated they are placed on hold "rarely." 14 respondents said they were placed on hold "sometimes" and only seven said they are placed on hold "frequently."

Question 2b2: If yes, how long are you typically placed on hold?

The average hold time reported was less than I minute, shorter than the previous survey.

Question 2c: Overall, are you satisfied with the reservation experience? Y/N

80% of respondents said that they were satisfied with the reservation experience, overall. All comments about reservation satisfaction can be found on page 7.



Question 2d: Would you prefer a different system here you could reserve trips yourself using a computer or smartphone instead of having to call SSTA? Y/N

An overwhelming number of respondents (102) indicated they would not prefer reserving their trips via smartphone or computer while only 15 percent said they would appreciate such a service. Respondents cited age as a primary reason for preferring phone calls over a smartphone or computer.

Question 3: What is your experience with the new scheduling software?

Nearly all respondents (116) answered this question, with almost half indicating their experience was "quick and easy" (48 percent) followed by "Can't really tell" (41 percent) and "Complicated and slow" (11 percent). One respondent commented "the system is better than the old software but it still needs improvement." A full list of customer comments about the scheduling software can be found on page 7.

Question 4: Have you received automated calls for your scheduled trips?

Very few respondents (15) indicated they were not receiving automated calls. From those providing comments, a common complaint was the reminder call in the evening has a different pick-up time than the reservation and often varies from the actual pickup time the following day. A complete list of comments about automated calls can be found on page 9.

Question 5: When you make a reservation, is SSTA generally able to give you the pick-up time you've requested, plus or minus one hour? Y/N



93 percent of respondents said that they were able

to travel within an hour of the time they had requested to do so, a decline from the last survey (97 percent). Seven percent of customers indicated they were unable to travel within an hour of the time they requested.

Question 6: Once you've made a reservation, does SSTA ever call you back to try to change the scheduled pickup time for any part of your trip? Y/N

Only 12 percent of respondents said that SSTA has or does contact them for a schedule change in their trips, which is lower than the previous survey (14 percent).

Question 6a: If yes, about how often does that happen: rarely, sometimes, or frequently?

Of those 14 responses, ten said that a request for schedule change occurs "rarely;" four respondents said that this occurs "sometimes," and none stated this occurs "frequently." Similar to the last survey, most respondents indicated that the schedule changes were not significant, when they do occur.

Question 7: Are you typically ready to take the van or sedan within five minutes of its arrival? Y/N

Almost all (114) respondents said that they are typically ready to take their ride within five minutes of the vehicle's arrival. Only six people said that they were not generally ready when the vehicle arrived.

Question 8: Does the van or sedan typically pick you up within 20 minutes of your scheduled pick-up time? Y/N

The vast majority of survey respondents (84 percent) indicated that the van or sedan is typically on schedule to pick them up.





Question 9: Based on your experience, please rate SSTA drivers on the following, using the rating system excellent, very good, good, fair, poor, or "I don't know/that doesn't apply to me."

A. Courtesy and respect shown by drivers.

Of all the measures taken during this multi-part question, the "excellent" rating was used in describing drivers' courtesy and respect more than any other; 60 percent of respondents said that the drivers' courtesy and respect was "excellent," an additional 25 percent rated it as "very good." 12 percent of respondents gave a "good" rating. There were no "fair" and only one "poor" responses in this category. One respondents did not provide a rating, stating too much variance between drivers to give them all the same rating.

B. Assistance provided with boarding/exiting and carrying packages/bags.

Seventy-one percent of customers said that the assistance provided by drivers was either "excellent" or "very good." There were 20 "good" responses, two "fair" responses, and only one "poor" response in this category. 12 respondents were unsure or chose not to answer this question.

C. Appropriate speed and care taken while driving.

Most respondents (84) said that the appropriate speed and care taken while driving was either "excellent" or "very good." Another 17 said that the driving was "good." There was seven responses for "fair" and none for "poor."

D. Knowledge of the lifts and straps that secure a mobility device.

Approximately half of all respondents (63) answered this question. Respondents said the drivers' knowledge of lifts and straps was either "excellent" (32), "very good" (21), or "good" (9). No respondents indicated drivers' knowledge as "fair" or "poor." 57 respondents do not use a mobility device.

E. Knowledge of the places you start and end your trips and how to get there.

Eighty percent of customers said that the drivers' street knowledge was either "excellent" or "very good," 18 percent said that their knowledge was "good". Only two respondents rated this question as "fair" and only one rated it "poor". Many respondents acknowledged that most drivers now rely on GPS for navigation and a few respondents noted that diverging from the GPS may improve navigation at times.

F. Maintaining a comfortable temperature and radio volume in the van or sedan.

Most respondents indicated comfort in the vehicles is "excellent" or "very good" with 37 percent and 38 percent of responses, respectively. Only seven percent of respondents rated the vehicle comfort level as anything less than good. Additional comments indicate that vans have more temperature issues than sedans and vans have uncomfortable, albeit necessary, suspension.



G. Overall, how would you rate the quality of service provided by SSTA? Excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?

41 percent of customers rated the SSTA service as "excellent" and 32 percent rated it "very good", a decline in "excellent" ratings from the previous survey (49 percent) and a notable decline from the 2015 survey (72 percent "excellent"). There were 16 "good" responses (13 percent), eight "fair" responses (seven percent), and two "poor" responses (two percent) in this category with 6 respondents unsure or unable to answer.



In addition to rating the service, respondents were asked whether they wanted to provide additional input (question 10); 102 did so, with a mix of positive and negative comments. A complete list of comments is provided on the following pages. As much as possible, the comments were recorded verbatim.

Survey Respondent Complete Comments

Reservation Satisfaction Comments

- I like being able to call to make a reservation since people on the phone cross check all the details.
- I have the same schedule every week but one day I was on vacation so my pick-up time was different. One of the reservation agents noticed and called me directly to double check if that time was okay. It was so thoughtful I told all the other riders about her that week. I am very happy with the service and I couldn't do anything without them.
- Tami and Brenda are great and I want to talk to them every time I call. They're compassionate and understanding and they follow the rules.
- If I had more money, I would buy them out and fire them all. The call reservation agents treat you like you are an idiot: they talk down to you, and I can't stand the way they talk to some cognitively disabled. If the State saw the way they treated some people, I think they would be upset since it doesn't seem they are upholding their end of the contract. I've talked to Gene to complain and he was not receptive to anything I had to say.
- It is problematic to call after hours; if I leave a message on the machine, the evening dispatcher isn't great about getting back to people in a prompt and timely manner.
- Anything dealing with the drivers is excellent, but trying to change a reservation can be very complex.
- Some people on the phone could be more personable since they can sometimes be a little bit harsh.
- Sometimes it's hard to hear young people on the phone.
- If there was an online or mobile scheduling with alerts to changes I would be very happy with that. It would take the responsibility off SSTA and I would assume responsibility for being tardy. It could be checked from anywhere, like if I am being collected from somewhere other than my house, a robo call to my house saying the ride is near does not help.
- Jordan Posner is very good to speak with.
- I enjoy the personal interaction of the phone calls and would not prefer a computer reservation system.
- There is zero consistency with how things will or should go.
- Some new people working there have gotten my rides messed up.
- Sometimes the phone rings a long time before they pick it up.
- It could be better but I won't complain.
- Strongly urge for an online system. I've been working with Morgan on setting up email notifications.
- Not very prompt getting to the phone, fine once on the call.
- Not often pleasant, often short and cold.
- Sometimes there are girls that are too fast but I understand they have a lot on their hands.
- Usually the agents are prompt, but sometimes they hang up on me around 4:00 p.m., could be an accident.
- Like it except they changed the cut-off from 5:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. which I don't like as much.
- On hold while it's ringing as it takes them a long time to answer but it's okay.
- Usually pleasant but sometimes takes long for them to answer the call

Schedule Software Comments

• I know the drivers have no control to plan a more efficient route since they're not involved in booking process. It is frustrating. Sometimes they pick me up at the right time but then the

route to get home will be so roundabout and take so much longer.

