

**Town of University Park  
Transit Task Force  
Tuesday, January 12, 2021  
7:30 PM – 9:00 PM**

- Meeting notes are in blue text below each agenda item.

**Agenda**

1. Welcome

In attendance were Mayor Len Carey, Town Clerk Andrea Marcavitch, Emily Alvarez, Kelly Hilovsky, Emily Ryan, Joe Thompson, and Carol Weese. David Tully was not in attendance due to the birth of his first child, Luke!

2. Approve Notes from 12/8 Meeting

Notes from the 12/8 meeting were approved without objection.

3. Discuss renaming transit and paratransit options for ease of communication

For ease of communication at the 2/9 public forum, the Task Force renamed the options from Appendix A in the 12/10 notes. The status quo is now option A, with other options arranged alphabetically (B, C, D, etc.). See appendix A of this document.

4. Progress of preliminary efforts to quantify the strengths and limitations of options

Task Force members thanked Town Clerk Marcavitch and Mayor Carey for providing excellent data on the Town bus operations that will enable calculation of certain strengths and limitations. Joe Thompson and Emily Alvarez will work on quantification of the status quo over the next several weeks and send the preliminary calculations to the rest of the Task Force for review and comment.

5. Consistent assumptions for quantifying the strengths and limitations of options

Calculations for the status quo will serve as consistent assumptions for other options that modify the status quo. Preliminary calculations for strengths and limitations of the status quo will be distributed to the Task Force for comment by Joe Thompson and Emily Alvarez in the coming weeks.

6. How best to present the strengths and limitations in a final report

The Task Force pledged to provide a short report to the Council that will lay out the process used by the Task Force to make decisions about what options to consider with detailed descriptions and calculations of strengths and limitations

for each option. The report will be structured around the options matrix in Appendix A.

7. Next steps: 2/9 Public Forum and 3/15 Council Presentation

The Task Force will hold a 2/9 public forum and then prepare a final report for the Town Council meeting on 3/15 in advance of budget deliberations. At the 3/15 Town Council meeting, the Task Force will be available to answer questions from the Town Council and the public.

8. New Business

None.

## Appendix A: University Park Transit Options Matrix for Public Forum

Blue text = things we can measure / calculate

Orange text = things we may need to better understand (interviews, maybe a survey)

Option		Strengths	Limitations
A	Status Quo (Bus Transit and Paratransit)	Inertia, <b>environmental benefits</b> , amenity value, option value, social value	<b>Very expensive - low ridership</b> , <b>Limits other budget priorities</b> , <b>equity - subsidies only go to limited populations</b> , large administrative burden on small government, pandemic effect makes limitations worse, limited available workforce (CDL, irregular hours)
A1	Status Quo with User Fee	<b>Budge revenue</b>	Likely not possible to charge high enough user fee to fully offset program, additional administrative burden.
A2	Status Quo with Reduced Service (Fewer Transit Stops, No Evening Service)	<b>Modest cost reduction</b>	Inconvenience to transit users
A3	Status Quo with Extra Bus in Evening Transit Rotation	Convenience for transit users	<b>Increased mileage and cost</b> , availability of drivers
A4	Status Quo with Alternating PG Plaza and CP Transit Stops (or more flexible destinations?)	Convenience for transit users	Increased town administrative burden, <b>increased mileage and cost</b>
A5	Status Quo with Transit Stop at CP, Not PG Plaza	Connection with Purple Line	<b>Additional mileage and cost.</b>
A6	Status Quo with Transit GPS Tracking	Convenience for transit users	<b>Cost for GPS hardware and maintenance</b> , increased administrative burden
A7	Status Quo with Transit ID Check	Eliminates free riders	increased administrative burden
A8	Status Quo with Transit Reservation System	Certainty about transit users and schedule	increased administrative burden
A9	Status Quo with PG County Partnership on Gas and Maintenance	<b>Operations and maintenance savings</b>	Maintenance timing not in town control, have to drive slightly further to gas station
A10	Status Quo with Electric Non-cdl buses	<b>Environmental benefits, revenue from selling old buses</b>	<b>Need to purchase electric buses</b> , <b>increased maintenance costs</b>
A11	Status Quo with Expanded Service to CHE and CP Residents for Fee	<b>Increased revenue</b>	<b>Additional mileage and cost.</b> Increased administrative burden
B	Bus Transit, HHUP Managed Contract/Rideshare Paratransit	lower town administrative burden, <b>some budget savings</b> , maintains amenity, option, and social values	<b>high budget cost</b> , low ridership, <b>ignores pandemic effect</b> , <b>limited available workforce (CDL, irregular hours)</b>
C	Contractor Managed Transit and Paratransit	Lower day to day administrative burden on town, <b>can sell buses</b> , <b>reduced O and M costs</b> , maintains social and amenity values, <b>potential budget savings</b>	Decreased environmental benefits? Loss of option value, Less control over day to day operations and communications. <b>budget savings?</b> Lost social value, Lost leverage over contract cost increases, <b>does not recognize pandemic effect</b>
D	No Transit, HHUP Managed Contract Paratransit	<b>Budget savings</b> , <b>low administrative burden on town</b> , pandemic effect, aligns well with HHUP priority; <b>more practical for para transit users (may increase ridership)</b>	<b>lose environmental benefits</b> and amenity and option and social values
E	Smaller Bus (No CDL) Transit, HHUP Managed Contract Rideshare Paratransit	<b>modest budget savings; can sell buses</b> ; maintains amenity (partial), option, and social values; <b>environmental benefits</b> ; more practical for para transit users (may increase ridership)	high admin burden on town, low ridership, <b>pandemic effect</b> , <b>need to purchase van</b> , HHUP continuity if performing town function,
F	Smaller Bus (No CDL) Transit and Paratransit	<b>Some budget savings no CDL; environmental benefits</b> , amenity value (partial), option value, social value; <b>can sell buses</b>	<b>Still Very expensive</b> , Crowds out other priorities, subsidies only go to limited populations, large administrative burden on small government, low ridership, <b>ignores pandemic effect</b> ; <b>need to purchase van</b>