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AGENDA ITEM 3

Approval of Minutes from September 2018 Meeting
MINUTES FOR ADOPTION
Public Transportation Advisory Committee – Teleconference Meeting
200 E. Riverside Drive Room 2B.1, Austin, Texas
September 18, 2018 10:00 A.M.

Committee Members Present and Participating:
John McBeth, Chair
Jim Cline, Vice Chair
J.R. Salazar
Ken Fickes
Marc K. Whyte
Dietrich M. Von Biedenfeld

Committee Members Participating via Teleconference:
None

TxDOT Present and Participating:
Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN)
Mark Sprick, Section Director, Public Transportation Division
Theo Kosub, Planner, Public Transportation Division
Josh Ribakove, Communications Manager, PTN

AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to Order.
John McBeth called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Safety Briefing.
Josh Ribakove gave a safety briefing for attendees at 10:01 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Introduction of Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) members and comments from members.
All members introduced themselves beginning at 10:02 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Approval of minutes from May 8, 2018 meeting (Action).
John McBeth opened this item at 10:04 A.M.

MOTION    Jim Cline moved to approve the May 8, 2018 meeting minutes.
SECOND    Ken Fickes seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously at 10:05 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 5: TxDOT’s Public Transportation Division Director’s report to the committee regarding public transportation matters.
Eric Gleason began his report at 10:05 A.M. The report touched on May/June 2018 Texas Transportation Commission actions, the State Safety Oversight program, FTA section 5329 disaster relief funding, a notice of funding availability in the FTA section 5339 bus and bus facilities program, TxDOT’s 2020/2021 Legislative Appropriations Request, and items the Public Transportation Division hopes will be approved at the Texas Transportation Commission’s September meeting.

Questions and comments: Ken Fickes, Jim Cline, John McBeth.

**AGENDA ITEM 6: Discussion of Federal Transit Administration (FTA)-required Transit Asset Management plans (Action).**

Eric Gleason introduced this topic at 10:28 A.M. The presentation was given by Theo Kosub.

Questions and comments: Ken Fickes, Jim Cline, Eric Gleason.

No action taken.

**AGENDA ITEM 7: Discussion of performance trends noted in the 2017 Texas Transit Statistics report (Action).**

Eric Gleason introduced this topic at 10:45 A.M.

Questions and comments: John McBeth, J.R. Salazar, Jim Cline, Eric Gleason.

No action taken.

**AGENDA ITEM 8: Discussion on FY19 work program topics including, but not limited to:**

- Implementation strategies in anticipation of additional funding included in TxDOT’s 2020/2021 Legislative Appropriations Request
- Administrative rule revisions in response to FTA Public Transportation Safety Program final rule (672, 673)
- Review of Intercity Bus program priorities and practices (Action).

Eric Gleason introduced this item at 11:01 A.M. and presented on implementation strategies in anticipation of additional funding included in TxDOT’s 2020/2021 Legislative Appropriations Request. Questions and comments: John McBeth, Jim Cline, Ken Fickes.

Mark Sprick presented on administrative rule revisions in response to FTA Public Transportation Safety Program final rule (672, 673). Questions and comments: Ken Fickes, Jim Cline, John McBeth, Eric Gleason.

Eric Gleason presented on PTN’s review of Intercity Bus program priorities and practices. Questions and comments: John McBeth, J.R. Salazar, Ken Fickes, Jim Cline.

No action taken.
AGENDA ITEM 9: Public Comment

John McBeth introduced this item at 11:50 A.M.

Eric R. Backes introduced himself as the new director of the Texas Transit Association.

AGENDA ITEM 10: Propose and Discuss Agenda Items for Next Meeting; confirm date of next meeting (Action).

John McBeth initiated and led this discussion beginning at 11:51 A.M.

Ken Fickes suggested Transportation Development Credits (TDC) as a topic, pointing out inconsistencies among TxDOT and Texas Metropolitan Planning Organizations in how the TDC process is implemented. John McBeth requested that at the next meeting TxDOT report on the amount of TDC awarded in recent years. Jim Cline requested information on how TDC are used.

The PTAC members in attendance agreed that the next meeting should be held in early December. A specific date was not agreed upon.

No action taken.

AGENDA ITEM 11: Adjourn (Action).

MOTION Jim Cline moved to adjourn.

SECOND Ken Fickes seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 12:04 P.M.

