MEETING AGENDA
Public Transportation Advisory Committee
Tuesday, April 30, 2019 | 10:00 A.M. (local time)
Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)
200 E. Riverside Drive, Room 2B.1, Austin, TX 78704

1. Call to Order.

2. Safety Briefing.

3. Approval of minutes from January 24, 2019 meeting. (Action)

4. TxDOT’s Public Transportation Division Director’s report to the Public Transportation Advisory Committee regarding public transportation matters.

5. Presentation and discussion on state-funded intercity bus service in the United States, and potential implications for program approach in Texas. (Action)

6. Presentation and discussion on state-funded intercity bus service in the state of Washington, and potential implications for program approach in Texas. (Action)

7. Public Comment – Public comment will only be accepted in person. The public is invited to attend the meeting in person or listen by phone at a listen-in toll-free number: 1-415-655-0003 [US] with attendee access code: 598 304 40. The meeting transcript will be placed on the Internet following the meeting.

8. Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting. (Action)

9. Adjourn. (Action)

I certify that I have reviewed this document and that it conforms to all applicable Texas Register filing requirements.

CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Joanne Wright, Deputy General Counsel, (512) 463-8630
AGENDA ITEM 3

Approval of minutes from January 24, 2019 meeting.
AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to Order.

John McBeth called the meeting to order at 9:30 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Safety Briefing.

Josh Ribakove gave a safety briefing for attendees at 9:31 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Approval of minutes from September 18, 2018 meeting (Action).

John McBeth opened this item at 9:34 A.M.

**MOTION**  Mark K. Whyte moved to approve the September 18, 2018 meeting minutes.

**SECOND**  Ken Fickes seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously at 9:33 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 4: TxDOT’s Public Transportation Division Director’s report to the committee regarding public transportation matters.
Eric Gleason began his report at 9:34 A.M. The report touched TxDOT's Long-Range 2050 Plan, the current status of federal funding programs, recent Texas Transportation Commission activity, funding issues associated with the current partial shutdown of the federal government, and the status of Texas' SmartBuy program.

**AGENDA ITEM 5: Presentation on Intercity Bus Program. (Action)**

Eric Gleason delivered this presentation beginning at 9:42 A.M.

Questions and comments: Jim Cline, J.R. Salazar, John McBeth, Mark K. Whyte.

No action taken.

**AGENDA ITEM 6: Discussion of Texas Administrative Code rule changes for public transportation agency safety plans. (Action)**

Mark Sprick delivered this presentation beginning at 10:28 A.M.

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

No action taken.

**AGENDA ITEM 7: Discussion of options and priorities for potential additional public transportation funding requested in TxDOT's current Legislative Appropriations Request letter (Action).**

Eric Gleason introduced this topic at 10:47 A.M. James Cardenas, Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI), delivered the presentation beginning at 10:49 A.M.

Questions and comments: Eric Gleason, John McBeth

No action taken.

**AGENDA ITEM 8: Public Comment**

John McBeth introduced this item at 11:18 A.M.

There were no public comments.

**AGENDA ITEM 9: Propose and Discuss Agenda Items for Next Meeting; confirm date of next meeting (Action).**

John McBeth initiated and led this discussion beginning at 11:19 A.M. Proposed agenda items: Discussion of options and priorities for potential additional public transportation funding requested in TxDOT's current Legislative Appropriations Request letter; Discussion on Intercity Bus Program.
The PTAC members in attendance agreed that the next meeting should be held on Tuesday, April 30 at 10 A.M.

No action taken.

**AGENDA ITEM 11: Adjourn (Action).**

**MOTION**  J.R. Salazar moved to adjourn.

**SECOND**  Marc K. Whyte seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 A.M.

Prepared by:     Approved by:

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

Addendum to Director's Report: Updated Intercity Bus Program presentation (presented at January 24, 2019 meeting).
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

Intercity Bus – Overview of Current Program and Potential Committee Discussion Topics
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.
Federal Program Allocation Requirements

- 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

- Operating: $321,831 (1%)
- Administration: $59,617 (<1%)
- Capital – Vehicles: $2,815,952 (12%)
- Capital – Facilities: $3,097,600 (13%)
- Capital – Preventive Maintenance: $59,617 (<1%)
- Grand Total: $23,643,240
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
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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>$779,792</td>
<td>$744,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/15–9/30/16</td>
<td>$1,843,170</td>
<td>$1,780,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/16–9/30/17</td>
<td>$1,609,191</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheduled stops (one way) 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>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/16–9/30/17</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Area Rural Transportation System (CARTS)

