

**The Far West Texas / El Paso
Regional Human Services – Public
Transportation Coordination Plan**

September 2017 – August 2022

Far West Texas / El Paso

Regional Transportation Coordination Committee

February 27, 2017

Acknowledgments

This plan was prepared under the direction and guidance of the Far West Texas/El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee in partial fulfillment of a regional human services- public transportation coordination planning requirement of the Texas Department of Transportation, Public Transportation Division. The plan represents a full year of research, analysis, discussion and composition by many transportation coordination stakeholders, including numerous health and human services organization and transportation providers serving the needs of older adults, persons with disabilities, persons with low incomes, veterans, commuters and the general public.

The Far West Texas/El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee (WTEP) is grateful for the contributions and input of many individuals and in particular Ms Rosario Fernandez at Project Amistad for her leadership as WTEP Chair during the time this plan was being developed; Bob Geyer formerly with El Paso County for providing Lead Agency support during the WTEP's eleven year history; Luis Chew and Jose Lara at Volar CIL for ensuring that persons with disabilities were given a meaningful voice in the development of the plan; Domingo Cordero for immense help with the plan's transportation inventory; Joanne Mundy for her thorough review of the draft, and the numerous organizations and individuals who participated in interviews, submitted surveys and lent their knowledge, expertise and insight into making this a document to improve the mobility and lives of persons throughout our six-county region.

Far West Texas / El Paso
Regional Transportation Coordination Committee
P.O. Box 1081
Marfa, Texas 79843

February 28, 2017

Dear Fellow Far West Texans:

As Chair of the Far West Texas/El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee, it is my honor and pleasure to present the 2017-2022 Human Services – Public Transportation Coordination Plan for our region. The document represents hundreds of hours of work and is devoted to our vision that “all persons of the six-county Far West Texas region will have access to customer-centered, dependable, convenient and safe transportation services and choices.”

The Far West Texas/Upper Rio Grande region is composed of Brewster, Culberson, El Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties an area of nearly 22,000 square miles and sharing a 500 mile border with the Republic of Mexico. Its rapidly growing population, remote rural and dense urban environments, impact of Mexico and unique geography present numerous challenges for the region’s population, especially for persons dependent on public transportation for their mobility. It is our hope that this plan represents a road map and continuation of our commitment to addressing those challenges.

The framers of this plan recognize the importance of mobility to the social and economic health of our region and that every transportation asset must be deployed as efficiently and effectively as possible to make the most of limited resources. Rather than a static document, this plan represents a framework to a dynamic approach for addressing our region’s mobility issues that will evolve in response to changing needs and conditions.

I thank all the contributors to this plan and encourage your active participation as we work together to ensure that the fundamental mobility needs of all persons of our region are met.

Respectfully,

Rosario Fernandez,
Chief Operating Officer, Transportation – Project Amistad
Chair – Far West Texas/El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee

Table of Contents

Far West Texas/El Paso 2017-2022 Regional Transportation Coordination Plan

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Executive Summary	1
A. Plan Purpose	
B. Planning Requirement and Summary of Coordination Legislation and History	1
C. Summary of the Region’s Population and Geography	2
D. Population Dynamics	3
E. Summary of Needs Assessment	4
F. Summary of Transportation Inventory	5
G. Mobility Issues and Priorities	6
H. Vision and Summary of Plan Goals, Objectives, Recommendations and Actions	7
I. Plan Scope and Framework	8
II. Public Transportation Resources in the Region	11
A. Introduction and Background	11
B. Summary of Transportation Inventory	11
C. Approach and Inventory Methodology	14
D. Inventory Limitations	14
E. El Paso City and County Inventory Detail	15
F. Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio County Inventory Detail	20
G. Public Transportation Funding	22
H. Inventory Results and Analysis	23
I. Implications for Regional Mobility and Coordination	25
J. Transportation Provider Profiles	26
III. Comprehensive Assessment of the Public’s Unmet Transportation Needs	27
A. Introduction and Background	27
B. Transportation Availability Summary	27
C. Needs Assessment Summary	28
D. Assessment Approach and Methodology	29
E. Needs Assessment Limitations	30
F. Regional Description	31
1. The Geography and Economy of El Paso City and County	31
2. The Geography and Economy of Rural Far West Texas	34
3. Population Density, Growth and Development Patterns	37

4.	Inter-Regional and Inter-National Travel Dynamics and Patterns	39
5.	The Population and Characteristics of El Paso and Far West Texas	39
G.	Health and Human Service Agency Survey of Mobility Needs	45
1.	Public and Transit Consumer Surveys	51
2.	Other Transportation Considerations	52
3.	Accessible Transportation Coalition	53
H.	Other Needs Assessments	54
I.	Assessment Conclusions and Implications for Regional Mobility and Coordination	54
IV.	Regional Mobility Gap and Duplication Analysis	58
A.	Mapping of Needs to Inventory	58
1.	Gaps in Regional Transportation System	58
2.	Geographic Distribution of System Gaps	59
3.	Transportation Gaps for Older Adults	62
4.	Transportation Gaps for Persons with Disabilities	62
5.	Transportation Provider Operational Challenges	63
6.	Duplication in Regional Transportation System	63
7.	Geographic Distribution of Transportation Duplication	64
5.	Consequences of System Gaps and Duplication	64
B.	Gap/Duplication Analysis	65
1.	Implications for Regional Mobilit and Coordination	65
2.	Discussion of Strategies to Address System Needs/Gaps/ Duplication	66
3.	Capacity of Transportation System to Respond to Needs /Gaps/ Duplication	69
V.	Alignment and Integration of Transportation Planning Processes	70
VI.	Regional Transportation Priorities, Recommendations and Actions	72
A.	Statement of Regional Transportation Coordination Vision	72
B.	Statement of Regional Transportation Coordination Mission	72
C.	Regional Transportation Coordination Goals & Objectives	72
VII.	Sustaining Regional Transportation Coordination Planning and Implementing Plan Elements	76
VIII.	Measuring Regional Transportation Coordination Performance and Effectiveness	78
	Attachment I – Inventory of Transportation Resources	80
	Attachment II – Transportation Consumer Surveys	81
	Attachment III – Human Service Agency interview Guide	82

I. Executive Summary

A. Plan Purpose

This plan represents the third Transportation Coordination Plan for the Far West Texas/El Paso Region and attempts to identify mobility priorities and formulate strategies to address those priorities through greater coordination between health and human service organizations and public transportation providers. The plan is based upon an assessment of the needs of transit dependent populations with special emphasis on older adults, persons with disabilities, persons with low incomes, veterans, commuters and children. The plan is also based on an inventory of existing transportation resources with an analysis of the gaps and redundancies in the existing public transportation system. The plan enumerates specific actions and projects to address system gaps, duplication, and population growth, while also outlining activities to achieve greater system efficiency and innovation. This plan attempts to articulate a realistic vision of effective regional mobility achieved through a mission of successful coordination efforts and carefully considered goals and objectives.

B. Planning Requirement and Summary of Coordination Legislation and History

The need for health and human services and public transportation coordination has grown out of the recognition that scores of federal programs support transportation services in one form or another with little or no coordination between them. In separate 1977, 1999 and 2003 reports, the U.S. General Accounting Office identified 62 individual funding streams that fund transportation resulting in inefficiencies, duplication and lack of coordination in local public transportation services. Executive Order 13330 issued on February 4, 2004 states:

Federally assisted community transportation services should be seamless, comprehensive, and accessible to those who rely on them for their lives and livelihoods. Transportation within and between our communities should be as available and affordable as possible.

Human services transportation coordination aims to improve transportation services for persons with disabilities, older adults, and individuals with lower incomes by ensuring that communities coordinate transportation resources provided through multiple federal programs.

Coordination will enhance transportation access, minimize duplication of services, and facilitate the most appropriate cost-effective transportation possible with available resources.

The federal transportation funding bill, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), enacted in 2005 first called for state Departments of Transportation to undertake activities to ensure that maximum feasible coordination of transportation programs occurs to optimize Federal grant awards. The subsequent, Moving Ahead for Progress Twenty First Century (MAP-

21) and, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), both contained provisions encouraging regionally based human services-public transportation coordination planning. The current FAST Act continues to require that a recipient of Section 5310 funds certify that projects selected for funding under this program are included in a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human service transportation plan and that the plan was developed and approved through a process that included participation by seniors; individuals with disabilities; representatives of public, private, nonprofit transportation and human service providers; and other members of the public.

The 78th Legislature of the State of Texas anticipated this need and prior to the issuance of the Executive Order adopted Texas Transportation Code Chapter 461 stating:

Public transportation services are provided in this state by many different entities, both public and private. The multiplicity of public transportation providers and services, coupled with a lack of coordination between state oversight agencies, has generated inefficiencies, overlaps in service, and confusion for consumers.

The code’s amendment established a requirement for “Statewide Coordination of Public Transportation” with three expressed goals:

- ✧ Eliminate waste in the provision of public transportation services;
- ✧ Generate efficiencies that will permit increased levels of service; and
- ✧ Further the state ’s efforts to reduce air pollution

To achieve these goals, the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) established a Regional Service Planning project within the Public Transportation Division in 2005 and required that each of the 24 planning regions in the state submit a Regional Transportation Coordination Plan to the Division by December 2006. Planning grants were awarded to Lead Agencies to support this requirement and stakeholders were identified and organized to begin the planning process. Again in response to its request, an updated regional plan was submitted to TxDOT on August 31, 2011. This plan was requested by TxDOT in February 2015 and represents the region’s third 5-year plan intended to cover the period March 2017-February 2022.

The 2006 and 2011 plans identified numerous transportation priorities, many of which have been achieved through local initiative or with continued support provided by TxDOT and secured by the County of El Paso to sustain a viable regional transportation coordination effort for the Far West Texas Region. A detailed summary of those activities and previous Regional Transportation Coordination accomplishments are profiled in Appendix I of this plan.

