MEETING OF THE

REGIONAL TRANSIT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 23, 2013
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

SCAG Los Angeles Office
818 West Seventh Street, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 236-1800

Videoconference Available

Orange County Office
600 S. Main Street, Suite 906
Orange, CA 92863

San Bernardino County Office
1170 W. 3rd Street, Ste 140
San Bernardino, CA 92410

Ventura County Office
950 County Square Drive, Suite 101
Ventura, CA 93003

Imperial County Office
1405 N. Imperial Ave., Suite 1
El Centro, CA 92243

Riverside County Office
3403 10th Street, Suite 805
Riverside, CA 92501

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Ed Rodriguez at (213) 236-1863 or via email rodrigu@scag.ca.gov

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1928 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1928.

REGIONALTRANSIT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA
January 23, 2012

The Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee may consider and act upon any   **TIME**   **PG#**
of the items listed on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as information
or action items.

1.0   <u>CALL TO ORDER</u>
(Wayne Wassell, Metro, Regional Transit TAC Chair)

2.0   <u>PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD</u> **-** **Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the agenda, or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee, must fill out and present a speaker's card to the assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty (20) minutes.**

3.0   <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>

     3.1   <u>Approval Items</u>

         3.1.1   <u>Minutes of the October 31, 2012 Regional Transit TAC Meeting</u>   5   1

4.0   <u>INFORMATION ITEMS</u>

     4.1   <u>Caltrans FY13-14 5304 Transit Planning Grants</u>   5   8
         (Alfonso Hernandez, SCAG Staff)

     4.2   <u>San Bernardino Bus Rapid Transit Projects</u>   20
         (Tim Byrne, SANBAG)

     4.3   <u>FY 12-13 Clean Cities Annual Survey Exercise</u>   10
         (Matt Horton, SCAG Staff)

     4.4   <u>Transit Best Practices – Initial Literature Review</u>   20   9
         (Steve Fox, SCAG Staff)

     4.5   <u>Transit System Performance Report Update</u>   20   16
         (Matt Gleason, SCAG Staff)

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

TRANSIT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA
January 23, 2012

===

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)
of the
Southern California Association of Governments

October 31, 2012

Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE REGIONAL TRANSIT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RTTAC). AN AUDIO RECORDING OF THE MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.

The Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee held its meeting at SCAG's office in downtown Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by Wayne Wassell, Chair.

Present:

Wayne A. Wassell (Chair)	MTA
Karen Sakoda	Metrolink
Joe Forgiarini	Sunline Transit Agency

Tele Conference:

Diana Chang	Culver City Bus
Chris MacKechnie	Long Beach Transit

Video Conference:

Vic Kahmi	VCTC
Helene Buchman	Gold Coast Transit
Jeremiah Bryant	Omni Trans
Gary Hewitt	OCTA
David Salgado	ICTC

SCAG Staff:

Stephen Fox	Matt Horton
Matthew Gleason	Osman Hamidzada
Ryan Kuo	Kurt Walker

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Wayne Wassell, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No comment was requested by the public.

Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC) – October 31, 2012

2.1   **Review and Prioritize Agenda Items**

It was determined agenda item 4.2 2012 RTP/SCS Amendment #1 would be presented before agenda item 4.1 SCAG High Speed Rail & Transit Subcommittee Update.

3.0   **CONSENT CALENDAR**

3.1   Approval Items

3.1.1   Minutes of the June 20, 2012 Regional Transit TAC Meeting

Motion was made (Hewitt) to approve the minutes. Motion was seconded (Chang) and unanimously approved. Motion passed.

4.0   **INFORMATION ITEMS**

4.1   2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Amendment #1

Ryan Kuo, SCAG staff, updated the committee on Amendment No. 1 of the 2012 RTP/SCS. Mr. Kuo stated that all six of the region's County Transportation Commissions (CTC's) have requested an amendment to the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS to revise major projects so that they can move forward in a timely manner.

It was noted that these are short-term projects that could suffer delays unless they are amended soon; therefore, this RTP/SCS amendment will be developed on an expedited schedule. Mr. Kuo stated the CTCs have been requested to submit all projects to be amended by November 9, 2012. It was further noted the analyses, which include modeling reruns, are required in order to ensure that the region maintains its positive air quality conformity finding.

Mr. Kuo stated that SCAG will be conducting this work over the next few months and anticipates presenting the draft 2012-2035 RTP/SCS Amendment No. 1 for a 30-day public review and comment period in spring 2013 as required by law. It is anticipated Amendment No. 1 of the 2012-2035 RTP would be submitted to the Regional Council for adoption in May or June 2013.

4.2   SCAG High Speed Rail & Transit Subcommittee Update

Philip Law, SCAG Staff, presented an update on SCAG's High Speed Rail & Transit Subcommittee. Mr. Law noted with the passage of the RTP/SCS earlier in the year there was a concurrent request to form subcommittees focusing on specific areas of the RTP/SCS including High Speed Rail & Transit. The HSR&T Subcommittee will inform policy actions and provide staff with direction and guidance in the development of the 2016 RTP/SCS. Mr. Law provided the Transit TAC with the HSR&T Work Plan and Charter. The next subcommittee meeting is Friday, December 9, 2012.

It was noted future meeting topics include transit best practices, Transit Oriented Development and finance strategies. The subcommittee will report monthly to the

Transportation Committee and it is anticipated the subcommittee will conclude its work by March 2013.

4.3   Transit Network Update Effort, Process and Initial Findings

Matt Gleason, SCAG staff, provided a briefing on the transit network update effort. Mr. Gleason noted Travel Demand Models are used to predict the impact of travel growth, to test potential new projects, and to test emissions for conformity for SB 375 adherence regarding criteria pollutants or greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Gleason noted data is collected in specific geographic zones or Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ).   This data includes existing and forecast socioeconomic data, including population, employment, income, roadway and transit networks and transportation costs. The data is processed through a four step process that includes the following:

- Trip Generation: the number of trips a TAZ will generate.
- Trip Distribution: the number of trips attracted.
- Mode Choice: the modes used are forecasted.
- Route Assignment: the routes used for those trips.

This is conducted for seven (7) Transit Sub-modes based on fixed routes only. Mr. Gleason noted data collection revealed the following:

- Fiscal Years 2007 – 2010 experienced a 21% drop in Local Transportation Funding.
- Approximately half of all operators made considerable cuts in service. Despite service expansions in some areas, vehicle revenue Hours remained relatively flat.
- Fourteen (14) of twenty-two (22) operators experienced a loss in unlinked passenger trips.
- Almost all operators surveyed raised fares.

