



Federal Transit Administration Goals Performance

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) granted the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) the authority to establish and enforce a comprehensive framework to oversee the safety of public transportation throughout the United States. MAP-21 expanded the regulatory authority of the FTA to oversee safety, providing an opportunity to assist transit agencies in moving towards a more holistic, performance-based approach to Safety Management Systems (SMS). This authority was continued through the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act).

In compliance with MAP-21 and the FAST Act, the FTA promulgated a Public Transportation Safety Program on August 11, 2016, that adopted SMS as the foundation for developing and implementing a safety program. The FTA is committed to developing, implementing, and consistently improving strategies and processes to ensure that transit achieves the highest practicable level of safety. SMS helps organizations improve their safety performance by supporting the institutionalization of beliefs, practices, and procedures for identifying, mitigating, and monitoring safety risks.

There are several components of the national safety program, including the National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NSP), published by the FTA to provide guidance on managing safety risks and hazards. One element of the NSP is the Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan. Public transportation agencies implemented TAM plans across the industry in 2018. The subsequent final ruling by FTA to implement the NSP is the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) rule, 49 CFR Part 673, and guidance provided by FTA.

PTASP Performance Measures

Safety is a core business function of all public transportation providers and should be systematically applied to every aspect of service delivery. For the transit agencies within the RGVMAB, all levels of management, administration and operations are dedicated to and responsible for the safety of their clientele and themselves. To improve public transportation safety to the highest practicable level in the State of Texas and comply with FTA requirements, the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) has developed individual Agency Safety Plans (ASP) in collaboration with the Rio Grande Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and the three primary Section 5307 Public Transportation Providers in the RGVMAB.

To ensure that the necessary processes are in place to accomplish both enhanced safety at the local level and the goals of the NSP, the City of Brownsville and B-Metro, City of McAllen and Metro McAllen, and the Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council (LRGVDC), and Valley Metro all have recently adopted their respective PTAPs



and the tenets of SMS including a Safety Management Policy (SMP) and the processes for Safety Risk Management (SRM), Safety Assurance (SA), and Safety Promotion (SP), per 49 U.S.C. 5329(d)(1)(A).¹ Though the RGVMPO is not yet required to report these targets, they have been included and considered throughout the planning process.

Table 7-10 displays the five-year average safety performance measures by mode of service provided by each agency. The modes of service represented in the table are fixed route, flex route, and demand response (DR). As the development and implementation of SMS is a relatively new requirement, each agency has also elected to maintain the benchmark performance as the first reporting year's target.

Table 7-12: PTASP Performance Measures

Measure/Target	B-Metro		Metro McAllen		Valley Metro	
	Fixed Route	Demand Response	Fixed Route	Demand Response	Fixed Route	Demand Response
Total number of reportable fatalities	0	0	0	0	0	0
*Rate of reportable fatalities per total vehicle revenue Miles by mode	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of reportable injuries	4.4	1	35	0	5.6	1
*Rate of reportable injuries per total vehicle revenue Miles by mode	2.95688	0.763527	0.000015	0	0.0000028	0.0000072
Total number of reportable events	74	12	36	0	6.2	1.2
*Rate of reportable events per total vehicle revenue Miles by mode	9.94587	9.16233	0.000015	0	0.0000031	0.0000087
Mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode	5,288	9,627	4,114	0	82,200	57,738

*rate=total number x 100,000/total revenue vehicles Miles traveled

Following the FAST Act, a 2015 FTA study found that about 40 percent of buses and 23 percent of rail transit assets were listed in marginal or poor condition, with a total backlog of around 90 billion dollars. Thus, the FTA took action to prevent further deterioration of public transit networks. In July 2016, TAM plans were codified as a legal requirement for transit agencies receiving FTA funding that provide open public transportation. Given limited funding, this framework establishes procedures and

¹ Federal Register, Vol. 81, No. 24

guidance for all public transportation networks to move towards a state of good repair.

The majority of transit assets owned or managed by the qualifying FTA-funded (Federal Transit Administration) public transportation providers in the RGVMAB are in good condition.

The transit providers in the RGVMAB are dedicated to continuously providing transportation solutions for accessibility to employment, education, medical care, grocery stores, and other services. With limited funding and a growing backlog of needs, it is critical to maximize existing resources, maintain a State of Good Repair (SGR), and provide the tools necessary for Public Transportation providers to provide safe, reliable, and cost-effective services.

Though asset management is a data focused endeavor, developing a plan is a collaborative process, requiring coordination and data sharing from many different agencies with different operating systems and reporting processes. Table 7-11 and Table 7-12 represent the TAM targets of the three 5307 transit agencies in the RGVMAB.

Table 7-13: B Metro TAM Performance Targets

Measure	Asset Class	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
Revenue					
% of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark	Bus	1	1	1	1
	Cutaway	14	14	14	14
	Van	36	36	36	36
Equipment					
% of vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark	Non-revenue/service automobile	1	1	1	1
Facilities					
Condition - % of vehicles with condition rating below 3.0 on FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale	Administration	1	1	1	1
	Maintenance	1	1	1	1
	Parking Structures	1	1	1	1
	Passenger Facilities	-	-	-	-



Table 7-14: Metro McAllen TAM Performance Targets

Measure	Asset Class	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
Revenue					
% of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark	Bus	50	20	20	30
	Cutaway	0	0	15	15
Equipment					
% of vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark	Non-revenue/service automobile	25	25	20	20
Facilities					
Condition - % of vehicles with condition rating below 3.0 on FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale	Administration	0	0	0	0
	Maintenance	0	0	0	0
	Parking Structures	0	0	0	0
	Passenger Facilities	0	0	0	0

Table 7-15: Valley Metro TAM Performance Targets

Measure	Asset Class	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
Revenue					
% of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark	Bus	11	11	6	6
	Cutaway	7	7	3	3
Equipment					
% of vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark	Non-revenue/service automobile	0	0	0	0
Facilities					
Condition - % of vehicles with condition rating below 3.0 on FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale	Administration	5	5	2	2
	Maintenance	2	2	0	0
	Parking Structures	2	2	0	0
	Passenger Facilities	5	5	3	3