C. Summary of the Region’s Population and Geography

The Far West Texas region corresponds with the Rio Grande Council of Governments region, Health and Human Services Region 10, the Workforce Solutions Borderplex Area 10 and the El Paso TxDOT District. The region contains all of Brewster, Culberson, El

Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties with a population of 848,562. Far West Texas is the 12th fastest growing council of governments region in the state according to Texas Data Center estimates for 2016. Much of this growth is concentrated in persons between the ages of 5 and 19 and over 65.

El Paso is home to the University of Texas at El Paso, the second largest school in the UT system, and Ft. Bliss, the largest military base in the United States. The proximity to Ciudad Juárez (the fifth largest city in the Republic of Mexico), Las Cruces (the second largest city in New Mexico) and White Sand Missile Range adds significant commuter demands on public transportation systems.

The region is 82.2% Hispanic and well above the state rate in percent of persons with a disability, with low income or elderly. Some communities in the region have poverty rates two to three times the state average. The region has amongst the lowest level of educational attainment and, along with the low incomes, suggests a greater reliance on public programs and a greater need for health services. The incidence of diabetes among low-income Hispanics is especially high resulting in a large increase of dialysis care. These factors combine to create a higher level of transit dependency than would be indicated by population size alone.

The region is the largest geographically in the state with an area of 21,709 square miles and contains five of the six largest counties in Texas. The five eastern counties in the region are considered highly rural or frontier and characterized by a few small towns that lie from 25 to 100 miles to the nearest community. The small size limits the level of amenities most of these local communities can support, especially medical and social services, resulting in extremely long distances to basic services. The mountainous region is traversed by state highways and county roads which often limit the ability of the elderly and infirm to drive the long distances necessary to obtain services. The long distances, as much as 200 miles round trip to the nearest pharmacy or 400 miles to the nearest dialysis center, also present economic barriers for persons with low income who are least likely to own well maintained and fuel efficient cars. The long distances and few local medical services are major reasons why many elderly persons leave rural communities in the region, negatively impacting local economies.

In El Paso, the Franklin Mountains extend south from the New Mexico border to within a mile of the Rio Grande, bisecting the city and squeezing traffic onto a highly congested I-10 corridor. The mountains complicate east-west travel and present challenges for the city's fixed-route transit system.

D. Population Dynamics

Complex dynamics associated with a massive expansion and subsequent contraction of Ft. Bliss in El Paso and social conditions in northern Mexico make long term predictions of El Paso's growth uncertain. While not counted in U.S. population figures, Juarez, Mexico, a city of 1.3 million people, is highly interdependent with El Paso both culturally and economically. Separated by only the narrow channel of the Rio Grande and home to five ports of entry with 65,000 border crossings daily, the combined populations of the

two cities would make the metropolitan area the third largest in Texas behind Houston and Dallas-Ft. Worth.

Four of the five eastern counties in the region are among the few rural counties in the state that grew between 2000 and 2010 but only one, Brewster County, grew between 2010 and 2014, adding just 38 residents. The remote beauty of the region both attracts retirees and visitors that return to make the region home and contributes to its transportation challenges. Recently announced shale discoveries and solar energy projects taking advantage of the area's natural resources could have a significant impact on the area's population, roadways and population needs.

E. Summary of Needs Assessment

While they share common mobility needs, the extreme differences between the relatively urban El Paso and the sparsely populated eastern counties is reflected in the differences in their transportation needs as well. In El Paso, rapid population growth of the communities outside the city limits in El Paso County overburdens the rural transit system serving those communities. The growing population and ridership is demanding expanded hours of service, especially in the early morning, as well as frequency of service. Additionally, there is a demand for more express service to reduce commute times. Many persons cite the difficulty of using the fixed route system when accompanied by more than one child, especially with a stroller. Of greater difficulty is getting to work after first getting a child to childcare when reliant on the fixed route system. Pathways to bus stops are not always accessible, there are too few shelters (an important accessibility feature given the often harsh West Texas climate), stops are not well marked, and a range of improvements are needed to accommodate persons with visual impairments.

The Sun Metro paratransit system known as the LIFT, provides demand-response coverage ¾ mile on either side of fixed routes and supplements the service using §5310 funds to provide additional coverage. Nevertheless, the LIFT provides only very limited same day service, which inhibits mobility for persons dependent on that service, and operates in a curb to curb mode which can limit the mobility of others.

El Paso County operates five commuter routes but does not provide complementary ADA paratransit services for residents of El Paso County outside the El Paso city limits. That gap is currently filled through a collaborative using §5310 funds, an approach that may not always be reliable considering the increasing rural need and demands on this funding source. El Paso County and Sun Metro's fixed route systems use common stops and transit centers to facilitate transfers and now cross-lists routes, boarding locations and other information in each other's service literature as a result of a previous transportation coordination project; however, passenger fares do not transfer from one system to the other. In addition, rapid rural community growth is occurring in disconnected urbanized areas for which El Paso County does not receive formula rural transit funds (§5311) making it increasingly difficult to address growing demand. These urbanized areas are factored into Sun Metro's urbanized (§5307) formula funding but local ordinance prohibits the provision of services beyond the city limits. The combination of these issues increasingly suggests the need for more seamless integration or combination of

these two systems into a single metropolitan transit service for all of El Paso City and County.

The five eastern counties of the region are largely served by one provider, Big Bend Community Action Committee (BBCAC), that operates general public, Medicaid, veterans, elderly and disabled and contracted transportation services through a demand-response and subscription service approach. Since all of BBCAC's services are provided in a demand-response mode, coverage in their large service area is nearly universal. Mixing multiple populations in the rural services increases the efficiency of the provider but often results in very early departure times, long waits and long trips.

BBCAC faces the challenge of servicing a very large geographical area and the long hours place high demands on vehicle drivers. Indeed, driver retention is a significant barrier to service expansion for BBCAC. Driver shortages have resulted in service reductions with some potential riders expressing frustration that the service is often not available when needed. More midday service could provide riders more service options and likely increase ridership. Advance reservation requirements limit mobility options and the introduction of a same day service alternative could address non-emergency medical or other needs that nonetheless have some degree of urgency. The feasibility of scheduled fixed-route service was the subject of a prior transportation coordination study which found insufficient resources (and drivers) to support both fixed route and demand response services; however, public interest in fixed-route remains and may increase public awareness and support for general public transportation services in the region.

F. Summary of Transportation Inventory

General public transportation exists throughout the region in the form of a fixed-route and paratransit system in the city of El Paso operated by Sun Metro; commuter service to the various communities in El Paso County outside the El Paso city limits operated by the County of El Paso; and general public demand-response service throughout Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties operated by Big Bend Community Action Committee. The latter service was introduced as a direct result of earlier regional transportation coordination efforts and therefore represents relatively new public transportation infrastructure for the residents of the five eastern counties of the region.

The region also benefits from two Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) projects that are approaching the end of their funding which could significantly affect the level of service that continues.

An Inter-City Bus (§5311f-ICB) subsidized commuter bus route provides weekday north and southbound service between El Paso and La Cruces, New Mexico with a midway stop in Anthony, Texas providing critical access for that low income community to the urban labor markets and White Sands Missile Range.

The Medical Transportation Program (MTP) that provides non-emergency medical transportation for the entire region is managed by Project Amistad which directly

operates the service in El Paso County and subcontracts for the service with BBCAC in the eastern counties. BBCAC also provides general public and various specialized transportation programs for veterans, non-MTP eligible and other riders through an integrated demand-response service, resulting in a high level of service integration in that system.

Recent changes to the Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities Program (§5310) which was formerly exclusively administered by TxDOT is now broken into urbanized and rural components. The program has provided capital support throughout the region to qualified organizations serving the elderly and persons with disabilities for the purchase of public transit vehicles and now allows a significant portion of funds to support operating costs. The rural component, still administered by TxDOT, is currently being used to subsidize much needed vehicle maintenance costs. The urban and financially much larger component is administered by the El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and is currently being used to support senior transportation in Socorro, fixed-route deviations in south central New Mexico and demand-response services in El Paso and rural El Paso County for trips with urban destinations.

The Area Agency on Aging provides funding to a variety of providers to support the operating cost of transportation services for segments of the elderly population. Many health and human service agencies purchase passes or contract for services using the existing transit providers. Some service organizations operate their own transportation programs to address specific client needs or because the organization's services are limited to enrolled clients for whom transportation is provided as an integrated package of services.

Regional transportation providers maintain extensive fleets but the current region-wide average vehicle age is now more than five years.

El Paso benefits from multiple inter-city bus and train services by virtue of its population density and placement on the I-10, I-20 and I-25 corridors. There is limited inter-city service in the eastern counties with Greyhound bus service only stopping in Van Horn and Amtrak only stopping in Alpine. All Aboard America links Presidio, Marfa, and Alpine with Ft. Stockton and Midland-Odessa in the adjacent region.

El Paso International Airport is the only facility in the region supporting commercial air traffic. Several municipal general aviation airports in the eastern counties provide critical access to air ambulance, fire suppression, emergency services and economic development for remote communities.

G. Mobility Issues and Priorities

Coordination between and among human service and transportation providers remains an important issue for the region, as is maintaining pace with population growth and land development. Better use of existing resources will result from effective policies and travel training programs to encourage and facilitate greater use of the Sun Metro and El Paso County fixed-route systems. Allowing seamless transfer between the County and

Sun Metro systems or the integration of the two systems into a single, county-wide metropolitan transit system will enhance this objective.

The region should continue to design and implement transportation solutions that address specific unmet mobility needs including those of single parents commuting to and from work and childcare, victims of domestic violence unable to use fixed-route services, residents of remote communities that require off-hours or more flexible options, and other specific populations that do not have access to private autos.

An Accessible Transportation Coalition previously explored multiple accessibility issues related to accessible pathways for the fixed-route system and scheduling for the demand-response systems. Their recommendations should continue to be carefully considered and proper resources identified and deployed so service levels are not diminished to address these needs.

Same day service also continues to be very limited on both the urban and rural demand-response systems, severely limiting mobility when persons dependent on these systems cannot anticipate transportation needs in advance. Appropriate resources obtained to expand services or derived from service efficiencies could be used to address this issue. Additionally, the recruitment of independent drivers through the MTP or innovative partnering with private taxi or shared-ride services could alleviate this need.

