Public Transportation Advisory Committee

April 22, 2021

Meeting Begins 10:05am
# MEETING AGENDA

**Public Transportation Advisory Committee**  
Thursday, April 22, 2021 | 10:00 A.M. (local time)  
Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)  
Virtual Meeting via Webex Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Call to Order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Guidance on virtual meeting participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Approval of minutes from January 29, 2021 meeting. (Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>TxDOT Public Transportation Division Director’s report to the Public Transportation Advisory Committee regarding public transportation matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Overview of current Texas Administrative Code state funding allocation formula and federal Section 5311 funding allocation formula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Update on Intercity Bus study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Public Comment – Public comment will only be accepted during the meeting. Link and details are below. The meeting transcript will be posted on the internet following the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting. (Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Adjourn. (Action)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I certify that I have reviewed this document and that it conforms to all applicable Texas Register filing requirements. CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Becky Blewett, Deputy General Counsel, (512) 463-8630.

***

The public is invited to attend this meeting and view meeting presentations via WebEx at https://txdot.webex.com/txdot/onstage/g.php?MTID=e94bf5d632072e5625ca7f845aab3e9c3 For toll-free audio and best audio quality, select the option to have the meeting call you.

**Special Accommodations**  
TxDOT makes every reasonable effort to accommodate the needs of the public. These virtual public meetings will be in English. If you have a special communication accommodation or need for an interpreter, a request can be made. If you have a disability and need assistance, special arrangements can also be made to accommodate most needs. Please call (512) 486-5958 at least two working days prior to the meeting, and be aware that advance notice is requested as some accommodations may require time for TxDOT to arrange.
Meeting Protocols

- Your line has been muted automatically upon joining the meeting.

- It is important to enter your name when joining the meeting – if you didn’t do that, please exit the meeting and rejoin.

- If you wish to comment on an agenda item, use the meeting’s chat feature to let Josh know – he will respond and can un-mute your line.

- Please remember not to place this meeting on HOLD – we’ll all hear your hold tone.
AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to order.
John McBeth called the meeting to order at 1:05 P.M.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Guidance on virtual meeting participation
Josh Ribakove briefed meeting attendees on virtual meeting protocols including how public comments can be submitted via Webex at 1:07 P.M.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Approval of minutes from January 7, 2021 meeting (Action).
John McBeth opened this item at 1:09 P.M.

    MOTION    Ken Fickes moved to approve the January 7, 2021 minutes.
    SECOND    Marc Whyte seconded the motion.

    Motion passed unanimously at 1:11 P.M.

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

Eric Gleason gave his report verbally beginning at 1:12 P.M. His report touched on federal COVID-19 relief efforts, the committee’s upcoming discussions on Texas Administrative Code rulemaking, and the current session of the Texas Legislature.
AGENDA ITEM 5: Presentation and discussion on Intercity Bus Program status.

Eric Gleason opened the item at 1:22 P.M. and introduced Theo Kosub (TxDOT-PTN), who gave the presentation with support from consultant Fred Fravel (KFH Group).

Additional comments from Eric Gleason.

No action taken.

AGENDA ITEM 6: Discussion on priorities for federal authorization/reauthorization efforts regarding transit funding.

Eric Gleason opened the item at 1:39 P.M.

Questions/comments from John McBether and J.R. Salazar.

No action taken.

AGENDA ITEM 7: Discussion on upcoming committee topics for FY 2021 (Action).

Eric Gleason opened the item at 2:06 P.M.

Comment from John McBeth.

No action taken.

AGENDA ITEM 8: Public Comment.

John McBeth introduced this item at 2:09 P.M.

No public comments.

AGENDA ITEM 9: Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting (Action).

John McBeth introduced this item at 2:10 P.M.

Agenda items had already been discussed: Intercity Bus Study and Texas Administrative Code rulemaking. Committee chose 10am on Thursday April 22 for their next meeting.

No action taken.

AGENDA ITEM 10: Adjourn (Action).

