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    Also participating virtually Fred Fravel, KFH Group, Inc.
MR. CLINE: This is the 2021 meeting of the Public Transportation Advisory Committee. We'll call this meeting to order.

Josh, could you please review the -- all right. Let's first of all start off with a roll --

Josh, if you could do a roll call for the PTAC members.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Happy to. That was Jim Cline. John McBeth, are you with us? If you can't talk, just type in the Chat.

MR. MC BETH: Here.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Okay. Detrich Von Biedenfeld?

MR. VON BIEDENFELD: I am here.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Ken Fickes?

MR. FICKES: Present.

MR. RIBAKOVE: And J.R. Salazar?

MR. SALAZAR: Here as well.

MR. RIBAKOVE: That is who we've got at this moment, Jim. And that is enough for a quorum.

MR. CLINE: Very good. Item number 2 is Guidance on the Virtual Meeting Participation.

Josh, could you give us a briefing on that, please?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Sure. Hi everyone. Your line
has been muted when you joined the meeting. If you want to comment during our public comment period, just let me know through the meeting's Chat or Q&A, and I can unmute your mic so you can comment.

    It's important to add to your name when you joined the meeting, and as far as I can see, everyone has. But if you haven't, then please exit the meeting and rejoin. Because seeing your name is how I'll know it's you and be able to unmute.

    Again, to comment on an agenda item, use the Chat feature. Let me know, I will respond to unmute your line, and use the Q&A as well. Don't place the meeting on hold, please, because we will all hear your hold tone or music, whatever that happens to be.

    I'm going to talk a little bit about committee motions. For standard motions, the Chair will request a motion from a specific member and then ask another for a second. And our standard questions today will be the Minutes and the meeting adjournment will end.

    So there are no other action items in this meeting.

    MR. CLINE: Thank you. Thank you, Josh. Item number 3 is that first action item which is the Approval of Minutes from the September 9th, 2021 meeting. Those were included with the packet of information, and if
you -- are there any questions from members of PTAC?

If there -- and when we get to the point, I will ask for a motion from J.R. and a second from Ken. Hearing no questions?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes, this is J.R. I move to approve.

MR. FICKES: This is Ken Fickes. I move to second.

MR. CLINE: All members of PTAC in favor of this motion signify by saying aye.

PTAC MEMBERS: Aye, aye, aye, aye.

MR. CLINE: All oppose, same sign.

The motion carries unanimously. Thank you for your help on that.

Item number 4 is the TXDOT Public Transportation Director's Report, and so Eric, I'll call on you to make that report.

MR. GLEASON: All right. This is Eric Gleason, TXDOT Division, Director of Public Transportation. Thanks, Jim, for that.

One more point of clarification to add to Josh's meeting protocols and that has to do with public comment. And I think Mr. Chair if it's all right with you, or Mr. Vice Chair, when we get through the presentation around Item 5, which is the next item in
the discussion of the Intercity Bus Program, that that
would be an appropriate time either immediately
following committee discussion or prior to that to
invite any public comment on that topic as opposed to
waiting toward the end of the meeting.

I want to make sure everyone is clear on that,
and that way the committee will have the benefit of
those comments in the context of that discussion. And I
also want to emphasize to everyone listening that that
discussion today -- we are not requesting any action on
the part of the committee, and I will probably
re-emphasize that when we get to it.

So for today this is all sort of, you know,
I -- if I had my report ready next Thursday, I'd throw
it out, and we're going to work with, you know, the
breaking news portion of what's going on. And it's
really two things that I want to identify for the
committee. Obviously the first one has to do with the
passage of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act by
the House. Now awaiting signature by the President.

This is a long awaited and, you know, seemed
to be on life support in any particular point along the
way, but bottom line on this for Transit from a funding
standpoint is a significant increase across the board, a
30 percent increase for the programs we administer as a
department. Just to give you a sense of what that means over the life of the authorization because the Investment Act also is an Authorization Act through 2026.

So our current level of funding the FY21 amounts that we manage as a department is about 66.7 million dollars. And at the end of authorization in fiscal year '26 that amount is going to be 94.1 million. So that's a 27.4 million increase, and it's comprised of two -- two chunks, if you will. The 30 percent across the board increase in program funding occurs in FY22, and then each year after that through the authorization there's a baseline percentage growth to each program. That varies anywhere from 2 to just over 3 percent depending on the year. And so when we add up the initial FY22 amount and then add in the gross each year in authorization, that actually results in a 41 percent increase, across the board increase in all of our programs over the lifetime of the authorization.

So this is an enormous opportunity for us as a state to I think make a significant and enduring impact on our programs. And as you might imagine, 75 percent of that increase is associated with the 5311 program. And so not only it's big, but the majority of it is around the 5311 program, which -- you know, I think at
this point the funding implications are pretty clear. I think what remains to be seen is what else from a what I call a programmatic level what other kinds of changes in our programs might be in the authorization legislation, and we've just simply not had time to go through and sort those out. And I hope to have more on that ready for the committee in January.

The other thing that -- that's at work here is our formula efforts and the schedule for that. And we have identified all along one of the -- one of the key milestones for us in this around the formula is the timing of the Census Bureau's (audio unintelligible) determinations. And typically that would be occurring in the spring of '22 and impacting FY23 programs.