Lack of service awareness was not identified as a high priority in the needs assessment; nevertheless much more could be done to maximize the functionality and utility of MyVetRide and its underlying one-call/one-click potential to achieve a truly comprehensive one-stop transportation information, eligibility and scheduling system for the region.

In the eastern counties, there was a notable improvement in transportation services awareness but increased concerns about service availability. The on-going challenge of recruiting and retaining qualified drivers should remain an urgent priority to combat the growing perception that weekday service is not reliably available and cannot be counted upon as a viable transportation resource. Increasing service frequency and possibly offering targeted fixed-route services should continue to be explored when resources are available. Alternatives to very long trips, reducing deadheads, and facilitating innovative mobility solutions for very remote communities through car sharing and other practices should be explored as is the continuing need to develop a viable transportation solution for residents of south Brewster county.

H. Vision and Summary of Plan Goals, Objectives, Recommendations and Actions

The vision of the Far West Texas/El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee is that all persons of the six-county region will have access to customer-centered, dependable, convenient and safe transportation services and choices. The Committee's purpose and mission is to maximize mobility and achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness of public transportation resources through proactive planning and

coordination between transportation providers and health and human services providers. To this end, the region adopted six goals:

1. Maintain an inclusive and sustainable planning process that seeks and values public participation, communicates its goals and activities to the public and honors its regional plan and priorities.
2. Fill unacceptable gaps in service, especially for transit dependent populations through the continuous identification and assessment of changing mobility needs, expansion of financial support, increased efficiency, redeployment of redundant resources and services innovation.
3. Provide technical assistance and training to transit providers and encourage linkages between providers and with organizations serving transit dependent populations to create a customer-centered and seamless public transportation system.
4. Ensure broad public knowledge of transit services and issues and maintain effective public awareness efforts targeted to significant segments regarding specialized services and resources.
5. Work to eliminate physical, financial, regulatory and operational barriers to the delivery of seamless regional services.
6. Enhance the mobility of older adults and persons with disabilities through an inclusive and deliberate process that encourages coordinated services and efficient use of limited §5310 funds to ensure the creation and continuation of mobility services where existing transportation services do not fully meet the needs of rural and urban communities.

Each of these goals and associated objectives are included in their entirety in section VI. of this plan.

I. Plan Scope and Framework

The Far West Texas/El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee intends this document to respond to the TxDOT February 2015 request for a new human services-public transportation plan for the six-county Far West Texas Region. The plan includes all the required elements of the Table of Contents required by TxDOT and several additional elements the Far West Texas region considered important to meaningful transportation coordination planning. The plan is built on an assessment of regional transportation needs, an inventory of transportation resources, an analysis of mobility gaps in the current and projected future transportation system and includes a vision for regional mobility, a mission and purpose for regional stakeholders, various goals and related implementing objectives or strategies to achieve our mission. Our intention is to clearly and explicitly address gaps and unmet transportation needs of

priority population groups including individuals with disabilities, older adults, persons with low incomes, veterans, commuters dependent on public transportation and youth.

This plan includes a current inventory of transportation resources (Section II. B) and an assessment of regional mobility needs (Section II. C). Plan Section III. will identify those areas, services, and approaches that represent current and anticipated gaps or deficiencies in the network of existing transportation services as well as identify service redundancy where redeployment of services will potentially increase service levels. Plan Section V. will lay out the regional mobility vision, goals, objectives and principles and a series of actions needed to address system gaps, growth, duplication, efficiency and innovation as well as specific project priorities for the use of various formula and discretionary transportation funding programs. It is beyond the scope of this plan or the activities of the Far West Texas/El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee to direct the planning or operations of transportation providers as directed by Texas Transportation Code Chapter 461.

II. Public Transportation Resources in the Region

A. Introduction and Background

This inventory includes traditional publically funded transportation resources as well as non-traditional and private resources that contribute to the mobility of persons in the region. Effective health and human services and public transportation coordination planning relies on a complete inventory of the region's transportation resources and assets. When compared to a clear and comprehensive assessment of a region's mobility needs, the inventory helps provide a picture of the extent to which those resources meet regional demand and identify gaps and duplication in the broader public transportation system. This inventory is primarily structured to identify transportation provider organizations, highlight their current capacity to deliver transportation services and project their resource needs to continue current levels of service. The inventory is intended to be a key pillar in the regional transportation coordination plan, underpinning the identification of system gaps and duplication and to be a reference for future public transportation planning.

B. Summary of Transportation Inventory

For the purposed of this inventory, public transportation will be classified as **general public** (generally thought of as mass transit); **public commuter** (focused on commuter needs and shares the scheduled fixed-route characteristics of mass transit but without some of its ancillary services); **specialized** (services available to limited eligible population and often limited trip purpose); and **inter-city** (in the form of motor coach or heavy rail service). Public transportation can also be classified by mode (how the service is delivered) including fixed-route, demand-response, vanpool, taxi, light rail, commuter rail, street car, bus rapid transit or motor bus. Different modes can exist within each classification of transit program.

General public transportation exists throughout the region in a variety of different forms or modes depending on service jurisdiction. Within the city limits of El Paso, Sun Metro operates two downtown circulator routes, 49 local bus routes, 13 express or specialized routes and the first of four planned RTS or rapid transit routes often known as bus rapid transit or BRT. Sun Metro's scheduled fixed-route bus service is complemented by ADA paratransit demand-response service and various limited specialty programs seven days a week.

El Paso County provides six scheduled, fixed-route **public commuter** services linking the various rural communities outside the El Paso city limits to Sun Metro transfer centers Monday through Saturday. El Paso County's fixed-route commuter service is not

complemented with a paratransit service; however a specialized service described below addresses some of this need. El Paso County also administers a weekday, morning and evening commute hour motor coach commuter service linking downtown El Paso, Anthony, Texas and Downtown Las Cruces in partnership with the New Mexico Department of Transportation. El Paso County additionally administers an extensive and expanding vanpool program that identifies geographically aligned commuter groups, provides vehicles and awards operating subsidies to reduce commuting cost and reliance on single occupancy vehicles.

Big Bend Community Action Committee, Inc. (BBCAC) provides weekday, general public, demand-response service throughout Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties as a subcontractor to West Texas Opportunities, the transit operator for the Permian Basin Rural Transit District. The latter service was introduced as a result of regional transportation coordination efforts nearly a decade ago and represents a maturing public transportation service for the residents of the five eastern counties of the region.

Several **specialized** demand-response transportation programs exist in the region. The Medical Transportation Program (MTP) is an entitlement, demand-response transportation program available Monday through Saturday for free, preauthorized, curb-to-curb trips to medical services for Medicaid recipients throughout the region. Project Amistad serves as a Managed Transportation Organization for the entire region and directly operates the service in El Paso County and subcontracts for the service to BBCAC in the eastern counties. Since the eastern county MTP sub-contractor also provides general public and various other specialized transportation programs through an integrated demand-response service, there is a high level of service coordination in that system.

A formal collaboration between Sun Metro, Project Amistad, Sun City Cab and Viba Transportation that provides demand-response transportation for the elderly and persons with disabilities exceeds the mandate of complementary ADA paratransit by extending service hours, range and supporting same day service. The program also fills a significant gap in El Paso County's rural demand-response commuter service for trips with an urban destination or for when and where paratransit services are unavailable or cannot be scheduled within a reasonable time. Since Project Amistad also operates the MTP in El Paso County, there is a significant level of service integration in their transit program.

Viba Transportation provides limited demand-response transportation services for Medicare managed care program clients and University Medical Center operates passenger vans for persons discharged from its hospital and in limited other instances when area residents have difficulty accessing its services.

Inter-city bus and train service is available through multiple providers in the City of El Paso by virtue of its population density and placement on the I-10/I-20 and I-25 corridors. Conversely, there is limited inter-city service in the eastern counties. Greyhound Bus Lines serves only Van Horn in Culberson County with multiple east and west bound trips and All Aboard America links Presidio, Marfa, and Alpine with Ft. Stockton and Midland-Odessa in the adjacent region with two northbound and southbound trips each day. Amtrak’s Texas Eagle/Sunset Limited service stops only in Alpine and El Paso with eastbound and westbound services three days each week.

Other transportation providers include six taxi cab companies that are licensed to operate in El Paso and most extend their services to Sunland Park, New Mexico and areas of El Paso County outside the city limits. Sun City Cab contracts with Fort Bliss to provide on-base cab service and operates five accessible cabs allowing it to participate in the collaboration to serve the elderly and persons with disabilities. Through this program it has transported a Sun Metro referred “New Freedom” passenger every day without fail for the last six years. Sun City Cab’s 24/7/365 commitment allows an unprecedented level of mobility for persons dependent on paratransit services. Both Checker and Border Cab have recently added accessible cabs to their fleets. Uber, which uses smart-phone technology to link riders with for-hire drivers also operates in El Paso but without the authority of the City’s vehicle for-hire ordinance and is not known to offer vehicles that are accessible to wheelchair users. Two single vehicle operators provide occasional cab service in the Brewster County community of Alpine. Taxi service in Presidio is generally limited to trips into Ojinaga, Mexico and Van Horn Taxi initiated service in Van Horn while this plan was being developed. No other private transportation services exist in Brewster, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis or Presidio Counties. Former private rural transportation providers cite the high cost of commercial vehicle liability insurance as the barrier to continuing service or entry into the market.

Table 1 Transit Service Availability by County

Transit Service / Service Area	Brewster	Culberson	El Paso	Jeff Davis	Hudspeth	Presidio	El Paso City
Fixed-Route General Public							√
Fixed-Route Commuter			√				
Demand-Response ADA Paratransit							√
Demand-Response Medicaid	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Demand-Response Veteran	√	√		√	√	√	√
Demand-Response General Public	√	√		√	√	√	
Demand-Response Specialized	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Inter-City Bus	√	√	√			√	√
Amtrak Rail	√						√
Taxi	√	√	√				√
Uber			√				√
VanPool			√				√

El Paso International Airport is the only facility in the region supporting commercial air traffic. The terminal is served by two Sun Metro routes, several public shuttles serving Las Cruces, Sunland Park and various destinations, private shuttles to hotels and four taxi cab companies. Several municipal general aviation airports in the eastern counties support private air travel and provide critical access to air ambulance, fire suppression, emergency services and economic development for remote communities. The airports in Alpine and Marfa make courtesy cars available to some travelers, but because public transportation in these areas is demand-response requiring advance reservations, transit is unavailable to arrivals who have not requested and received confirmation of service in advance of their arrival.

