

TRANSIT SERVICE DELIVERY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

12th Floor North Conference Room

600 East Main Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Monday, May 13, 2013

10 a.m. – 2 p.m.

1. Call to order – Chair (10:05 a.m.)

Members Present:

John McGlennon – Chair

Cindy Mester – Vice Chair

Steve Pittard

Kevin Page

Roger Cole

Ken Pollock

Al Harf

Donna Shaunese

2. Public comment period – None
3. Approval of minutes – Minutes were approved by committee without change. The committee requested more detail in the minutes.
4. Review of legislation: Goals/responsibilities of TSDAC

Two issues to be resolved were discussed

- a. Formula/Funding Schemes
- b. Allocation of \$160M

The group clarified that the responsibilities of the TSDAC apply to FY14 funding that becomes available July 1 and beyond. Several items were discussed and tabled for resolution at a later date, including whether operating funding allocations should employ proposed operating budgets or prior year actual operating costs, the methodology for performance-based, operating assistance allocations, and the timing for allocating additional capital assistance (i.e., in a mid-year revision to the SYIP or carry it over to FY15).

VDRPT staff clarified the assumptions it used in fashioning the draft, six year improvement program. The funding under \$160 million was allocated the same way as in prior years. The following items were discussed for future allocation at this portion of funding:

1. Operating assistance allocations limited to the “\$160 million” pot, and based on proposed operating budgets rather than prior year actuals
2. All operating costs treated as eligible, consistent with the change made by SB 1140

3. 95% eligibility cap eliminated ~~scrapped~~, again consistent with the change made by SB 1140
 4. Capital distribution based on same tiering structure VDRPT has used in recent years
 5. Operating and capital assistance resulting from new money acknowledged only as a revenue source, without any distribution knowing that the distribution of new money awaits the outcome of the TSDAC deliberation
5. Goals and associated performance measures
1. Changes were made to the Transit Delivery Service Outcome Threshold Chart in the Fourth Quad and other facets of the Chart were discussed.
 - Consensus to strive for Q4
 - Important to define “high quality” and well as “E&E”
 - Discussed demographic vagaries, noting that service area population is sometimes more than how the Census defines it (e.g., college students), a point to be mindful of if performance measures ultimately chosen include a demographic variable
 - Important to define a “rider” (e.g., unlinked trips)
 2. Key notes were made to the working draft of the framework.

Discussion regarding Efficiency versus Effectiveness took place. The objectives all deal with effectiveness, not efficiency. Efficiency is an essential consideration too, requiring the inclusion of measure(s) that get at efficiency which are based on data common to all systems despite their differences. [note: suggest we not totally delete the peer vs self-comparison item as this was mentioned at the meeting and not formally resolved although self-comparison has been a predominant focus]
6. Lunch Break
7. Public Comment - Public provided comments on how the operating assistance formulas should be structured.
- Jim Regimald (VML) – Presentation is located on the DRPT website under TSDAC
 - Steve Yaffe (Arlington) – Presentation is located on the DRPT website under TSDAC. Be inclusive of all modes and do not use peer grouping.
 - Marc Adelman (Danville) – A “one size fit all” model will not be appropriate. Clarification was requested on separating modes of service and whether there would be a “worst case scenario” within the formulas. Different types of service need to be evaluated separately.
 - Gha-is Bashir Paige (PAT) – Poor performance should not be punished and innovation should be rewarded. Commuter services should be awarded extra points as they reach out to others. His organization is an example of reaching out to the community and making partnerships to encourage more ridership. A goal should be to increase the number of “choice riders”.
 - Becky Martin (Blacksburg) – Measures should recognize the inherent differences between demand response and fixed routes.

Linda McMinimy (VTA) – Goals and objectives come in many forms with transit.
Kevin Danker (WATA) – Using surveys would not be useful as data availability is likely to vary. . He also mentioned the need to account for Title VI considerations. The needs of transit dependent individuals need to be considered.
Susan Wilson (Portsmouth) – Congestion relief is great for economic development, and it was better for regional transit over local transit.

8. TSDAC Resources needed to develop formulas –

The group discussed the desirability for 3 years worth of data. FY11 data is in hand and FY12 data has been requested. Prompted question whether use of NTD data would meet the “three year” desire; VDRPT staff said no because not all systems have three years of NTD history. Several scenarios were discussed, including using the SJ297 metrics, without closure..

9. Plan for June Meetings/Schedule required to prepare for GA and CTB Meetings

Next Meeting has been scheduled for Monday, June 3rd from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. at 600 East Main Street, 12th Floor Conference Room North, Richmond, 23219

10. Adjourn (2:10 p.m.)