Prepared by:     Approved by:

__________________________  _________________________________
Josh Ribakove    John McBeth, Chair
Public Transportation Division  Public Transportation Advisory Committee
AGENDA ITEM 4

Director's Report - Supporting Document
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Texas Transportation Plan 2050: Background</th>
<th>4-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transit Approach</td>
<td>12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your Texas Transportation System at a Glance

- **Total Annual Transit Trips**: 283,000,000
- **Roadway Centerline Miles**: 314,000
- **Miles of Railroad Track**: 10,539
- **Commercial Airports**: 24
TxDOT: From Planning to Service

**TTP**
- Texas Transportation Plan
- 25-30 year outlook
- Assess long-term needs and inform investment strategies

**UTP**
- Unified Transportation Program
- 10 year outlook
- Prioritize and advance project concepts for construction

**STIP**
- Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
- 4 year capital improvement program
- Identifies projects for construction with funding sources
What is the TTP?

- Policy document, updated every 5 years, that:
  - Guides planning and programming decisions for the development, management, and operation of the statewide, multimodal transportation system in Texas over the next 30 years; and
  - Provides a performance-based framework to link investment decisions to your vision for the transportation system

- Consultant Team:
  - High Street (lead),
  - Whitman, Requardt & Associates (WRA – bus transit)
What is Involved?

- Refresh Goals & Objectives
- Update Performance Measures
- Engage Stakeholders and the Public
- Assess Needs & Forecast Revenues
- Evaluate Investment Scenarios
- Recommend Implementation Strategies
Long-term Challenges

- **More people, more needs:** Texas population is expected to triple by 2050

- **Emerging technology:** the future of connected and autonomous vehicles among other advancements is uncertain

- **Environmental risk:** clean air amidst growing traffic and increased need for a resilient transportation network
What’s New?

Better engagement
- Participate via a Virtual Open House

- Refining TxDOT goals, objectives, and performance measures
- Further emphasis on economic vitality and sustainability

Interactive visualizations
- Exploratory graphics that enable a deeper dive into system performance

Expanded technical considerations
- More detailed economic and safety analyses with further considerations for the environment and emerging technologies
Draft TTP 2050 Goal Areas

Maintain a Safe System
- Build a resilient network
- Reduce crashes
- Lessen crash severity

Preserve our Assets
- Preserve structural integrity
- Provide smooth roads
- Keep transit fleet running and devices operating
- Reduce long-term costs

Optimize Movement of People and Goods
- Reduce congestion
- Increase travel time reliability
- Enhance multimodal connectivity

Use Resources Responsibly
- Deliver the right projects
- Reduce user costs
- Leverage technological advancements

Enhance Sustainability
- Find sustainable funding
- Provide livable communities
- Protect and enhance natural environment
- Promote equity

Promote Economic Vitality
- Foster trade
- Grow the economy
- Accommodate economic development
- Provide economic opportunity and job access

Invest in People
- Value our employees
- Communicate effectively with customers
- Coordinate with stakeholders and partners

Which goals are most important to you? What would you change or add?
TRANSIT APPROACH

TTP 2050
Texas Transit by the Numbers

- Transit vehicles (including buses & vans)*: 2,855
- Transit trips in 2017*: 30 million
- Total transit trips in 2017**: 283 million
- Typical annual federal & state apportionments**: $597 million

*State-funded urban and rural transit districts.
**All public transit, including metro transit authorities.
Source: TTI 2017 Urban and Rural Area Transit Needs Assessment
The TTP 2050 will include a baseline of funding necessary to continue current operations (operating and capital expense), and

Expansion of service to fill gaps in geography and schedule to address needs of under-served population (current and future).

TTP 2050 will also include information about Metropolitan Transportation Authorities’ needs.
Transit Needs: Continuing Operations

- Forecast of operating and capital needs for continuing operations will be developed using:
  - Inputs to TTI’s *Urban and Rural Area Transit Needs Assessment*,
  - Current PTMS data (fleet & facilities),
  - TAM Plans (PTN and agency-developed, for projected fleet and facilities needs).

- TTI will be contacting transit districts for their TAM Plan data, starting early February.
• Build on TTI’s *Urban and Rural Area Transit Needs Assessment* which estimated additional operating costs to close span and coverage gaps. Four scenarios were developed (below).
  ➢ the *Needs Assessment* did not include additional facilities, therefore
  ➢ TTI will contact transit districts for their forecasted needs for facilities, starting in early February.

• The consultant (WRA) will assess historical public investments pertaining to intercity bus operations (Section 5311-f grants) and TxDOT’s contribution.