C. Approach and Inventory Methodology

Information for this Inventory was obtained directly from the transportation providers through a combination of written surveys, responses to follow-up questions and phone interviews. The purpose was to be as complete and comprehensive as possible, yet depict information in the clearest and most meaningful way for transportation coordination purposes. By their nature, public transportation resources are fluid and change depending on funding levels, program and/or contract terms, logistical considerations or ridership demands. Each transportation provider is discussed in some detail and individually profiled in charts appearing in Attachment I. Transit services and resources are organized to avoid duplicate counts, since several programs are associated with one entity and operated by another. This separation is important given the vast differences in transportation needs, approaches, trip logistics and other concerns between the urban and rural communities. The profiles rely partially on the inventory of TxDOT funded transportation resources prepared by the Texas Transportation Institute in 2015, but even for resources included in the TTI inventory, additional information was collected and an attempt was made to update any information that may have changed. The TTI inventory included only two TxDOT funded transportation providers in the region.

While rolling stock is certainly key to the delivery of public transportation services, a listing of actual vehicles is not the focus of this inventory. A listing of vehicles will be included in the appendix, but the inventory will focus on transportation programs, partnerships, service integration, and funding.

D. Inventory Limitations

Any such inventory necessarily depicts resources in place at a point in time and therefore may not be an accurate picture at a future point. To address this concern, care was taken to provide some historical data to establish funding trends, nevertheless, the future is unpredictable and the reader should attempt to verify information for more current

periods. The current political environment also creates a large amount of uncertainty about future funding levels impacting the level of local service so trend analysis may be an unreliable predictor of future resources. Unlike the previous plan, this inventory does not include school bus fleet information from the region's school districts. Since responses to the transportation resources questionnaire are voluntary and the plan staff had no means to compel a response, some transportation organizations failed to respond and there are unfortunate omissions.

E. El Paso City and County Inventory Detail

The City of El Paso occupying the extreme western tip of the region has a population of 669,711 in its 1013 square miles with a resulting density of 611 persons per mile. The balance of El Paso County, outside the El Paso County city limits, has a population of 154,151 and a density of 202 persons per square mile. General public transit is provided within the El Paso city limits by Sun Metro, a municipal department of the City of El Paso and governed by its City Council acting as a Mass Transit Board. Sun Metro is the direct recipient of large urban (49 CFR §5307) formula and related transit funds from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and receives a portion of the city sales tax to offset operating costs.

Sun Metro operates 64 urban fixed and circulator routes and the LIFT, its paratransit system. Sun Metro awarded First Transit Inc. the transit management contract for fixed-route service and MV Transportation Inc. the transit service contract for its LIFT paratransit system. Sun Metro also operates one route through an intergovernmental agreement for service to Sunland Park, New Mexico and operates one route through an interlocal agreement with the County of El Paso. Sun Metro recently transitioned its fixed-route hub and spoke configuration to a feeder system built around six transfer centers also served by circulator routes. The change allows more express service from the terminals to downtown and other major destinations. Sun Metro's paratransit service, The LIFT, exceeds the complementary ADA standard and operates 1.5 miles beyond its fixed route services but within the city limits.

A major element of Sun Metro's reconfiguration is the launch of one bus rapid transit (BRT) line along the highly commercial Mesa Street corridor and the planned introduction of three additional BRT lines along the Alameda, Montana, and Dyer corridors. Each line will feature stations with raised platforms to facilitate level bus entry and prepaid fares to speed loading.

The El Paso Streetcar Project is in construction. El Paso Streetcar consists of a 4.8 mile, single-tracked loop system, with 27 stops. The El Paso Streetcar will begin at the Downtown Transfer Center in the area near the Downtown Shopping District and

International Bridges, traveling north through a downtown loop via Santa Fe, Franklin, Kansas and Father Rahm, as well as a northern loop via Stanton, Baltimore/Glory Road, and Oregon passing the University of Texas at El Paso area, the Cincinnati Entertainment District, then returning back to the downtown loop.

Sun Metro operates a combined fixed-route/paratransit fleet of 232 active buses and logs 9.8 million vehicle revenue miles annually. The current average age of the Sun Metro fleet is 6.5 years. Sun Metro maintains 530 passenger shelters.

Fares on Sun Metro fixed-routes are currently range from \$.30 to \$1.50 with standard day, weekly and monthly passes costing \$3.50, \$12.00 and \$48.00 respectively. Various discounts are offered for seniors and persons with disabilities, students and members of the armed forces. One way fares on the paratransit LIFT service are \$2.50. Certified LIFT users can use any Sun Metro fixed-route service free of charge.

Sun Metro is the previous recipient of urbanized Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC, 49 USC §5316) funds and operates a city-wide demand-response service called Jobs Express for low income individuals referred by several human service organizations. Appropriations for the JARC program were not included in either the Moving Ahead for Progress-Twenty First Century (MAP-21) or FAST Act and Sun Metro's JARC funds will expire within the next 12 months resulting in uncertainty for those programs. Another JARC funded program operated by the Opportunities Center, an El Paso based homeless services agency, has already expired.

Sun Metro has been the recipient of New Freedom funds (49 USC §5317) with which it contracted with Project Amistad, Sun City Cab, Viba and Volar Transportation to provide services that go beyond its ADA mandate including extended hours, extended range, will call and limited same day service. This collaboration is continuing with the award of an Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities program grant (49 USC §5310) to Project Amistad by the El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the designated recipient of urbanized §5310 funds. Information about Sun Metro's transit programs and services, including route maps and schedules can be found at: <http://www.sunmetro.net/index.html>

The County of El Paso serves as a Rural Transit District (RTD) for the area of the County outside the El Paso city limits for which it receives a combination of state and federal public transportation funds under 49 USC 5311 and subcontracts with First Transit Inc. for the operation of four general public commuter service fixed-routes. El Paso County also receives Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and contracts with Sun Metro and First Transit for two additional commuter service fixed-routes. The County is the recipient of a TxDOT administered Inter-City Bus grant and partners with New

Mexico Department of Transportation to provide express motor-coach service between El Paso, Anthony, Texas and Las Cruces, New Mexico operated by All Aboard America, a for profit inter-city bus company. Through a separate CMAQ grant, El Paso County administers a vanpool program operated by Enterprise Inc. that identifies and organizes rider groups, supplies and maintains leased passenger vans and currently manages 55 vanpools throughout the county.

The County of El Paso bus fleet consists of 15 mini-busses with a seating capacity of 18, including space for two wheelchairs. Communication between dispatch and drivers is accomplished by cell phone. All of the County vehicles are wheelchair lift equipped. The average age of vehicles in the County of El Paso fleet is 7 years but at the time of this writing, funds have been secured to replace the two highest mileage vehicles in the fleet. Apart from stops at Sun Metro transfer centers, there are no passenger shelters along El Paso County Transit's routes, a previously identified issue and subject of a transportation coordination planning project to identify potential sites and unsuccessful capital funding application. Information about El Paso County's transportation programs, including routes and schedules can be found at www.epcounty.com/transit

The University of Texas at El Paso provides fixed route transportation services for its students, faculty and staff, also through a subcontract arrangement with First Transit, operating five fixed routes on and around the UTEP campus adjacent to El Paso's downtown. Service is provided without fare to UTEP students, faculty and staff presenting valid IDs funded through student fees. The Miner Metro fleet consists of 11 mini-buses with a seating capacity of 16 and five standard buses with a capacity of 28. All but one of the mini-buses are wheelchair lift equipped. Information about Miner Metro can be found at www.utep.edu/search/minermetromap.aspx

Project Amistad (PA), is a large, non-profit social service agency and currently holds the contract with the Texas Department of State Health Services to operate the demand-responsive Medical Transportation Program (MTP) for a twenty-three county region of west Texas as a Managed Transportation Organization (MTO). PA directly operates the MTP in El Paso County and subcontracts with Big Bend Community Action Committee to operate the MTP program in Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis, and Presidio Counties and with West Texas Opportunities for the remaining counties. The MTP provides free transportation for Medicaid recipients and, given the importance of medical services access and the growing number and frequency of trips to dialysis clinics, is a core element of specialty transportation services.

PA participates in the city-wide demand-response program collaboration using El Paso MPO administered urbanized New Freedom funds and operates two rural fixed-routes linking rural El Paso county communities Sun Metro transfer centers using TxDOT

administered rural JARC funds. The near term expiration of that JARC funding leaves the future of those programs uncertain. Additionally, PA provides transportation services for the El Paso Housing Authority, for Komen for the Cure and for clients of Project Bravo, a private non-profit community action agency. Project Amistad maintains a fleet of 49 mini-buses and 7 vans, all wheelchair-lift equipped, with a seating capacity ranging from 12 to 20. The average age of a PA vehicle is 7.5 years.