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 (one way) 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>Passengers</th>
<th>Average Daily Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15–8/31/16</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16–8/31/17</td>
<td>10,104</td>
<td>28</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>$883,346</td>
<td>$158,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>$1,262,240</td>
<td>$150,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scheduled stops (one way) 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>5</td>
<td>170,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>230,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>230,518</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>59,207</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/15-8/31/16</td>
<td>53,003</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/16-8/31/17</td>
<td>51,632</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amarillo to San Antonio

**Yearly revenue and expense**

- **$1,385,604** (9/1/14–8/31/15)
- **$1,802,657** (9/1/15–8/31/16)
- **$1,983,553** (9/1/16–8/31/17)

**Yearly passengers and average daily passengers**

- **42,173** (9/1/14–8/31/15)
- **42,760** (9/1/15–8/31/16)
- **45,767** (9/1/16–8/31/17)

- Average daily passengers:
  - **116** (9/1/14–8/31/15)
  - **117** (9/1/15–8/31/16)
  - **125** (9/1/16–8/31/17)

**Scheduled stops (one way) and yearly miles**

- **16** (9/1/14–8/31/15)
- **16** (9/1/15–8/31/16)
- **16** (9/1/16–8/31/17)
RGV Metro Service

**Yearly operating budget**

- **9/1/18–8/31/19:** $1,213,297

**Yearly maintenance budget**

- **9/1/18–8/31/19:** $464,863

**Daily scheduled one way trips**

- **9/1/18–8/31/19:** 166
Key Policy Considerations for Committee Discussion

- Program Emphasis: Operating vs. Capital
- Program Objectives: Texas-specific vs. Overall Federal
- Service Performance Objectives
- Program Delivery Options
<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>- Project Description - Planning efforts - Demonstrated need - Benefits - Timeline - Personnel - TxDOT goals</td>
<td>- Improvement to ICB service - Support “feeder” service - Fill gap where service has been reduced or lost - Improve Amtrak facility - Proposed high-speed rail facility</td>
<td>- Financial justification - Demonstrated need - Coordination with other organizations</td>
<td>- Anticipated ridership - Serves areas without existing intercity service - Potentially self-sustaining</td>
<td>- Operations - Vehicle purchase - Transit infrastructure - Planning studies - Marketing studies</td>
<td>- State evaluated intercity bus and established service priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf Measures</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes. Meet 40% farebox recovery.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes. NTD reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrantees</td>
<td>- Private carriers - Public carriers</td>
<td>- Undetermined</td>
<td>- Public agencies - Private providers</td>
<td>- Public agencies - Private for profits - Non-profits</td>
<td>- Public providers - Rural providers - County transit providers</td>
<td>- Private providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM 5

Presentation and discussion on state-funded intercity bus service in the United States, and potential implications for program approach in Texas.
STATE-FUNDED INTERCITY BUS SERVICE UPDATE

TxDOT Public Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting
April 30, 2019
Provide data to support PTAC decision-making regarding TxDOT’s approach to funding and delivering intercity bus service in Texas.

Contribute to more cost-effective use of Section 5311 (f) Intercity Bus Program funding.
Overview

• Texas intercity bus service inventory
  – Update of 2010 TTI report
• Intercity bus service markets and demand
  – Summary of relevant research

This assessment does not include charter bus service.
TEXAS INTERCITY BUS SERVICE INVENTORY
InterCity Bus Service Connections in Texas (Feb. 2019)

Legend
- Cities
  - Green: Recently received 5311 (f) funds through TxDOT
  - Pink: Has not recently received 5311 (f) funds through TxDOT
About the Map

• Specific routings not shown
  – Many providers do not use them
  – Subject to traffic conditions and driver discretion

• Levels of intercity bus service not indicated
  – Number of operators
  – Number of trips/day
Current Intercity Bus Service in Texas

- All Aboard America
- Amtrak “Thruway” bus connections
- Arrow Trailways of Texas
- Greyhound
- Jefferson Lines
- Megabus
- OurBus
- Tornado Bus Company
- Turimex Internacional
- Vonlane