---

**Current FY2016 Operating Cost = $208.5 million.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Span Gap Operating Cost</th>
<th>Coverage Gap Operating Cost</th>
<th>Coverage Gap Vehicle Replacement Cost*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-hour weekday</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-hour weekday</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-hour weekday, 8-hour Saturday</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-hour weekday, 8-hour Saturday</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEX

- TERM Lite is an analysis tool to help transit agencies assess the percent of assets operating in a State of Good Repair (SGR)

- WRA will use TEX Lite to develop needs assessment for MTAs

- It was developed from the national analytical tool TERM Lite

- **Condition Monitoring** - Where are we today?
- **Condition Management** - “What if” Analysis
- **Long-Term Capital Plan Support** - How should we prioritize limited investment dollars?
Inputs Required:

- An inventory of capital assets
  - An Excel based "Inventory Publisher" is available to transfer inventory data to TEX Lite.

Outputs Generated:

- Current SGR backlog
- Whether SGR is increasing or decreasing
- Asset conditions
- Investment required to attain SGR
- Multi-criteria prioritization rankings
- Long term SGR plan
NEXT STEPS

TTP 2050
• TTI will contact transit districts starting in early February to ask about –
  ➢ TAM Plan (districts who developed their own plans), and
  ➢ Future facility needs.

• TxDOT & High Street will Start Round 1 Public Meetings, week of Jan. 28 (schedule, next slide).
From January through March 2019, we will be hosting our first round of public meetings in various cities across the state. We will be returning for a second round this summer.

Tentative Round 1 Schedule:

1. Week of January 28
   Austin → San Antonio

2. Week of February 4
   Laredo → Corpus Christi → Pharr

3. Week of February 18
   Houston → Tyler → Dallas/Fort Worth

4. Week of February 25
   Abilene → Lubbock → Amarillo

5. Week of March 4
   El Paso → Odessa → San Angelo
Thank you for your attention. We hope to hear from you.
Thank you for your attention.
We hope to hear from you.

• Thoughts / Comments / Questions
AGENDA ITEM 5

Intercity Bus
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

Intercity Bus – Overview of Current Program and Potential Committee Discussion Topics
Federal Program Description

- The 5311(f) Intercity Bus (ICB) program is designed to strengthen the connection between rural areas and the larger regional or national intercity bus system.

- ICB funding supports the system's service infrastructure through operations planning, marketing assistance and capital investment in facilities and vehicles.
The FAST Act requires that each state spend no less than 15 percent of its annual non-urban area (5311) apportionment for the development and support of intercity bus transportation, unless it can certify, after consultation with affected intercity bus service providers, that the intercity bus service needs of the state are being met adequately.
State Program Description (How we do it in Texas)

- **Selection Process**
  
  - Every biennium TxDOT PTN solicits grant applications through a competitive call for projects that help fulfill program objectives.
  
  - Applicants seeking funding for operating assistance must submit information that demonstrates whether a route(s) is new or existing, a feeder service route, priority ranking, total mileage within Texas, number of years funded, and the number of times the route(s) have received operating assistance from TxDOT.
Federal and TxDOT Program Objectives

- Support the connection between rural areas and the larger regional or national system of ICB service.

- Support services to meet the intercity travel needs of residents in rural areas.

- Support the infrastructure of the ICB network through planning and marketing assistance and capital investments.

- Support and promote the coordination of services among providers, across jurisdictions and program areas, and coordinate between rural and urbanized areas.
2016 – 2018 Awarded Grants

- $17,500,000 (74%)
- $3,100,000 (13%)
- $2,800,000 (12%)
- $59,800 (<1%)
- $322,000 (1%)

Grand Total: $23,781,800
2018 Coordinated Call for Projects – Award Recipients

- All Aboard America!
- Ark-Tex Council of Governments
- Capital Area Rural Transportation System (CARTS)
- El Paso, County of
- Greyhound Lines, Inc.
- Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council
2018 Intercity Bus Routes

- All Aboard America: Midland-Odessa to Presidio
- Ark-Tex Council of Governments (3 routes)
- Capital Area Rural Transportation System (7 routes)
- Greyhound: Route 1 - Lubbock to El Paso
- Greyhound: Route 2 - Amarillo to San Antonio
- Greyhound: Route 3 - San Antonio to Del Rio
- Greyhound: Route 4 - Amarillo to El Paso
All Aboard America!