Project Amistad also hosts a regional Aging, Disability and Transportation Resource Center (ADRTC), a veterans services program with a transit component and offers numerous other services. More information about Project Amistad can be accessed at www.projectamistad.org

Bienvivir Senior Health Services is also a private non-profit organization that operates a program of all-inclusive health care for the elderly which includes transportation for its member clients in defined areas of the city and county of El Paso. While limited to its member clients, the organization provides comprehensive health services, including limited housing and adult day activities, and operates an extensive transportation system which may represent a model for this important and growing population. The Bienvivir fleet consists of 39 mini-buses, 34 of which are wheelchair lift equipped, with a seating capacity ranging from 9 to 12. All the Bienvivir vehicles have GPS and the average age is 6 years. Information about Bienvivir programs is located at www.bienvivir.org

University Medical Center operates a patient shuttle service for out-patient and non-emergency hospital admissions and discharges for patients without other transportation. The service also provides limited demand-response service to hospital affiliated persons to non-hospital medical appointments on an advance request basis. No other hospital in the region provides these services. The University Medical Center (formerly Thomason Hospital) has a fleet of two, 14 passenger mini-buses, both equipped with a wheelchair lift. www.umcelpaso.org

The Opportunity Center for the Homeless is a non-profit services agency offering medical, mental health, substance abuse, veterans, employment, education, temporary shelter and long-term housing programs. The Opportunity Center also operates a demand-response transportation service for residents of shelter and housing programs and clients of various services organizations using three, 9-seat passenger vans with an average age of 10 years. After HUD funds supporting the program were exhausted, the Opportunity Center scaled back the program which nevertheless, continues to deliver 30 rides per day. The Opportunity Center also provides dispatching services to Sun Metro's Job Express program providing an average of 60 rides per day. www.homelessopportunitycenter.org

Viba Transportation is a private, for-profit transportation company and provides demand-responsive transportation services for eligible seniors and patient transportation services

under service contracts with the Area Agency on Aging, Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services (DARS), Medicare managed-care organizations and area medical providers. Viba also participates in the §5310 funded collaboration with Sun Metro, Project Amistad, Sun City Cab and Volar to provide enhanced mobility for older adults and persons with disabilities. Viba maintains a fleet of 3, one year old, 8-passenger vans and 5 wheelchair lift-equipped mini-buses with an average age of 7 years. www.vibatransport.com

The City of Socorro recently received §5310 funding from the El Paso MPO for the purchase of one lift equipped, 14-passenger vehicle to support its senior services program. Centro De Salud Familiar La Fe, a community health program; Nazareth Hall Nursing Center; and Good Samaritan Society – White Acres have previously received assistance through TxDOT’s §5310 program to purchase vehicles which they operate to provide transportation services exclusively for their own clients.

Sun City Cab is a local taxi-cab operator and is contracted by the U.S. Army to provide on-base transportation services for Ft. Bliss personnel. Sun City Cab previously received a New Freedom grant, administered by the El Paso MPO, to provide accessible cab services that go beyond the ADA paratransit requirements for riders referred by Sun Metro’s paratransit LIFT program. As noted in the summary above, through a combination of New Freedom and §5310 funds, Sun City Cab has transported program participants every day without fail for the last six years. Five other taxi companies are licensed by the City of El Paso to provide cab services in the City which does not limit the number of licenses issued. Uber also operates in El Paso, but outside of the City’s Vehicle for Hire ordinance which is currently being revised to encourage more entrants into the market and strengthen enforcement across all providers regardless of business model. www.suncitycab.com

El Paso is also served by Amtrak, Greyhound, El Paso-Los Angeles Limousine and Los Paisanos Autobuses through their respective downtown terminals. Amtrak provides 3 east and west bound inter-city trips each week. Greyhound provides 2 east-bound (I-10), 5 northeast-bound (I-20) and 9 west-bound (I-10) and 3 north-bound (I-25) inter-city trips each day from El Paso. Both operators link to their national networks. El Paso-Los Angeles Limousine also provides motor-coach service with 4 west-bound departures, 3 north-bound and three south-bound (Ciudad Chihuahua) departures each day. Another private operator provided cross border service to Juarez every 90 minutes.

El Paso International Airport (ELP) hosts 6 commercial airlines offering 49 daily departures and active air taxi, armed forces and general aviation service. A combined total of 2,763,213 persons enplaned and deplaned at the airport in 2015. ELP is served by two Sun Metro fixed route and three of the City’s five licensed cab companies with 96

cabs permitted to serve the ELP terminal along with several rental car companies. Horizon City and Fabens each host a municipal, general aviation airport, the only other airports in El Paso County, with fuel service and lighted runways of 6400 and 4200 feet respectively.

In summary, El Paso city and county enjoy a relatively high level of mobility through their respective fixed and commuter route systems, multiple specialized demand-responsive services, free Medicaid transportation and numerous private and inter-city services.

F. Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio County Inventory Detail

The eastern counties of the Far West Texas region include Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis, and Presidio Counties, an area of 20,696 square miles and bordered by the Permian Basin to the east, the Republic of Mexico to the south and the State of New Mexico to the north. The five rural counties of the region have a combined population, area and density of 25,783 persons, 20,696 square miles, and 1.2 persons per square mile.

Big Bend Community Action Committee, Inc. (BBCAC), headquartered in Marfa, Texas is the sole public transportation operator for the five rural counties of the region and operates demand-responsive MTP and rural (49 USC §5311) general public transportation services for Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties. The MTP services are provided as a subcontractor to Project Amistad and the general public transportation services are provided as a subcontractor to West Texas Opportunities, the RTD operator in the adjacent Permian Basin. BBCAC also receives transportation funding from the Big Bend Regional Hospital District for medical trips not covered by the MTP and from the Highly Rural Transportation Grant (HRTG) program of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs for trips to and from VA medical facilities or VA paid medical care.

With the exception of the MTP, each of the other transportation programs resulted from regional transportation coordination planning efforts. Additionally, BBCAC operates mid-day services transporting elderly subscription passengers to congregate meals programs in Alpine, Marfa and Presidio with Older American Act funding from the Area Agency on Aging (AAA), and is contracted by area churches to provide transportation for their services and events. BBCAC maintains transportation offices and bus fleet in Alpine, Marfa, Presidio and Van Horn.

While all of BBCAC's transportation services operate on a door-to-door, demand-responsive basis requiring advance scheduling, many trips occur on a regular and

predictable basis. Because it is the only operator of §5311, MTP and AAA transportation in the region, its services are highly integrated with passengers representing each program often present on each trip. As the previous recipient of §5310 funds to purchase vehicles and operator of nutrition and other related transportation services for older adults and persons with disabilities, BBCAC regularly received rural §5310 funds for preventative maintenance, helping to offset operating costs and perpetuating its integrated service mix.

BBCAC maintains a fleet of 13 passenger vans with seating capacity 5 and 12 mini-buses with seating for 10 to 12. All but five of the vehicles can accommodate one or more wheelchairs and 2-way communications. The average age of the vehicles in the fleet is about 5 years. Information about Big Bend Community Action Committee is available at www.bbcac.org

Big Bend Regional Medical Center and the Cities of Marfa and Presidio and the Sunshine House in Alpine also received past §5310 grants for vehicle purchases to support senior nutrition and related activities. None of those vehicles remain in service and each organization now contracts with BBCAC for mid-day congregate meal transportation maximizing the use of transit assets.

All Aboard America provides inter-city motor coach service between Presidio and Midland with two north-bound and two south-bound trips each day with stops in Marfa and Alpine in the region and Ft. Stockton, Crane, McCamey, Odessa, the Midland-Odessa Airport (MAS) and Midland. Greyhound operates east and westbound service along I-10 with Van Horn in Culberson County, it's only stop in the region. www.allboardamerica.com

Likewise, Amtrak runs three east and west bound trains each week along the Union Pacific corridor with its Sunset Limited service, but its only stop in the region outside of El Paso is in Alpine in Brewster County. www.amtrak.com

The only Greyhound stop in the eastern counties is in the city of Van Horn. A regional transportation coordination supported request was made to Greyhound to reinstate a stop in Sierra Blanca which received an affirmative response in 2015, but to date service to that community has not been restored. www.greyhound.com

The only taxi service in the five eastern counties is operated by two companies with a total of 2 vehicles and limited to service originating in the City of Alpine and one new company operating one vehicle in Van Horn. Former and current operators note the challenge of providing taxi service in small rural communities given the high cost of commercial liability insurance.

Public, general aviation airports in the region are located in Alpine, Del City, Marfa, Presidio and Van Horn with paved and lighted runways of 6000, 4700, 6200, 5200 and 6000 feet in length. Presidio, Van Horn and Del City are unstaffed facilities without fuel. Alpine and Marfa are minimally staffed airports with fixed based operators providing fuel, automated weather observing stations (AWOS) and other services. While not enabling general public mobility, general aviation airports afford an important transportation resource for the rural communities especially by supporting air ambulance, fire suppression efforts, law enforcement and business travel vital to the economies of remote rural communities. Their further development has the potential to improve these services and access to them by residents of the surrounding communities.

G. Public Transportation Funding

Sun Metro receives annual capital §5307 funding directly from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), a portion of El Paso city sales tax and funds from El Paso County to operate one route. West Texas Opportunities/Big Bend Community Action Committee receive §5311 capital and operating assistance directly from TxDOT based on formulas that consider land area, population, and various performance factors such a revenue miles, passenger boardings and local contribution to operating expenses. As the designated urban recipient, the El Paso MPO receives annual FTA allocations of §5310 Enhance Mobility for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities program funding based on a similar formula that includes incidence of those populations. TxDOT receives an annual §5310 allocation from the FTA which it re-allocates to each TxDOT district. Both the El Paso MPO and TxDOT conduct competitive selection processes to award §5310 resources to eligible recipients in their jurisdictions.

Significantly, the FAST Act requires that projects receiving §5310 funds must be included in regionally developed human services – public transportation coordination plans. The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act also allows 45% of §5310 to support operating expenses. Since §5310 resources are one of the few remaining discretionary transportation funding programs and because it is the only program for which the region receives annual rural and urban allocations, transportation coordination planning should carefully consider this new flexibility and attempt to match capital and operating needs to unique and otherwise unfunded transportation gaps in the region.

MAP-21 eliminated the JARC and New Freedom funding programs, but allow recipients of §5307 and §5311 transportation funds to operate JARC and New Freedom programs using their formula allocations. This rule also affords operators in the region a degree of flexibility but may put JARC and New Freedom type programs in competition with core formula funded transit services.

Additional discretionary funding is often awarded by TxDOT or the FTA on a competitive basis to support various, often capital expenses. Thanks to recent Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) competitive grant program funded purchases, several older rural system vehicles were recently replaced but the region-wide average vehicle age is still about seven years.

The Area Agency on Aging provides funding (Title II B and E of the Older Americans Act) to a variety of providers to support the operating cost of transportation services for the elderly population. Besides AAA, only Workforce Solutions Borderplex Area 10 and the Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services spend significant program funds on client transportation, mostly through the purchase of bus passes and occasionally through the reimbursement of private auto use.