Mr. Gleason concluded by noting possible new future steps including new shape files and maps related to small operator networks, additional conferencing with small operators regarding their networks and additional strategies to incorporate large network changes.

4.4   System Performance Report Update

Matt Gleason, SCAG Staff, provided in update on the System Performance Report. Mr. Gleason noted SCAG has employed Performance Based Planning since the 1998 RTP and system performance is analyzed every four (4) years as part of the Transit Appendix of the RTP. Mr. Gleason noted MAP 21 is changing some of the ways performance measurement is conducted particularly regarding the preparation of the FTIP. While the nature of those changes is still being developed data collection and analysis will occur more frequently under MAP 21.

Mr. Gleason noted that staff recommends the production of an annual Regional Transit System Performance Report. This report, similar to MTC's *Statistical Summary of Bay Area Transit Operators,* would provide an annual format for measuring system performance, through the analysis of data reported by transit operators to the National Transit Database and the Office of the State Controller.

It was further noted staff has conducted a review of planning documents, reports, and resources to assess what types of performance measures should be analyzed on an annual basis. Given this review, staff proposes to produce an examination of current system performance along the following tiers.

1. Rapid Transit (heavy rail, light rail, commuter rail, bus rapid transit operations)
2. Regional / Subregional (larger operations of motor bus service – including operations across jurisdictional boundaries by agencies receiving FTA 5307 funds)
3. Local (local and circulator motor bus service operations)
4. Specialized Operators (demand response and rural transit operations)

Mr. Gleason noted staff intends that the initial iteration of the report will focus on a series of cost efficiency, cost effectiveness, service delivery, mobility, and maintenance and productivity measures. The data would be analyzed at the mode and agency level, in contrast to the RTP analyses where data was presented at the regional level. Staff proposes the following performance measures.

Performance Concept	Performance Measure
Cost Efficiency	Operating cost per revenue vehicle hour
	Farebox Recovery
Cost Effectiveness	Operating cost per passenger trip
Service Effectiveness/ Productivity	Passengers per vehicle revenue hour
	Passengers per vehicle revenue mile
Maintenance	Fleet Average Vehicle Age
Mobility/Travel Time	Average Vehicle Speed

Mr. Gleason noted next steps include 1) Analyzing Fiscal Year 2011 NTD data which is anticipated in November 2012, 2) Provide further updates at the next RTTAC meeting on January 31, 2013, and, 3) create operator profiles. Mr. Gleason concluded by stating a draft document is anticipated in March 2013 and a final document in April 2013.

4.5   Regional Rail Update

Steve Fox, SCAG Staff, presented a regional rail update. Mr. Fox reviewed the following recent actions.

LOSSAN Locally-Controlled Joint Powers Authority (JPA)
Mr. Fox noted on August 31, 2012, the state Assembly and Senate approved SB 1225, allowing for local control of the Amtrak Pacific Surfliner service. The governor signed the bill on September 28, 2012. Work is now underway by the LOSSAN Board and staff in developing the new JPA's by-laws and governing structure. AB 1779, a companion bill that allows for local control of Amtrak's San Joaquin service in the Central Valley, also passed.

The purpose of a new, locally-controlled JPA is to enhance LOSSAN's ability to implement speed, service and marketing improvements, especially in light of upcoming changes to federal operating subsidies per Section 209 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (PRIIA), and the Southern California MOU improvements.

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency will have direct control of Amtrak operations, similar to Northern California's Capital Corridor JPA for Amtrak's Capital Corridor Service that was formed in the early 1990's. The new JPA will focus only on the state-supported intercity rail service and not on modifications to Metrolink or NCTD Coaster governance structures.

It was noted the benefits of local management of passenger rail service in the LOSSAN corridor include:
- More efficient resource allocation related to service expansion, frequencies, and schedules;
- A unified voice at the state and federal level when advocating on passenger rail issues, including funding for capital improvements;
- Consolidated services such as fares, ticketing, marketing, and passenger information systems;
- Coordinated capital improvement prioritization; and,
- More focused oversight of on-time performance, schedule integration, mechanical issues, and customer service.

Southern California Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
Mr. Fox noted the Southern California MOU was executed by the participating agencies in June 2012 and the project list was submitted to the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA). The top project for each of the five participating counties will be funded first, and then projects will be funded based on their ranking according to the performance criteria decided on by the MOU Working Group. The state approved $500 million in Prop 1A bond funds to be sold for the MOU in the FY13 budget.

California High-Speed Train (CA HST) Project

Mr. Fox stated the CHSRA Board of Directors announced the hiring of Jeff Morales as the Authority's new Chief Executive Officer (CEO). Mr. Morales is a former director of Caltrans and has extensive experience in large and complex transportation issues. More recently, the CHSRA announced Michelle Boehm has been selected as the new Southern California Regional Director. Ms. Boehm has a wealth of experience in transportation planning, project development and community outreach.

Further, Mr. Fox noted CHSRA recently received a federal Record of Decision (ROD) for the environmental study of the Merced to Fresno section in the San Joaquin Valley. This will be the first segment to start construction which will begin in 2013.

Work has begun on the supplemental alternatives analysis stage of the Los Angeles to San Diego via the Inland Empire segment of the project. This stage will further refine the preliminary alternatives analysis stage that was completed in the spring of 2011. The timeline for this phase of the study has been significantly pushed back.

Metrolink

Mr. Fox noted Metrolink implemented a number of new services this summer and also raised fares to address rising operational costs. Enhancements include adding one round-trip from Riverside to Laguna Niguel on the Inland Empire-Orange County line, adding an additional train between Laguna Niguel and Fullerton on the Orange County Line, and adding four weekend round-trip trains on the Orange County Line between Los Angeles Union Station and Oceanside.

This allows riders from across Southern California to take advantage of the $10 weekend pass to visit destinations in Orange County such as Disneyland and the beach areas. Fares increased an average of 7% system-wide on July 1, 2012. Metrolink ridership for July 2011 thru June 2012 was 12 million boardings, and revenues were $80 million. Although revenues were up 5% from the prior year, they were $1.8 million (2%) less than budgeted for FY 2011-12. This reduced revenue to budget may be related to several factors including fare enforcement issues along selected lines, especially the Antelope Valley and San Bernardino lines. Metrolink staff is participating in a board level ad-hoc task force which is working on strategies to improve fare revenue collection.