- Sometimes when they bring me home they drop someone else first so it can take me an hour to get home since I'm usually the last to get dropped off. They should re-route the drop off and pickup. My pickup is 10:30 a.m. and other guy is 10:40 a.m. so I have to wait for the guy to come out.
- Their scheduling system or method is really what creates the only problem.
- Once in a while there are mix ups where I don't get picked up at the right time or sometimes they'll have to drop off two other people before I get dropped off and that has made me late.
- Sometimes scheduling is done by a computer and they have other pick-ups so sometimes I get there later than anticipated.
- Sometimes they make mistakes upon booking and sometimes the route becomes really long depending on the number of drop-offs.
- They could improve their time efficiency. Not efficient when I have to leave an hour before an appointment that is 4 miles away.
- They rely too much on computers and don't use enough common sense when scheduling rides since the routes can be so inconvenient.
- Today they picked me up early and when they brought me home, I was only 15 minutes away but it took 30 minutes because the route was inconvenient.
- My ride was scheduled for 7:30 a.m. for an 8:00 a.m. appointment and 5 minutes before 8:00 a.m. I called and they said I was now scheduled for 8:10 a.m. The drivers are great but I struggle with the scheduling. It's frustrating that I have such a small window to be ready but they can and have come up to 30 minutes ahead of my scheduled time.
- I always schedule my rides to appointments super early because I know they will be late.
- Sometimes it's an inconvenient route, they've driven right by my destination sometimes to go drop other people.
- Sometimes there are two of us getting picked up and going to similar places but we can't ride together, we have to go separate. Why make us go independently? We could go together.
- The staff here worked hard to get SSTA to come to our facility but there have been major issues with the timing. My main complaint is the length of time it takes to get somewhere, the routes are awful.
- The issue with navigation is the system sends the driver down the busiest street. If the drivers were willing to take advice from clients, who travel to the same places frequently, they could improve their navigation.
- New software seems to be running on a bus system as opposed to their own system. Frustrating for the drivers, but they are nice to me. Software should be changed so it's better for the drivers and participants.
- Sometimes it says the destination will be on the left but it's really on the right.
- It was better and more functional when they used paper versus what they have now.
- Picking up and coming home, sometimes there are too many stops that take long or is delayed.
- Once in a while things get messed up.
- At times the drivers are at odds with the schedule with the order of when they need to drop people off. Problems seem to be caused by the last-minute add-ins.
- Doesn't take into account that you have to strap in a wheelchair and the lift, not sure if they consider that time or traffic time, but they typically run late.
- Frustrating since the actual pick-up time isn't anything that was discussed
- Not a big deal for me but it's slow.
- It's terrible. It doesn't take into account traffic or seem to understand how to make a route.

Automated Call Comments

- Change the automatic voice because the lady is annoying. A nice friendly male would be good.
- Sometimes I don't get the automated calls the night before or in the morning 15 minutes before arrival. For the most part it's been reliable and not too much trouble.
- The confirmation call that comes reminding me rings my home phone, and the call that tells me I'm going to get picked up also comes to my home phone but I'm not there. I don't think it's their fault though.
- I have about 15 minutes before they get here once I get the call, but lately, I get the call and then the van pulls up 3 minutes later. Because of this, I have missed my ride before. I would appreciate it if they tried to contact me before they leave me.
- I am autistic, and it's difficult and disruptive to my day when there is no plan for the changes that come to the schedule last minute. This happens when I get a call that the van is on its way but then show up one minute later, which is 20 minutes early. Would be great if the calls included an accurate time estimate.
- The varying pick up times and not knowing right away that they varied is the issue. A 15 minute warning doesn't cut it.
- When the schedule changes there is no call saying that the schedule has changed.
- Need a better voice.
- Lately, the reminder the day before doesn't always happen and I rely on that and would like it to continue.
- Have them start talking sooner. There is a long pause and some people may hang up.
- They're not accurate at all. Would like a person to do that. Sometimes they call to say they'll be there in a few minutes but have already driven by.
- They need to be more accurate. Generally they are quite a bit off and could be an hour early based on the call or 5 minutes. Large range.
- They should try to aim for more accuracy.
- It would be nice if they would call if they can't find me or to let me know they are waiting outside but they don't do that all the time.
- Call comes at night but it says 'subject to change' but you have no way of knowing when that change is. There's only a 5 minute window for the bus to wait for you but you don't even know when the time changed from 3:00 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.
- If they were accurate, they would be fine.
- Wish that they would always call the day of or the day before the trip.
- Seems pointless, when you call for a reservation they fit you in the schedule, but then when you receive the phone call it's a different time. Sometimes I don't even get a call. Sometimes they leave a voicemail and sometimes they don't.
- Sometimes the call comes at helpful times (5/10 minutes before) and sometimes it calls a little too close to the pick-up time. The automated message says "times are subject to change" which is ok, but then they should announce what the change is.
- Sometimes they are wrong, so I have to call in but they do fix it and they apologize.
- The automated has a tendency to change your schedule and that's difficult for doctor appointments.
- I receive them 50% of the time. Helpful when I get the call and I can get ready. Very problematic if they don't call.
- Sometimes the automated message doesn't come the night before.
- Accuracy should be improved. They call you at night to remind you but if something is wrong from the automated call, the office is closed so you can't call back to even fix it at that time.

- I'm satisfied with it.
- Should put the pertinent information of the calls first, and provided it all quicker for shorter calls. I typically hang up before the full message has played out.
- I like the reminders. Sometimes the voicemail doesn't list the pick-up time so it's frustrating if I can't make it to the phone on time and can't call back until the morning to confirm my time.
- I don't need reminders but I appreciate the calls.
- They are consistent with the time they give at night with when they get there in the morning.
- 90% of the time I receive one of these calls,
- They should call every time, the night before, even on weekends (they call less frequently then), and the calls should be more accurate as to what the driver is told.
- I'm glad to have them as reminders.
- Usually they call 10-15 minutes before the van arrives, but sometimes the call comes once the van is there. They should always call before the van is in the driveway.
- They could be friendlier. They should call more at the same time. It's not helpful if some calls come 30 minutes and some come 2 minutes before the van arrives.
- Calls are slow and robotic and not helpful.
- I am more secured when I get the calls after 6:00 p.m. to know I have a ride the next day. I'm glad for these calls.
- I'd rather have personal calls but understand why it's automated.
- Usually they call at the same time the driver arrives, I would like it to be an earlier warning.
- They're okay when they're audible. Recently some have been silent.
- Whenever I got them they only left a short message. Sometimes it's a partial message. Now I miss them and need to call myself.
- The robo call in the morning saying the ride is close is different (earlier) than the time from the robo call last night. If this time was later it wouldn't be an issue but the change in time can be an issue.
- They don't get my name right, however, they usually call the night before and in the morning and it works well.
- They are pretty on target. There has been only I time there was a great distance between when they said they were coming and when they showed up. I enjoy these calls because I know when to schedule my breakfast.
- Sometimes it says I have one ride when I have two. Other times it doesn't give a reminder.
- Need to be more consistent.
- I hate them! We will arrive soon means they are here now or will be in 20 minutes. It just doesn't work.
- Works well!
- Sometimes I don't get the call. If they could call the night before consistently that would be good but the more valuable call is the robo call 15 minutes before pick-up. This means I might miss my ride.
- They need to make them prompt. When drivers don't come on time they need to call me.
- They call when I'm away on my trip.
- It would be more helpful for me to get a specific time just because of the amount of time it takes me to get ready and get out the door. I call in the morning to get a specific time, if I could get a call for specific time I wouldn't be as rushed.
- These are often wrong. It is ridiculous that there are three different times for a pick-up: I. the reservation time, 2. the pick-up time from the automated call the night before, and 3. the time the driver shows up. There is too much variation.

- They should call with more of a warning. Sometimes the driver arrives at a different time than the automated call from the night before and then the "driver arriving soon" call comes too late.
- Inconsistent.
- They are often wrong. There should be a call in the morning that accurately tells you when the driver will arrive.