In addition to the various factors in transit funding formulas, federal support for public transportation is ultimately determined by congressional and legislative appropriations. In the short term, transit funding levels were marginally increased with the passage of the FAST Act and to a lesser degree in the most recent Texas Legislative session.

H. Inventory Results and Analysis

General public transportation exists throughout the region with fixed-route and paratransit services available for most of the El Paso urbanized area, commuter service available in the rural communities of El Paso County and demand-response services available in the five eastern counties. Sun Metro's fixed route service provides ready access to the locations of most workforce, housing, public assistance intake locations, community action, emergency shelter, hospitals and other health and human services organizations in El Paso County. A multi-provider collaborative augments Sun Metro's paratransit program in El Paso and even provides service to rural residents with urban destinations.

Two JARC funded fixed routes operated by Project Amistad provide transportation to needy colonias adjacent to El Paso, but the future of that service is uncertain with the expiration of those funding sources. Likewise, both Sun Metro's Job Express and the closely aligned Homeless Opportunity Center transportation program currently rely on soon-to-expire JARC funds.

The Area Agency on Aging provides Title III B & E funds to cover transportation operating expenses for organizations providing transportation for older adults. TxDOT has previously provided \$5310 funds for the purchase of vehicles serving the elderly and persons with disabilities and now supports the preventative maintenance of those vehicles. These resources are often combined for the operation of their typically demand-response or subscription transportation programs. The El Paso MPO has become the

recipient of urbanized §5310 funds and has awarded grants to area providers for both capital purchase and operations expense, including support of the multi-provider collaborative noted above.

The entirety of the Far West Texas region is served by the Medical Transportation Program which provides six day a week door-to-door, demand-response services in all six counties. Project Amistad is the regional Managed Transportation Organization for the MTP and directly provides the service in El Paso County and Ft. Hancock. MTP services in Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties are subcontracted to BBCAC which has operated the MTP continuously for over 25 years. Administered by the Department of State Health Services, the State of Texas made structural changes to the program which included the conversion to a capitated funding system whereby each region receives a fixed sum for transportation services based on the number of eligible recipients in the region. Changes in the capitation formula complicate advance planning, but the system has been able to provide all eligible requested trips.

The eastern counties §5311 funded general public transit services resulted from recommendations found in the *Far West Texas / Regional Transportation Coordination Plan* submitted to TxDOT in December 2006 and follow-up coordination efforts conducted by the County of El Paso following the plan's submission. Early efforts of the provider concentrated on developing a fleet and other infrastructure allowing limited service. As capital resources were secured, service levels have greatly increased with trips to Midland-Odessa and El Paso occurring almost every weekday in addition to local demand-response weekday service through the five eastern counties.

The sole operator in the eastern counties of the region, BBCAC, provides general public transportation, non-emergency medical transportation, various older adult transportation services, veterans' transportation and other subsidized transportation services for specialized populations. As a result, BBCAC operates in a highly integrated fashion mixing passengers from various programs on each trip, consistent with an early objective of transportation coordination planning. Furthermore, BBCAC makes efficient and effective use of §5310 preventative maintenance funds, particularly in light of the high concentration of older adults and disabled passengers. Nevertheless, combined funding levels and efficiently integrated services still do not afford the resources necessary to dispatch many vehicles from each originating community every day, limiting mobility options. The lack of viable taxi-cab or other vehicle for hire services combined with the advance notification requirement of BBCAC makes same-day public transportation options essentially non-existent in the five rural counties. The only scheduled transportation in those counties is the inter-city bus services provided by Greyhound currently limited to Van Horn, All Aboard America which is limited to Presidio, Marfa and Alpine and Amtrak in Alpine.

Only one hospital in the region (University Medical Center in El Paso) provides patient pick up and discharge transportation services and limited, medical related demand-response service to non-hospital destinations. However, Medicaid Managed Care organizations provide limited transportation service as does Bienvivir under its “providing all-inclusive care for the elderly” model. Some nursing homes and adult activity centers provide transportation for residents to and from day center activities, others do not, resulting in significant mobility disparities for residents or participants of these programs. None of these services are provided in the eastern counties outside of the MTP, Highly Rural Transportation Grant (HRTG) program for veterans, and general public transportation services, all of which generally require 24 advance notice to schedule a trip. Support from the Big Bend Regional Hospital District, nevertheless subsidizes medical trips for persons ineligible for the MTP or MTP companions when advance trip reservations can be obtained.

I. Implications for Regional Mobility and Coordination

A diverse array of transportation providers, both public and private exists within the more densely populated El Paso city limits and to a lesser extent in the rural portion of El Paso County. A single non-profit transportation provider serves the five eastern counties. All have recently acquired new or replaced existing older rolling stock resulting in fleets with an average vehicle age of seven years. Many providers in the region have also added ITS hardware, software and communications devices.

The variety of urban providers facilitates a range of transportation services and modes required to provide mobility solutions in the more densely populated and complex urban environment of El Paso. In spite of its geographical and demographic challenges, the municipal Sun Metro fixed-route and paratransit systems provide extensive coverage within the city limits of El Paso. Planned implementation of three additional bus rapid transit (BRT) lines and circulator lines attached to strategically placed transit centers should lessen trip times while providing more route coverage. Sun Metro’s LIFT system already uses New Freedom and other funds to extend paratransit service hours and coverage and a recent award of urbanized \$5310 funds to a Project Amistad led collaborative with Sun City Cab and Viba Transportation accepting Sun Metro referrals will continue that important service enhancement.

The County of El Paso obtained Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds several years ago to launch a vanpool program targeted to area employers. The program has grown to 55 vanpools operating every workday, removing hundreds of private autos from the daily commute. While vanpool participants contribute to operating costs, CMAQ funds are used to lease the vehicles and subsidize other costs, greatly reducing the expense of getting to work. The County of El Paso was also recently awarded

§5311(f) inter-city bus funds to continue operating support of a commuter service between Anthony and El Paso, leveraging New Mexico DOT funds which support the Anthony to Las Cruces segment of the route.

The range of transportation resources in the region and the diversity of transportation operators support a flexible and responsive infrastructure to meet future mobility challenges. Complementing this infrastructure is a professional administrative capacity and experienced transportation planners and managers ready to deploy resources to meet those challenges.

J. Transportation Provider Profiles

Individual profiles of each transportation provider in the region appear in Attachment I. The profiles provide contact information and outline each of the programs the provider operates including service mode, reservation requirements, geographic area served, service availability, fares, eligibility for service and funding source. The profiles also display basic fleet information. Since transportation services change with funding programs and fleets are constantly being replaced, the profiles represent the provider at a point in time rather than as an invariable picture of the organization. Nevertheless, the profiles do offer a picture of the capacity of the organization and overall view of the breath and depth of the regional transportation system and its resources.

III. Comprehensive Assessment of the Public's Unmet Transportation Needs

A. Introduction and Background

Transportation needs identified in this assessment will be evaluated against the Inventory of Transportation Resources to discover mobility gaps, overlaps, and other public transportation issues for the purpose of identifying priorities for new or expanded service; options for redeployment of redundant resources and opportunities for improvement through informed system planning, development, innovation and service coordination.

The human services – public transportation coordination plan built on the foundation of this Needs Assessment and the Inventory of Transportation Resources is the third such plan developed for the region and represents a continuation of an ongoing planning process rather than a break from it. The third plan will therefore rely in part on previously identified needs, issues and priorities that remain relevant in the context of continuously evolving demographics, resources, practices and services.

The focus of this plan is the assessment of mobility needs of the region's residents with particular emphasis on older adults, persons with disabilities, persons with low incomes or receiving public assistance, veterans, persons served by health and human services organizations and the regional workforce preparation system, children and others deemed to be more transit dependent than the general population.

B. Transportation Availability Summary

Personal mobility is fundamental to a productive and fulfilling life but is taken for granted by most persons, especially those who have access to and can operate a private automobile or those for whom public transit is easily accessible and convenient. The overwhelming majority of households in the region use private automobiles for their exclusive or primary means of transportation. Many persons of the region however, must rely on a family member, friend, public or private system for their transportation needs, a situation that is complicated by the numerous geographic, demographic and resource challenges of this large and diverse region.

Residents within the municipal boundaries of El Paso are well served by Sun Metro which operates a system built around 64 fixed-route routes including several express routes, seven transfer centers, two super stops, and one bus rapid transit line with three additional BRT lines schedule to open in the future. A complementary ADA paratransit system extends its range to $\frac{3}{4}$ mile either side of all fixed routes, essentially providing service to the entire city limits.

Other non-profit and private providers operate various specialized transportation services, often in close coordination with Sun Metro, that also complement its services. Project Amistad is the regional Medicaid Managed Transportation Organization (MTO) for the

region and directly provides non-emergency medical transportation for Medicaid recipients in El Paso County.

Public transit in El Paso is further complemented by multiple taxi-cab companies, Amtrak, Greyhound, other inter-city bus and vehicle for hire services, not all of which are accessible to wheelchair users. Bicycle use is increasing, but represents a tiny portion of transportation modes.

Rural El Paso County is served by six commuter routes each linking outlying communities with Sun Metro transfer centers within the El Paso city limits. Recent expansion allows for near continuous service throughout the work-day, but headways still average more than 30 minutes. While some routes wind through rural community neighborhoods, most of the service lies along major rural arterials making it difficult for some to easily reach locations where the County buses can stop. El Paso County does not provide paratransit services and while some demand-response, curb-to-curb service is available to rural residents through a Project Amistad/Sun City Cab/Sun Metro/Viba Transportation collaboration, service to rural El Paso County residents remains limited.

Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio comprise the five rural counties of the region which are characterized by a very low population concentrated in a few small towns, many of which are at great distances from larger cities that offer basic amenities and services, particularly medical care. The low population diminishes general public transportation formula funding and the extremely low population densities largely preclude the economic viability of scheduled fixed-route service. While demand response service is available for the general public and is subsidized or free for several eligible populations, the service requires advance reservation and is often limited to one trip option each day. That option usually has a very early morning departure time and, unless sufficient ridership is scheduled, may not exist at all.

