

TRANSIT SERVICE DELIVERY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

12th Floor North Conference Room

600 East Main Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Monday, July 1, 2013

10 a.m. – 2 p.m.

1. Call to order – Chair (10:07 a.m.)

John McGlennon

Steve Pittard

Donna Shaunesey

Ken Pollock

Cindy Mester

Kevin Page

Al Harf

2. Public comment period

- a. Neal Menkes (VML) stated that he recognizes all the hard work that the committee has done thus far and hopes for closure soon. He mentioned that there is six more months of hard work that will require everyone's efforts. He said that data is required from everyone in a timely manner. The transition year is to work out all of the kinks, carve out capital money, get software to get the job done and a statewide database deadline to accomplish these goals. DRPT is to focus on the technology to gather the data. He believes that there should be a use it or lose it technique for the funds. Thanked Thelma Drake for her hard work in changing the debate with transit.
- b. Brian Smith (HRT) focused on the performance and size weighting factors referenced in the letter sent by HRT to TSDAC prior to the meeting. He suggested that TSDAC consider adding another factor such as system-area population to the factors of operating costs and ridership would allow better recognition of system differences. In regard to performance factors, he expressed his opinion that four factors would be superior to three, and that HRT felt that as a result, option #9 would be preferable to option #11.
<http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/activities/files%5CTDCHR%20letter%20to%20TSDAC%20June%2028%202013.pdf>
- c. Linda McMinimy (VTA) commented on the progress that TSDAC has done. She has received feedback that simple is the best approach for the measures, which would mean fewer tiers. She would like to see systems rewarded based in effectiveness and efficiency.

3. Approval of minutes from June 3rd and June 17th – both sets were approved.

4. Consultant/staff/committee discussion of formula refinements and test results and implementation of allocation formulas

Ryan Gallivan joined via telephone and presented the committee with his recommendations on addressing TSDAC's desire to provide recognition of high performance systems with less ability to improve dramatically. He offered three

options: a national “peer comparison” similar to one employed in TCRP Report #141; a Virginia “peer comparison” system, with individually constructed peer groups for each system; and, a statistical model providing regression analysis to establish performance expectations for systems, which would then be compared to actual system performance.

The details of the proposals are here:

<http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/activities/files%5CTSDAC%20Presentation%207-1-13.pdf>

The Committee discussed the three options and decided that the first offered the most promise. VDRPT staff and Mr. Gallivan were asked to refine the concept.

In addition, Mr. Gallivan discussed sizing factors and the introduction of input variables in the models.

<http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/activities/files%5CConcepts%20for%20Rewarding%20High%20Performance.pdf>

<http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/activities/files%5CBenchmarking%20Model%20Example.pdf>

5. Staff presented information on Capital Tier definitions and recommendations on use of current budget vs. actual operating costs for transit operating assistance. TSDAC and staff discussed the preferred number of tiers, inclusion within tiers and participation rates. There was also discussion of the possibility of VDRPT technical assistance and technology for data collection, and the option of reserving capital funding for competitive grants to address congestion mitigation or enhancing service for transit dependent populations. Issue was raised of whether existing grant programs were able to provide for this.

<http://www.drpt.virginia.gov/activities/files%5CTSDAC%20Capital%20Budget%20Comparison%202012-2013.pdf>

- a. Definitions were distributed by Terry Brown. They can be found in the grantee handbook and are used by the FTA.
6. TSDAC discussed the remaining models and agreed to designate a preferred model for use for the transition year (FY14) allocation of funding. The Committee unanimously agreed to use model 11 as the transition model for year one. TSDAC and staff also discussed the current level of confidence in the data needed to implement this model and plans to verify the accuracy of the data.
7. Public Comment

- a. Brian Smith (HRT) reiterated a preference for model 9, suggesting that it achieves the same outcome with added benefits. He said that metrics better account for differences between the systems.
8. Plans for July 15 meeting – Discuss of timeline dates (CTB, GA, etc)
DRPT to provide the follow to TSDAC Committee Members by Thursday, July 11th:
 1. Year 1 transition using model 11 with a 3 year rolling average
 2. Year 1 with self comparison - Future
 3. Sizing inputs vs. outputs
 4. Data collection and technology

In addition, the committee will need to address the Capital Tiering issues and continue work toward the recommended method of allocation after the transition year. Final determination of use of budget versus actual costs.

TSDAC also agreed to schedule an additional meeting for July 29 from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.

9. Adjourn