All Aboard America
Intercity bus service connecting Midland, Odessa, Crane, McCamey, Ft. Stockton, Alpine, Marfa, and Presidio

Amtrak “Thruway” bus connections
Supplement Amtrak rail network
Operated by Greyhound, Southwestern Coaches, and Lone Star Coach

Arrow Trailways of Texas
Serves Killeen, Temple, Round Rock, Austin, Waco, and Houston

Greyhound
~150 stops in Texas plus stops in other states, Mexico, and Canada
Several partners
- All Aboard America
- Ark-Tex Council of Governments
- Southwestern Coaches
- Valley Transit Company

Interlined with Arrow Trailways of Texas

Jefferson Lines
Connects Wichita Falls to cities outside Texas

Megabus (owned by Coach USA)
Connects Austin, Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio to selected cities outside Texas
OurBus
Marketer and coordinator, not operator
Connects Austin, Dallas, and Houston

Tornado Bus Company
~45 stops in Texas plus stops in other states and Mexico
Coordinates ticketing for El Expreso Bus Company
Operates in Texas, 8 other states, and Mexico

Turimex Internacional (owned by Grupo Senda)
80 stops in Texas plus stops in other states and Mexico
Multiple stops in some cities

Vonlane
“Premium” bus service
Connects Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, and San Antonio
INTERCITY BUS MARKETS
Intercity Bus Markets

- Evolving over past 20 years
- Traditional (conventional) markets
- New (emerging) markets

Traditional = captive rider focus
New = choice rider focus
Traditional Markets

- Typical passenger
  - Lower-income
  - Does not own a car
  - Travels primarily to see family and friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Trip Purposes</th>
<th>Shopping/services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit family/friends</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>Tribal lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports/seaports</td>
<td>Military bases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational institutions</td>
<td>Vacation/recreation/special events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional facilities</td>
<td>Connection to passenger rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typical passenger
- Lower-income (2/3 make less than $35,000 per year)
- Does not own a car
- Travels primarily to see family and friends

Passengers also travel to health care, travel connections, education, shopping, services such as lawyers, special events, vacation/recreation, and employment

Employment includes seasonal workers.

More than 50% have at least a high school education

Approximately 42% are between 18 and 34

Almost 60% travel fewer than 450 miles

Typical intercity bus trip generators
- Airports and seaports
- Major hospitals
- Correctional facilities
- Educational institutions
- Regional malls
- Government offices
- Tribal lands
- Military bases
Hospitals: patients and visitors
Correctional facilities: visitors, employees, and released inmates
Regional malls: employees and shoppers

Intercity bus also operates as feeder to passenger rail

In 2001, more than 95% of long-distance trip mileage was associated with car or air travel.

**Round Trip Examples**
- 100-200 miles: Austin/San Antonio, 159 miles
- 300-499 miles: Austin/Fort Worth, 379 miles
- 500-999 miles: Austin/Lubbock, 747 miles
- 1,000-1,999 miles: Austin/El Paso, 1,153 miles; Austin/Denver, 1,842 miles
- 2,000+ miles: Austin/Las Vegas, 2,540 miles

2011 Michigan DOT survey findings
- Most passengers traveled to boarding location by car
- 12-15% used local transit
- 22-27% transferred from another intercity bus

2014 Minnesota survey
- Passengers choose intercity bus for reasons of price and lack of a car more than for any other reason
- Travelers chose other modes out of concerns for number of routes, destinations served, service frequency, and travel time
New Markets

- Emergence of “curbside” or “express” services
- Market influences
  - Competing options
  - Station environment
  - Amenities
  - Information
  - Marketing
  - Area transit usage

Mid-2000s saw amount of intercity bus service in US increase after decades of service cuts
Emergence of new “curbside” or “express” intercity bus services (e.g., Megabus)
  - Featured direct connections and more comfortable on-board experience
  - Targeted specific markets
  - Offered features that appeal to choice riders
Established operators modified their services to compete

Factors influencing choice intercity bus rider market
  - Fuel prices
  - Number/quality/cost of competing options
  - Stop/station environment
  - Amenities (e.g., online ticketing and reserved seating)
  - Amount of information available
  - Targeted marketing (e.g., “first class” service)
  - General level of transit usage in the area