Midland/Odessa to Presidio

**Yearly revenue and expense**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/14–9/30/15</td>
<td>$1,843,170</td>
<td>$779,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/15–9/30/16</td>
<td>$1,780,507</td>
<td>$744,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/16–9/30/17</td>
<td>$1,609,191</td>
<td>$582,276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scheduled stops and yearly miles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Stops</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/14–9/30/15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>375,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/15–9/30/16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>385,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/16–9/30/17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>385,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yearly passengers and average daily passengers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Average Daily Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/14–9/30/15</td>
<td>16,624</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/15–9/30/16</td>
<td>13,459</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/16–9/30/17</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ark-Tex Council of Governments

Lamar to Titus County

Yearly revenue and expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/16–9/30/17</td>
<td>$2,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/17–1/31/18</td>
<td>$696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheduled stops and yearly miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/16–9/30/17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/17–1/31/18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yearly passengers and average daily passengers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Average Daily Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/16–9/30/17</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/17–1/31/18</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Route A 1510 - Austin to San Marcos

### Yearly revenue and expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>$1,337,591</td>
<td>$21,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>$1,078,521</td>
<td>$23,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/17-8/31/18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scheduled stops and yearly miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Stops</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/17-8/31/18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Yearly passengers and average daily passengers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Yearly Passengers</th>
<th>Average Daily Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>10,104</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/17-8/31/18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gold Route: El Paso-Anthony-Las Cruces

Yearly revenue and expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/14-8/31/15</td>
<td>$135,647</td>
<td>$158,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>$1,226,240</td>
<td>$150,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>$883,346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yearly passengers and average daily passengers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Yearly Passengers</th>
<th>Average Daily Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/14-8/31/15</td>
<td>16,624</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>13,459</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheduled stops and yearly miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Stops</th>
<th>Yearly Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/14-8/31/15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>375,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>385,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>385,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amarillo to San Antonio

Yearly revenue and expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/14-8/31/15</td>
<td>$1,385,604</td>
<td>$1,164,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>$1,413,388</td>
<td>$1,405,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>$1,532,046</td>
<td>$1,802,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheduled stops and yearly miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Stops</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/14-8/31/15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>408,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>404,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yearly passengers and average daily passengers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Average Daily Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/14-8/31/15</td>
<td>42,173</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>42,760</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>45,767</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RGV Metro Service

Yearly operating budget

- $1,213,297 (9/1/18–8/31/19)

Yearly maintenance budget

- $464,863 (9/1/18–8/31/19)

Daily scheduled one way trips

- 166 trips (9/1/18–8/31/19)
Key Policy Considerations for Committee Discussion

- Program Emphasis: Operating vs. Capital
- Program Objectives: Texas-specific vs. Overall Federal
- Service Performance Objectives
- Program Delivery Options
### Types of Program Delivery Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Model</td>
<td>Applicant driven</td>
<td>Applicant driven</td>
<td>Applicant driven</td>
<td>Grantor led</td>
<td>Grantor led</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum level of service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrated need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TxDOT goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvement to ICB service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support “feeder” service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fill gap where service has been reduced or lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve Amtrak facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposed high-speed rail facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial justification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrated need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coordination with other organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Anticipated ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Serves areas without existing intercity service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potentially self-sustaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vehicle purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transit infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marketing studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State evaluated intercity bus and established service priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf Measures</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes. Meet 40% farebox recovery.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes. NTD reporting.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrantees</td>
<td>- Private carriers</td>
<td>- Undetermined</td>
<td>- Public agencies</td>
<td>- Public agencies</td>
<td>- Public providers</td>
<td>- Private providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public carriers</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Private for profits</td>
<td>- Private for profits</td>
<td>- Rural providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-profits</td>
<td>- Non-profits</td>
<td>- County transit providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM 6

Bus Agency Safety Plans
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Bus Agency Safety Plans
PTAC – January 24, 2019
The PTASP Process

- **Final Rule Published**: July 19, 2018
- **Effective Date**: July 19, 2019
- **Approved Plans by**: July 20, 2020

PTASP Applicability

**YES**
- Transit Systems receiving FTA funds
- Section 5307

**NO**
- Do not operate transit system: Planning funds only
- Commuter Rail Service – FRA
- Passenger Ferry Service – USCG
- Transit Systems receiving ONLY 5310 and 5311 funds
Safety Plan Development and Implementation

- Rail Transit & Large Bus Operators develop own agency plans
- TxDOT responsible for Small Bus Operators with 100 or fewer vehicles in peak revenue service
  - Approach = develop jointly
- **ALL** held accountable for implementing individual agency plans
PTASP Requirements

- Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan
  - Approved by Accountable Executive and Board of Directors
  - Annual Review/Update
  - Compliance with Public Transportation Safety Program/National Safety Plan
  - Assignment of Chief Safety Officer

- Safety Management System (SMS)

- Safety Performance Targets

- Rail Agencies Only: Emergency Preparedness Plan

- Employee Reporting Program
Federal Funds for Plan Development & Implementation

- No additional funding provided to TxDOT or Bus Operators for compliance with the PTASP Final Rule