C. Needs Assessment Summary

Both the urban and some of the rural population of the region is growing rapidly. The region has a high concentration of older adults, persons with disabilities, veterans, and children. The region has an especially high incidence of persons living below the poverty level. Much of the population growth is concentrated in these groups which are more likely to be dependent on and/or benefit from public transportation. The relatively low incomes and high poverty incidence in the region contributes to a high level of Medicaid recipients, both contributing to Medical Transportation Program (MTP) funding while placing more demands on it.

The very high concentration of Latinos, especially when combined with other demographic factors, contributes to a high incidence of diabetes which has special transportation considerations. For those whose disease progresses to the point of requiring dialysis treatment, the frequency of treatment sessions and related medical needs and uncertainties particularly stresses transportation providers.

Information gleaned from consumer surveys and human service organization interviews revealed strong support for and satisfaction with public and specialized transportation services. Many also recognized or speculated on the tremendous logistical, organizational, operational and resource challenges of providing a public transportation service. Numerous comments singled out the difficult and “amazing” job drivers do.

Nevertheless, both transportation consumers and representatives of human services organizations that have experience with public transportation systems point to a common set of issues and unmet transportation needs. Many of these are resource related, some operational and others identify transportation provider practices or policies which are felt to impede service.

The mobility needs identified in this assessment generally fall into one of more of the following areas:

- Insufficient or less than optimal service levels
- Inconvenient service delivery or design
- Excessive wait time/trip duration
- Excessive service cost
- Uneven service reliability
- Unavailability of service
- Inaccessibility of service
- Reduced personal independence

Many elements of these issues derive from the reality of transportation logistics in a world that has to contend with externally set funding levels, traffic, weather, machine failure and other factors beyond the control of the transportation provider. These concerns are important to and have a direct impact on the life quality of various stakeholders and especially the transit consumer. This needs assessment will attempt to outline those needs; describe issues and impacts associated with them and classify them according to where and with which transportation mode they exist to better understand the issue and how it can best be improved or resolved.

D. Assessment Approach and Methodology

This needs assessment relied on a range of existing data sources and original research conducted for this plan. In addition to regional geographic and demographic data, the needs assessment examined the independently developed Community Action Plans compiled by the two Community Action Agencies that serve the region, reports and news articles related to local transportation issues, and state and national transportation literature for the identification of common themes and insights that might bear on transit issues in far west Texas. In addition, mobility issues identified in a two-day Accessible Transportation Coalition workshop facilitated by Easter Seals Project Action were considered for this needs assessment.

The original research was conducted through a combination of written transportation consumer surveys and interviews with directors and senior management of 18 individual

health and human services organizations that serve the region, including the regional Workforce Development System and the various component agencies of the Texas Health and Human Services Commission.

The written survey (included as Attachment II) was prepared in both English and Spanish by Lead Agency staff with input from a regional coordination plan workgroup and included questions on common travel desires; awareness of and experience with various travel modes; accessibility requirements; factors that limit client use of fixed-route and demand-responsive transportation; and the identification of time and location service needs.

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with each key health and human service agency personnel using a detailed interview guide (included as Attachment III) to collect information on agency services, client access to those services, agency provided transportation assistance; specific client transportation needs, and agency experience with outside transportation services. The in-person format allowed the interviewer to delve more deeply into client mobility needs and issues and promoted a real time exchange of ideas and, importantly, the opportunity to ascertain the organization's knowledge of transportation resources, programs and organizational or other complex factors that impact their use.

Finally, the results of an Accessible Transportation Coalition workshop facilitated by Easter Seals Project Action were incorporated into the needs assessment and represent the input and views of a broad array of persons throughout the region. While the focus of the two-day event was on transportation accessibility, numerous, more general needs and issues were identified that impact other transit dependent populations and the general public. Even though the event was held in early 2008, many of the findings remain relevant and are carried over from the previous Regional Plan as are other findings for which contemporary evidence corroborates their importance.

E. Needs Assessment Limitations

This needs assessment attempted to be as accurate and comprehensive as possible but information derived from surveys, interviews, census data and transit related reports remains imperfect, especially in a dynamic demographic and economic environment. It is important to note that the consumer surveys were not conducted through a random sampling process and therefore the results lack statistical significance for making inference to the population in general. Rather, the surveys help to identify a range of mobility needs, issues and patterns and confirm observations of service gaps and overlaps gained from other sources.

Additionally, an attempt was made to identify and survey every health and human service organization in the region that serves a population likely to be transit dependent. Most agreed to be interviewed and every need or issue mentioned became a part of the needs assessment, regardless of its frequency across multiple organizations. Commonly identified issues or needs were highlighted, but all needs were recorded even if the issue did not occur for multiple organizations.

Furthermore, both survey and interview responses may have been clouded by the perceptions, biases and limited personal experiences of the respondents. Follow up interviews helped to introduce a common lexicon so there was a consistent use of transit terms and definitions. The interviews also helped to dispel commonly held myths about public transportation which may have influenced responses and to ask additional questions based on the role of the respondent. Many organization interviews involved multiple staff persons, expanding the perspective of the organization.

Most of the demographic data used in this assessment relies on the 2010 U.S. Census and the 2010-2015 American Community Survey 5-year estimates. These Census Bureau sources are not ideally current, but were used extensively to extract information that enumerated the incidence and proportion of transit dependent persons in the population or otherwise indicated the likelihood of transit dependency. The Texas Data Center at the University of Texas at San Antonio provided useful background and guidance interpreting census data. Other socioeconomic and health resources data are much more current and derived from different Texas Department of State Health Services reports. Infrastructure and economic information was taken from a variety of reports prepared by the Texas Department of Transportation, Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts and the El Paso branch of the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank. Original sources are cited where known.

Information on the region's geography was similarly derived from a number of sources including Sun Metro, the City of El Paso, the El Paso MPO, TxDOT and the Texas Comptroller. While geographic change is glacial in speed, its relationship to issues such as proximity to and social dynamics within Mexico, rural land use and other factors can be significant and change rapidly. Public transportation exists in physical space and involves transporting people from where they are to where they want to go, so constraints such as distance, roadway congestion, pathway accessibility and suitable stop and route locations cannot be understated.

F. Regional Description

1. The Geography and Economy of El Paso City and County

The Far West Texas region addressed in this plan is comprised of Brewster, Culberson, El Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties and corresponds with the Council of Governments Rio Grande Planning Region 8, Health and Human Services Commission Region 10 and Workforce Solutions Borderplex Area 10. The region covers an area of 21,709 square miles, is geographically the largest such planning region of the state and containing four of Texas' five largest counties.

The region is bounded by New Mexico to the north, the Republic of Mexico to the south and west and the Permian Basin Region to the east. There are seven ports of entry along the region's nearly 500 mile border with two northern Mexican states. Ports of entry between Texas and Mexico are limited to Presidio and El Paso Counties. The special port of entry in Brewster County is located in Big Bend National Park and is mostly limited to pedestrian day visitors with virtually no through traffic.

Not in the Far West Texas planning region but contiguous to its eastern border are Pecos and Reeves Counties, the fifth and sixth largest counties in the state, which must be traversed to reach the cities of Ft. Stockton and Pecos, the location of the nearest dialysis centers. Pecos County must also be traversed to reach Midland-Odessa, the location of many medical and other amenities and destination for much of the rural eastern county population for those services.

The region contains the city of El Paso, the sixth most populous city in Texas and the largest border community in the world, with five border crossings to Ciudad Juárez including a new point of entry recently completed in the city of Tornillo in southeast El Paso County. With the Guadalupe Tornillo International Bridge now in operation, one in five of all Texas ports of entry between to Mexico will be in El Paso County. Ciudad Juárez, Mexico's fifth largest city had a population of 1.3 million persons according to its 2010 census. More than 6.8 million pedestrians, 2.5 million personal vehicle passengers and 266,000 bus passengers passed through El Paso's ports of entry in 2015.

The close economic link between El Paso and Juárez is exemplified by the 300+ maquiladora plants that employ more than 178,900 workers whose output largely returns to the U.S. for distribution. Roughly USD 51 billion or 16% of all US-Mexico trade is transported via the ports of entry in the Paso del Norte Region.

As recently as 2007, the New York Times reported that

Corporate expansion in Juárez has created thousands of engineering, design and managerial jobs as well. Many of these people work in Juárez, live in El Paso and shop and dine in both places. Consequently, they cross the border regularly, speeding through the dedicated commuter lanes on two of the bridges that span the river (after passing a Homeland Security background check). In fact, the El Paso-Juárez region is the largest bilingual, binational work force in the Western Hemisphere [and that] Ciudad Juárez is now absorbing more new industrial real estate space than any other North American city.

The financial crisis of 2008-2009 and the Great Recession it triggered coupled with an extreme level of violence associated with Mexican drug cartels battling for control of Juárez dramatically changed this economic climate and growth. The Wall Street Journal reported a mass exodus of people who could afford to leave the city and an estimate of over 116,000 abandoned homes, which could roughly be the equivalent of 400,000 people who have left the city due to the violence. Many of these people joined the population of El Paso and some have or will likely return to Juarez sometime in the future.

The last eight years have experienced continuous growth and the Sinaloa cartel's displacement of the Juárez cartel has returned the city to a level of normalcy but with a somewhat diminished population and level of economic output.

In addition to its international border with the Republic of Mexico, El Paso also borders the state of New Mexico and is about 30 miles from Las Cruces, the second largest city in

New Mexico with a population of 100,360 and home to New Mexico State University and the nearby White Sands Missile Range and Test Facility, the largest military facility in the United States at 3200 square miles and southern New Mexico's largest employer. Doña Ana County surrounding Las Cruces and bordering El Paso County has a population of 209,233. An estimated 20,000 people commute daily between El Paso/Juarez and Doña Ana County.

Fort Bliss, at 1700 square miles, is the second largest military installation in the nation behind the adjacent and largest White Sands Missile Range. Ft. Bliss hosts an active congressionally authorized force of 26,365 in 2015 with a supporting community population exceeding 120,000. The base grew rapidly as a result of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Act which was intended to transform and reshape the U.S. Defense Department's infrastructure. This realignment process was expected to bring more than 20,000 new troops to Ft. Bliss and about 53,000 family members but subsequent congressional action reduced national troop levels so the facility is expected to see a reduction of 5% to a level of 25,146 in 2017.