Other characteristics
  - Intercity bus market in Mexico is large; Mexico-based operators increasingly accessible in Texas
Intercity trips of 100-400 miles are most viable and competitive.
On-demand and “pop-up” intercity bus services are being explored.
Intercity bus operators are partnering with Transportation Network Companies to create door-to-door experiences.
Ticket aggregators improve the visibility of intercity bus operators.
Premium services appearing in more parts of the US.
Subsidized services are becoming part of national intercity bus networks.
More Trends

Estimated Passenger Trips on US Intercity Bus Lines (in millions/year)

Other = intercity bus services that originated to serve specific demographic markets

Source: Adapted from Schweitzerman et al., 2016
Other = intercity bus services that originated to serve specific demographic markets
INTERCITY BUS DEMAND
Intercity Bus Demand

- Comprehensive ridership data not available
- Researchers have estimated usage/demand using sources such as Census and NHTS
- Estimation methodologies developed to date generally applied in context of traditional markets

San Marcos CARTS station
Demand Estimation

1. Relate ridership to population, travel distance, airport access, coordination with national network, and/or current travel options
2. Consider corridor capacity
3. Use public input and agency input
4. Assess spatial and temporal connectivity
5. Apply trip generation rate based on NHTS and population
6. Compare environments

If we wanted to estimate intercity bus usage or demand in Texas, how might we go about it? Estimation methodologies published to date tend to take one of the approaches listed here.

2001 Illinois DOT: Methodology assumed intercity bus travel was proportional to populations of endpoint cities and inversely proportional to distance between endpoint cities

2010 TTI: Ranked intercity rail/express bus system corridors based on demographics, estimated travelers (mostly car and plane), and transportation corridor/network capacity

2011 Montana DOT: Used public input and survey of transportation agency managers to assess intercity bus service needs; also considered spatial and temporal connectivity of intercity and rural bus services

2011 TCRP Report 147: Provided two demand estimation models
   Regression model based on existing routes’ ridership, length, stop-and area populations and whether or not route serves an airport and is part of a national network
   Region-specific trip generation approach based on National Household
Transportation Survey (NHTS) and applied to stop-area population

2014 Minnesota DOT: Identified demographic characteristics associated with current services and looked for unserved areas with similar characteristics

2017 Chaddick Institute: Statistical model for estimating intercity bus trips between metro areas
   Considered trip length and whether or not there are existing express coach and rail travel options in corridor
   Also identified metro areas with populations of 700,000+ that have no Amtrak or express coach service – McAllen is one of these
SUMMARY
Newer providers offering direct connections and amenities such as on-board Wi-Fi, reserved seating, and online ticketing (sometimes via ticket aggregators like busbud.com and wander.com) → Established providers made changes to compete → More services that appeal to choice riders → More riders
QUESTIONS?
For More Information

Kelly Blume, PE
Texas A&M Transportation Institute
505 East Huntland Drive, Suite 455
Austin, Texas 78752
Office 512.407.1170 | Mobile 407.721.6673
K-Blume@tti.tamu.edu
AGENDA ITEM 6

Presentation and discussion on state-funded intercity bus service in the state of Washington, and potential implications for program approach in Texas.
Travel Washington
The past (decade), present, and future of intercity bus service in our state

National Conference on Rural, Public and Intercity Bus Transportation
Breckinridge, CO
Oct. 2, 2018

Greg Wright
Community Liaison
WSDOT

Brian Lagerberg
Director, Public Transportation
WSDOT

Nhan Nguyen
Community Liaison Lead
WSDOT
What is the Travel Washington Intercity Bus Program?

- The **Travel Washington Intercity Bus Program** connects rural communities in Washington state with larger urban centers, providing connections to the national intercity transportation network that include bus, rail, air, and ferry.
  - The program uses federal 5311(f) formula funds and private, in-kind matching funds provided by Greyhound to operate the program.

- **WSDOT Intercity Bus Program goal**: To provide mobility and access for rural residents with unmet transportation needs.

- **FTA objectives**: Support the connection between non-urbanized areas and the larger regional or national system of intercity bus service, and to support these services through capital assistance.
Four rural, intercity bus routes

- The **Grape Line** launched in 2007, averaging 5,000 passenger trips annually with three round-trips daily from Walla to Pasco operated by Central Washington Airporter.

