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.

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 don’t place this meeting on HOLD – we’ll all hear your hold tone.
# Agenda

## MEETING AGENDA

**Public Transportation Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, November 9, 2021 | 10:00 A.M. (local time)
Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></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 September 9, 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>Presentation and discussion on Intercity Bus Study results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</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>7.</td>
<td>Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting. (Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Adjourn. (Action)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item 3 – Approval of Minutes from 9/9/2021 Meeting

Minutes for Adoption
Public Transportation Advisory Committee – Webex Meeting
September 9, 2021 10:00 A.M.

Committee Members Present and Participating: None (Virtual Meeting via Webex)

Committee Members Participating via Webex:
John McBeth, Chair
Jim Cline, Vice Chair
J.R. Salazar
Marc K. Whyte
Ken Fickes
Diehrlich M. von Biberstein

TxDOT Participating via Webex:
Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN)
Josh Ribakove, Communications Manager, PTN

AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to order.
John McBeth called the meeting to order at 10:05 A.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 10:05 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Approval of minutes from July 27, 2021 meeting (Action).
John McBeth opened this item at 10:07 A.M.

MOTION Ken Fickes moved to approve the July 27, 2021 minutes.
SECOND J.R. Salazar seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously at 10:07 A.M.

Meeting adjourned at 11:21 A.M.

Prepared by: 

Approved by: 

______________________________

Josh Ribakove
Public Transportation Division

______________________________

John McBeth, Chair
Public Transportation Advisory Committee

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 10:08 A.M. His report touched on federal infrastructure and RAISE funding.

AGENDA ITEM 5: State Public Transportation Grant Program and Federal Transit Administration Rural Program Formulas; overview and discussion of potential changes to Texas Administrative Code governing allocations to transit districts.
Eric Gleason gave this presentation beginning at 10:12 A.M.

Questions/Comments from the committee: J.R. Salazar, Jim Cline
Questions/Comments from the public: Jackie Reha, Brazos Valley Center for Independent Living;

AGENDA ITEM 8: Public Comment.
John McBeth introduced this item at 11:18 A.M. – One additional comment via meeting chat from Albert Eby, City of Beaumont, related to the previous item.

AGENDA ITEM 9: Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting (Action).
John McBeth introduced this item at 11:20 A.M.

Agenda items and upcoming meeting date had already been discussed. Upcoming meeting date: November 9.

AGENDA ITEM 10: Adjourn (Action).
MOTION J.R. Salazar moved to adjourn.
SECOND Jim Cline seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously at 11:21 A.M.
Agenda Item 4

TxDOT Public Transportation Division Director’s report to the Public Transportation Advisory Committee regarding public transportation matters.
Agenda Item 5

Presentation and discussion on Intercity Bus Study results.
Strategic Direction Report (SDR): Intercity Bus Service Characteristics

- Provides rural area access to and among urbanized areas with concentrations of employment, healthcare, and educational opportunities as well as connections to state and national intercity bus and other travel networks;
- Integrates ticketing, scheduling, marketing and coordination of services among service providers and stakeholders to maximize convenience of access and use for the customer and performance outcomes;
- Allows for the transport of luggage, baggage and, in some cases freight, generally associated with longer distance travel needs; and
- Operates as a fixed route, fixed schedule service.
### Table 1: Types of Program Delivery Models
(Comparison of State DOT 5311(f) Programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic and Delivery Model</th>
<th>Texas (current)</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Texas (proposed)</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum level of service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, within threshold criteria; regional/national system connection.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Target levels by service type</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, contractors must provide minimum runs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Evaluation Criteria              | - Project Description  
- Planning efforts  
- Demonstrated need  
- Benefits  
- Timeline  
- Personnel  
- TxDOT state goals  
- Improvement to ICB service  
- Support “feeder” service  
- Fill gap where service has been reduced or lost  
- Improve Amtrak facility  
- Proposed high-speed rail facility  
- Financial justification  
- Demonstrated need  
- Coordination with other organizations  
- Demonstrated need/benefit: consistency with State priorities/local plans  
- Coordination/integration with supporting services and stakeholders  
- Anticipated performance outcomes  
- Readiness: implementation timeline  
- Partnerships  
- Sustainability  | - Anticipated ridership  
- Serves areas without existing intercity service  
- Potential self-sustaining  
- Operations  
- Vehicle purchase  
- Transit infrastructure  
- Planning studies  
- Marketing studies  | - State evaluated intercity bus and established service priorities |

| Performance Measures             | None | None | Yes. Meet 40% farebox recovery. | Potential targets  
- Ridership  
- Cost/rider  
- Cost/hour; cost/mile  
- Farebox recovery | None | Yes. NTD reporting. | None |
| Subgrantees                       | - Private carriers  
- Public carriers | - Undetermined | - Public agencies  
- Private providers  | - Private for-profit carriers  
- Public providers (Transit Districts)  
- Public agencies  
- Private for profits  
- Non-profits  | - Public providers  
- Rural providers  
- County transit providers  | - Private providers |
Summary of July PTAC Presentation
Current Rural Area ICB Network (Subsidized and Unsubsidized)
Evaluation of Options