Positive Comments

- I'm very pleased with the service.
- On May Street there is a bump so the driver always drives very slowly because it hurts if you hit it.
- As far as I know this is the best senior transportation service and it is very economical.
- We couldn't do without this service.
- I've been satisfied with SSTA and have been using them for years.
- Overall would rate SSTA's service more than excellent!
- They treat me very good and they provide wonderful service.
- I am happy with the service because their price is right.
- It's a very good service and it's been a godsend for me.
- Drivers are friendly.
- Vans are always clean.
- This program is a godsend. It transforms people's lives. I wish more people would take the bus, everyone needs to stop driving as of yesterday.
- They all do a tremendous job. I don't know how all the vans manage to get there on time, it's magic.
- I've talked to everyone over the years and the people are all great and helpful and I don't know what I'd do without them.
- I have been taking the bus for three years and I know the office people so at times I'll call the office folks and let them know my ride is taking too long. When I call, there is always a solution on how to solve the problem, which I really like. It depends on who the dispatcher is but it is helpful.
- I'd like to thank them so much because it really helps us senior citizens. The service is wonderful.
- Drivers have great personalities. Very impressed with knowledge of vehicles. Always clean vans too. You can tell the drivers take responsibility for the cleanliness of their vehicles. Keep on doing what they're doing because it's a wonderful service for our community and it's a privilege to have them.
- Haven't had one unpleasant driver. They help me with my groceries and walker. I would get lost without them because they know the route better than me. They always ask for my temperature preference. The vehicles are comfortable but the roads are bad, not their fault though. Very respectful program and informative to changes. Thankful for the program.
- Have to carry a little cart for oxygen. Drivers are very helpful with that.
- Majority of the time SSTA is excellent, and a few times they're very good.
- We could not do what we do without SSTA. I think they do an excellent job. I only had one problem with one driver and they corrected it very quickly. We love SSTA.
- I can't complain they are good, and I am satisfied.
- I'm very happy with SSTA.
- I love this service and I'm very satisfied. Drivers are very friendly and kind. I've never met a mean one yet. I take the ramp because a shopping cart acts as a walker and they always help

me get my stuff up and down safely. The drivers are very careful and polite.

- Every year that we've used it, the service seems to get better and better.
- The drivers always ask if it's too hot or too cold and they're all excellent. I have no fault with them at all on any level. They are a godsend. The price is right, and they are right on time and it is very convenient.
- All the drivers are very polite.
- The girls I talk to on the phone are very patient and courteous and I've had no problem in any way and same with the drivers. I find no fault with them and they are very kind. Anything that you can do to make them feel appreciated with what they do, maybe give them a recognition party, but they should be shown some acknowledgement because they are doing a tremendous job. The manager is so kind and is a wonderful manager for that company.
- Most of the drivers are really good.
- I lose things all over town and they go and retrieve them for me. If they weren't there, I would be lost.
- People are so lucky to have them. I hope they keep this going because it's really the best.
- They've been very concerned about me because I have a cane. Best drivers I have ever driven with. I think they are very excellent.
- I think everyone at SSTA from the drivers to the phone agents are gracious, kind. They make things go smoothly. I have no negative remarks about anyone there. The system here in Vermont is wonderful. They deserve praise and they work very hard.
- I really appreciate that this is available. I have a car but sometimes cannot drive and I would be housebound without this service. For only \$2.50 I can get around.
- The temperature is always comfortable, I'm only on the bus a short while so it doesn't matter to me. Bob Flynn who retired was a very nice driver. All the new young drivers are very kind and polite and they are always so happy. It's a very good company and provides an excellent service. I'm very thankful for them because I cannot take a regular bus or drive a car.
- I'm very happy with SSTA and it is a wonderful service that I greatly appreciate.
- I or 2 drivers are not so good but in general the drivers very good. Drivers know how to do the straps quickly 4/5 times (not 9/10).
- There's rarely music in the vans but when there is, which is nice, it's a good volume.
- Some drivers talk, others don't and that's fine. Some drivers offer more assistance but I don't need it. I'm amazed at how well they do even when short staffed. This program is very good no matter what.
- Very grateful for the service. I used to use this service 5 days a week and it is very dependable.
- One time I lost my glasses and I was pleased that the driver had collected it and got it back to me, I think his name was Charlie.
- I wouldn't be able to work if it wasn't for this service so I am thankful and understanding of inconveniences.

Negative Comments

- Woman this morning, Ginger, was really sweet, but SSTA doesn't treat her well. She got me there on time. SSTA treats their help like they treat the people they pick up.
- Vans are not that comfortable because there are a lot of bumps.
- If you ever ask to change your time, it's a song and dance.
- I have been a little cold on the busses and have only had one driver that went a little fast.
- Need more lights in the back of busses.
- Vans are not extremely comfortable, the suspension is uncomfortable but I understand why.

- They hit every bump and the vans are disgusting, but the sedans are fine.
- Can't rely on their times. It can be stressful riding with them since I'm not sure if I'll arrive at appointments on time, but I'm glad the service is there so I don't have to spend all my money on taxis. Just wish they were more reliable.
- Both reservation agents and drivers seem short staffed.
- Drivers go a little too heavy on the speed bumps.
- I don't have much nice to say about SSTA except that they get me to work.
- A few times the bus showed up one hour early from my scheduled pick up time.
- Inability to make a last minute trip is an issue.
- Some drivers tend to go fast over bumps, painful in the back of the van.
- They need to get more drivers and I know they are trying.
- Williston Central School has a bus stop, but SSTA won't take me to my granddaughter's school because it's a specialty bus not a regular bus. I don't have a way to get there to take care of my special needs granddaughter, because of GMT's ridiculous rule, so I have to now buy a car.
- My condition is permanent, I'll never walk again, if anything things are getting worse, but GMT has me continually go in to get evaluated, and it seems like a waste of time for me to continue to go in to be questioned and evaluated more.
- Some of the vans are very dirty and the back of bus is uncomfortable.
- The seats are very straight and they should be a little longer on the bottom so we don't slide off. I take a cushion to sit on since the seats aren't comfortable and the vinyl is so slippery. Suspension is also quite stiff on the bus, but no busses have ever broke down on me.
- Interstate and potholes have been an issue with drivers' speeds.
- There have been problems with the temperature in the summer when it's too hot. Lack of air conditioner in the summer can be just as life threatening as not having heat in the winter, but the heat always works. Vans don't have proper suspension and this particular winter was bad because the roads are in bad shape, and it's exaggerated in the van. The wrong bump can really set off anyone's pain with back problems.
- For temperature, if the air conditioner doesn't work, they should not use those vans, as it can be ungodly hot in there. I can't go in anything over 80 degrees because of the medicine I take and it feels it can get much hotter in there in the summer. I just wish they had newer vans since the air conditioning can break and the vans are so bumpy but they provide excellent service.
- I'm glad that they are around since we do need the service, but the main problem is that I just need them to be reliable, so when I've missed so many appointments because they are late, I just can't depend on them.
- I find SSTA extremely frustrating to deal with.
- I don't like that I can be 5 minutes late but they can be up to 30.
- Some vehicles raddle and are uncomfortable. I know they do the best they can and I'm looking forward to the new equipment.
- Riding in a van is like riding in a school bus.
- For some stops that are within five minutes, I feel sometimes for that, the fares are a little high.
- The vans have stiff suspension and you feel every single bump but the sedans are fine.
- Someone should be hired to tighten up all the clanks and nuts and bolts on the vans since it's so noisy and really bothers those with hearing aids.
- Sometimes I'm left behind because I don't know they're there to pick me up.
- Missing the vehicle when you are out somewhere is awful. Sometimes they have not returned

to pick me up and that is very difficult.

- The only thing I have a gripe about is when I schedule a ride and they pick me up but then need to drop people off and I can miss an appointment I needed the ride for because it took so long. I understand the service and I'm thankful but it's tough to make appointments.
- Only once or twice have securements been done incorrectly. The worst incident was a belt not secured on the lift once.
- I've had a female driver who is very good, Fanny or something like that, who I like. Other drivers have not been very nice and they treat you like shit. Some drivers need coaching about their behavior. Speed is also an issue for the drivers, some go too quickly.
- One driver cussed me out and threatened to throw me off the bus but some are nice. I had a driver one time, take the scenic route on a 15 minute trip to take 30 minutes and it made me late for work. There is a new form for the passengers, there should be one to rate the drivers. Some are nasty and disrespectful. The dispatcher always takes the bus driver's side on everything.
- I have missed a driver because they didn't know to collect me from the handicap entrance at my work, rather than the front entrance with stairs.
- Some drivers drive too fast. One time I had a driver seemingly hit pot holes on purpose and go fast over speed bumps. When I made a comment as he dropped me off his response was "At least I got you here in one piece." Standards should be higher than that.
- The busses are total shit. They're not good for me and it hurts to ride around, the cars are good though.