- The **Dungeness Line** launched in 2008, averaging 15,500 passenger trips annually with two round-trips daily from Port Angeles to SeaTac airport operated by Olympic Bus Lines for 10 years and now by Greyhound Bus Lines.

- The **Apple Line** launched in 2008, averaging 5,000 passenger trips annually with one round-trip daily from Omak to Ellensburg operated by Northwest Stage Lines.

- The **Gold Line** launched in 2010, averaging 5,000 passenger trips annually with two round trips daily from Kettle Falls to Spokane Intermodal operated by Central Washington Airporter.
Connections

Seattle-Tacoma International Airport

Port of Seattle

Amtrak

Greyhound

Coho Ferry

Trailways

Spokane Police
International interest

• In July 2018, WSDOT was contacted by CBC Radio 1 in Vancouver, Prince George, and Kelowna, BC, inquiring about the success of the Travel Washington program as Greyhound was in the process of discontinuing services in the western Canadian provinces.

• Don Chartock, Grants and Community Partnerships manager with the Public Transportation Division at WSDOT, went on the air a number of times and talked about the success of the program, how it is operated, and how the program is funded under 5311(f).

• WSDOT welcomes further discussion with our neighbors up north, sharing information and experiences with them as they explore possible solutions to reinstate some form of intercity bus service in the provinces.
Coverage of the Travel Washington intercity network

- Washington state total population: 7,073,146
- Population within 10 miles of intercity stops/stations: 5,421,117
- Population within 25 miles of intercity stops/stations: 6,766,255
- About 77 percent of Washington residents live within 10 miles of intercity stops.
- Roughly 96 percent live within 25 miles of one.

Source: KFH Group
Northeast Washington connections
System ridership performance
5311(f) annual program costs
Technical memorandum: consultation/outreach

Consultation/outreach process:

• Public/stakeholder meetings.
• On-board surveys of Travel Washington riders.
• Online community survey.
• Surveys of public transit agencies, regional planning agencies.
• Telephone consultation interviews with intercity carriers.
• Review of Washington State Human Services Transportation Plan, regional human services plans, other plans.

Source: KFH Group
Technical memorandum: needs assessment

Intercity bus trip generators/attractors:
- Colleges and universities
- Commercial airports
- Hospitals and medical centers
- State prisons
- Military bases
- Tribal lands

Source: KFH Group
# Technical memorandum: evaluation of Travel Washington

## Travel Washington operating statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Riders</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Vehicle Trips</th>
<th>Operating Cost(^{(1)})</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Net Operating Cost(^{(2)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple Line</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>133,115</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>$ 253,407.30</td>
<td>$ 90,246.19</td>
<td>$ 163,161.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungeness Line</td>
<td>16,824</td>
<td>160,389</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>$ 1,053,814.00</td>
<td>$ 632,876.30</td>
<td>$ 420,937.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Line</td>
<td>5,098</td>
<td>131,040</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>$ 305,921.30</td>
<td>$ 86,003.50</td>
<td>$ 219,917.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape Line</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>118,580</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>$ 314,283.70</td>
<td>$ 51,593.00</td>
<td>$ 262,690.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31,241</td>
<td>543,124</td>
<td>5,836</td>
<td><strong>$ 1,927,426.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 860,718.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,066,707.31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Operating Cost plus "Profit"\(^{(3)}\) $1,573,829.84
- Billable Cost $1,490,268.70

\(^{(1)}\) Gross Operating Expense
\(^{(2)}\) Gross Operating Expense less Revenues
\(^{(3)}\) Net Operating Cost plus "Profit"
Technical memorandum: evaluation of Travel Washington