We learned yesterday that the Bureau is now targeting a summer release for those determinations, and, you know, the general feeling is that that will be later in the summer rather than earlier. And, you know, I would remind everyone that the summer actually extends through September 20th, the solstice.

So I think we're looking at an end of year, end of federal fiscal year announcement of those determinations, which we need to complete our work around any changes to the formula. And so that's kind of -- we're going to take another look at our schedule
and again have that ready for you in January, but it's
going to push us back, the whole process back around
rule making four, five months.

So, you know, that's kind of a wrench in our plans. We've talked about that being a possibility and
now we'll have to program that in more specifically. So stay tuned for that.

So I'm thinking that's probably all I want to
say on that right now. So we'll have a more complete interpretation of what's in authorization and then the impact that will have on our current rule making process.

The final thing I will mention, some of you may recall that early on when we were talking about why do we need to make changes to the rules, clearly we felt the formula changes were important, but we identified at that time that if we were to get authorization in the midst of our process, that we would consider expanding the scope of the rule making to bring in those other programs we managed, such as the 5310 program, for example, bring that into our rule change discussions. And so here we are, we have that situation.

And so the other thing we'll be doing between now and your meeting in January, we'll be trying to assess how we do that from a scheduling standpoint. You
know, how we'll get information in front of you as the committee and when to expand that scope to include the full extent of authorization. So lots to figure out, more to do and more information on that at your meeting in January.

So I think that's probably the extent of my report. I will tell the committee that we have scheduled a statewide conference call with Rural and Urban Transit Districts for next Thursday where I'll say at least as much as I have this morning and perhaps some more depending on what more we may know.

So in the context of today's report, I'm willing -- let's see if there aren't some questions that committee members may have that we can write down. I would remind you that we can't go so far in that discussion under this item to actually reach conclusions or discuss too much more beyond just identifying what your questions might be at this point.

So I'll -- I'll open it up. I know that Ken has already identified some possible changes in the Transportation Development Credit Program where the -- you know, there is the ability to entertain a pilot that might look at exchanging development credits with other states in return for some -- some -- I imagine some monetary value for them for state, that it can take
advantage of a development credit.

So all that remains to be seen, but if you have had a chance to look through and identify other things you're interested in hearing about, we can take those down now if you have them or we can assemble those over the time frame between now and our January meeting.

So I'll open it up for any comments on anything I just said.

MR. CLINE: Any comments from PTAC members?

PTAC MEMBER: No, that made sense.

MR. GLEASON: So feel free in the ensuing time frame to send to -- want it sent to Josh or Karen?

MR. RIBAKOVE: To Karen.

MR. GLEASON: Send to Karen Burkhardt (phonetic) any issues you may identify as you learn more about what's in the legislation or questions you have, and we'll try and accumulate those over the next time frame and get answers for you if we can by the January meeting.

MR. CLINE: Very good, Eric.

MR. GLEASON: And I think that concludes my report.

MR. CLINE: One request I would make, this is Jim, Eric, if you could, please send Karen's contact info to the PTAC members after the meeting. Just to
make sure we got good contact info for her.

MR. GLEASON: We'll do. Josh will send that out immediately following the meeting, if not now.

MR. CLINE: Very good. Okay. Eric, I think we've got Item Number 5, which is up next which is presentation and discussion on Intercity Bus Study Results. And one thing that I think I'm going just before you kick that off and introduce our guest, I -- in your thoughts that you had earlier about taking public comment, and I liked feedback from the PTAC members, if we could at the conclusion of the presentation take any feedback from members outside -- or members of the public that may have questions and then we can have our discussion, or if you prefer to put the order differently, but I do think bringing the public comment in at this point as Eric suggested would be very positive.

Any thoughts on that about opening it up first before we have a committee discussion?

Hearing none, Eric, I'll turn the floor over to you and then we'll open it up for some public discussion as soon as Fred finishes his presentation.

MR. GLEASON: All right. Well, thank you. So I'm going to -- let's see, Josh, can we get the presentation up?
The way this will roll today is I'll open it with a couple of slides, and then I'll close it and everything in between will be Fred and his team from KFH talking and sharing with us their conclusions from the study.

So let's see, Josh, let's go back to the cover slide if there is one. If there's not one. Okay. There it is. Okay.

So just to kind of remind the committee of where we've been on this over the last number of months, the committee concluded its work on a Strategic Direction Report back I believe in the fall of 2019. And one of the recommendations coming from that was that we engage the services of a consultant team, an expert team to help advise us and inform us how best to move to the new -- the new direction we wanted to accomplish with the program. You know, going from a program today, which is largely based on whatever we get from a proposal standpoint, to one where we know enough about what we want to accomplish with the program so that we can identify what in our minds are the priority connections for this program to help us make. And we engaged KFH, specifically Fred Fravel and his team, to help us with -- with identifying what we might need to know and know more about to allow us to become more
strategic in our approach to the program.

So -- and the committee has been going along with that -- the progress on that study all along. And you may recall that the last presentation in July we presented information that had identified all the potential connections to examine, but did not at that point in time have for you conclusions as around which of those represented priorities for us to pursue under the -- under the current program.