It was further noted Metrolink's development of the Positive Train Control (PTC) collision avoidance system is moving forward. There have been challenges in obtaining some equipment and radio spectrum but solutions have been developed to address these issues. Testing is continuing on rolling stock. Metrolink's PTC

system is scheduled for revenue service in Sept. 2013, well ahead of the federal December 2015 mandate.

Amtrak

California State Rail Plan – Caltrans DOR prepares the California State Rail Plan every two years. This document reviews the current operations of the three state-supported intercity passenger rail services (Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin and Capital Corridor) and outlines ten-year plans for operations, marketing, capital improvements, service expansions and new services, such as daily passenger rail service from Los Angeles to the Coachella Valley. The plan also examines freight operations, including policy issues, international trade growth, and intermodal operations. The 2013 plan is currently in development and is scheduled for completion in June 2013.

Coast Daylight – The Coast Daylight line is currently being studied as a rail service operating between Los Angeles and San Francisco. It would operate one round trip per day, but unlike the Coast Starlight which serves Oakland and Emeryville and not San Francisco, this route would travel up the San Francisco peninsula from San Jose and serve Santa Clara, Palo Alto, Millbrae and downtown San Francisco.

Ridership - Although ridership in the LOSSAN corridor as a whole is strong, ridership on the Pacific Surfliner continues to be consistently down compared to last year. It is down year over year for nine of the last ten months, including 5% in July 2012. Some of the ridership loss is attributable to extensive track work and its corresponding service disruptions, elimination of off-peak fares and a significant drop in Rail2Rail passengers.

XpressWest

A couple of developments have happened with XpressWest, formerly DesertXpress. This summer the company renamed itself to "XpressWest" to more accurately reflect its role as the first leg of a larger western U.S. high-speed passenger rail network. Also, XpressWest and Metro have signed letters of commitment to work together to define what would be necessary to deliver high-speed rail service between Los Angeles and Las Vegas through the High Desert Corridor between Victorville and Palmdale to connect with existing rail service.

4.4 **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 11:02 a.m. The next meeting of the Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee is January 23, 2013.

THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (Caltrans) APPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANTS
FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is committed to improving mobility across California. Transportation Planning Grants are intended to promote strong and healthy communities, economic growth, and protection of our environment. These planning grants support closer placement of jobs and housing, efficient movement of goods, community involvement in planning, safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle mobility and access, smart or strategic land use, and commute alternatives. The final results of these grants should lead to the adoption, initiation, and programming of transportation improvements that improve mobility, access, and economic vitality.

The 2013-2014 Transportation Planning Grant application package is accessible on the Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning's website at **http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html**. Training videos and form samples can also be found at this website. Be sure to review the guidelines as there have been some changes from the previous years.

Caltrans invites your participation in the following Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Transportation Planning Grant programs:

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
Funds community involvement in planning to improve mobility, access, and safety while promoting economic opportunity, equity, environmental protection, and affordable housing for low-income, minority, and Native American communities.

COMMUNITY-BASED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
Funds coordinated transportation and land use planning, which promotes public engagement, livable communities, and a sustainable transportation system that includes mobility, access, and safety.

PARTNERSHIP PLANNING
The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has authorized Caltrans to encourage or strengthen multi-agency and/or government-to-government partnerships. Partnership Planning grants fund transportation planning studies of multi-regional and statewide significance in partnership with Caltrans.

FTA 5304 TRANSIT PLANNING:
The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has authorized Caltrans to award grants to MPOs and RTPAs from the following three programs:

- STATEWIDE/URBAN TRANSIT PLANNING STUDIES
Statewide or Urban Transit Planning grants fund studies on transit issues having state wide or multi-regional significance to assist in reducing congestion.

- RURAL/SMALL URBAN TRANSIT PLANNING STUDIES
Rural or Small Urban Transit Planning Study grants fund public transportation planning studies in rural or small urban areas of California (transit service area with pop. of 100,000 or less).

- TRANSIT PLANNING STUDENT INTERNSHIPS
Funds are available for student internship opportunities in transit planning at public transit agencies.

Application(s) Must Be Sent To Caltrans Via E-Mail By: **April 2, 2013 5:00 P.M.**

In addition, all Sub-Recipient(s) must work with various cities or Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for the planning study that will work with the current regional plans for your area. Submit your proposal to the agency you want to work with by their deadline. For Sub-Recipients in the SCAG region, the following deadlines apply below:

Project Information (i.e. table below) Must Submitted to SCAG Via E-Mail by: **February 15, 2013 5:00 P.M.**
Application(s) Must Be Submitted to SCAG by: **February 28, 2013 5:00 P.M.**

Sub-Recipient No. 1	If Applicable, Sub-Recipient No. 2	District No.	Project Title	Project Description	Grant Category	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Grant Funds	Total Project Cost
City of ABC	N/A	7	City of ABC Transit Center Feasibility Analysis	City of ABC is seeking $300,000 from Caltrans to fund the Transit Center Feasibility Analysis. The Project would provide the City of ABC with more detailed information to assist in determining how a second transportation hub within its area might help meet the growing transit demand of the region and what location would be preferable for maximum system efficiency.	Statewide or Urban Transit Planning Studies	$ 35,000	$ 5,000	$ 300,000	$ 340,000

Environmental Justice & Community-Based Transportation Planning Grants: OfficeofCommunityPlanning@dot.ca.gov
Partnership Planning & Transit Planning Grants: Regional_Planning_Grants@dot.ca.gov

Any questions regarding the Community Based or Environmental Justice grants, contact
Wilford Melton at (213) 897-1344

If you have any questions regarding the FTA 5304 or FHWA Partnership, contact
Charles Lau at (213) 897-0197 and/or
SCAG: Alfonso Hernandez (213) 236-1897; hernande@scag.ca.gov

DATE: January 23, 2013

TO: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)

FROM: Steve Fox, Senior Regional Planner, 213-236-1855, fox@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Transit Best Practices – Initial Literature Review

BACKGROUND

As with many industries, the transit industry has a large body of "best practice" literature. The goal of the best practice exercise is to provide benchmarking and lessons learned examples for the transit professional to use in planning and designing aspects of service delivery so as not to reinvent the wheel and to avoid mistakes. The body of literature is very broad and includes such areas as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), smart fare media, bus facilities, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) design, employee relations and productivity, and service planning.

Initial discussions of this subject have occurred with the High-Speed Rail & Transit (HSR&T) Subcommittee and will also take place with the RTTAC. These discussions and the input received will provide a foundation for the development of the transit and rail elements of the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) update.