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Cost per Mile</th>
<th>Revenue per Mile</th>
<th>Subsidy per Mile</th>
<th>Cost per Rider</th>
<th>Revenue per Rider</th>
<th>Subsidy per Rider</th>
<th>Boardings per Trip</th>
<th>Farebox Recovery</th>
<th>Route Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple Line</td>
<td>$ 1.90</td>
<td>$ 0.68</td>
<td>$ 1.23</td>
<td>$ 58.99</td>
<td>$ 21.01</td>
<td>$ 37.98</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>35.61%</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungeness Line</td>
<td>$ 6.57</td>
<td>$ 3.95</td>
<td>$ 2.62</td>
<td>$ 62.64</td>
<td>$ 37.62</td>
<td>$ 25.02</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>60.06%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Line</td>
<td>$ 2.33</td>
<td>$ 0.66</td>
<td>$ 1.68</td>
<td>$ 60.01</td>
<td>$ 16.87</td>
<td>$ 43.14</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>28.11%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape Line</td>
<td>$ 2.65</td>
<td>$ 0.44</td>
<td>$ 2.22</td>
<td>$ 62.57</td>
<td>$ 10.27</td>
<td>$ 52.30</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>16.42%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 3.55</td>
<td>$ 1.58</td>
<td>$ 1.96</td>
<td>$ 61.70</td>
<td>$ 27.55</td>
<td>$ 34.14</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>44.66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical memorandum: evaluation of Travel Washington

Travel Washington performance: fiscal year 2016–17 ridership and revenue with new contract costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Operating Cost&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Cost per Mile</th>
<th>Revenue per Mile</th>
<th>Subsidy per Mile</th>
<th>Cost per Rider</th>
<th>Revenue per Rider</th>
<th>Subsidy per Rider</th>
<th>Boardings per Trip</th>
<th>Farebox Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple Line</td>
<td>$310,257.00</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>$72.22</td>
<td>$21.01</td>
<td>$51.21</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungeness Line</td>
<td>$520,716.00</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$3.95</td>
<td>$(0.70)</td>
<td>$30.95</td>
<td>$37.62</td>
<td>$(6.67)</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>121.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Line</td>
<td>$538,410.00</td>
<td>$4.11</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
<td>$105.61</td>
<td>$16.87</td>
<td>$88.74</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>15.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape Line</td>
<td>$506,520.00</td>
<td>$4.27</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
<td>$3.84</td>
<td>$100.84</td>
<td>$10.27</td>
<td>$90.57</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>10.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,875,903.00</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
<td>$1.87</td>
<td>$60.05</td>
<td>$27.55</td>
<td>$32.50</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>45.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>(1)</sup> Gross Operating Expense
Looking forward
What’s next for Travel Washington?

• Updating the Travel Washington Intercity Bus Plan in 2018.

• Will there be a fifth line or route expansions?

• Possible connections with BC in the future?
The 2018 Travel Washington Intercity Bus Statewide Plan Update

The analysis will focus on three actions:

• Conduct a system performance review of the four Travel Washington Intercity Bus Lines addressing existing conditions, ridership demand, fare structure, scheduling, and continued funding probability.

• Review, prioritize, and recommend proposed future network expansion alternatives.

• Identify, prioritize and recommend the highest potential of non-surveyed rural communities with unmet transportation needs/gaps.
Looking ahead: policy questions and issues: funding

• How much funding is available?
  – FY 2018 Section 5311(f) 15 percent allocation is $2,001,816.
  – With new contracts that include carrier provision of buses, the annual contract cost for the four routes is $1,875,903.
  – The difference between those figures is $125,913.
  – Expanding service is likely to require use of unexpended funds for operation, so what happens when those funds are gone?

• Availability of in-kind match from Greyhound may be limited:
  – Could be dependent on the specific project.
  – Some states are using toll credits as in-kind match, which may be possible in Washington.
Looking ahead: policy questions and issues

Next steps

• Review route/coverage concepts to eliminate ineligible services; refine remaining concepts.
• Estimate demand, revenue, and cost for those remaining.
• Apply minimum performance standards.
• Prioritize based on multi-factor analysis:
  – Likely performance.
  – Presence/absence of alternative existing service(s).
  – Ability to serve area(s) of high-density need.
  – Ability to make meaningful intercity connection.
  – Operating feasibility; availability of potential operators.
Looking ahead: policy questions and issues

• Goals
  – Is it…
    a) **Coverage**, to make sure that as many citizens as possible have access to an intercity link within a defined distance?
    b) Or **ridership**, within a set of defined performance parameters (e.g., farebox recovery, cost per rider, riders per trip)?
  – If it is the latter, there might be cases in which expansion could be improving frequency on an existing route (even a Greyhound or Northwest Trailways route) rather than a new route.
Questions?
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