So -- so Fred is going to take you through that last sort of step in their work today, and then they're going to also give us their thoughts on conclusions, findings and outcomes. And I just want to remind the committee of two things from the Strategic Direction Report. Let's go to the next slide, Josh.

The first -- the first thing I wanted to remind folks of was, you know, this is where we ended up in a description of what -- what characteristics would comprise intercity bus service in the rural areas of our state. And these are completely consistent with the definition of the program from a federal level.

And then the next slide then is I mentioned briefly a strategic decision to move from an approach to the program that is described in the left-hand white column, the first left-hand white column. And then the
green shaded program is where we -- is where we want

to move to. And so those are -- in my mind those are
the two of the more significant conclusions from the
Strategic Direction Report. Have been informed the work
that Fred is going to conclude for you with his
comments.

So at this point I'm going to turn it over to
Fred. He's going to remind everyone of where we ended
up in our discussions in July, then take us through the
remainder of their work getting us to a picture of what
a set of priority connections can look like for us based
on that work. And then a general reminder again as we
come into this for both the committee and the listening
public. The committee is not taking action on this
today. We are -- and won't take action on the findings
from the study.

And I will conclude then with sort of a so
what do we do now and provide the committee with a brief
overview of how we are moving forward with the results
from the study to move us in a direction more consistent
with the green shaded column.

So now I'll turn it over to Fred, and Fred,
why don't you take us through the rest of your work.

MR. FRAVEL: Okay. Thank you, Eric, and good
to hear everybody online this morning. Can you all hear
me? Am I good?

  MR. GLEASON: You're good.

  MR. FRAVEL: You're good.

Okay. Let's go to the next slide. This slide kind of is a summary of what we have been looking at and thinking about over the past, well, I want to say a couple of months or whatever.

As you may recall, in our last meeting we had been through a process of looking at a good inventory of the existing network, and that included both the unsubsidized service and the section 5311F service.

We had been -- sort of applied that network to the demographics of this state to see if there were areas that really were distant from service, particularly focusing on rural areas that were a long way from the nearest intercity bus stop and looking for those.

We had gathered input from surveys of regional planning agencies, transit operators. We had regional stakeholder meetings, they were virtual by that time, but we got a lot of good input. And sort of based on all of that, we had developed a number of potential connections.

So on this map basically if you're looking at it, the blue routes are the existing section 5311F
funded routes and the green routes were a number of the potential connections that were developed. Now, it's a little hard to see on the screen, but there are also the red routes underlining are the -- what was the unsubsidized network in 2019.

So you got your Strategic Direction Report and we got our scope of work and then the pandemic hit. And it has made both gathering data and our unknowns even more unknown as we've gone through this process. So the subsidized network that you -- the unsubsidized network that you see there basically is the network as it was in 2019.

The carriers, I don't know if you recall, but the intercity bus carriers, the ridership dropped to about 20 percent of its pre-pandemic levels, and since that unsubsidized network relies completely on fare box revenue, you know, that obviously put the carriers in a real bind. Their strategy was to reduce frequency where they had multiple frequencies. In some cases if they were already down to one round trip a day and the ridership was light, they either suspended service or reduced it to two or three days a week.

So as ridership has come back, they've been filling that back in. But in the meantime, there was a substantial amount of federal money that flowed through
the state through the CARES Act and subsequent relief acts, although most of it for intercity bus in Texas came through the CARES Act to try and maintain that network.

So we've gone ahead and evaluated everything as if that network has come back, but I just want to caution everybody there's a lot of uncertainty there. So next slide.

Part of our input process included surveys of the intercity bus carriers, and the purple lines on here were a couple of routes that intercity carriers said these may not be -- you know, we may need ongoing help to keep these services.

So in our next steps of analysis we looked at basically all of the blue routes, existing 5311F, we put them in the same mix with the green routes, which were all of the proposed connections, and with the purple routes. And so we had a list of -- trying to think -- 38 routes that we wanted to analyze and compare. And as you can imagine, there are a lot of -- a lot of dimensions to that. So let me just kind of walk you through what we did and where we got to.

So if you want to do the next slide, Josh.

Josh?

Okay. So we wanted to look at what we've been
funding, what we potentially could fund, a couple of
routes that the carrier said might need funding, and we
wanted to use basically the same set of metrics on all
of them.

We wanted to look at do they cover more of the
state, are there more rural areas that would have access
to the -- the national network. How cost effective
would they be, what kind of performance standards should
we propose, and -- and what -- what network do we have
if we apply those.

So to do that we had to develop a lot of data
for each group. Once we had all of that data, we ranked
all of the routes on each of the measures that we had,
and then the rankings were used to develop a score. So
there was a ranking, you know, 1 to 38 or whatever,
which is the best, which is the worst, but we didn't
just sum the rankings, we kind of scored them. So
the -- the top -- and it varied by measure. The top 20
percent or something maybe got a higher score number and
the very bottom ones got a lower score. Because we, you
know, these things are all a bit imprecise. So
what we're -- what we're really doing here is
constructing a set of measures that are in effect kind
of rounded off to basically identify pretty much a group
of routes that are higher and a group of routes that are
lower on these different measures.