MOTION  Jim Cline moved to adjourn.

SECOND  Ken Fickes seconded the motion.
Motion passed unanimously at 2:14 P.M.

Meeting adjourned at 2:14 P.M.

Prepared by:     Approved by:

__________________________  _________________________________
Josh Ribakove    John McBeth, Chair
Public Transportation Division  Public Transportation Advisory Committee
Agenda Item 4

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

Director’s Report

COVID-19 Response Update
Summary of Initial FTA Report Data – Rural Transit Program

- Most rural transit districts reduced service, some suspended altogether
- Most are now back to normal operations, some continuing to operate reduced service levels
- 20/1000 employees tested positive – all recovered
- Over 85% employees vaccinated
### FY 19–21 Q1/Q2 Comparison – Rural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VRM</th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</td>
<td>15,022,939</td>
<td>11,994,321</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Hours</th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</td>
<td>736,453</td>
<td>565,692</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</td>
<td>$44,304,426</td>
<td>$50,441,074</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Per Hour</th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</td>
<td>$60.16</td>
<td>$89.17</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</td>
<td>2,349,291</td>
<td>1,207,768</td>
<td>-49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 19–21 Q1/Q2 Comparison – Urban

### VRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>13,027,885</td>
<td>10,095,502</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>$61,656,130</td>
<td>$62,838,363</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>866,798</td>
<td>708,288</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>13,346,086</td>
<td>3,890,278</td>
<td>-71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Per Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2019 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>FY 2021 Q1/Q2</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>$71.13</td>
<td>$88.72</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Federal Emergency Relief Funding Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CARES</th>
<th>CRRSAA</th>
<th>ARP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5311</strong></td>
<td>$121,720,471</td>
<td>$3,316,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$48,656,784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>$271,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5311(f) (ICB)</strong></td>
<td>$21,480,083</td>
<td>$6,980,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$18,052,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5310</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,360,560</td>
<td>$1,360,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$143,200,554</td>
<td>$1,360,560</td>
<td>$11,929,714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 FY 21 set aside and ARP funding

**Key:**
- April Commission Action
- June Commission Action
- Commission Action TBD
CARES Act Expenditures

CARES Allocations/Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RTD-5311</th>
<th>ICB-5311 (f)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocation</td>
<td>121,720,471</td>
<td>21,480,083</td>
<td>143,200,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures to Date</td>
<td>48,656,784</td>
<td>18,052,015</td>
<td>66,708,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of current Texas Administrative Code state funding allocation formula and federal Section 5311 funding allocation formula.
TAC Review – Summary of Scope

- Primary Objectives/Focus for Today:
  - Respond to impacts of 2020 Census urbanized area designations and shifts in rural area population on TAC allocation formulas.
  - Consider modifications in response to Federal formula program growth

- Secondary Objectives:
  - Revise to be consistent with potentially new authorization requirements
  - Improve clarity and transparency of language
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTAC Initial Discussion of Rulemaking Need</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTAC Meetings to Discuss Changes to Rules at</td>
<td>July/October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Level</td>
<td>January 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiannual Operators Meeting</td>
<td>July 2021/Jan. 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Release of Urbanized Area Designations</td>
<td>Spring 2022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 23 State Funding Award (Partial)</td>
<td>June 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTAC Meeting to Comment on Draft proposed Rule Text</td>
<td>July 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 23 State Funding Balance Award and FY 23 Federal</td>
<td>January 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumed timing based on 2010 Census process
Step 1: Objectives/Guiding Principles (from 2017 Effort)

- Overall: Fair, Transparent, and Simple

- Specific – Revisions? (July 2021 PTAC meeting)
  - Reward Performance Efficiency and Effectiveness
  - Encourage Local Investment and Coordination
  - Facilitate System Integration
  - Provide Reasonably Stable and Predictable Allocations from One Year to the Next
  - Preserve Flexibility to Address Unforeseen Circumstances
Step 2: Understanding the Current Formula – History

- **Historical Perspective – 2004/2005 and the New World Order**
  - Shift from allocations based on history to allocations based on need and performance.
  - Commission-driven reallocation of baseline funding amounts.
  - SAFETEA-LU triggered increases in federal formula program size paired with a decade of static State funding levels.