Neutral Comments

- Different colored vans would be helpful.
- They should give the drivers change to be able to help the people in wheelchairs out since it's harder for them to break a \$20 bill.
- They should consider a training for the drivers if something happened on the van like an emergency such as a seizure or heart attack.
- Service is fine as long as they pick us up when they planned.
- The vans could use better shocks, but a lot of that is also that the streets are so crappy and full of potholes.
- Neither I nor the driver had any change for the last two trips I have taken. I would like to get one of the punch-cards but I'm not sure how to get one.
- In terms of assistance with boarding, some drivers are very excellent and some are only fair. Maintenance of vans are fair, while the sedans are very good.
- They need more drivers, they seem to be in extreme overload all the time.
- When it's hot in the summer the van can get hot but I think SSTA tries to do the best they can.
- Comfort and maintenance depends on the van. Everything is good, they just need more drivers and more vans especially given the aging population in this area is growing.
- Sometimes it's hard because the phone service ends at 4pm so it would be helpful if they were open another hour until 5pm.
- Seats are fine, it's convenient, no frills, no padding, and could be improved but I have no complaints based on the purpose it is used for.
- When you buy a ticket its good for 25 rides. I would suggest an incentive to buying the 25 ride ticket, like getting 2 free rides.
- I would like same day reservations and also the option for weekend rides.
- I like the van for my walker, it gets smashed in car trunks.

- There's a new driver who worked for the post office, post office employees know where everything is so if SSTA is looking for drivers, reach out to former post office workers.
- Some drivers are good, others just sit there. Gary, Mr. McGee are great. The younger ones are questionable. Just one time I had a driver who was in a hurry, crabby, and driving too fast.
- I would really like 10 minutes to get out to the van. I know they have other riders or schedules to keep so maybe it isn't practical but from a rider's standpoint it would be nice.
- Just as important as temperature and radio volume is odor. There are bus drivers who could benefit from improving their personal hygiene.

2019 ADA Phone Survey Script

May I speak with ______ (If not available, ask when it might be convenient to call back and speak with that person).

My name is Laina/Andrew and I am calling on behalf of Green Mountain Transit and SSTA. We are conducting a short Customer Satisfaction Survey about the SSTA service you use. Do you have time to answer a few brief questions? All of the information you provide will be confidential and your name will not be attached to your answers. Also, I do not work for SSTA so I encourage you to feel comfortable providing honest answers.

- 1. When you contact SSTA to make a reservation do you:
 - Call yourself Have someone else call on your behalf Not need to call because you have a standing trip
- 2. [If answer to #1 is "self", otherwise skip to #3]
 - a. When you call, is the SSTA reservation agent prompt and pleasant? Yes No
 - b. When calling to make a reservation, are you ever placed on hold? Yes No
 - 1. If yes, how often does that happen? Rarely, sometimes, frequently
 - 2. How long are you typically placed on hold by SSTA when making trip reservations?
 - c. Overall, are you satisfied with the reservation experience? Yes No
 - Would you prefer a different system where you could reserve trips yourself using a computer or smartphone instead of having to call SSTA?
 Yes No
- 3. What is your experience with SSTA's trip scheduling software?
 - a. The software seems to work well and the process is quick and easy
 - b. The software seems to make things complicated and slow
 - c. I can't really tell how the software affects things Comments
- 4. Have you received automated reminder calls for your scheduled trips?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

Comments/suggestions on ways to improve these calls

5. When you make a reservation, is SSTA able to schedule your pick up time when you want to be picked up, plus or minus one hour?

Yes No Explain

[If No, then ask the following]

3a. If you can, please provide the trip date and pickup time you requested.

- 3b. Does GMT have your permission to contact you regarding this issue? [Yes No]
- 6. After you make your reservation with SSTA, do they ever call you back to try to change the scheduled pick up times for any part of your trip?
 - Yes No
 - a. If yes, about how often does that happen? Rarely, sometimes, frequently
 Explain
- Are you typically ready to take the van/sedan within 5 minutes of its arrival? Yes No

8. Does the van/sedan typically pick you up within 20 minutes of your scheduled pick up time?

Yes No

- 9.Based on your experience, please rate SSTA on the following:
Please use the following ratings for each question:
Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor N/A
[For any Fair or Poor responses, follow up to get explanation]
 - a. Courtesy and respect shown by drivers
 - b. Assistance provided with boarding/exiting and carrying packages/bags
 - c. Appropriate speed and care taken while driving
 - d. Knowledge of lifts and knowledge of how to secure your wheelchair to floor (if applicable)
 - e. Knowledge of the places you start and end your trips and how to get there
 - f. Maintaining a comfortable temperature and radio volume in van/sedan
 - g. The comfort and maintenance of the vans or sedans you ride in
 - h. Overall, how would you rate the quality of service provided by SSTA in general?
- 10. Do you have any comments or suggestions you would like to share?

White Paper: Microtransit in Montpelier

Microtransit Working Group

convened by



August, 2019

INTRODUCTION

New technologies such as smartphone apps and route optimization allow for on-demand, flexible services to be delivered much more efficiently than in the past. This "microtransit" service allows passengers to request trips with no advance notice, and drivers to pick up and deliver passengers based on manifests that are updated in real time. The software that runs this service balances the goals of minimizing passenger waiting time and maximizing the efficiency and productivity of the vehicle trips.

In September 2018, the Sustainable Montpelier Coalition held a roundtable on transportation for key stakeholders, including major employers, merchants, and public sector representatives, and had presentations pertaining to various local transit options. This meeting led to a Microtransit Working Group in early December convened by the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans), with key constituents including the City of Montpelier, Green Mountain Transit, Sustainable Montpelier Coalition, Vermont Center for Independent Living, and Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission. The goal of this group was to begin considering the potential for a microtransit service in Montpelier, based on experiences and results of microtransit services elsewhere in the US.

The Microtransit Working Group is exploring the feasibility of operating microtransit service in the Montpelier area as a substitute for some of the existing bus and demand response service operated by Green Mountain Transit. A range of operational models are possible, as described below.

SERVICE MODELS

In December 2018, VTrans issued a request for information (RFI) to potential microtransit operators/vendors. Four companies responded, two of which were vendors with credible real world experience in multiple settings: Via and TransLoc. Follow up questions were sent out to those entities and their responses are reflected in the information provided in the rest of this paper.

There are two broad catgories of service models available in the industry:

Transportation as a Service (TaaS) – In this model, an independent contractor is chosen to provide the microtransit service as a turnkey system. The contracted company will provide vehicles, drivers, insurance and the operating/dispatch software and other system components needed for complete operations. Via, the only TaaS service provider who responded to the RFI, claims that they can be operational 12 weeks after a bid award. In their RFI follow up, they offered this commitment:

"On an ongoing basis, VTrans will receive highly-detailed data about the performance of the pilot and will be empowered to recommend adjustments or refinements to better meet its goals over time. On a day-today basis, however, Via will provide all operations of the service on VTrans' behalf, including fleet management, driver onboarding and scheduling, high-touch customer service, and advanced analytics."

Software as a Service (SaaS) – In this model, the vendor provides the dispatch and operating software for the service with the assumption that the current transit provider will operate the service. Both Via and TransLoc can offer the SaaS model. This model would require GMT to be willing to reallocate drivers and vehicles from existing shuttle routes to microtransit service and to adopt the hardware and software necessary to process and dispatch the ride requests.