DISCUSSION

The body of transit best practice literature is extensive. Staff has been conducting a literature review of best practice efforts among various elements of transit service delivery including first mile/last mile, ITS, smart fare media, transit signal priority, BRT and on-road bus facilities. In addition, best practices are being identified and discussed by the HSR&T Subcommittee over the course of its six meetings. Following is a discussion of best practices studied to date.

First Mile/Last Mile

First Mile/Last Mile strategies are designed to increase the range and desirability of transit by removing barriers around transit stations and providing alternatives to access transit. Strategies include adequate sidewalk facilities, bike facilities such as bike lanes and lockers, bike sharing and car sharing. These strategies can increase the effective range of transit stations from less than ¼ mile to ranges greater than ½ mile.

In 2009, SCAG partnered with the City of Los Angeles in a study to maximize first mile/last mile strategies. The report, "Maximizing Mobility in Los Angeles – First and Last Mile Strategies" focused on six specific cost-effective strategies that can be used around transit stations. In 2012, SCAG began a partnership with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) to examine different station types and develop first mile/last mile recommendations geared towards these station types. Knowing this, the most effective strategies can then be implemented where they can be most effective.

Literature Review

The Mineta Transportation Institute published a report titled "Using Bicycles for the First and Last Mile of a Commute." This document details a bicycle summit held by the Institute to address how to best integrate cycling with existing forms of commuter transit and ways to increase first/last mile ridership. The main topics focused on safety, bikes on transit, the future of bike sharing, and work accommodations. Safety is being addressed as more and more bike facilities such as bike lanes are being implemented. Bikes on transit topics focused largely on the issues of bikes on Caltrain. Caltrain has seen a rise in the number of passengers taking bikes on board, which has caused capacity issues on their trains. Caltrain is updating its current fleet to be able to hold more bikes and planning for their new electric fleet to have adequate bicycle capacity. (Metrolink and L.A. County Metro Rail have taken out passenger seats to allow for more bikes recently.) Bike sharing was mentioned by many of the speakers and is starting to be implemented across the county. Anaheim has recently started a program and the cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles are following. On the subject of work accommodations, the speakers touched on having adequate safe bike storage areas at work. They also mentioned the need for space for people to go change and transition from biking to work. The full report is located here:
http://transweb.sjsu.edu/MTIportal/research/publications/documents/BikeCommute.pdf.

The Mineta Transportation Institute also authored a report titled: "Bicycling Access and Egress to Transit: Informing the Possibilities." This report looks into integrating bikes with transit as both become increasingly popular across the U.S. and are therefore resulting in bike capacity issues on transit vehicles. The study included five case studies in Boulder/Denver, Chicago, Ithaca, Portland and Santa Clara County. The study provides a baseline understanding of transit/cycling integration strategies. The full report is located at
http://transweb.sjsu.edu/PDFs/research/2825_bicycling_access.pdf.

"Bike Sharing in Europe, the Americas, and Asia" provides a historical review of bike sharing programs around the globe and looks at the future of bike sharing. It identifies four distinct generations of bike sharing: the first, free bike systems; the second, coin deposit systems; the third, information technology based systems; and finally, demand response, multi modal systems. The third system is the one being used today that is based on information technology and user fees. While the different cities vary, they are not deposit systems but rather member-based that a user pays for throughout the year. Non-members pay as they go but at higher rates. The next generation of bike sharing programs will include four advances over the third generation: flexible, clean docking stations; bicycle redistribution innovations; smartcard integrations with public transit and car sharing programs, and technology advances that will include touch screen interfaces; and GPS tracking and electric bike options at certain locations. Bike sharing began in Europe, which still is the world leader, but is really taking off in the U.S. The City of Anaheim recently rolled out a program and the City of Long Beach is launching one this spring. The paper details many experiences in individual cities and discusses lessons learned in the areas of bicycle theft and vandalism, bicycle redistribution, information systems, insurance and liability considerations, and pre-launch caveats.
http://76.12.4.249/artman2/uploads/1/Bikesharing_in_Europe__the_Americas__and_Asia.pdf

"Integrating Bicycling and Public Transport in North America" is another study of bike-transit integration in North America. This is a case study of bike integration in six American cities: San Francisco, Portland, Minneapolis, Chicago, Washington, and New York; and two Canadian cities: Vancouver and Toronto. These cities have undertaken various measures of integration for bike and

transit, including: 1) provision of bike parking facilities at rail stations and bus stops, with different degrees of shelter and security; 2) multi-functional bike stations providing not only parking but also a range of services such as bike rentals, repairs, parts and accessories, bike washing, showers and lockers; 3) bike racks on buses; 4) allowance of bike on rail options; and 5) bike paths, lanes, and on-street routes that lead to public transport stations and stops, thus facilitating the bike's role as feeders and collectors for transit. The main finding and recommendation was that there is a need for more funding to provide 1) more secure parking at rail stations and 2) to increase bike carrying capacity on rail systems. http://www.nctr.usf.edu/jpt/pdf/JPT12-3Pucher.pdf

Intelligent Transportation Systems and Smart Fare Media

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) are systems that use modern detection, communications and computing technology to collect data on system operations and performance, and communicate that information to system managers and users for managing and adjusting the transportation system to respond to changing operating conditions, congestion, or accidents. ITS technology can be applied to arterials, freeways, transit, trucks, and private vehicles. ITS includes Advanced Traveler Information Systems (ATIS), Advanced Public Transit Systems (APTS), Advanced Traffic Management Systems (ATMS), Advanced Vehicle Control Systems (AVCS), and Commercial Vehicle Operations (CVO).

Smart fare media are being used more and more by transit agencies. The fare medium is a smart card with a chip that has stored value loaded on it. Its benefits are many, including eliminating the burdens of cash fare payments (exact change and longer boarding times at each stop), the ability to use on multiple transit operators within a particular region, and origin and destination information that is of great value to transit planners.

Best practices on this subject in our region include work being done by OCTA and VCTC's smart card implementation projects. At the December 21, 2012 HSR&T Subcommittee meeting, OCTA discussed its smart card/fare integration project. OCTA is intelligently designing its smart fare architecture by looking at other examples and considering the systems of other transit operators in the region and in their service area.   OCTA hosted a Southern California "Super Users" Group discussion in partnership with SCRRA (Metrolink) and the USDOT Volpe National Transportation Systems Center in July 2011. OCTA is investigating an account based, open payment fare system, and no such system is fully operational in the U.S. at this point in time. OCTA expects to conclude the study and begin implementation of the system in late 2014. VCTC also presented Ventura County's history with smart cards, being one of the very first in the nation to implement a smart card. VCTC's efforts began in 1994, with a Smartcard Demonstration Partnership, and was implemented county-wide in 1996.