So it's a really big, messy spreadsheet to some, you know, to do the ranking and then do the scores, and then we summed the scores, and then we did another process where we put weights on it. So that if we thought that the coverage aspects were more important, we could, you know, add more weight to those just to see how the difference came out.

So kind of a -- I'm not showing you the sausage making because it's just ugly. You know, it's best to see the product. So anyway, so there are a lot of aspects to that. So next slide, Josh.

So you might ask where we got the data for everything. Whoops, did we go past? Wait a minute. I think we're past one of those slides.

MR. RIBAKOVE: Right. This is the next slide in the deck that we have.

MR. FRAVEL: This is the next slide, right.

Okay. So this is how we put the coverage aspect of it together. We looked at the population of each of the routes and how much of that population that is served by that route would be added by having that route. So if it's an existing 5311F route, it's really how many people would lose service if we quit funding it. And we were focusing on the nonurbanized
population. So we're looking at how much nonurbanized population is really served as a result of 5311F funding.

We looked at each of the potential stops on these routes and looked up information about what we called key destinations. Colleges and universities, military bases, major medical facilities, and if a route, you know, served one or two or three of those, we wanted to include that because, you know, it affected -- the population is the origins and the destinations are part of the destination aspect of looking at transportation need.

We also had information from the demographic analysis on the census block groups, and we had a score, a transit dependence index score for every block. We've been a state that focused on whether that block group was basically higher than the state averages in terms of senior population, low-income population, autoless households, young adults, persons with mobility limitations. So those were all kind of wrapped into a score, and what we counted was if a route served towns that had a number of high transit dependent scores, that was part of the coverage as well.

And then finally we added a measure, we called it connectivity benefits, but in some cases a route --
one of the things that it does is it really allows
people to make connections between two places that are
already served, but that to get between them, you know,
currently you'd have to make multiple transfers and
would have a very long travel time. So that if our
potential route is a direct connection, we gave it some
points for that.

On the cost effectiveness side, we looked at
measures coming out of the -- you know, kind of out of
your Strategic Direction Report, fare box recovery,
boardings per trip, subsidy per passenger trip. And
we've developed some performance standards by looking at
your existing 5311F, and then we applied those to see if
any of these potential routes fell below those
standards, and we'll get to the standards later, but
we'll come back to that.

Ridership of course is an issue and talk about
that a little bit. I think the next slide is the one
that talks about ridership. Josh, if you've got that
one. No? Yes.

Obviously we had an issue in -- with the data.
One is we used 2019 ridership for the existing 5311F
funded routes. So those routes were all affected in
2020 by the pandemic. You know, we were looking at, you
know, really what the full ridership potential was so we
used the 2019 numbers also to line up. Because for the new routes we didn't have 2019 data, but we have a transit cooperative research program demand model that we could use to estimate potential ridership. And that model basically has a regression equation, it has a trip rate model, and it uses the population for each stop, the one-way route length, and a couple of factors about -- that were found to be significant when the model was calibrated. One is whether the service is being operated by a national network company, which seems to have higher ridership, and oddly enough another one is if it serves a major correctional facility. That seemed to be significant when they built the model, at least in the regression equation.

So we basically estimated ridership for all the potential routes. We used existing ridership for all of the existing 5311F routes. We did not have data for the two routes that the carrier said might need help because they have been previously unsubsidized so it hadn't been reported to the state. And by that point the carriers weren't sure what the ridership would be going forward after the pandemic. So what we did was apply the model to that to estimate the ridership in the same way as the potential routes. Next slide.

So as you could see, we're building this big
spreadsheet where we're going to score everything and now we're looking at cost effectiveness. That side of it. So among all the states I've worked on, TXDOT actually has great data on their 5311F program. I don't know about the other programs, but we had really good information to work with, and a couple of places where we found little holes or something, they came up with it right away. So we were able to really get to the fare box recovery by route, the subsidy per passenger trip by route and the boardings per vehicle trip by route for 2019. And so we used that as a basis, and then for the routes that were potential routes that we didn't have that existing data, I want to -- I shouldn't say this, we had to make it up. No. We used the route length, we estimated the annual number of trips that would be on the route to come up with the annual revenue miles. We applied a cost per mile for similar services that we got by looking at the existing 5311F. We used the estimated ridership from the demand model, and then we estimated revenue based on a revenue per passenger mile that is typical for intercity bus fares.

So, you know, for the potential routes, basically we had to do some -- some preplanning. We tried to be consistent across all of the routes. If somebody were to develop one of these routes as a
project, it's entirely possible they might decide that they want lower fares and that could increase the deficit, or they might do something that, you know, changed the route length or whatever. But we applied these same metrics to all of these routes because we were trying to get to an overall comparison. Next slide.

Okay. So if you think back to the process I described for each of those measures I just mentioned, the coverage and the cost effectiveness, we ranked each group, then we scored it, and then we summed the scores, and then we applied weighting. And we basically in one set of weights we multiplied all of the coverage factors by three and left cost effectiveness at one. The other way around, we left coverage of one and we measured, we multiplied the cost effectiveness scores by three and then we summed them. So each route had a summation of the scoring under each of these scenarios.