- Federal funds may be used to develop and implement a safety plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5303</th>
<th>5310</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5304</td>
<td>5337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5307</td>
<td>5339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Rail SSOA Section 5329 funds may **not** be used for any bus activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTN Develop Draft Rules</td>
<td>January – March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packet to Governor’s Office for Review</td>
<td>March - April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Draft Final Rules</td>
<td>April - June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief PTAC on Draft Final Rules</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Final Rules to Commission</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices &amp; Public Hearings</td>
<td>August – September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Adoption</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish in TX Register</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM 7

Options and Priorities for Potential Additional Public Transportation Funding Requested in TxDOT's Current Legislative Appropriations Request
Implementation of Additional Transit Funds: Prioritization Options

Presentation to PTAC  |  January 24, 2019
Texas A&M Transportation Institute  |  James P. Cardenas
Objectives

Answer the question:
• How might additional state funding for transit, related to the Needs Assessment Exceptional Item, be implemented?

Discuss options for implementation
• Lay out the main options for distributing additional funds to transit districts.

Understand important considerations for each option
• Discuss the implications of different implementation options.
Agenda

- Assumptions
- Prioritization Approaches
- Additional Considerations
- Discussion and Questions
Key Assumptions

- $5M per year of new state funds, compounding each year. *Example:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Added Funds in Year</th>
<th>Continuing Funds (from prior years)</th>
<th>Total Additional Funds in Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5M</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5M</td>
<td>$5M</td>
<td>$10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5M</td>
<td>$10M</td>
<td>$15M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4…</td>
<td>$5M</td>
<td>$15M</td>
<td>$20M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each year, *added* funds would be prioritized to expand service in a limited number of transit districts. (Need to select prioritization approach.)
- Span threshold = 14 hour weekday service.
- Eventually, all coverage and span gaps will be filled, regardless of prioritization approach.
Two Prioritization Approaches

**Need:**
Use needs to prioritize recipients

**Coverage Gaps**

**Span Gaps**

**Performance:**
Use performance or outcomes to prioritize recipients

**Ridership**

**Cost Effectiveness**
Need Option 1: Coverage Gaps

Method
• Definition:
  o Focus on providing transit service to populations and areas that currently do not have general-public transit service.

• Ranking process:
  o Rank coverage gap areas by population that would gain transit service.

• Funding process:
  o Each year provide funds, up to $5M, to begin serving the most populated coverage gap(s).
  o Continue filling gaps each year until all coverage gaps are filled, then begin filling span gaps.

Results
The most-highly populated coverage gaps (influenced by density and land area) would receive funding first.
Need Option 2: Span Gaps

Method
• Definition:
  o Focus on expanding existing service to 14-hours on weekdays.
• Ranking process:
  o Rank span gap areas by the span gap hours. (How many span hours are needed to provide 14-hour weekday service?)
• Funding process:
  o Each year provide funds, up to $5M, to expand service hours at the transit districts with the largest span gap(s).
  o Continue filling gaps each year until all span gaps are filled, then begin filling coverage gaps.

Results
The transit districts with the largest total span gaps (i.e., need the most additional hours across all modes operated) would receive funding first.
Performance Option 1: Ridership

Method
• Definition:
  o Focus on adding service to the transit districts (with a gap) with the highest ridership.

• Ranking process:
  o Rank gap areas by the transit district’s ridership.
  o Notes
    • Because coverage gap areas do not have ridership, they would fall to the bottom of the list.
    • Expected ridership could also be used instead of current ridership.

• Funding process:
  o Each year provide funds, up to $5M, to expand service hours at the highest-ridership transit districts with span gap(s).
  o Continue filling gaps each year until all span gaps are filled, then begin filling coverage gaps.

Results
The transit districts with the highest ridership (totaled across all modes) would receive funding first.
Performance Option 2: Cost Effectiveness

Method

• Definition:
  o Focus on adding service to the transit districts (with a gap) with the best cost effectiveness (cost per rider).

• Ranking process:
  o Rank gap areas by the transit district’s cost effectiveness.
  o Notes
    • Because coverage gap areas do not have ridership, they would fall to the bottom of the list.
    • Expected cost effectiveness could also be used instead of current cost effectiveness.

• Funding process:
  o Each year provide funds, up to $5M, to expand service hours at the most cost-effective transit districts with span gap(s).
  o Continue filling gaps each year until all span gaps are filled, then begin filling coverage gaps.

Results

The most cost-effective transit districts (based on all modes operated) would receive funding first.
Additional Considerations

• Once prioritized recipients are selected for a year, complete a transit development plan or service plan to ensure estimated funding is appropriate for filling the identified gap.
• Enact data collection protocols to enable impact and benefits assessment.
Questions and Discussion