



FTA SGR Transit Agencies Feedback Session Results

Presented by:

PricewaterhouseCoopers

Kristy Fridley, Mark Baumgardner, and
Charles Baldwin

Discussion Topics

1. Definition of SGR & Safety Critical Assets

Moderated by: Aaron James, FTA Office of Engineering and Ryan Frigo, FTA Office of Safety and Security

2. Asset Management Plan Requirements

Moderated by: Leslie Rogers, FTA Regional Administrator for Region 9

3. Apportionment of Federal Funds & Technical Assistance

Moderated by: Mary Martha Churchman, FTA Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Program Management

Topic 1: Definition of SGR & Safety Critical Assets

Sub-Topic A: State of Good Repair

- What should constitute a “major system”?
- Should FTA consider components lower than the “major system” level for determining SGR compliance?
- What should be the percentage threshold for a transit agency’s overall “transit system” to be in good condition to declare the transit system in a SGR industry-wide?
- What period of time should be used for assessing SGR compliance?

Sub-Topic B: Safety Critical Assets

- Do you agree with the proposed criteria for determining “safety critical” assets for SGR funding purposes?

What should constitute a “major system”?

- Major systems may include the following:
 - Fare equipment
 - Rolling stock
 - Power
 - Track
 - Stations
 - Train control
 - Mechanical systems
 - Bridges & tunnels
 - Maintenance systems
 - Bus facilities
 - Rail facilities
 - Parking
 - Bus shelters
 - Loops
 - Communications
 - Vertical transportation
 - Propulsion power
 - HOV lanes
 - Non-revenue vehicles
 - Operations control
 - Crossings
 - Call centers
 - Human resources
 - Information technology
 - Security
 - Employee facilities
 - Asset Management Rules and Policies?
- Some of these components may be grouped under larger asset categories. For example, all facilities may be grouped as one component.

Should FTA consider components lower than the “major system” level for determining SGR compliance?

- For Federal funding purposes, FTA has considered developing a definition for state of good repair at the transit system level
- Several participants recommended that FTA consider major components or types of assets when determining SGR compliance, rather than assessing SGR on a system-wide basis

What should be the percentage threshold for a transit agency's overall "transit system" to be in good condition to declare the transit system in a SGR industry-wide?

- Many participants stated that it would be difficult to develop an overall percentage threshold for SGR, based on the following considerations:
 - Small/large and new/old agencies have different thresholds and needs related to SGR
 - A percentage scale may not provide an accurate picture of SGR needs
- State of Good Repair should include qualitative and quantitative measures, and account for the following factors:
 - Condition (e.g., planned rate of degradation v. current condition)
 - Performance/service (e.g., must be able to deliver 90-95% service to customers)
 - Age
 - Impact on safety/safety risk
 - Backlog

- All agencies have different asset compositions; however, all agencies have the following types of assets: Fleet, Fixed, and Linear
- FTA should consider developing a weighting or ranking system to determine SGR for different asset types
 - May use a 1-5 scale; however, specific definitions and consistent criteria will need to be developed for each ranking
 - The definitions for each ranking may vary by asset type
 - May need to include a weighting based on asset type (e.g., safety critical assets may carry additional weight)
 - Must be both consistent (to include standard criteria), and customizable (to accommodate the needs of different transit agencies)
 - Consider Failure Mode Effects and Critical Analysis (FMECA) tool
- FTA needs to determine how to account for the range or distribution of assets along the 5 point scale (e.g., if an agency has half of its assets categorized as a 5 and half of its assets categorized as a 1, the average score is a 3)

What period of time should be used for assessing SGR compliance?

- FTA may incorporate SGR compliance as part of the triennial review process
- All transit agencies should have an SGR plan, and FTA should review transit agencies on the progress of meeting the SGR plan every 3 years

Do you agree with the proposed criteria for determining “safety critical” assets for SGR funding purposes?