BENEFITS AND GOALS

Traditional bus routes work best in linear corridors where they can efficiently serve many trip origins and destinations. The City Commuter between Barre and Montpelier is an example of a linear route, connecting the centers of the two cities with the many trip generators along the Barre-Montpelier Road. Bus routes are less efficient when the patterns of origins and destinations are spread out over a wider area, necessitating a more circuitous routing and thus slower and less direct trips for the passengers. The Montpelier Circulator is an example of this type of non-linear route.

Microtransit has the potential to be a more efficient way to serve the transit demand in a non-linear area. By focusing on the origins and destinations of the passengers who are requesting trips at a specific time, the trips for those passengers can be quicker and more direct, making the service more competitive to driving. While a lightly-used bus route may be empty for parts of its service time, a microtransit vehicle would only be operating when there are trip requests. Microtransit service can also be scaled up and down in response to demand, while bus routes operate on a fixed schedule whether demand is up or down.

At the present time, the vast majority of people using the local bus routes in Montpelier are those who do not have access to an automobile or cannot drive for whatever reason. For transit to become attractive to the people who currently drive, it must become more convenient, and some of the hidden subsidies for driving should be removed. The primary hidden subsidy is free parking, available to most of the employees in Montpelier. The rates charged for metered spaces in the downtown area also greatly understate the actual cost of building and maintaining that parking space, not to mention the opportunity cost of what that land could otherwise be used for.

The design competition sponsored by the Sustainable Montpelier Coalition demonstrated that city residents understand that the city would be better off if the land used for parking downtown was used instead for housing and businesses and parks. However, they still want travel into downtown to be convenient. It is here that a well-designed microtransit service can serve as an essential piece in a redevelopment of the downtown area and provide greater mobility for a wider region as well.

If this redevelopment is achieved, facilitated, in part, by microtransit, the carbon footprint of Montpelier can be significantly reduced. More housing and businesses downtown means more trips accomplished on foot. Longer trips would be accomplished on bus routes or microtransit vehicles, with multiple passengers sharing rides. Car ownership would drop and the need for parking would diminish.

To achieve this long-term goal, people will have to believe that microtransit is a viable and sustainable option for them. The following goals are essential to making it work:

- Educating the public about how it works prior to startup
- Scaling the level of service (number of vehicles on the street) appropriately so that wait times are short
- Engaging with employers (including city and state government) to create incentives to using microtransit
- Ensuring good riding experiences so that people who try it once or twice will want to use it more regularly
- Ensuring that riders of existing bus routes that may be replaced by microtransit are no worse off





CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Microtransit could be an important component of a sustainable redevelopment of our downtowns, allowing people to maintain their mobility without owning automobiles. Fewer automobiles means less land devoted to parking and more possibility for walkable and accessible communities. To date, there are no examples of microtransit working in a city as small as Montpelier, with a resident population of under 8,000 and a daytime population under 14,000. If this project can work successfully in a small city context, it will create an attractive model for other similarly-sized communities in Vermont and elsewhere.

A successful trial will likely require both a well-designed and appropriately scaled service as well as a comprehensive community engagement and education effort to explain the benefits of microtransit. The audience for that effort includes current transit users and residents and workers in Montpelier who drive into the downtown area.

The Microtransit Working Group will continue to work with vendors and stakeholders to develop a microtransit plan for Montpelier. As this plan takes shape, the community engagement and education process can begin to build a constituency for the service.

Microtransit Working Group

VTrans City of Montpelier Green Mountain Transit Sustainable Montpelier Coalition Vermont Center for Independent Living Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission







July 30, 2019

Mr. Hendrik Opstelten Program Manager, Office of Research, Demonstration and Innovation Federal Transit Authority 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Opstelten:

It is my pleasure to write a letter of support for the Vermont Agency of Transportation's (VTrans) application for FTA's Integrated Mobility Innovation (IMI) Demonstration Program. Since November 2018, Green Mountain Transit has had the opportunity to participate in VTrans' "Microtransit Working Group" and we have duly considered, investigated, and produced the documents necessary to embark on such a project.

Green Mountain Transit is excited to participate in this opportunity, and once again, demonstrate the successful implementation of a technological development for Vermont (and on behalf of rural regions across the country). We have long considered Microtransit to be a potential improvement over the existing in-town fixed routes (and demand response program), and the work by the Microtransit Working Group has only reinforced our predispositions. We are also glad to have the public private partnership with an industry leader in Via. We feel a move to Microtransit in our Capital city would bring more mobility options to more people while improving service for those who currently access the transit systems. Furthermore, by combining all transit services into one mode, we expect to realize cost and environmental efficiencies. We will support this project by participating in the newly formed "Microtransit Advisory Committee" and will contribute to the overall considerations, operational details, and outreach activities that will be so critical to this project's success.

We are also eager to see how VTrans can work with Via to understand how this technology can bring greater mobility, coordination, and efficiencies to our small towns that make up most of Vermont's landscape. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jon Moore GMT Interim General Manager

101 Queen City Park Road, Burlington, VT 05401 | T: 802-864-2282 F: 802-864-5564 6088 VT Route 12, Berlin, VT 05602 | T: 802-223-7287 F: 802-223-6236 375 Lake Road, Suite 5, St. Albans, VT 05478 | T: 802-527-2181 F: 802-527-5302



Vermont Agency of Transportation Montpelier Microtransit Feasibility Study

August 2019



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
1. Executive Summary	2
2. Via Overview 2.1 Firm History 2.2 Current Operations	4 4
 3. Feasibility Study Methodology 3.1 Understanding Goals 3.2 Reviewing Existing Conditions 3.3 Projecting Microtransit Demand 3.4 Simulation Overview 2.5 Scenarios and Recommendations 	6 6 7 7 10
 4. Existing Conditions and Demand 4.1 Fixed-route services 4.2 Specialized Transportation Services 4.3 Estimating Demand 	11 11 12 13
5. Service Zone and Service Design Parameters	15
 6. Simulation Results Scenario 1: Fixed-Route Bus Replacement (Existing Demand) Scenario 2: Fixed-Route Bus and Specialized Transportation Replacement (Existing Demand) Scenario 3: Medium Demand Scenario 4) High Demand Summary of Results Quality of Service 	16 16 17 17 18 19
 7. Microtransit Operating Models 7.1 Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) 7.2 Transportation as a Service (TaaS) 7.3 Operating Model Summary and Recommendations 8. Recommendations and Conclusions 	 20 20 20 21 22
ס. הכנסוווויבוועמנוטווא מווע נטוונועאטווא	22

1. Executive Summary

The Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) has carried out this microtransit feasibility study (the Study) to understand how shared, on-demand transit (microtransit) can successfully complement or replace fixed-route bus routes and specialized transportation services in Montpelier and surrounding areas. These fixed-route and specialized transportation services are operated by the Green Mountain Transit Agency (GMTA). In order to understand whether microtransit could expand the reach of sustainable, high-quality transit services to as many people as possible, VTrans engaged Via to analyze existing transit and specialized transportation ridership data, develop models from simulation of microtransit services, and determine fleet requirements for an efficient microtransit network. This Study explores opportunities for strategic deployment of microtransit technologies, and recommends next steps for VTrans and GMTA in Montpelier.

To understand how microtransit can be most effective in Montpelier, Via considered the following data:

- Historic fixed-route and specialized transportation ridership to understand base demand and travel patterns;
- Land-use, demographic, and economic data to further understand potential travel demand;
- Input and feedback from VTrans, GMTA, and the Montpelier Microtransit Working Group;
- Quality of service assumptions and service design parameters grounded in Via's experience planning, designing, and operating services in other markets; and
- OpenStreetMaps and Google Maps data including road layout, traffic speeds, and turn restrictions.

These data were analyzed and converted into inputs for Via's proprietary simulation tool. Via simulated permutations of several microtransit service scenarios, with a focus on understanding the different fleet sizes and service quality parameters that could be used to replace the fixed-routes in Montpelier, specialized transportation services in the area, or both. In addition to simulating existing riderships, Via also modeled high-demand scenarios, based on the expectation that a high-quality microtransit service may induce demand by competing with private vehicle travel.