- **Changes (2006 – present)**
  - Formalization of Vehicle Mile Award
  - Creating and funding Large Urban category
  - Other tweaks and adjustments
Step 2: Understanding the Current Formula – State

- TAC language includes specific amounts of funding to be allocated solely based on need and performance criteria
  - Appropriated biennium total
  - Specific Rural, Small Urban, and Large Urban Allocations

- Need and Performance Criteria: Rural vs. Urban (Large and Small)
  - Rural: 65% Need (Population (75%) and Land Area (25%)) / 35% Performance (3 equally weighted factors)
  - Urban: 50% Need (Population only) / 50% Performance (4 factors)

- Funding in excess of specified amounts distributed on discretionary basis

- Floor (10%) governing amount of decrease from one year to the next

- DFW Area Statutory Urban Areas – State Statute Requirement
State Funding Formula – Current TAC Language

Biennial State Transit Funds: $67,682,134

- Eligible Large Urban Areas, $7,000,000
  - 50% Need
  - 50% Performance
  - 100% Population

- Small Urban Areas, $20,118,748
  - 50% Need
  - 50% Performance
  - 100% Population

- Rural Areas, $40,563,386
  - 65% Need
  - 35% Performance
  - 75% Population
  - 25% Land Area

- Statutory Urban Areas, $1,541,672
  - 50% Need
  - 50% Performance

Areas of the Formula with Fixed Amounts

Proportional Share Elements of the Formula Expressed as Percentage
Step 2: Understanding the Current Formula – Federal (Rural)

- Combination of pre-determined amounts and variable amounts depending on overall total apportionment

- Federal Set-asides for Administration and ICB

- Pre-determined amount ($20.1 million) distributed based on need and performance criteria that mirror State Rural program allocations

- Up to 10% Discretionary after Set-asides

- Rest plus available prior year funding distributed by Total Vehicle Miles
FTA 5311 Formula Funds: FY 18 Example - Current TAC Rules

Congressional Authorization & Appropriation
FTA Apportions Full or Partial Annual Amount
- $43,510,493 Full Amount for FY 18

Set - Asides
Required or Authorized by Statute
- Intercity Bus (ICB): Set at 15%; $6,526,574
  - Awarded through Coordinated Call
- State Program Oversight: Allowed up to 10%
  - FY 18 Allocation $1.13M (2.6%)
  - Full Apportionment = $43.5 M, less Set-Asides of $7.6 M, Balance $35.9 M; therefore a Maximum of $3.59 M awarded pro rata or competitively

Need and Performance Formula
Fixed at $20.1 M
- Formula in TAC
  - 65% “Need” and 35% “Performance”
  - Need defined as 75% Population and 25% Area
  - Performance is equal weight given to:
    - Local share contribution
    - Miles per dollar
    - Riders per mile

Competitive / Service Levels
Competitive Awards
Through Coordinated Call
- No more than 10% of Balance, after Set-Asides Deducted (FY 18 no more than $3.59 M)

Total Vehicle Miles
All Rural Transit Districts
- Balance after Set-Asides, $20.1M, and Competitive Awards Deducted Plus Remaining Prior Year Balances (FY 18 Minimum of $12.16 M)
Step 2: Understanding the Current Formula – Summary

- **Proportional Share-driven Allocations**
- **Need information is decennial census-based – remains constant from one year to the next**
- **Urban Transit District need amounts are census-driven, Urbanized Area-based, and calculated separately even if combined in practice (Midland-Odessa)**

**Sources of Change in Annual Allocations**
- Performance data is annually updated and triggers changes in overall annual allocation amounts among transit districts
- District boundary changes impact both need and performance calculations
- Corrections to data collection methods
Overarching Discussion Areas – Key Policy Considerations