- Safety criticality criteria should include:
 1. Asset requires removal from service
 2. Asset requires reduced performance
 3. Asset does not require removal of reduced performance
 4. No issues with the asset
- Criteria applies to both bus and rail
- Criteria will assist transit agencies in determining prioritization of projects
- Railroads use a system very similar to the FTA concept

Topic 2: Asset Management Plan Requirements

- Components of an Asset Management Plans
- FTA Standards / Guidance
- AMP/SGR Performance Measures
- Reporting & FTA Oversight of AMP and SGR

Components of Asset Management Plan

- Inventory of Assets
 - Subset may include: Linear, Fixed, Fleet, & System
 - Separated by Bus and Rail
- Condition of Assets
 - Establish standard definitions per condition (1-5) for each asset class
- Age & Useful Life of Asset
- Maintenance History
- Usage History (Density)

Standards vs. Guidance

- General desire to begin with guidance and transition to minimum standards
- Guidance and/or standards should focus on a limited number of asset classes
 - Can asset classes tie to TERM-Lite?
- Consider coordination with APTA when establishing guidance and/or standards
- FTA should give RTAs several years to adjust

AMP/SGR Performance Measures

- General desire to have quantitative performance measures over AMP/SGR initiatives
- General desire to develop minimum levels of performance by asset class
- Standards will vary by RTA
- Avoid “targets” – especially in the beginning
- Potential Performance Measures:
 - Reduction in number of assets with a condition of “1”
 - Reduction in Backlog
 - Condition Index by asset class

Standards vs. Guidance

- General desire to begin with guidance and transition to minimum standards
- Guidance and/or standards should focus on a limited number of asset classes
 - Can asset classes tie to TERM-Lite?
- Consider coordination with APTA when establishing guidance and/or standards
- FTA should give RTAs several years to adjust

Reporting and FTA Oversight of AMP and SGR

- General desire for self-certification / compliance
- Oversight should be performed within existing oversight / compliance processes
 - Potentially leveraging the Triennial Review process
 - Potentially leveraging Title VI Reporting model
- Consider ISO 9000 Series certifications for larger systems

Topic 3: SGR Funding Formula Summary Areas

- Overview of SGR Funding Formula
- Goals and objectives for formula
- Potential variables/metrics for formula
- Items to consider

Overview of SGR Funding Formula

- FTA is working with Congress to develop a formula for allocating funding
- Funding formula proposes a two-tier system:
 - One tier for bus systems – 25% of the funds
 - One tier for rail systems – 75% of the funds
- Nearly one-third of the funding for the next six years has been identified for Bus and Rail State of Good Repair
- Formula will be designed to evaluate transit systems rather than competing projects

Goals and Objectives for the Formula

- Assure equitable treatment of the relative needs of rail and bus systems
- Reward agencies that engage in preventative maintenance but do not punish those that have failed to adequately maintain their assets
- Distinguish condition assessments between different asset categories
 - Distinguish types of non-vehicle assets
 - Treat rolling stock differently than other asset categories
- Formula should be easy to understand

Potential Variables/Metrics for the Formula

- Ridership
 - Passenger trips: Demonstrates total ridership
 - Revenue miles: Indicates how things deteriorate over time
 - Population density: Indicates anticipated ridership
- Severity indicator to identify need
 - e.g., Total backlog / annual cost to maintain SGR
- Asset-specific condition measure
- Steady state need
 - e.g., Asset value / useful life
- Steady state need / passenger miles or trips

Items to Consider

- What is the right age for a system to begin receiving funding?
- How much of funding should be allocated to legacy vs. newer systems?
 - e.g., Provide a baseline apportionment to the legacy systems and allocate the rest on need and performance
- How do you quantify whether or not a project is deliverable?
- How do you incentivize preventative maintenance?
- Should you provide funding to a system that has a backlog highly leveraged with debt?

Items to Consider (Continued)

- How do you ensure funding is not provided to systems to subsidize operations?
 - Transit systems will use funds for greatest need
- What performance measures should be in place to evaluate how the systems use the funding?