Literature Review
"Interoperable Transit Smart Card Systems: Are We Moving Too Slowly or Too Quickly?" discusses the array of institutional factors affecting public transit operators' adoption of interoperable smart cards. Although many transit agencies have implemented smart card technologies as stand-alone systems that cannot be used on other systems, others have done so as part of a regional partner architecture in which multiple agencies with contiguous or overlapping service areas develop compatible systems. Through a review of the literature and in-depth interviews with industry experts, it was found that whereas interoperable systems have the benefit of allowing riders to use one fare card across multiple operators, such systems have proved difficult to form and coordinate as they require consensus among multiple parties. Four main institutional issues hindering implementation were identified: 1) staff and elected

officials are often hesitant to relinquish local control over fare policies and collection because individual transit agencies are guided by different missions or priorities and tend to serve different markets of user groups; 2) the future of smart card technology is uncertain; 3) decentralized systems of decision making mean that inter-jurisdictional governance structures tend to be far more informal than intra-organizational operations and management; and 4) transit agencies typically lack the institutional capacity to comprehensively evaluate the costs and benefits of interoperable systems, and as a result, there are few rigorous evaluations of smart cards. A conclusion is that there are no national or regional standards for the technology and this remains a barrier. http://pubsindex.trb.org/view.aspx?id=777674

"Smart Card Data Use in Public Transit: A Review" is a comprehensive review of smart card usage worldwide. First, the varying technologies used are introduced along with advantages and disadvantages. Major issues addressed include: user convenience, vehicle dwell time delay, cost, fare security, and interoperability. Second, methods of using data are analyzed in three different approaches: strategic long term planning, tactical (service adjustment) planning changes, and evaluation of operational data. The paper also looks at smart card commercialization applications that have been conducted globally. https://www.cirrelt.ca/DocumentsTravail/CIRRELT-2009-46.pdf

"Travel Pattern Analysis Using Smart Card Data of Regular Users" is another paper discussing the integration of smartcard fare boarding data with GIS location-based information to analyze transit ridership for better service planning. The authors' methodology was applied to the Minneapolis/St. Paul Metro Transit agency in 2008. (Only 50% of riders at the time used a form of smart card for transit ridership.) The study placed particular emphasis on analyzing different stored values on cards against spatial usage of the ridership. The study showed that smart fare media can be used to identify ridership patterns that can lead to more efficient and effective service planning and evaluation. ftp://ftp.hsrc.unc.edu/pub/TRB2011/data/papers/11-4258.pdf

"Implementing Regional Fare Systems" is an article in *Mass Transit* magazine that focused on the Seattle and Bay Areas' experiences of their respective public transit agencies cooperating to create a regional fare system on one smartcard. In the Seattle case, one of the challenges was deciding governance structure and business models to be used. Three types of governance structure were options: a joint powers authority, a main lead agency, or an inter-local agreement. The decision was with the inter-local agreement where costs and responsibilities were shared among partner agencies. In the Bay Area the major challenge was to incorporate 24 transit agencies in to one architecture. This was managed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the largest challenge was fare issues among so many transit operators.
http://www.masstransitmag.com/article/10219958/implementing-regional-fare-systems

Transit Facilities and Bus Rapid Transit

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is bus transit service that reduces travel time through treatments such as traffic signal priority, automatic vehicle location, dedicated bus lanes, limited-stop service, and pre-boarding fare payment. BRT service is often branded with its own fleet livery and stations. In our region, Metro operates the Orange Line and the Metro Rapid network. The Orange Line is "true" BRT, operating exclusively on its own right-of-way. The Metro Rapid network runs along city streets in mixed-flow traffic lanes (some bus lanes are in the planning phase), but benefits from signal priority and limited stops. Both services have reduced passenger travel time by 15 to 25% and have attracted new riders to transit. The 2012 RTP/SCS includes new BRT or limited stop service throughout the

SCAG region, including the sbX now being built in San Bernardino County and others in the planning stage in Orange and Riverside counties.

Literature Review
"Comprehensive Evaluation of Transit Signal Priority System Impacts Using Field Observed Traffic Data" was an analysis on an existing transit signal priority (TSP) system in Snohomish County, Washington State for Community Transit (CT) buses. In this study, impacts of the TSP system on both transit and local traffic operations were quantitatively evaluated on the basis of field-observed data. Simulation models were also built and calibrated to compute measures of effectiveness that could not be obtained from field-observed data. With simulation models and field observed data, the impacts of the TSP system on both transit and local traffic operations were quantitatively evaluated. The evaluation results showed that CT's system provided "remarkable" benefits to transit vehicles, with insignificant impacts to local traffic on cross-streets under the current coordinated control strategy. The major recommendation of the study was that more of CT's buses be equipped with the TSP technology. (In our region, it was found that the Metro Rapid program also had an insignificant effect on regular vehicle cross traffic for the Metro Rapid's extensive network of over 20 lines along heavily congested corridors. This was even true along Wilshire Blvd. where buses were running along the corridor every five minutes or less.) http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/research/reports/fullreports/699.1.pdf

"Integrating Transit Signal Priority within Adaptive Traffic Signal Control Systems" is another study looking at the effectiveness of different types of TSP systems. The study looks at three types of TSP and the effects they have on both transit vehicles and general traffic flow. The study involved a 21-intersection section of the Columbia Pike arterial in Arlington, Virginia. The study analyzed simulated peak morning, peak afternoon, and midday traffic on the three types of TSP: "fixed-time control," "adaptive splits," and "adaptive spits and offsets." The conclusion showed that all three methods provide benefits to transit service. Moreover, when express bus service was combined with the adaptive technology the best benefits were gained. As with other studies, it was shown that there were no negative general traffic flow consequences.
http://filebox.vt.edu/users/hrakha/Publications/Transit%20Signal%20Priority%20within%20Adaptive%20Control%20-%20Ver5.pdf

"Effective Bus-Only Lanes" explores geometric design and institutional barriers to effective bus-only lanes in the United States. It highlights design features for effective bus lanes in those communities with bus-only lanes (U.S. and abroad) and discusses institutional barriers, such as objections to remote enforcement and mixed-flow vehicle capacity reduction. It uses the City of San Francisco as an example of how a network of bus-only lanes could be implemented and what benefits could be derived. The current bus-only lanes in San Francisco vary in type and hours of operation. Some are peak hour curbside lanes; some are all-day or full-time curbside lanes; and the remainder are all-day or full-time dedicated lanes. Some allow taxis to operate in the lane with the buses. The conclusion is that San Francisco should standardize the hours of operation, signage and markings for its bus only lanes to improve bus service while decreasing operating costs. http://arch21.org/BusLanes/CB06C273.pdf