- **Objective** - Evaluate Each Route Using Common Metrics:
  - Coverage/access improvements
  - Cost-effectiveness
  - Performance Standards

- **Methodology**:
  - Develop comparable data for each route
  - Then all connections were ranked on each measure
  - Rankings were used to develop a score for each route on each measure
  - Sum of scores for each route
  - Then scores were ranked
Factors Considered: Coverage and Cost-Effectiveness Criteria

- **Coverage:**
  - Additional population served
  - Number of key destinations
  - Number of additional Census Block Groups with high Transit Dependence Index scores
  - Connectivity benefits

- **Cost-Effectiveness:**
  - Farebox recovery
  - Boardings per trip
  - Subsidy per passenger-trip
  - Performance Standards
  - Ridership-actual or estimated
Factors Considered: Ridership Estimation

• **Current Services:**
  - 2019 ridership for 5311(f) funded routes

• **New Connections:**
  - Estimated ridership for potential routes/previously unsubsidized routes using the Transit Cooperative Research Program Report 147 model, averaged result of two methods
  - Population for each stop
  - One-way route length
  - Model assumptions
Factors Considered: Cost-Effectiveness

- **Key Measures:**
  - Farebox Recovery
  - Subsidy per passenger trip
  - Boardings per vehicle trip

- **For Estimating Potential Route Performance:**
  - Route length
  - Estimated annual trips & estimated annual miles
  - Cost per mile for similar services
  - Estimated ridership
  - Estimated revenue based on revenue per passenger-mile
Existing 5311(f) Projects – Coverage and Cost-effectiveness

• Most West Texas routes scored well (above 30) whether analysis was weighted in favor of coverage or cost-effectiveness

• Regionally-focused routes show mixed results under either weighting, suggesting a need for different performance metrics, or alternative funding model

• El Paso-Las Cruces service functions more as a commuter service than ICB

• Presidio-Midland-Odessa route would be prioritized when weighting in favor of coverage, just below threshold when cost-effectiveness is highly weighted
Development of Performance Standards:

• **Performance Standards:**
  - Subsidy per passenger below $150
  - Minimum Farebox recovery 4% for rural feeder service and 15% for intercity
  - Minimum passengers per vehicle trip of 3

• Subsidy per passenger trip is high because of trip length

• Developed based on performance of existing rural area ICB services nationwide and other long-distance carriers
Statewide Rural Area ICB Priority Service Network

• **Inclusion in Priority Connections:**
  - Existing Subsidized services clearing minimum performance standards
  - Existing subsidized services with high coverage and cost-effectiveness scores
  - Additional connections with high coverage and cost-effectiveness scores

• **Issue:** Not all existing subsidized services exhibit the characteristics of ICB service included in the Strategic Direction Report.
Analysis Findings

• Many existing 5311(f) routes highly ranked in coverage and cost-effectiveness scenarios

• Two currently unsubsidized routes identified by carriers as potentially needing subsidy scored well and are included

• Regionally-focused and commuter service routes did not score well under either coverage or cost-effectiveness scenario, but some did clear minimum performance standards — are they a different category of service?
  – Short routes do not add much ICB population coverage or key destinations
  – Low ridership means = high subsidy per passenger
  – Farebox recovery low
  – 2019 data usage caveats

• Consideration of grandfathering routes: Actual existing ridership is more valuable than potential?
Strategy Recommendations

• Coordinated Call to include a list of priority connections, but allowing for other proposals

• Prioritize Applications to:
  – Maintaining existing service—funding to maintain previously unsubsidized service
  – Service expansion consistent with priority connections
  – Funding to maintain existing 5311(f) service that meets performance criteria

• Application of performance standards to service
Strategic Direction

• **Near-term Strategic Direction**
  - Balance existing program commitments with proposals for new connections consistent with ICB study recommendations
  - Account for impact of the pandemic on previously unsubsidized rural area services
  - Specifically track performance of new connections consistent with ICB study findings to evaluate potential success of new direction

• **Longer-term Strategic Direction:**
  - Align subsidized service connections more closely with desired ICB service characteristics
  - Create sustainable core network of ICB services and allow for continuous improvement with new service proposals
  - Position program to seek and effectively utilize potential expansion in federal programs
Implementation of Results: Challenges and Opportunities to ICB Program

• Near-term Service Funding Decisions:
  - June 2022: Commission Action on ICB Coordinated Call Projects
  - September 2022: Effective date of new ICB Project Grant Agreements

• Challenges Ahead:
  - Ridership recovery in overall ICB markets
  - Pandemic impact - costs and frequency
  - Acquisitions in ICB marketplace
  - Performance-based transitions from existing to new connections

• Opportunities:
  - Unobligated Federal Program Balance and Future Increases (IIJA)
  - 2022 Coordinated Call: Provider interest in priority connection areas
  - Future assessment of ICB service potential and needs (FY 24/25)
Public Comment
Agenda Item 7

Propose and discuss agenda items for next meeting; confirm date of next meeting.
Adjourn.