

FY2006 Budget
Board Budget Committee request for information

BBC Date	Tracking #	Question/Requested Information
May 11,2006	39	Provide a listing of high priority bus services with highest potential for ridership,and current process for eliminating low performance bus routes
May 11,2006	40	Status of FY06 Metro Matters Expenditure

Board Request: **Provide a listing of high priority bus services with highest potential for ridership, and current process for eliminating low performance bus routes**

Date Requested: 5/11/2006

Tracking Number: 39

Assigned to Dept/Office: OPER

Contact Person: Jim Hughes

Executive Summary Reply:

Listing of high priority bus service with the highest potential for ridership

Proposed for FY07 is \$ 3.3 million in service improvements that respond to past growth on existing service and anticipated growth along certain corridors. In addition staff developed a list of additional service improvements for FY08 that have the potential to increase ridership.

- Improvements in priority bus corridors – those with highest current or potential ridership – will benefit the most customers and be most cost-effective

- The top 50 lines carry 75% of the ridership

- Staff uses the Regional Bus study as a tool to guide it when recommending service improvements.

The Regional Bus Study recommends service improvements along the following corridors to increase ridership:

- District

- H Street / Benning Rd

- 16th Street

- Georgia Avenue

- Maryland

- Bi-County Transitway

- Virginia

- Chain Bridge Road

- Washington Boulevard

- Leesburg Pike

- McClean- Crystal City

Additional routes that have the potential to increase ridership if crowding and service reliability are improved:

- District

- 90,92 - U St.-Garfield

- S2,4 - 16th St

- H2,3,4 – Crosstown

- Maryland

- Y5,7,8,9 - Georgia Ave.-MD

- T18 - Annapolis road

- Q2 - Veirs Mills road

- C2,4 - Greenbelt-Twinbrook

- Virginia

- 23A,C - McLean Crystal City

- 16G,H,K,W - Columbia Hts West

- 2A,B,C,G - Washington Blvd

- 2A,B,C,G - Washington Blvd

These corridors and routes carry approximately 145,000 weekday passengers or 33% of Metrobus' daily ridership.

Current process for eliminating low performance bus routes

Bus Route Performance Evaluation Staff analyzes the performance of each Metrobus route on an ongoing basis to:

- o Determine if a service adjustment is required to meet demand
- o Determine if a service adjustment is required to improve service reliability
- o Effectively measure service performance
- o Evaluate service adjustments as necessary to ensure application of guidelines for entire regional bus network

Data from various sources is used to document ridership on an ongoing or as needed basis to support the evaluation:

- o Farebox,
- o Ride-check
- o Stationary
- o Operator data

Performance Analysis Each route is reviewed to determine if there is a problem or if there has been a significant change in its performance. Several performance measures are used to evaluate the overall route performance and provide the best indication of the overall performance of a route. Five performance criteria are used so one criterion does not carry more weight than others. A route is a poor performer if it falls below 4 or more of the 5 performance measures minimum guidelines:

- o Passengers Per Trip
- o Passengers Per Revenue Mile
- o Cost Recovery
- o Subsidy Per Passenger
- o Ridership

Based on these performance measures, staff produces a Semi-Annual Bus Route Productivity Report. The Productivity Report is used as a diagnostic tool to determine if minor changes are necessary to improve a routes performance or if a major change is needed. If a route is a poor performer staff identifies low cost or no cost changes to improve its performance if applicable. Staff recommends a route for elimination only if it is considered a poor performer and staff determines that there are no options to improve productivity; or if it has low ridership and alternative service is available. All service change proposals are coordinated with the local jurisdictions and internal staff.

Board Request: [Status of FY06 Metro Matters Expenditure](#)

Date Requested: [5/11/2006](#)
 Tracking Number: [40](#)
 Assigned to Dept/Office: [CFO](#)
 Contact Person: [Keith Chunephisal](#)

Expenditure Status as of May 25, 2006

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Expended</u>	<u>Balance</u>
Program Element A - IRP			
• Rolling Stock: Bus	\$61.0	\$38.9	\$22.2
• Rolling Stock: Rail	0.8	0.3	0.5
• Passenger Facilities	22.0	8.6	13.4
• Maintenance Facilities	14.0	1.9	12.1
• Systems	13.4	4.9	8.5
• Track and Structures	13.1	4.9	8.3
• Information Technology	2.8	2.1	0.7
• Program Management &	5.8	5.8	0.1
• Preventive Maintenance	20.7	13.8	6.9
• Financing Expense (TIF/	112.8	168.9	(56.1)
	<u>\$266.5</u>	<u>\$250.1</u>	<u>\$16.4</u>
Program Element B - Rail Cars and Facilities			
• Rail Cars	55.4	3.6	51.8
• Facilities	59.1	32.9	26.1
• Systems	63.3	13.0	50.3
	<u>\$177.8</u>	<u>\$49.5</u>	<u>\$128.3</u>
Program Element C - Buses and Facilities			
• Buses	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.5
• Garage	8.9	0.0	8.9
• Customer Facilities	5.8	1.3	4.5
	<u>\$15.2</u>	<u>\$1.3</u>	<u>\$13.9</u>
Other Projects			
• Credit Facility	\$2.0	\$0.7	\$1.3
• System Expansion Plann	0.0	0.0	0.0
Debt Service	<u>12.2</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>12.2</u>
	<u>\$14.2</u>	<u>\$0.7</u>	<u>\$13.5</u>
Expenditure not yet posted		22.1	
Metro Matters	\$473.7	\$323.7	\$150.0
Program Element D - Security Program (100% Federal)			
• Back-Up Operations Con	\$17.6	\$0.0	\$17.6
• Other Security Initiatives	20.9	0.0	20.9
Subtotal	<u>\$38.5</u>	<u>\$0.0</u>	<u>\$38.5</u>
Grand Total	\$512.2	\$323.7	\$188.5