"Bus Rapid Transit Systems on Conventional Highways: A Review of the Literature and Practice" documents examples of BRT systems implemented on arterials, freeways and busways. On-street bus facilities have widespread applicability because of their relatively low costs, ease of implementation, and opportunities for incremental deployment. For these on-street facilities, numerous implementation options exist depending on the placement of the bus lane (curb or median), direction of flow (normal or

contra-flow), mix of traffic (e.g. dedicated bus lanes, buses and taxis, buses and goods delivery vehicles, or mixed traffic flow with automobiles), and traffic controls (turn controls, parking, loading and unloading of commercial motor vehicles, and signalization). Off-street BRT facilities, however, require higher investments in land and construction, and commonly take the form of special bus roadways that vary by type of construction (above grade, at grade, below grade), direction of flow (concurrent or contra-flow), and treatment of stations (on- or off-line). The paper discusses each type of treatment with its strengths and weaknesses.
http://www.path.berkeley.edu/PATH/Publications/PDF/PWP/2009/PWP-2009-01.pdf

"TCRP Report: Volume 1: Case Studies in Bus Rapid Transit" is a comprehensive review of implemented BRT systems around the world using 26 case studies, of which 12 are in North America. The report discusses reasons for implementing BRT, features of BRT, performance, costs, BRT prospects, and lessons learned on BRT elements such as the planning and implementation process, system concepts and packaging, running ways, stations, vehicles, fare collection, ITS applications, service planning and operations, traffic-transit integration, and performance.
http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_90v1.pdf

"The BRT Standard" is a publication by leading technical experts to come to a common understanding of what constitutes internationally recognized best practices in BRT system design. Many are unaware of the characteristics of the best BRT systems and their potential to provide a quality of customer service usually associated with light rails and subways. This lack of awareness frequently results in demands for rail when BRT may be a comparable and much cheaper alternative. It can also result in inaccurately labeling minimal improvements to standard bus service as BRT. "The BRT Standard" provides a framework for system designers, decision makers, and the sustainable transportation community to implement and identify top-quality BRT systems. A corridor of a system can be certified as "Gold Standard," "Silver Standard," or "Bronze Standard" based on the scorecard. 2012 is a pilot year to test the scorecard and make modifications as needed.
http://www.itdp.org/documents/BRT_English_REVISED2_FINAL_LR.pdf

Performance Measurement

Transit agencies collect data to help identify how efficiently service is being delivered, how well service is being provided to their customers, and to understand the effects of actions taken previously to improve performance. Agencies use performance measures to monitor whether agency and community goals are being met, assess system performance over time, and identify ways to improve service in order to attract new riders. This also helps formulate productive changes to policy and procedures.

Literature Review
"Public Transit Performance Measurement Study" is a literature review of performance measures best practices prepared for Sound Transit. It details primarily West Coast transit agencies as examples that are recognized as being leaders in transit service delivery and the use of performance management systems.
http://reneewing.com/pdf/Performance_Measures_Study.pdf

"Assessing Transit Service Performance: Recommended Standards for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority" reviews a range of typical transit performance measures and discusses the

logic behind each one. It focuses on the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority's (VTA) use of transit performance measures. It includes a peer review and attempts to identify best practices in the industry in order to formulate effective recommendations for VTA. Finally, the paper provides six recommendations to improve VTA's performance measures.
http://www.sjsu.edu/urbanplanning/docs/URBP298Docs/urbp298_HonorsReport_Tyree.pdf

"TCRP Report 88: A Guidebook for Developing a Transit Performance-Measurement System" is a guidebook that provides a step-by-step process for developing a performance-measurement program that includes both traditional and non-traditional performance indicators that address customer-oriented and community issues. The guidebook also provides an eight-step process for implementing or updating a performance-measurement program. The guidebook discusses categories of performance measures that agencies may wish to consider, different types of measures that can be used, data sources and data collection, management techniques that can be employed, and methods of reporting results. Detailed summaries are presented for over 400 performance measures, and twelve case-study examples of successful performance-measurement programs are provided.
http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_report_88/Guidebook.pdf

"TCRP Report 141: A Methodology for Performance Measurement and Peer Comparison in the Public Transportation Industry" is an important resource for transit managers, decision-makers, and others interested in using performance measurement and benchmarking as tools to (1) identify the strengths and weaknesses of their organization, (2) set goals or performance targets, and (3) identify best practices to improve performance. The research effort developed and tested a methodology for performance measurement and peer comparison for all fixed-route components of a public transit system (the motorbus mode specifically) and major rail modes. The report complements TCRP Report 88: "A Guidebook for Developing a Transit Performance-Measurement System," which describes how to implement and use performance measurement on an ongoing basis at a transit agency. The report describes eight steps for conducting a benchmarking effort.
http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_141.pdf

NEXT STEPS

A completed literature review will be provided to the HSR&T Subcommittee at its sixth and final meeting on February 15, 2013, and also to the RTTAC at its April 2013 meeting. The best practice research, along with presentations and discussion at the HSR&T Subcommittee and the RTTAC, will be incorporated into the State of Transit Report as appropriate, and will provide a framework and starting point for development of the 2016 RTP/SCS update.

REPORT

DATE: January 23, 2013

TO: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Matt Gleason, Associate Regional Planner, 213-236-1832, gleason@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Regional Transit System Performance Report Update

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
SCAG typically analyzes available performance data to establish existing conditions as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) development and update. At the October 31, 2012 Regional Transit TAC meeting, staff reported on efforts to establish an annual review of system performance, and to establish data collection procedures to assist in increased performance monitoring in response to requirements in Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). Staff will provide an update on this effort, including a draft analysis of existing National Transit Database (NTD) data for an agency operating fixed route bus service in the SCAG Region.

BACKGROUND:

Since the 1990s, MPOs have been advised by the federal government to consider the performance of their long range planning documents. Beginning in 1998, SCAG has incorporated performance based planning into its Regional Transportation Plans, and has encouraged performance based planning throughout the region. SCAG has a relatively long history of using performance measurement in developing the RTP, going back to the 1998 RTP. For the 2004 RTP, SCAG developed a set of measurable goals and outcomes that included the principal of sustainability, which is not limited only to the environment and the transportation-land use connection, but also has important implications on how the region meets its critical system preservation needs.