- What is the basis for allocation amounts (specific or percentage)?
- Definition of “Need” – options in addition to traditional pop/land area?
- Performance – does overall approach work? Correct measures?
- Discretionary – use, distribution
- What is the appropriate split between categories of the overall formula – need, performance, discretionary?
- Use of formula funds – general use vs. targeted use
- Eligibility for discretionary funds – higher threshold than for formula funding?
- Others?
Next Steps – 90 Day Look Ahead

- Confirm Administration and Commission briefing schedule
- Prepare white papers for initial policy discussion topics
- Semiannual Operators Meeting – July 21
- PTAC Meeting – July 22
Agenda Item 6

Update on Intercity Bus study.
Purpose of Study & Background

- Welcome – Introductions

- Study initiated in response to PTAC revised Intercity Bus (ICB) Program Strategic Direction Report

- Intended to determine program changes needed to enable TxDOT to provide strategic direction in solicitations

- Project goals and objectives align with those in the report

- Project schedule to provide input for any needed changes in next Coordinated Call or eGrant forms
## Timeline: Progress to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nov 2020</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan 2021</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off and Info Gathering</td>
<td>Policy Context Tech Memo #1</td>
<td>Service Profile of Existing ICB Service in Texas Memo #2</td>
<td>Needs Assessment: Data Collection &amp; Analysis; Consultation Process-Stakeholder Outreach Memos #3 &amp; #4</td>
<td>Priority Areas for Future Program Growth; Evaluation of Existing and Proposed Services Memos #5 &amp; #6</td>
<td>Performance Indicators Memo #7</td>
<td>Seamless Trip Information and Ticketing Memo #8</td>
<td>Innovative Service Delivery Models Memo #9</td>
<td>Draft Final Report with all Memos</td>
<td>Final Report with all Memos</td>
<td>Wiggle Room</td>
<td>Contract Ends Oct. 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Analysis

- FTA Section 5311 program is addressed in 43 TAC § 31.36 of Texas Administrative Code (TAC)

- TAC does not address how funds are to be awarded—provides flexibility

- Section (A) requires the department to consider “...outstanding requests from intercity operators and rural transit districts...”
  - Could include option in application for applicant-developed services in addition to defined TxDOT scope, or
  - Include a Request for Information soliciting input prior to issuing coordinated call

- No change in Administrative Code needed to provide strategic direction
Existing Intercity Bus Service

- Four categories of Intercity Bus Service statewide:
  - Traditional intercity bus service (Greyhound)
  - Latino market/cross-border intercity bus service (Omnibus)
  - Short-distance or regional services (All Aboard America or CARTS Interurban routes)
  - Express curbside services (Megabus, Flixbus, Vonlane – not a focus area for this study)

- Rural areas not served by express curbside type services

- Significant COVID impacts—ridership fell to around 20% of normal:
  - Traditional carriers reduced frequencies, suspended some routes, tried to maintain network
  - Express carriers suspended many services
The Texas Intercity Bus Network: Routes and Carriers
Demographic Needs Analysis: Network Coverage

- 66% of Texans live within 10 miles of an intercity bus stop (18.5 million people)

- 94.2% of Texans live with 25 miles of an intercity bus stop (26.3 million)

- 5.8% of the state’s population lives more than 25 miles from an intercity bus stop (1.6 million people)
Transit Dependent Index Based on Percentage of High Needs Population

Map of Texas showing the transit dependent index based on the percentage of high needs population. The map uses color coding to indicate different levels of transit dependency across various cities and towns in the state. The legend includes symbols for Greyhound routes, other intercity bus routes, and carrier stops, with color bands representing very low to very high transit dependency relative to the study average.
Most Populated Urban Clusters: Areas > Than 25 Miles From An ICB Stop

