

**Transit Service Delivery Advisory Committee  
VIRTUAL MEETING**

**July 29, 2025**

**1:00 p.m.**

**600 East Main Street, Suite 2102  
Richmond, Virginia 23219**

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **TSDAC Members Present**

Chair McGlennon, Ms. Mattice, Ms. Jackson, Ms. Pinkard, Mr. Dyke, Ms. Mester, Dr. Smoot

### **DRPT Staff Present**

Director Robinson, Ms. Mayton, Mr. Trogdon, Ms. Parker, Mr. Sparks, Mr. Price, Mr. Sonenklar, Ms. Garbarini, Ms. Husain, Ms. Stankus, Ms. Dubinsky, Ms. Monaco, Mr. Tuten, Mr. Mucha, Ms. Lazar

### **Call to Order/Introductions (Chair McGlennon)**

Chair McGlennon called the meeting to order at 1:00pm on July 29<sup>th</sup>. At 1:01pm, Chair McGlennon recessed the meeting due to technical issues.

At 1:32pm, Chair McGlennon called the meeting to order. TSDAC members introduced themselves.

### **Approval of May 13, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Chair McGlennon)**

On motion of Mr. Dyke, the May 13 meeting minutes were approved, unanimously.

### **MERIT Review Findings (Consultant Staff)**

Mr. Macek, DRPT Consultant, began the presentation on the MERIT Review Findings.

Ms. Mattice noted that operating expenses are utilized in the MERIT formula as a proxy for a cost-of-living expense. Ms. Mattice inquired if Petersburg Area Transit saw an operating cost decrease due to service reductions. Director Robinson said the understood that Petersburg Area Transit maintained service levels but saw a decrease in its state operating assistance allocation. Mr. Sparks confirmed that to be the case.

Mr. Macek continued his presentation. Mr. Macek presented on findings of the MERIT Operating Program review, and findings from tested scenarios. Mr. Macek presented the Sizing + Performance Adjustment Scenario and noted it is 65% service or outcome measures, and 35% input/cost measures. It also removes the performance trend adjustment.

Mr. Macek presented the impact on operating funding of the Sizing + Performance Adjustment results. Ms. Mattice inquired about commuter bus service, especially given

dead-head service, and how it factors into the scenario. Mr. Macek notes that, under the scenario, deadhead miles count towards VRH and VRM. Ms. Mattice inquired about whether the passenger ridership on commuter buses would skew performance under the scenario and whether commuter buses have a sunk cost and if that was demonstrated in the findings.

Mr. Macek continued the presentation. Mr. Macek noted that no tested scenario was able to adequately address the goal of predictability due to various events that may happen across all transit agencies that impact the formula allocation. Mr. Macek noted potential alternative approaches but also noted the subsequent limitations. Mr. Macek concluded his presentation.

Chair McGlennon opened for questions. Ms. Mester asked for a clarification and then inquired about the trend adjustment. Ms. Mattice inquired about ridership impacts due to uncontrolled events and how trend data was meant to smooth out changes that may result from such events. Mr. Macek noted that big changes to budgets or ridership mainly impacted the sizing adjustment. Ms. Mester inquired about other potential recommended scenarios. Mr. Macek provided answers.

Ms. Jackson noted that modest changes to operating allocations may mean be more impactful to agencies depending on their size. Ms. Jackson suggested that there is not enough information as to whether the trend is or is not beneficial, yet. Mr. Sonenklar provided additional context to the trend adjustments, providing a scenario of a high-performing transit agency with flat trend lines and stable operating characteristics that can lose funding.

Ms. Mattice commented that TSDAC should have the opportunity to delve into the data and inquired if trends that compared a transit agency with itself, as opposed to statewide trends were looked at. Mr. Macek said no it was not considered.

The presentation moved on to the MERIT Capital section with Ms. Sciarrino presenting on potential improvements to the MERIT Capital Program, including adding subcategories, developing new methodology, and more.

Chair McGlennon inquired about the accountability criteria. Mr. Trogon noted that there has been improvement in accountability, but it is always stressed.

Chair McGlennon opened for questions. Dr. Smoot commented on one of the major concerns of the CTB being for agencies to have a right-sized fleet, using the example of buses either being over-crowded or under-utilized. Dr. Smoot noted members of the CTB have suggested there is little the State can do to address service over/under capacity issues.

Ms. Sciarrino noted that transit agencies have different scenarios and capacity at different times of day. Mr. Trogon suggested that a dialogue will be opened with the operators regarding transit vehicles and what the future of fleets should be.

Ms. Mester commented on the suggestion of moving the MERIT Capital program to a two-year cycle and suggested that the MERIT Capital process may not be ideal for the right-sizing of vehicle capacity/fleet size. Ms. Mester inquired about the impact of incentivization scoring. Ms. Sciarrino provided an answer. Ms. Mester inquired about previous funding rounds, and how those would have been impacted. Ms. Mester inquired about the proposed Major-SGR Scoring. Ms. Sciarrino and Mr. Sonenklar provided answers.

Chair McGlennon inquired about whether some replacement assets fit into DRPT's SGR program. Mr. Sonenklar provided an answer. Mr. Sonenklar noted that if a projects condition has not been tracked in the past, it can be categorized as minor enhancement.

Ms. Mattice inquired about the impact of moving to a two-year cycle.

Ms. Jackson commented on the potential of moving to a two-year cycle.

### **Open Discussion**

Ms. Pinkard thanked DRPT and the consultant team.

Director Robinson thanked the group, and suggested collecting members pros and cons. Director Robinson noted that the MERIT Program's funding formulas should not be static.

Chair McGlennon noted that without new funding being made available at the State or Federal level, localities seeking transit may require localities to put up more funding themselves.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment.

### **Wrap Up/Next Steps**

Mr. Trogdon discussed the next steps of the MERIT Review Process. Director Robinson suggested the members provide feedback as they can and discussed scheduling the next meeting. Director Robinson provided more next steps.

### **Adjourn**

At 3:23PM, Chair McGlennon adjourned the meeting.