



Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation

Transit Service Delivery Advisory Committee (TSDAC)

VDOT Auditorium

1221 East Broad Street, Richmond, VA

July 7, 2016

10:00 AM to 2:00 PM

Minutes

Members Present:

John McGlennon, Chair

Susan Schruth

Brian Smith

Ken Pollock

Cindy Mester, Vice-Chair

Cheryl Openshaw

Kate Mattice

1. Call to Order / Introductions (10:03 AM) – Chairman McGlennon called the meeting to order. He offered condolences to Steve Pittard for the loss of his father. Chairman McGlennon informed the Board along with the public that today was a full agenda.
2. Highlights of the June 16th Transit Capital Project Revenue Advisory Board Meeting – DRPT Director Jennifer Mitchell briefed the Board on the meeting of the Revenue Advisory Board on June 16, 2016. Director Mitchell stated that:
 - a. The TSDAC Board will be working closely with the Revenue Advisory Board for a July 2017 report to the General Assembly. The Revenue Advisory Board will rely on TSDAC for data analysis and recommendations.
 - b. The Revenue Advisory Board has been charged with developing a proposal for new capital funding revenues and will also be developing a new prioritization strategy; with one part focused on State of Good Repair projects and a second part based on new and expansion projects that considers SmartScale (HB2) factors.
 - c. The Revenue Advisory Board stressed that a one-size-fits-all approach won't work.
 - d. The Revenue Advisory Board members highlighted the need to develop information on how to make the business case for additional transit capital funding revenues.
3. State of Good Repair (SGR) Allocation Discussion – Tom Harrington and Iris Ortiz from Cambridge Systematics presented:

http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/media/1892/tsdac_july7_prioritization_v2.pptx - slides 1-10

Discussion points included:

- a. New process should not further complicate grantee's ability to apply for funds. Be cognizant of differing requirements and criteria at the Federal level.

- b. The FTA Transit Asset Management process includes a prioritization process and we should be consistent with that if possible. Consider doing a crosswalk between current model and SGR asset management work already done by FTA.
 - c. DRPT/PennDot Asset Management Project – phase 2 (TransAM) will be up and running in August and it will be statewide by the end of the calendar year. The next phase will include a capital planning tool with anticipated completion in 18 months.
 - d. When looking at how other states and localities are allocating transit capital funds, we may want to also look at how successful those methodologies have been.
 - e. Pennsylvania has a sophisticated way of looking at rural needs.
 - f. Need to be sensitive to data gathering requirements and we should weigh the cost vs. value of data – e.g. data may be “expensive” to gather/report and may not add much to value to the methodology. For example, FTA learned that not as much SGR data is needed for buses and it is for rail.
 - g. An SGR tool that gives information to grantees alerting them to when certain vehicles can be replaced is desired.
 - h. There is a gap in understanding of how transit is funded compared to roads. There is a need for common language and equity in levels of investment across modes. (i.e. Code requires that highway maintenance needs be funded before capital investment)
4. Smart Scale / HB-2 Criteria Discussion – Tom Harrington from Cambridge Systematics presented:

http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/media/1892/tsdac_july7_prioritization_v2.pptx - slides 11-26

Discussion points included:

- a. For commuter rail, can credit be given for getting cars off longer segments of highway?
 - b. We need a clear set of definitions
 - c. Needs to be equitable across the state.
 - d. We should explore having flexibility to not separate SGR from other capital needs in a prioritization framework.
 - e. Need to figure out how to handle “replacement” projects that have “expansion” aspects embedded in them.
 - f. Framework – check to make sure that work is not duplicated – check FTA’s asset management categories.
 - g. Guiding Principles; slide 16 gives a good start on this.
 - h. Criteria – Rural vs. Urban – that may not be the best approach; it may be better to look at system or service characteristics rather than using a straight urban/rural separation.
 - i. Process needs to be scalable and minimize duplication of effort.
 - j. Make sure that the process is user friendly
 - k. The process is parallel with VDOT’s version of Smart Scale
 - l. More data is needed
5. Lunch Break (12:06 pm) – reconvened at 12:45 pm
6. Operating Cost Formula Discussion – Nate Macek from Parsons Brinkerhoff presented:

<http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/media/1890/drpt-tdac-operating-assistance-presentation-draft-v3pptx.pptx>

Jamie Motley, DRPT Director of Financial Planning and Budget presented:

<http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/media/1893/2017-tdac-operating-allocation-comparative-analysis.pdf>

Discussion points included:

- a. Legislative requirement that “these [operating allocation] measures and their relative weight shall be evaluated every three years and, if redefined by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, shall be published and made available for public comment at least one year in advance of being applied.” We are at the three year mark.
 - b. Requests were made to see gross vs. net and the year over year impact for the past three years.
 - c. A couple questions: Has the three year rolling average worked? and Did we achieve what we intended?
 - d. Consensus is that the process is working well and there is a need for predictability in how these funds are allocated. No changes appear to be needed at this time.
 - e. TSDAC has a lot of work to do on the capital allocation funding picture.
7. Wrap-up / Recap Next Steps – Director Mitchell stated the next Revenue Advisory Board would be held in September, so an October date would need to be made for TSDAC. The information that she is hearing that the Board would like to see prior to the next meeting is:
- a. Distribute Guiding Principles
 - b. Map out different services across the state in preparation for a proposed rural vs. urban or similar weighting structure.
 - c. More information and timeline on DRPT’s Asset Management Project/Tool
 - d. Work on information needed to “tell the story”.
 - e. Distribution of intermediate work products/information prior to next meeting to allow committee members to provide input/feedback in advance.
8. Public Comment - None
9. Adjourn (1:40 PM)