Top 30 Urban Areas > 25 Miles from TX ICB Stop

1. Texas City UA
2. Lake Jackson - Angleton UA
3. Galveston UC
4. Cleburne UC
5. Granbury UC
6. Paris UC
7. Brownwood UC
8. Palestine UC
9. Bay City UC
10. Pampa UC
11. Stephenville UC
12. Rockport UC
13. Breham UC
14. Gatesville UC
15. Port Isabel - Laguna Heights UC
16. Gun Barrel City UC
17. Jacksonville UC
18. Levelland UC
19. Borger UC
20. Andrews UC
21. Athens UC
22. Dayton UC
23. Port Lavaca UC
24. Snyder UC
25. Zapata - Medina UC
26. Vernon UC
27. Bonham UC
28. Cleveland UC
29. Pearsall UC
30. Graham UC
Stakeholder Outreach Meetings

- Six regional virtual meetings (attendees):
  - March 23: Panhandle (5)     March 24: Gulf Coast/Houston (12)
  - March 25: West (7)          March 30: North / East (13)
  - March 31: South Central Valley (8)  April 1: Center – I35 corridor (4)

- Meeting invitations / surveys sent to:
  - Transit operators
  - Regional planners
  - Centers for independent living
  - Community action agencies
  - Veterans support organizations
  - Tribal entities
  - Higher education institutions
  - Private intercity operators

- Private intercity operators also sent survey, offered chance for individual meeting
Stakeholder Input from Meetings: Preliminary Observations

- Many intercity services in rural Texas have been discontinued / many rural stops removed in last few decades. New facilities were constructed (e.g., in Early) for ICB routes that ceased operating.

- Gaps in connectivity of existing services across the state. Regional connectivity hampered by jurisdictional boundaries. Existing connectivity often means traveling in different direction to access ICB network in urbanized area.

- Unserved areas/corridors examples.

- Difficult to access information on available services (including ICB routes and schedules) – mobility managers may not even have this info, Spanish speakers may not understand.

- Rural ICB stations/stops often poorly marked / unsheltered / in disrepair.

- Cost of service / fares cost-prohibitive to low-income residents of the Valley/South Texas.

- Challenges to navigating transfers from ICB to local service riders who are elderly and/or have a disability.
Stakeholder Input Survey Responses: Preliminary Observations

- Rural ICB needs identified in responses (preliminary examples)
  - More service in the rural counties between Odessa and El Paso and to rural areas near Big Bend National Park
  - Connections from the Brownwood area to Austin and DFW
  - Connections in rural South Texas including Crystal City, Carrizo Springs, Uvalde, Del Rio, Eagle Pass (including weekend service to San Antonio)
  - Need to improve conditions around some intercity stations/terminals

- Many additional locally-focused and urban-focused needs also mentioned
Overall Progress To Date

- Analysis and input on track to inform shift to strategic direction
  - Policy changes
  - Service needs/issues

- Know where services were—COVID changes make it unclear what they will be

- Know location of populations (overall and high needs) in relation to existing network

- Identified potential unmet needs based on analysis

- Input helping to identify unmet needs/issues

- On track to meet contract end date (10/31)
Next Tasks

- **Technical Memorandum #4** to document surveys and stakeholder input—in progress.

- Priority Areas for Future Growth (based on results of previous tasks)
  - Potential improvements
  - Data for assessing potential improvements
  - Projected Data
  - Technical Memorandum #5

- Evaluation of Existing and Proposed Services
  - Calculate performance measures
  - Develop performance standards
  - Apply standards and prioritize services
  - Present results
  - Technical Memorandum #6
For More Information

- Project web page
  

- Contacts

  **TxDOT:**
  Theo Kosub
  Strategic Programs Coordinator
  TxDOT Public Transportation Division
  (512) 486-5971
  Theodore.Kosub@txdot.gov

  **KFH Group:**
  Bennett Powell
  (512) 372-8807
  bpowell@kfhgroup.com

  Fred Fravel
  (301) 951-8660
  ffravel@kfhgroup.com
Agenda Item 7

Public Comment.
Agenda Item 8

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