On the basis of this analysis, we recommend using microtransit to replace the three fixed routes operating within Montpelier as well as the specialized transportation services that provide critical mobility to the disabled, elderly, and others with special requirements. In order to accommodate all existing riders and some growth, we recommend, at minimum a fleet of three to five vehicles, with the entire fleet in operation during peak hours. Our simulations indicate that a fleet of five vehicles

should accommodate peak-hour ridership of up to 35 trips per hour, in excess of the approximately 27 trips per hour taken during peak hours on the existing system.



For riders within the proposed 7.8 square mile service zone, a microtransit service will reduce wait times and journey durations, with the majority of riders waiting less than 15 minutes from the time they request a vehicle and travelling for less than ten minutes once their vehicle arrives. This should substantially improve rider experience, as current bus headways are up to an hour. Riders will also benefit from real-time vehicle tracking, automated payments, and more direct trips to their destinations.

Microtransit will improve quality of life for local residents, increasing access to healthcare, employment, educational institutions, businesses, and community centers.

2. Via Overview

Via plans, designs, and operates microtransit systems around the world. Microtransit technology enables customers to share rides by dynamically routing vehicles in real-time in response to demand. Using advanced algorithms, microtransit optimizes the balance between maximizing fleet utilization and ensuring that each rider has a high-quality experience.

2.1 Firm History

Via was founded in 2012 with a simple, yet highly ambitious mission—to deliver the world's most convenient and affordable shared rides to everyone, everywhere. Via delivered its first rides in 2013 in Manhattan, starting with just a handful of drivers. Identifying a gap in the transit network between the Upper East Side and Midtown Manhattan, Via launched as a shared, dynamic service that enabled commuters to reach work conveniently, and at a transit-comparable price. Via was the first transportation network company to offer shared, dynamic rides, and is still the most efficient and most advanced shared ride platform in the world—we provide more shared rides in New York City, for example, than Uber and Lyft combined.

2.2 Current Operations

Over the past six years, Via has become a world leader in planning, designing, and operating on-demand transit and new mobility services. Today, we are supporting on-demand and innovative transit solutions through over 80 partnerships with public agencies and institutions in more than 20 countries. Our core competencies are:

- **Microtransit Planning:** Via's proven service planning and alternatives analysis approach guides our clients through a structured microtransit planning process, broad enough to ensure no use-case opportunity is missed while detailed enough to produce a clear path to deployment, if desired. Our proprietary microtransit simulation tool, a core component of our service planning offering, allows Via to test permutations of the proposed service and clarify complex trade-offs between quality of service (QoS) and operational efficiency.
- Microtransit Operations: Since launch, our microtransit business has grown to provide over two million rides per month to over one million customers in both our partnership services in over 70 locations and in our consumer-facing services in New York City; Chicago; Washington, DC; Amsterdam; London; and Milton Keynes. To date, we have provided more than 60 million rides.
• **New Mobility Solutions:** In addition to Via's microtransit platform, we have developed expertise in new mobility solutions including Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS) technology and integrations, dynamic road pricing, tolling, demand management, autonomous vehicle routing and ridesharing platforms, and micromobility offerings. Via continues to develop technology and expertise as we seek to offer our partners a suite of fully-integrated, technology-enabled mobility solutions.

To support our growth and global operations, Via has a software team of 200 full-time professionals with deep experience in advanced algorithms, data science, digital mapping, database architecture, product management, and app development, and 300 full-time employees focused on operations, growth, member services, expansion, business development, and partner success.



Via's direct-to-consumer services are shown in the map above in light blue; Via partner deployments in dark blue; and Via's microtransit planning studies in orange.

VTrans

3. Feasibility Study Methodology

The purpose of this Study is to understand if microtransit is feasible in the Montpelier area, and, if so, how different service design parameters will impact the performance of the microtransit network. Via's approach to the Study included:

- 1. Working with VTrans and GMTA to understand the goals of the Study;
- 2. Reviewing ridership data and interviewing VTrans and GMTA staff to better understand existing transit and specialized transportation ridership data, as well as other drivers of potential demand for microtransit services in the Montpelier area;
- 3. Projecting demand;
- 4. Simulating scenarios to determine if microtransit is a cost-effective and feasible alternative to fixed-route transit in the Montpelier area; and
- 5. Generating different microtransit service scenarios using simulation outputs and making recommendations as to the feasibility and potential operation of microtransit in the Montpelier area.

3.1 Understanding Goals

Microtransit can achieve a number of goals for transit agencies, including:

- Providing transit in previously underserved areas (transit deserts)
- Providing suburban mobility
- Retiring under-performing fixed route services
- Providing first- and last-mile connections to fixed route services
- Mitigating traffic congestion
- Reducing parking congestion
- Upgrading a paratransit offering

VTrans and GMTA indicated two primary goals for a microtransit service: 1) increasing ridership and improving the quality of service for three existing fixed route services in the Montpelier area; and 2) upgrading existing specialized transportation services and, to the extent feasible, providing both general and specialized transportation services using the same fleet.

Via worked with VTrans and GMTA staff to define a proposed microtransit service zone that included the areas served by the three fixed-route services of interest. Care was taken to ensure that major employers, commercial areas, healthcare providers, and other points of interest were included in the service zone. Agency staff provided ridership data for both fixed-route transit and specialized transportation, along with information on the operation of these services.

3.3 Projecting Microtransit Demand

For Via's microtransit simulations, demand was modeled as the **volume and distribution of ride requests** over a given period of time. For this report, historic fixed-route and specialized transportation ridership was used to project demand (see Existing Conditions and Demand for more details). Real-world ridership will depend on a wide range of factors, some specific to the Montpelier area, others dependent on operational elements like marketing budget or quality of service goals. These factors include:

- Travel patterns
- Alternative modes of travel (e.g. availability of buses, taxis, bicycles)
- Demographics (e.g. age, income, access to vehicles, mobility characteristics, mode choice)
- Pedestrian infrastructure
- Seasonality of demand (e.g. tourist season)
- Employment density
- Residential density
- Retail and entertainment density
- Fare structure
- Parking availability
- Marketing budget and effectiveness
- Weather conditions
- Congestion levels

Via benchmarked against quality of service at peak hours, when demand is highest, in order to accurately guide fleet size requirements. During off-peak hours, the full fleet would not be required.

3.4 Simulation Overview

Microtransit simulations were conducted to determine the quality of service based on different fleet sizes, demand scenarios, and service areas. This highly technical exercise leveraged Via's microtransit simulation tool, which predicts how different zones and fleet configurations will perform as real microtransit services. This process is described below:

- 1. **Uploaded microtransit service zone options.** The origins and destinations of all trips are limited to these zones. Different zones were tested in order to understand how zone boundary changes impacted overall service performance.
- 2. **Generated underlying road map** by pulling data within the service zone boundaries from OpenStreetMap, including all roads categorized by type, turn restrictions, and street walkability and drivability information.



Screenshot of Via's simulation tool, showing a potential microtransit zone (outlined in blue) and three "terminals," which are discussed below. The red lines show roads, with different widths representing different road classifications, each with a different traffic speed.

3. **Determined traffic speeds** by querying Google's Maps APIs for traffic speeds specific to the time of day during which the service is being simulated. This ensured that wait times and trip times of the simulated service reflect real-world traffic data at the time of day for which service is being modeled.





- 4. **Set "terminals"** to designate staging areas for vehicles that do not have active ride assignments. Terminals are safe parking areas that are distributed throughout the service zone. When empty, vehicles are routed to the terminal where the system has predicted demand. This ensures that each vehicle is used efficiently and that passengers benefit from the shortest possible wait times.
- 5. Generated "Virtual Bus Stops" to determine safe places for pickups and drop-offs. Virtual Bus Stops were generated throughout the zone, at points where vehicles can safely park. Virtual Bus Stop generation considered unique features of the zone, such as the pedestrian walking map, no parking/standing areas, and bus stops.
- 6. **Input demand scenario(s)** to simulate the number and types of trip requests we expect to see in the zone. See Section 2.3, Projecting Microtransit Demand, for more details.
- 7. **Set simulation parameters** by determining the optimal configuration for achieving service quality and passenger aggregation targets. These inputs—like fleet size, vehicle capacity, optimal wait times, and walk distances to/from Virtual Bus Stops—are those we adjust most

frequently when creating and iterating upon a new service. After these variables were set, we performed a number of different simulations for each zone, testing how adjusting service parameters impacted the quality of service, capacity, and efficiency. A screenshot of the simulation tool is shown below.