And the above 30 is kind of the sum of scores. If you could see the whole ranking, you'd see 30 was kind of a break point, and then, you know, above that there's a group of routes that kind of either way they looked pretty good, and then there's kind of a mid-pack of routes that seemed to go up or down depending on whether it was cost effectiveness or coverage. And then
there were several routes that really just -- they
didn't score highly under either scenario, and I'll come
back to those. It's not that they're bad routes, but
they don't -- they didn't score very well here.

So a lot of the longer intercity bus routes,
West Texas routes scored pretty well because they
provide coverage that wouldn't exist otherwise and
they -- kind of the ridership and revenue factors were
fairly high. Some of those Greyhound routes have very
high -- relatively high fare box recovery rates and
lower subsidy per passenger. And so a number of those
sort of longer distance intercity bus routes scored
pretty well.

The more regional shorter routes, they were
the ones that are more mid-pack. If we looked at
coverage, some of them kind of moved up in the rankings,
and if we looked at cost effectiveness, they went down.
And, you know, we could talk about it, but in a sense
they're really doing some things different in a way.

One of the existing 5311F routes is the El
Paso to Las Cruces Gold Route Service, which is really
if you look at the schedules, if you'll look at the
route, look at the stops, it's really a commuter bus
service. And so, you know, I've looked at commuter bus
services, I think it does pretty well as that, but I
don't -- it didn't score well as intercity bus partly because it didn't provide new coverage. El Paso has intercity bus service, Las Cruces has intercity bus service, and there isn't a lot of rural population in between that's served by this. So if we're scoring it on those program requirements, it didn't score really well.

You know, to some extent our issues are kind of constrained by the nature of this program and its focus on intercity bus access for rural areas, which is a set of criteria that may be different from some of the other transit programs that you might have.

One of the other routes that seemed to really go up and down, depending on whether we looked at cost effectiveness or coverage, is the Presidio, Fort Stockton, Midland, Odessa route that's operated by All American Bus Lines. Its ridership performance measures had been kind of declining in the three years up to 2019, and we used the 2019 numbers. And it kind of met the criteria if we looked at coverage, but if we weighted cost effectiveness highly, it fell down because its -- its -- by 2019 its subsidy per passenger had climbed up quite a bit. It's a fairly long route, which is one of those things that brings the cost up, and it's in a lightly populated area so the ridership is not
high. So, you know, it's an existing route, you have real riders who have been using it, it's part of the national intercity bus network, but that's -- it's kind of an issue around that one as well. Next slide.

So this is a map of kind of the network if we put all of the potential routes in and the 5311F routes where we weight coverage and access high. And, you know, you could see the blue routes or the existing 5311, the purple again is -- are the routes that some of the carriers said might need help, and then the green routes are routes that are, you know, highly ranked connections when you really look at that. And you'll see that the Presidio, Midland, Odessa service is on this map, and there are a number of other connections.

Now, there are a few of the potential routes that fell off the map in this case because of the cost effectiveness issues. So if you want to show the next slide, Josh.

Okay. This is what happens when we -- whoop, whoop, back one. This is the map that we get to if we weight cost effectiveness at three times. And you'll see that there's a number of changes, and certainly we lose the Presidio, Fort Stockton route. The overall coverage declines a fair amount.

So, you know, there's really -- if we're
looking at a statewide program, you kind of have to consider both aspects of that and include that.

Now, I mentioned performance standards. Josh, if you want to bring up the next slide. And we had -- I would say our team with TXDOT we had some discussions about these. The subsidy per passenger, the max $150, the initial reaction was, whoa, that's way high, and it is a high number. They're -- typically intercity bus subsidies per trip are much higher than you'd experience for some kind of local or regional transit because the trip lengths are long. If you figure out the subsidy per passenger mile for a lot of your public, urban public transit systems, and then apply that to a trip that's 120 or a 150 miles long, you get numbers that are like a hundred dollars per trip or 100 -- up to 150.

Now, the $150 level does eliminate a few of your existing 5311F routes. A $100 level would eliminate more of them, and it might be something that the program moves to in a future year, but for this initial round. The other thing is we're dealing now with a period, and we'll get to this in the strategy, there's a lot of uncertainty and things are very dynamic. And by that I mean, you know, as Eric pointed out in his earlier discussion, two weeks ago when we were putting these slides together we didn't have an
infrastructure bill and Greyhound was still owned by the first group who were trying to sell it. And now Flixbus has purchased Greyhound, we have an infrastructure bill, the world keeps changing at a very rapid pace. So part of our thought here also was to allow some performance standards and a structure that deals with the uncertainties that we do not know really what the demand curve will be and how many of those previously unsubsidized route carriers may need to apply for to keep that basic network intact going forward.

The minimum fare box recovery, four percent for rural feeder service. Four percent is a number we see some -- you know, fairly often looking at rural public transit services, you know, in terms of if they're general public services. At 15 percent for intercity, I think your intercity routes all clear that at the moment. Minimum passengers per vehicle trip of three. Again, that's not very many people, but some of our forecasted routes and a couple of your existing ones didn't quite make that.