Beginning with the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), MPOs have been also been called upon to incorporate Maintenance and Operations strategies into both the Metropolitan Transportation Plans (MTPs) and the Congestion Management Plans (CMP) produced by Congestion Management Agencies. Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) the omnibus transportation authorization passed in June 2012, continues to reinforce the importance of performance based planning in the MTP process, while also reinforcing the importance of maintain a state of good repair for transportation infrastructure and assets.

MAP-21 amends 23 U.S.C 150(c) to require MPOs to work in collaboration with transit agencies and state DOTs to establish performance measures consistent with performance targets related to transit asset management and transit safety, as set forth in 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 5329(d).

MAP-21 also mandates MTPs must employ performance based planning, that MTPs must include a System Performance Report, and that Transportation Improvement Programs must include "a description of the anticipated progress brought about by implementing the TIP towards achieving the performance targets. MAP-21 mandates the Secretary of Transportation to issue final rules for the establishment of performance targets for transit at the state and MPO levels, following which, states shall have three months to establish targets, and MPOs shall follow in enacting their own targets within 180 days (49 U.S.C. 5326(c)(1)). This rulemaking process will impact the production of the 2016 RTP/SCS. Staff expect that the formal adoption of these rules by the Regional Council will occur by June 2015, when the technical work to produce the 2016 RTP/SCS will be well underway.

The Secretary is required to promulgate two types of rules for transit: Transit State of Good Repair Standards, and Transit Safety standards. However, in addition to incorporating these new measures and targets, producing a System Performance Report, and addressing performance progress through the FTIP, SCAG will continue to perform the kind of performance based planning it has practiced since the 1998 RTP.

DISCUSSION

As an incremental step towards a) producing of a System Performance Report for the 2016 RTP/SCS, b) to incorporate an annual review of system performance geared towards planning for operations and maintenance into SCAG's transit modal planning practices, staff recommends the production of an annual Regional Transit System Performance Report. This report, similar to MTC's *Statistical Summary of Bay Area Transit Operators,* would provide an annual format for measuring system performance, through the analysis of data reported by transit operators to the National Transit Database and the Office of the State Controller.

Staff have conducted a review of planning documents, reports, and resources to assess what types of performance measures should be analyzed on an annual basis, what modes should be analyzed, and which transit properties should be included in the analysis.

Given this review, staff proposes to produce an examination of current system performance along the following tiers, similar to the tiering structures in the 2001 and 2004 RTPS:

1. Rapid Transit (heavy rail, light rail, commuter rail, bus rapid transit operations)
2. Regional / Subregional (larger operations of motor bus service – including operations across jurisdictional boundaries by agencies receiving FTA 5307 funds)
3. Local (local and circulator motor bus service operations)
4. Specialized Operators (demand response and rural transit operations)

Operations within tier one and tier two are proposed to be the focus of the 2012-2013 system performance work effort, due to availability of data sources, including the national Transit Database and the Office of the State Controller's Transit Operators and Non-Transit Claimants Annual Report. In future years, strategies for analyzing tier three and tier four operations will be pursued.

Staff intend that the initial iteration of the report will focus on a series of cost efficiency, cost effectiveness, service delivery, mobility, maintenance and productivity measures, similar to MTC's *MTC Statistical Summary of Bay Area Transit Operators*. The data would be analyzed at the mode and agency level, in contrast to the RTP analyses where data was presented at the regional level. Staff believes that disaggregated analysis at the agency level can provide a benchmarking resource for transit properties in the SCAG region. Wherever feasible, a timeseries including 1991, 2001, and 2011 data will be analyzed to establish trends.

Proposed Measures

Performance Concept	Performance Measure
Cost Efficiency	Operating cost per revenue vehicle hour
	Farebox Recovery
Cost Effectiveness	Operating cost per passenger trip
	Operating cost per passenger trip
Service Effectiveness/ Productivity	Passengers per vehicle revenue hour
	Passengers per vehicle revenue mile
Maintenance	Fleet Average Vehicle Age
Mobility/Travel Time	Average Vehicle Speed

Proposed Format

Staff has begun the analysis process for the production of the Regional Transit System Performance Report. During the meeting, staff will present a draft analysis of existing NTD data for an agency operating fixed route bus service in the SCAG Region. Staff intends to work with participating operators to address any gaps in reported data, and ensure that the final presentation of performance data is as complete as possible.

Staff will present initial findings from one operator of fixed route transit to provide an example of the format for the system performance report, and to allow discussion of any data cleaning that may need to occur.

R E P O R T

DATE: January 23, 2013

TO: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Matt Gleason, Associate Regional Planner, 213-236-1832, gleason@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC) Charter Review

---

*EXECUTIVE SUMMARY***:**
At the June 3, 2009 meeting of the RTTAC, SCAG staff presented the draft committee charter, which identifies the committee purpose, composition, and duration, and discusses the committee responsibilities and meeting schedule as it relates to the development of the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The charter was subsequently reviewed by the RTTAC at its October 21, 2009 meeting. As SCAG begins the process of developing the 2016 RTP/SCS update, staff seeks input from the RTTAC regarding potential updates to the charter, as may be appropriate.

BACKGROUND:
Per Title 23, Chapter 1, Section 134(c)(1) of the United States Code, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) "in cooperation with the State and public transportation operators, shall develop long-range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs through a performance-driven, outcome-based approach to planning for metropolitan areas of the State." At the technical level, SCAG includes public transportation operators in regional planning efforts through the RTTAC, as part of a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive planning process for developing Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and Federal Transportation Improvement Programs (FTIPs).

Staff will consider input received from the RTTAC and will return in May 2013 with an action item regarding the updated charter.

ATTACHMENT:
1. Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee Charter, June 2009

Regional Transit TAC Charter

Purpose

The Transit Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provides a forum for public transit agencies and County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) to discuss projects, programs, and policies related to transit and the Regional Transportation Plan.   The existing Memoranda of Understanding between public transit operators and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) mandates this cooperative planning effort.

This work will include ensuring the technical integrity for the transit component of the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP" or "Plan" herein), including, but not limited to its assumptions, methodologies, and data used in developing the transit component of the RTP. The TAC will also review and provide technical input to the performance analysis of Plan alternative strategies that will comply with the federal and state requirements, including SB 375.

Composition

The Transit TAC will be comprised of staff representatives from the public transit agencies from within the SCAG region, CTCs, state and federal agencies, and SCAG subregions. The TAC will select a chairperson and a vice chairperson from amongst the representatives for each four-year RTP cycle. The chairperson and vice chairperson must represent either a public transit agency or a CTC.