Screenshot of a simulation performed using Via's simulation tool. The map displays routing, pickups, and drop-offs, while the dashboard left of the map displays key performance indicators including the number of requests, wait time distributions, and pickup and drop-off walking distance.

3.5 Scenarios and Recommendations

After completing a series of simulations, we determined the total microtransit fleet size necessary to accommodate the peak-hour demand associated with different average daily ridership scenarios, as well as minimum vehicle size, and approximate weekly vehicle hours, since the number of vehicles required to be on the road to provide a steady quality of service will vary with demand at different hours of the day and on different days of the week. On the basis of these scenarios, we were able to determine that microtransit is a feasible replacement for fixed-route transit and specialized transportation in the Montpelier area, and to recommend service parameters to VTrans and GMTA.

4. Existing Conditions and Demand

4.1 Fixed-route services

Montpelier, the state capital of Vermont, is located in Central Vermont, approximately 40 miles southeast of Burlington. The city has a population of approximately 7,500.¹ The proposed service zone also includes portions of Berlin, a town of approximately 3,000.² Major demand centers include downtown Montpelier, in the northeastern corner of the proposed service zone and Hospital Hill, at the southern end of the zone. Major employers in the proposed service zone include the State of Vermont, the Central Vermont Medical Center, and the headquarters of the National Life Insurance Company.



¹ U.S. Census Bureau

² Id.

At present, three fixed-route buses are operated by GMTA within Monteplier and between Montpelier and Hospital Hill. These are:

- **Route 92, Montpelier Circulator:** The Montpelier Circulator runs in two loops around downtown Montpelier, and will deviate up to one half of a mile from its route on request. In addition to the center of Montpelier, the circulator serves the Hunger Mountain Co-Op, the Community College of Vermont, the Montpelier pool and recreation center, and National Life. The bus takes one hour to run both loops, operates from Monday-Friday between 6:50 and 5:30, and is free.
- **Route 82, Montpelier Hospital Hill (MHH):** The MHH route runs from downtown Montpelier to Hospital Hill, providing connections to the Central Vermont Medical Center, Berlin Mall, the Berlin Shaw's, and at BlueCross Blueshield of Vermont at specific times and by request. The bus will deviate up three quarters of a mile from its route by request at least 24 hours in advance. The route runs with one hour headways on Monday-Friday from 7:16am to 6:16am and on Saturday from 8:16am to 6:16pm. The fare is \$1.50.
- **Route 88, Capital Shuttle:** The Capital Shuttle runs in a loop between the Vermont Department of Labor, which is the site of a major parking lot, the Vermont Statehouse, and National Life headquarters. Deviations of up to one tenth of a mile are permitted on request. The Shuttle runs every 20 minutes, Monday-Friday from 7:20am until 5:25pm and is free.

4.2 Specialized Transportation Services

In addition to these fixed-route buses, GMTA provides several forms of specialized transportation in the Montpelier area. These services include:

- **Non-Emergency Critical Care Transportation:** Transportation for qualifying individuals to reach ongoing radiation and dialysis treatments.
- **Elderly and Disabled Transportation:** Special transportation services for individuals who are 60 years of age or older and/or individuals with disabilities for non-Medicaid medical appointments, meal sites, senior centers, shopping and pharmacy trips, radiation and dialysis treatment and general daily needs.
- **Medicaid Services:** Transportation services for medicaid-eligible individuals for medically necessary and approved trips.

Via analyzed stop-level longitudinal transit ridership data for the Montpelier area fixed-route bus routes as well as origin-and-destination data for all specialized transportation trips in the Montpelier area. Transit ridership is approximately 20 percent higher during the legislative session (January through May).





In addition, Via was provided specialized transportation data for trips in the Montpelier area November 30, 2017 through November 30, 2018. This data was filtered to include only trips within the proposed microtransit service zone (both origin and destination are inside of the zone), approximately 7,800 trips in total.

GIS analysis of specialized transportation OD data show that an average of about 20 trips a day are taken within the service zone. Many of these trips appear to be within the downtown Montpelier area or between the downtown Montpelier area and Hospital Hill—most likely for medical visits.

Existing Daily Ridership	Average Day	Legislative Session	
	Trips / day	Trips / day	
Fixed-route ridership	165	224	
Specialized transit ridership	20	20	
Total	185	244	

maximum peak-hour demand of 27 trips.

Daily peak transit ridership is during the afternoon, between 2pm and 4pm. At this time, an average of 21 trips an hour are taken. Given the increase the approximately 20 percent increase in demand during the legislative session, it is assumed that peak-month, peak-hour demand is about 25 rides an hour. Specialized transportation contributes about 2 additional riders to this demand, for a total



Hourly Fixed-Route Bus Ridership by Time of Day

Approximately 40 percent of fixed-route travel is between Montpelier and Hospital Hill, 50 percent is within downtown Montpelier and between downtown Montpelier and National Life, and the remaining 10 percent is to and from other points.



A heat map of predicted trip origins and destinations. Yellow and orange indicate a high density of trip origins and destinations, while green indicates a lower density of origins and destinations.

The proposed service zone was initially determined on the basis of input from VTrans and GMTA. It includes Hospital Hill, National Life, and downtown Montpelier, and extends north to the Vermont Community College. On the basis of feedback from the Montpelier Microtransit Working Group, the service zone was extended to the northwest to include Hubbard Park neighborhood. This service zone includes all of the areas served by the Montpelier Circulator, the Montpelier Hospital Hill bus, and the Capital Shuttle.

Via began by assuming the following service design parameters. In most cases, these service parameters establish outer bounds, and the average customer experience is characterized by much shorter walking distances, wait times, and detours than the maximum permitted. These parameters were informed by Via's experience operating similar services.



Design Parameter	Recommendation
Maximum pick-up / dropoff walk	400 meters, or approximately 6 minutes (average walking distances were significantly shorter, see Section 5, Simulation Results, for more details).
Maximum wait time	30 minutes (average wait times were significantly shorter, see Section 5, Simulation Results for more details).
Maximum detour	10 minutes. This means that no passenger riding in a given vehicle will experience a detour of more than 10 minutes.
Fleet Composition	Vehicles with either 12 or six seats. Most of GMTA's existing fleet of vehicles has 12 seats, while microtransit services deployed successfully in other areas sometimes use smaller, six-seater vehicles.

The results of the simulations are shown in the following section. Four scenarios were modeled:

- Scenario 1: Fixed-Route Bus Replacement (Existing Demand)
- Scenario 2: Fixed-Route Bus and Specialized Transportation Replacement (**Existing** Demand)
- Scenario 3: Fixed-Route Bus and Specialized Transportation Replacement (Medium Demand)
- Scenario 4: Fixed-Route Bus and Specialized Transportation Replacement (**High** Demand)

Vehicle hours are provided for all scenarios to assist VTrans and GMTA in understanding the relative costs of different approaches to providing microtransit. Via assumes that the number of vehicles operating at different times of the day will be adjusted to meet demand, with the most vehicles operating during peak hours in the afternoon and a reduced fleet operating on Saturdays.

Scenario 1: Fixed-Route Bus Replacement (Existing Demand)

In order to replace the three fixed-route buses operating in the proposed service zone, microtransit service must be able to support a peak-hour ridership of up to 25 rides an hour within the quality of service parameters defined above. Via's simulation results indicate that a fleet of four vehicles can meet this level of demand. Three vehicles should be adequate at times of day when demand is lower. Should VTrans and GMTA elect to offer a more limited service on Saturdays or Sundays, a still smaller fleet might be sufficient. While this service could be provided using the existing GMTA fleet, smaller six-seater vehicles would also be adequate.