So these were really based on looking at your existing 5311F, looking at information from some other services around the country. Some of the smaller states have performance criteria that, you know, the maximum subsidy per trip is a smaller number. You look at
Vermont, and that has a lot to do with the fact that they have higher population densities and shorter bus routes. So they've set their thresholds differently.

So basically these are the -- we applied this to the list of potential routes and existing routes, and we didn't include any routes in the list that didn't meet those performance criteria, nor did we include any of the existing or potential routes that didn't meet the criteria.

So these would be applied going forward. If somebody started a route and it didn't meet these criteria, our thinking is that TXDOT would be monitoring this, and basically if they didn't achieve this in a year, they would be told they've got a limited period of time to either increase the performance or the program, the route would be discontinued, the funding for it. So that's kind of our thinking on that going forward. So anyway, that's kind of what we got to on the performance standards. So Josh, next slide.

So as I mentioned, we included the existing subsidized services that meet those performance standards. We included the existing subsidized services that scored well on the high coverage and the high cost effectiveness scores, and then there were a couple that were kind of in that marginal zone which we included,
you know, basically in part because they are services that had existing ridership. And I think, you know, a route that has people that are already on the bus is probably worth giving a little bit of a favor to over a potential route with potential riders that we don't really know whether they'll come up or not.

Now, an issue that we have going forward is intercity bus service. There are federal -- the Federal Circular, the FTA Circular for 5311, includes Chapter 8 which says this is what 5311F service is about, you guys have developed a nice definition for what that means in Texas, which we saw earlier, but as I mentioned, not all of the things in the existing program maybe meet that.

Certainly the El Paso-Las Cruces route really doesn't have a meaningful connection with the national intercity bus network. It doesn't really serve rural areas very much. It's a good service that people use. If you had another way to fund it, I would say move it out of the ICB program and fund it that way. But there are real riders riding it, so there's kind of a policy issue there, what do we do with that.

And then some of the rural feeder routes I think are also kind of a concern. They've been designed to provide the meaningful connection because CARTS, the provider was using 5311F and Greyhound in kind matched
so they needed to make the connection. But there's --
there's an impediment issue with -- with those services
I think going forward and we'll come back to that is to
-- in a sense they need to serve multiple markets to be
more feasible in a cost-effective sense.

The people in -- close in and rural areas are
-- you know, they need to get into town to go to the
doctor or the bank or whatever and then come back the
same day, and their service, that's really designed to
connect them to a bus that takes them out of state.
They're not a lot of people coming from each of those
rural areas who need that every day. So it's a combined
market issue.

Let's look at the map just so everybody could
see what we're talking about what this priority network
is, Josh, if you want to pull that up.

So the other map we had all of the green
routes in one column, and in this one we've kind of
pulled them out and given our map of priority
connections. I think this is the map we want to put in
the coordinated call and say, you know, we'd like you
to -- you know, these are our priority connections, you
propose on these, or if you have something that's not on
this map, if you're running an existing unsubsidized
service and it's -- you know, you need money to keep it
going or there's something that you're aware of in your
local area, the coordinated call would still be open to
that. You'd have to provide the rationale and the
figures that would support that, but basically this is
the coordinated call instead of corridors that would be
included.

And you can see it's a lot of the existing
5311F. It's a couple of the previously unsubsidized
routes and some of those priority corridors that we've
identified. If you've ran all of this, you would have a
very high level of coverage of intercity bus service
across the state in relation to your population. It's
kind of hard to see on this map, but we have those grade
outlines where the existing unsubsidized network is as
well.

So I know, you know, there's a temptation to
think we should take our money and put it into the
routes that have high ridership, but those are the
routes that the private sector can run without our
funding. You know, the Texas Triangle, the Laredo to
San Antonio, Austin-Dallas, those corridors are -- you
know, we're hoping that the demand comes back and that
those will be services that can be operated without any
subsidy. That long corridor from Dallas-Fort Worth over
to El Paso, which has -- had multiple -- still has
multiple frequencies on it, is a real key route. We
don't -- you know, we don't need to fund that, I don't
think. We need to fund the stuff that connects to it.
So this is -- this is our map with priority connections.

Josh, you want to pull up the next slide. I
know I'm kind of racing through this, but there's a lot
of content and I know we don't want to spend all day
here.

I mentioned before a couple of the issues with
different routes. Many of the existing 5311F routes are
on that map because they were highly ranked, and those
currently unsubsidized routes identified by the carriers
is potentially needing subsidy. They both scored well
and they're on the map as well. We don't know if the
demand is back for those, whether to apply for funding
for those or not. Potentially I could imagine that
those if they did need funding that they might be
something that could become profitable over the two-year
cycle.

The regionally focused routes I mentioned
before they really didn't -- they were kind of at the
bottom of that overall ranking either way, and what this
suggests to me maybe is that a couple of directions we
could go. And there -- there's a little bit of
foreshadowing in your previous study on the strategic
direction about categories of service that -- and this may be something that, you know, today is more feasible because we are looking at potentially some more funding, is to carve out a piece of this program and make that into something that focuses on services that meet the 5311F requirements, but maybe have a different set of performance criteria reflecting that they're really rural feeders. You know, that those -- the performance measures we put in that are low numbers of riders per trip and high subsidy per passenger, those are really stretched out in effect to allow some of these regional services to fit into this program. But we -- we could do a -- kind of a two-part program. I think that's a policy discussion going forward. We haven't really settled what that might be.