In the event that a vacancy occurs in the chair or vice chair positions, the organization that appointed the member serving as chair or vice chair shall have the option to appoint a replacement member, which shall assume said position. If such organization elects not to exercise this option, the Transit TAC shall elect a new chair or vice chair representing an eligible TAC member.

Duration

The Transit TAC will continue on an ad-hoc basis for the duration of the 2012 RTP development period, which is expected to conclude when SCAG receives a letter from Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration on the Plan's conformity determination, anticipated to occur on or about June 2012.

Responsibilities

The primary responsibilities of the Transit TAC are as, but not limited to, the following:

1. Provide input on planning and technical assumptions associated with transit
2. Provide input on performance measures, methodology and process
3. Provide input on establishing base year and baseline performance conditions
4. Provide input on transit strategies to be considered for inclusion in the RTP
5. Provide input in establishing regional goals, and performance objectives for the transit component of the 2012 RTP
6. Provide input in establishing transit alternatives that address mobility needs and complement land use changes that may result in complying with SB 375
7. Review, evaluate and provide input to the analysis of strategy alternatives, leading to the selection of a preferred alternative for inclusion in the 2012 RTP.

Meetings

The Transit TAC shall convene meetings on a quarterly basis, with authority to convene or postpone meetings as needed. Meetings will take place at SCAG's Main Office in Los Angeles unless otherwise agreed upon. Meeting agendas will be prepared by SCAG staff in consultation with the chair of the TAC, and be provided to members in advance of each meeting. Minutes of each meeting will also be prepared by SCAG staff.

The TAC will invite members of management, other divisions, or outside firms/agencies to present on pertinent information, as necessary. Meeting agendas will be prepared and posted in advance. Minutes for each meeting will be completed by the appropriate SCAG administrative staff.

All agendas and meetings will be made available on the SCAG Transit webpage at http://www.scag.ca.gov/transit/index.htm.

Members may attend meetings via teleconference.

REPORT

DATE: January 23, 2013

TO: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Matt Gleason, Associate Regional Planner, 213-236-1832, gleason@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Update on HSR&T Subcommittee and Upcoming HSR&T/Finance Joint meeting

---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
At the October 31, 2012 Regional Transit TAC meeting, staff reported on the formation by the Regional Council of six subcommittees, including the High Speed Rail and Transit (HSR&T) Subcommittee, as part of the implementation strategy for the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The HSR&T Subcommittee is charged with providing leadership and strategic policy formulation for high-speed rail, commuter rail, and transit in the SCAG region, and providing staff with direction, guidance and focus in the development of the 2016 RTP/SCS update.

This report provides an update on the HSR&T Subcommittees held to date. The HSR&T Subcommittee agendas are available at: http://www.scag.ca.gov/committees/rtpscssubcommittees.htm#hsrts.

DISCUSSION:

High-Speed Rail & Transit Subcommittee Meeting Summaries

1st Meeting, October 5, 2012
The meeting was attended by Subcommittee members and representatives from SCAG's partner agencies including XPressWest, Caltrans and the California High-Speed Rail Authority. Subcommittee Chair Karen Spiegel reviewed the purpose and objectives of the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee's Work Plan and Deliverables were discussed and they were unanimously approved by the subcommittee.

Three (3) presentations were made for informational purposes and included: 1) a regional rail update by SCAG Planner Steve Fox, 2) an overview of MAP-21 by SCAG Legislative Analyst Jeff Dunn, with particular emphasis on transit and rail, and 3) an update on Measure J by David Yale, Executive Officer at Metro. There was a good level of discussion by subcommittee members.

2nd Meeting, November 9, 2012
The meeting was attended by Subcommittee members and representatives from SCAG's partner agencies including OCTA, Caltrans and the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

The emphasis of this second meeting was on rail and the speakers provided a comprehensive and coordinated overview of rail projects and planning in our region. Presentations included: 1) an update on the CA High Speed Train project by Michelle Boehm, Southern California Regional Director, 2) an update on the Southern California High Speed Rail Memorandum of Understanding by Don Sepulveda, Executive Officer for Rail at Metro, 3) an update on Metrolink by Gray Crary, Metrolink Chief Strategic Officer, 4) an update on RCTC's rail planning and implementation efforts by Sheldon Peterson, Riverside County

Transportation Commission Rail Manager, 5) an update on the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency Strategic Implementation Plan by Linda Bohlinger, HNTB Corporation, 6) an update on the 2013 California State Rail Plan by Linda Culp of the San Diego Association of Governments, and 7) an update on Amtrak's Northeast Corridor Visioning Plan by Jonathan Hutchinson of Amtrak.

3rd Meeting, December 21, 2012

The third Subcommittee meeting focused on transit and transit best practices. Items for discussion included: 1) a regional transit update by SCAG Planner Matt Gleason, 2) a presentation on travel behavior and transit mode choice by Professor Brian Taylor, UCLA, 3) a presentation on smart fare media in Orange County by Jorge Duran, Orange County Transportation Authority, 4) a presentation on smart fare media in Ventura County by Vic Kamhi, Ventura County Transportation Commission Bus Transit Director, and 5) a presentation on predictive arrival technologies and mobile applications by Lan-Chi Lam, Metro Web Design and Strategy Manager.

4th Meeting, January 18, 2013

The fourth Subcommittee meeting focused on the nexus between transit and land use. Items for discussion included: 1) a presentation on SCAG and Metro's First Mile/Last Mile Strategic Plan by SCAG Planner Alan Thompson, 2) a presentation on transportation and land use interactions by Professor Genevieve Giuliano, USC Price School of Public Policy, 3) a presentation on planning for transit oriented development in the post-redevelopment environment by Cecilia Estolano of Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors, LLC, 4) a presentation on joint development programs at Metro by Roger Moliere, Chief of Real Property Management & Development at Metro, 5) a presentation on the City of Fullerton's streetcar project by Jay Eastman, Mobility Planner for the City of Fullerton, and 6) a presentation on the economic development aspects of transit oriented development by Ron Golem of Bay Area Economics. The Subcommittee also received a draft technical memorandum on best practices in public transit service delivery and a draft outline for a regional passenger rail vision element for the 2016 RTP/SCS update.

Forthcoming: 5th Meeting, February 7, 2013

The fifth Subcommittee meeting will be a joint meeting with the Transportation Finance Subcommittee.

Forthcoming: 6th Meeting, February 15, 2013

The sixth Subcommittee meeting will be the final meeting.