Daily Ridership	Peak-Hour Ridership	Vehicles	Vehicle Size	Vehicle Hours	Average Wait Time	Average Walk
Trips per 12 hour day	Trips per hour	Number of vehicles	Seats per vehicle	Vehicle hours per week	Minutes from Request to Pickup	Meters from Request to Pickup Site
225	25	3-4	6+	256	10-15	145

Scenario 2: Fixed-Route Bus and Specialized Transportation Replacement (Existing Demand)

In order to replace specialized transportation services within the proposed service zone in addition to the three fixed-route buses, a microtransit service must be able to support a peak-hour ridership of up to 27 rides an hour. In addition, specialized transportation trips often require longer pickup and dropoff times, as rides may require more time to enter and leave the vehicle. Via's simulation results indicate that a fleet of five vehicles should be adequate to meet this level of demand, with four vehicles sufficing during most of the day even three vehicles sufficing during slower periods of the day.

Daily Ridership	Peak-Hour Ridership	Vehicles	Vehicle Size	Vehicle Hours	Average Wait Time	Average Walk
Trips per 12 hour day	Trips per hour	Number of vehicles	Seats per vehicle	Vehicle hours per week	Minutes from Request to Pickup	Meters from Request to Pickup Site
244	27	3-5	6+	266	10-15	130

Scenario 3: Medium Demand

While simulation results indicate that five vehicles are necessary to support peak-level demand for the combined ridership of existing fixed-route and specialized transportation services, a fleet of this size should also be adequate to support significant additional ridership if deployed throughout most of the day. This capacity may be important if access to microtransit service unlocks additional demand. A five vehicle fleet should be adequate to support up to 300 rides a day, and a peak-hour ridership of 35.

Daily Ridership	Peak-Hour Ridership	Vehicles	Vehicle Size	Vehicle Hours	Average Wait Time	Average Walk
Trips per 12 hour day	Trips per hour	Number of vehicles	Seats per vehicle	Vehicle hours per week	Minutes from Request to Pickup	Meters from Request to Pickup Site
300	35	4-5	6+	328	10-15	130

Scenario 4) High Demand

If demand for microtransit services greatly exceeds existing demand for transit and specialized transportation, or if VTrans and GMTA are interested in exploring operational alternatives, the agencies may choose to procure an operator that will provide microtransit services, including vehicles and drivers, under a Transportation as a Service (TaaS) model, explained further below in the Microtransit Operation Models section of this report. VTrans and GMTA should only pursue such a model if it allows for lower costs-per-vehicle hour than the existing model, in which case a larger fleet that can support increased demand of up to 400 may be feasible. This model is also highly scalable, should the agencies eventually be interested in increasing fleet size to support an enlarged service zone, or to meet higher levels of future demand.

Daily Ridership	Peak-Hour Ridership	Vehicles	Vehicle Size	Vehicle Hours	Average Wait Time	Average Walk
Trips per 12 hour day	Trips per hour	Number of vehicles	Seats per vehicle	Vehicle hours per week	Minutes from Request to Pickup	Meters from Request to Pickup Site
400	45	5-6	6	410	10-15	135

Summary of Results

The recommended fleet sizes for these different demand scenarios are shown in the table below. Microtransit becomes more efficient as the density of ride requests increases, meaning trips are more easily aggregated.

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Units
Ridership	225	244	300	400	Trips / day
Peak Hour Ridership	25	27	35	45	Trips / hour
Fleet Size	3-4	3-5	4-5	5-6	Vehicles
Vehicle Size	6+ Seats	6+ Seats	6+ Seats	6+ Seats	Seats / vehicle
Vehicle Hours (M-Sa.)	256	266	328	410	Vehicle hours / week
Average Wait Time	10-15	10-15	10-15	10-15	Minutes from Request to Pickup
Average Walk	145	130	130	135	<i>Meters from Request to Pickup Site</i>

Quality of Service

The table below provides more detail on the expected service quality for microtransit users in the Montpelier area.

Parameter	Quality of Service
Average Wait Time (ETA)	15 minute average wait times. Via simulated a service which reached all riders within 30 minutes.
Average Walk Distance	Average walk of 100 to 200 meters (1-2 minutes) for ambulatory passengers, with a maximum walk of 1,640 feet. Curb-to-curb service is provided for limited mobility and wheelchair passengers.
Average Ride Duration	10-15 minutes
Accessibility	Public microtransit services are fully accessible. Via assumed a minimum of one wheelchair accessible vehicle (WAV) in each scenario which will provide limited mobility passengers with equivalent levels of service.
Fare	Via recommends setting a fare marginally higher than the existing GMTA fixed-route bus fare of \$1.50 and waiving this fare during a very limited trial period through either a general promotion or using discount codes.

Because improvements in convenience and quality of service can draw more riders into the transit network, the microtransit system may reach capacity during peak periods. Should the service prove so popular that users are turned away when requesting a ride, Via recommends a number of short-term solutions such as pricing incentives, booking eligibility restrictions, and other tools that ensure those who need the service most are prioritized, and the service is scaled in a cost-efficient way.

7. Microtransit Operating Models

VTrans seeks to understand how different the financial and service considerations of different operating models. Via has considered two alternatives:

- 1. **Software as a Service (SaaS):** In this model, the microtransit vendor provides the necessary microtransit technology, including the microtransit operating system and mobile applications, along with a full suite of tools and support services. This model is for agencies who prefer to use their own drivers, vehicles and dispatchers.
- 2. **Transportation as a Service (TaaS):** In this model, the microtransit vendor provides a turnkey solution that includes microtransit technology, plus drivers, vehicles, and operations management.

7.1 Software-as-a-Service (SaaS)

VTrans and GMTA may prefer to provide microtransit services using the existing GMTA fleet, drivers, and operations team. In this case, either agency may procure a microtransit platform solution. Depending on the solution the agencies select, ongoing service design and optimization, operational support, and customer service may be included. The advantages of this approach include the greatest continuity from existing fixed-route bus and specialized transportation services and limiting the necessity to reallocate vehicles and drivers to other routes or services.

It is recommended that any platform solution include, at a minimum, the following:

- Dynamic vehicle routing
- Passenger aggregation (sharing)
- Rider and driver apps
- Supporting for booking by phone, some form of cash payment for unbanked individuals, etc.
- Backend administrative tools
- Ongoing technical, operational, and marketing support
- Analytics tools and reporting

7.2 Transportation as a Service (TaaS)

VTrans and GMTA may choose to procure a vendor to provide microtransit services in the proposed service zone with a solution that includes provision of drivers and vehicles in addition to the underlying technology. Via does not recommend launching a TaaS service for a fleet size of less than six vehicles, due to the significant fixed costs involved in running such a service. The advantages of a TaaS solution include potentially lower hourly per-vehicle costs than current operations, as well as

scalability—a service could be launched with current service hours and a given fleet size and, as ridership grows, VTrans and GMTA could evaluate whether to increased fleet size and/or extend operating hours.

7.3 Operating Model Summary and Recommendations

Scenario	Weekly vehicle hours ³	Annual Vehicle Hours	Estimated hourly cost	Estimated annual cost
Operating model	Vehicle hours / week	Vehicle hours / year	Cost / vehicle hour	Cost / year
Software-as-a- Service	266	14,000	\$60-70	\$840,000 - 980,000
Transportation-as- a-Service	266	14,000	\$45-70 ⁴	\$630,000 - 980,000

³ Based on weekly vehicle hour estimates from Scenario 2

⁴ Hourly vehicle costs are based on data from six similar microtransit services

8. Recommendations and Conclusions

Via's simulations indicate that microtransit can efficiently replace the existing fixed-route transit and specialized transportation services in the Montpelier area, providing a higher quality of service to existing GMTA riders. Further, a microtransit service will be easily scalable to accommodate increased levels of demand over time.

Four vehicles should be adequate to accommodate existing peak transit demand (approximately 225 riders a day, with a daily peak of 25 riders an hour). Specialized transportation (paratransit and demand-response) serves approximately 20 additional riders a day. Five vehicles with as few as six seats each should be adequate to support peak-hour, peak-month demand across existing transit and specialized transportation ridership, and should be capable of supporting a level of induced, additional demand as well, up to approximately 300 rides a day. With a sixth vehicle, a microtransit service could support a ridership of up to approximately 400 rides a day, or about double the average daily ridership today.