Again, we also -- just a caveat again, we used 2019 data. We're not sure exactly what the demand curve for either of the intercity services or for the more regional feeders is, you know, at the moment and what it will be over the next couple of years.

And I mentioned a little bit about my bias for doing some grandfathering of routes. You've got people that are using the route now. You know, you need to kind of take that into account rather than ditching them for something that's speculative. So that's just a
consideration that I have looking at some of these things. So with all those unknowns, Josh, next slide.

MR. GLEASON: Fred?

MR. FRAVEL: Yeah.

MR. GLEASON: Fred, this is mine.

MR. FRAVEL: Okay. Okay. I have a stickie on the wrong page then, Eric. You run with this.

MR. GLEASON: Thank you. I appreciate everything, Fred. I want to remind the committee that, you know, we've encouraged KFH in their work and in what you've heard today to -- we want them as experts to give us their best thinking. And all of that will help us independent of that, using it. But independent of that, develop, you know, where we think we need to go with this program. And so using the information and the recommendations as informing that direction, I want to try and boil it down both for the committee and for those on the line listening where we see this program headed in both sort of a, you know, overall standpoint and then some near-term and longer-term strategic direction for it.

So the most immediate impact that this work from KFH has, and we've talked about this, wanting to inform the now current call for projects for the coordinated call. The -- that will be published -- the
call will be published on Friday of this week, the 12th. And in that call, what we have done with the information that Fred and his team has provided for us is that -- that last map that you saw, which was basically the -- the priority connection network comprised of as Fred described, routes that exist today and perform above the performance thresholds or performance standards recommended. And those routes that exist today that provide both high coverage and high cost-effectiveness along with new connection proposals with desirable ridership estimation traits that contribute significantly to coverage and cost effectiveness as well.

And so all of those connections on that map, that last map that you saw are identified in the coordinated call as connections we are interested in receiving proposals for. And assuming we get a combination of applications at the end of the process, both for new coverage and -- or new connections versus existing connections, we are going to look at prioritizing those applications to make sure that we are maintaining existing service. You know, any previously unsubsidized service. So that's a group that, you know, may be emerging from the pandemic that we didn't subsidize before but post-pandemic may need assistance.
Service expansion consistent with priority connections and then starting to maintain any existing service that meets or exceeds the performance criteria. And so, you know, that's how we're going to look at the applications we get. We are going to -- you know, this in general I think for those of you who have been following this entire discussion, we are elevating the role of performance in our decision-making, both in terms of anticipated performance with an initial decision to fund the connection, as well as sustaining ongoing subsidies in routes that may not be performing up to standard. Next slide, Josh.

So from a strategic direction program standpoint, near-term strategic direction we're going to balance our existing program commitments with proposals for new connections consistent with the study recommendation, we'll account for the impact of the pandemic on previously unsubsidized services, and we will significantly track performance of new connections to evaluate the potential success of the new direction.

The longer term we're going to, you know, move toward aligning all subsidized service connections more closely with the desired ICB service characteristics. I can imagine us creating sort of a sustainable core network of services and then allowing for continuous
improvement with new service proposals. And then we're going to position the program so that we can seek and effectively use potential expansion in federal programs.

So that is, you know, in a wrap up sense this is where we see us moving. We are clearly committed to the notion of a transition time frame associated with any services that may not fall under the categories that we've discussed.

Special note on the El Paso to Las Cruces connection. Agreeing with everything Fred commented on with respect to that and its relevance to intercity bus. What I would add to the general conversation though, that model is -- first of all, we do that service in conjunction with the Mexico DOT. It's a partnership and we share the financing on it. And it is a model that is completely consistent with the way the -- Mexico approaches its intercity bus program. So yes, it's done exactly in line with, you know, the general definition of the program, but it also is consistent with approach into Mexico that has been generally accepted by the FTA. So that remains to be sorted out over time.

So with that, I believe we've completed the presentation around this. A lot of information to absorb. Looking to use the coordinated call, this coordinated call to make progress towards this goal that
we have, and -- but making sure that as we move forward
we -- we transition out of and into new investments in a
way that is -- that recognizes the importance that a
current investment might play with any given service
provider and the people that use it.

And I believe that concludes our presentation
around topic 5, Mr. Vice Chair.

MR. CLINE: Yeah. And Eric, I think at this
point, and Josh, if we could -- if there -- before we
begin committee discussion, I'll have a few questions.
But I think it will be really valuable to see if anyone
else who's online has comments and questions regarding
this presentation, if that's all right with you.

MR. RIBAKOVE: If anyone would like to make a
comment or has a question, please let me know in Chat or
Q&A and I can unmute the microphone.

So far nothing, Jim, but I should let you know
that our Chair, John McBeth, had a dental appointment
and had leave at 11:00 o'clock.

MR. CLINE: Okay.

All right. Hearing nothing from the public,
are there any questions from members of PTAC regarding
this?

Okay. Let me if I could, Eric, just a couple
of questions that I have. I noticed something to maybe
we want to consider is it seems there's a route between
San Marcos and San Antonio that had not been -- had been
completed in previous versions. So maybe something to
think about there.

    I don't -- and then on the same kind of
numbers in increased funding that are going to happen in
some of the other categories are going to happen here
too, isn't this a percentage of the 5311?

    MR. GLEASON: Yes, yes. There will be -- so
the way the 5311 funding works for intercity buses,
it's a required set aside that it's 50 percent of the
overall apportionment to the state. So as that overall
apportionment goes up, so does the intercity share of
it.

    MR. CLINE: In our discretion as we go
forward, it's not the amount, it is -- I mean from
TXDOT's perspective, the discretion is how it's
prioritized, and thus -- and so when we move it to more
space, that's what you're looking at there; is that
correct?

    MR. GLEASON: Still -- I didn't quite catch
all that, Jim. It didn't --

    MR. CLINE: Oh, I'm sorry.

    MR. GLEASON: It seemed to be interrupted,
yeah.
MR. CLINE: No, no, no. When we -- so 50 percent of the money comes out, I think this is general discussion, right, I mean in terms that I can understand it.

MR. GLEASON: Yeah.

MR. CLINE: And so our discretion is not about how -- it's a 50 percent direct number, that is out -- that's laid out by federal law?

MR. GLEASON: That's correct. That's correct.

MR. CLINE: And so -- but the discretion we do have is how do we prioritize that. And so, you know, in very informative to me. Again, I think that just the question that I have is to please take a look at that, that gap.

MR. GLEASON: Will do. Yeah, we'll look at that.

MR. CLINE: That seems to be an area in my (audio unintelligible).

Any other questions that may come up? Any other comments from PTAC members?

And Eric, as we go forward, not an action item today, is there an action item that will be forthcoming?

MR. GLEASON: No.
MR. CLINE: In future years?

MR. GLEASON: What I would offer the -- what I would offer the committee is a discussion as we meet in the spring as we have -- as we complete our evaluation of proposals received, either your April or for sure your July meeting, we would be able to come back to you with the results and how well that reflected some of the information or the information we've got for us now that move toward our new direction.

So I think that would be a reasonable check-in opportunity. And at that point in time, you know, the results seem to indicate we ought to revisit the Strategic Direction Reports, and that would be an appropriate task for the committee to decide to do.

MR. CLINE: Very good. I would suggest that next we've got Item 6, which although we've offered the opportunity for public comment on the ICB program, if there is public comment on any other items that may be out there. Josh?

MR. RIBAKOVE: Jim, currently I've got nothing else. We have heard briefly from someone, but he just said that he didn't have much to say today.

MR. CLINE: Okay. So with no public comments under Item 7, let's move to Item 7 which -- no, no, Item 6.
So Item 7, which is an action item, to discuss agenda items for the next meeting and confirm the date of our next meeting, we are -- our scheduled meeting on January 25th of 2022 at 10:00 a.m.

Are there any specific items for discussion from members, recommended items for discussion from members of PTAC?

MR. GLEASON: So Mr. Chair, this is Eric again, just to remind the committee that we intend to wrap up the committee's discussion around areas of potential change in the state rural and urban formula discussion and the federal 5311 formula discussion we've been having.

So it would be our intent to devote as much time as we needed to -- to that wrap up, and then in addition to that, we would entertain other topics.

One of the items we could have as a separate item or I could just make it the topic of my Director's Report would be, you know, a more detailed discussion of the Investment Act, the Infrastructure Investment Act and what it means for Texas. And our -- I think the information of the rule making -- of the schedule and the rule making can be covered under that topic, but just a further deeper dive into the Investment Act.

MR. CLINE: All right. I certainly think that
that's important. Any other items that are out there from the PTAC committee members?

Okay. If that's -- hearing none, we do need to -- an action item is listed to confirm the date of our next meeting. I would entertain a position from Detrich and a second from J.R.

MR. VON BIEDENFELD: Oh, I make a motion that we confirm the November -- well --

MR. CLINE: January 25th.

MR. VON BIEDENFELD: January. I'm looking at the bottom that said that. We confirm January 25th, 2022 as our next meeting date.

MR. SALAZAR: This is J.R. I second that.

MR. CLINE: All right. With a motion and a second, all in favor say aye.

PTAC MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CLINE: (Audio unintelligible) The motion carries unanimously. So we will meet on January 25th, 2022 at 10:00 a.m.

Item 8 is adjournment, and I would, you know, barring any discussion of other items, I would entertain a motion from Ken and a second from J.R. for adjournment.

MR. FICKES: I move that we adjourn.

MR. SALAZAR: I'll second that.
MR. CLINE: Very good. With the motion and a second, all in favor say aye.

PTAC MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. GLEASON: I just want to say a very happy and safe holiday season.

MR. CLINE: Yes, and Eric, thank you and the staff for all you do to make this happen. We look forward to seeing you online on the 25th of January. Thank you.

MR. GLEASON: All right, guys, take care.

MR. CLINE: Yep.

MR. JOSH: Thanks everyone. That concludes our PTAC meeting for today. As you know, the next meeting will be on Tuesday, January 25 at 10:00 a.m. Thanks everyone.

(Proceedings concluded at 11:17 p.m.)
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