Over this period however, Ft. Bliss was transformed into one of the most technically advanced army installations in the world, employing state-of-the-art technology from different military branches. Ft. Bliss is part of a two-state regional military complex of more than 7,100 square miles (4.1 million acres) consisting of Ft. Bliss, Biggs Army Air Field, New Mexico's White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base. Together, these facilities comprise the largest contiguous land area owned by the U.S. Department of Defense. The Base Realignment and Closure Act parallels a Department of Defense strategy of assigning soldiers to a single base for the life of their military careers. This approach combined with the previous growth of Ft. Bliss will have a lasting impact on the population of El Paso as base personnel establish community connections, put down roots, raise families and retire in the region.

The William Beaumont Army Medical Center and adjacent Veterans Administration El Paso Medical Center provide medical care for active duty personnel and retired veterans throughout the region. Both are known as regional centers for the care of wounded warriors returning from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan and serve as the post's Warrior Transition Battalion. The VA just completed its first year of operating its Veterans Transportation Service program in El Paso County with demand already outstripping its full-time two van capacity.

While geographically the smallest of the six counties in the region, El Paso County nevertheless produces the largest agricultural output generating 51% of the region's crop value and 43% of its total agricultural value. Much of this production lies along the Rio Grande as it leaves the city for its long run to the Gulf of Mexico. The lower valley, as it is commonly called, is home to numerous pecan, cotton, and vegetable farms in addition to alfalfa fields, cattle ranches and dairies. The cities along this corridor: Socorro, Clint, San Elizario, Fabens, and Tornillo lie outside the El Paso city limits and are home to farm workers and, increasingly, city dwellers seeking lower housing costs.

Each of these cities has seen population growth in the last decade with some above the state average. Also southeast of El Paso, Horizon City has grown 253% from 2000 to 2014, more than nine times the state average of 25.1% and almost 18% each year. However, since the 2010 census, Horizon has added an estimated 1,742 residents at an annual growth rate of only 2%. The communities northwest of El Paso but still in the County: Canutillo, Vinton and Anthony are experiencing less rapid growth but are also home to increasing numbers of low income families.

Most of El Paso's civilian economy is centered in manufacturing, retail trade, education/health/social services and is heavily influenced by its close proximity to Mexico. A growing technology sector has a synergistic relationship with Ft. Bliss and White Sands and, as the most bi-lingual city in the state, El Paso will likely continue its rapid job and population growth as the Hispanic population of the state and nation grow.

El Paso is home to the University of Texas at El Paso with a spring 2016 enrollment of 22,309, a 2.6% increase from the prior spring semester. The university employs nearly 3,000 faculty and staff. The campus recently completed a \$270 million dollar construction and renovation program. UTEP is largely a commuter school and operates the Miner Metro shuttle service in and around its campus for students and employees. Texas Tech University recently established a branch of its medical school in El Paso and the El Paso County Hospital District's University Medical Center also recently completed a 354,000 square feet construction and renovation project at a cost of over \$182 million.

Like many other Sun Belt cities, El Paso has a concentrated mostly commercial downtown with a hand-full of high rise buildings, surrounded by older inner-city neighborhoods and sprawling suburban and exurban development. Uniquely, El Paso is bisected by the Franklin Mountain Range and Ranger Peak (5653 ft.) which extends from the Doña Ana County line in the north to within two miles of the border with Mexico, essentially dividing the city into eastern and western halves and complicating intra-city travel.

Most of the population of El Paso County is clustered within a few miles on either side of I-10 and to a lesser degree along U.S. 54 running north toward Alamogordo, New Mexico. The concentration of the population along the I-10 route, the large number of border crossings with Juárez, the commuter volume between El Paso and Las Cruces (also on I-10) and the impact of the Franklin Mountains squeezing the city near downtown combine to create a highly congested I-10 corridor. El Paso has undertaken a large-scale project to build Loop 375 around the city so travelers have an alternative to I-10. Portions of Loop 375 are completed. Another proposed I-10 alternative is the Northeast Parkway, a 21-mile stretch of highway to connect Loop 375 with Highway 404 in New Mexico, mitigating congestion at the border between the two states.

2. The Geography and Economy of Rural Far West Texas

To the east of El Paso, the rural Brewster, Culbertson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties occupy the northern reach of the Chihuahu Desert and are characterized by vast ranch lands dotted with a few small remote cities. The area is considered the most

mountainous in Texas and contains all of the state's mountains over 5000 ft. The populated areas of the rural counties range in elevation from 2000 to 4800 feet and are often at some distance to the nearest other community. The cities of the region are most often connected by county roads, state and U.S. highways, and in the northwest, by IH-10. Ranching still plays a major role in the rural region's character if not economy, but most employment is centered in education, border protection, retail trade, and tourism related jobs. The classic western topography has long attracted motion picture production, an appeal that continues today.

The recent purchase of a massive "water ranch" in northern Hudspeth County by the El Paso Water Department and the eminent construction of a 42 inch high pressure natural gas pipeline between the Permian Basin and Mexico through Brewster and Presidio Counties suggest a future of pipeline construction, albeit unwelcome in some quarters. The experience of rural transit providers in areas of intensive extraction of oil and gas from shale formations is heavy tractor-trailer traffic, extensive roadway damage and lots of broken windshields. Areas of rapid shale development have also experienced boom-bust cycles creating job opportunity on the boom side and unemployment on the bust side. The nearby Permian Basin experienced considerable growth with the introduction of hydraulic fracturing, resulting in a severe shortage of truck drivers and attracting a workforce from the Big Bend region with the local transit operator losing drivers in the wage competition. Oil and natural gas prices recently dropped to 15 year lows but are now slowly rising, and the massive pipeline may foster another boom cycle. The recently announced discovery of substantial fossil fuel reserves in the Delaware formation in the southern Permian Basin extending into Jeff Davis County will likely impact roadway, workforce, housing and commuting conditions. The regional transit provider has consistently cited driver recruitment and retention as its greatest operational challenge.

Alpine, the county seat of Brewster County is the largest city in the rural counties and is home to Sul Ross State University with an enrollment of about 2000 students. Sul Ross is the largest employer in Alpine and the only post secondary educational institution in the rural counties. More than 80 miles south of Alpine is Big Bend National Park with 801,000 acres on the big bend of the Rio Grande. Texas' only other national park, Guadalupe Mountains, is in northern Culberson County and contains Guadalupe Peak, the state's highest elevation at 8,749 ft.

In nearby Presidio County, Big Bend Ranch State Park with over 300,000 acres, is the largest state park and comprising more than half of all of the state park land in the Texas. Marfa, the Presidio County seat, is headquarters of the U.S. Border Patrol Big Bend Sector and home to the Chinati and Judd Foundations, housing work of the late Donald Judd, considered the father of the minimalist art movement of the mid-twentieth century. The presence of these collections began the synergistic draw of galleries, artists, other arts organizations and film and music festivals to create what the press has called a remote arts mecca, attracting thousands of visitors each year. A 52-room hotel recently opened in Marfa's small downtown, almost doubling the hotel room capacity of the city.

Twenty six miles north of Marfa is Ft. Davis, the Jeff Davis County seat and home to the Davis Mountains State Park, Ft. Davis National Historic Site and the McDonald

Observatory, an internationally significant research facility of optical and infrared telescopes.

Each of these features along with the region’s scenic beauty draws numerous visitors and forms the foundation of the area’s tourist based economy. Travel and tourism is the second largest export-oriented industry in Texas (serving consumers outside the state) behind oil and gas, accounting for \$68.7 billion in earnings and 647,900 employed in the state. The economic impact of travel in El Paso and Hudspeth Counties is consistent with the state proportion, but the impact of travel and tourism in Culberson, Jeff Davis Brewster and Presidio Counties is up to five times that of the state, punctuating the importance of this sector to the region. Table I displays travel and tourism impact factors for far west Texas.

Table I: Travel and Tourism Impact by County

County	Total Direct Travel Spending (in thousands)	Earnings (in thousands)	Percent of County Earnings	Travel and Tourism Related Employment	Percent of County Employment
Brewster	\$66,880	\$33,490	15.0%	1,400	24.0%
Culberson	31,880	4,880	6.8	160	8.2
El Paso	1,624,310	410,780	2.1	13,540	3.2
Hudspeth	4,470	370	0.4	10	0.4
Jeff Davis	8,260	3,920	10.1	110	7.4
Presidio	9,870	1,910	1.4	60	1.9
Total	1,74,670	455,350	-	15,280	-

Source: The Economic Impact of Travel in Texas, Dean Runyan Associates, July 2016

With 500 miles of international border and much turmoil in northern Mexico, the Department of Homeland Security and its Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Drug Enforcement Agency and other law enforcement units have a considerable presence throughout the region and forms another significant component of the economy. The relative shortage/availability and cost of housing in neighboring communities creates noteworthy commute patterns for various Department of Homeland Security agents and the personnel of other rural counties’ employers including local schools and the growing tourist industry.

Culberson County is home to two wind farms with a combined total of 147 turbines capable of producing 68 megawatts of electricity. Much of the rural region has been identified as having the nation’s highest concentration of solar rays reaching the earth’s surface per square foot due largely to its latitude, number of sunny days, clean air and altitude. Several companies have proposed and received state and local tax abatements to construct utility scale photo-voltaic plants potentially creating numerous temporary construction jobs and a handful of permanent positions. Given these favorable local attributes and global climate concerns, there is a high likelihood that the region will be transformed by solar energy production sometime in the future unless a more distributed energy production and storage becomes the norm.

These geographic and climatic attributes also support a significant greenhouse operation in Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties, generating over \$75 million in vegetable production and producing almost 90% Texas’ cluster table tomato output.

With populations ranging from 90 in Redford to 6,026 in Alpine, the cities in the rural counties are of insufficient size to support many commercial and medical enterprises. Valentine has only 46 occupied households and not a single retail business. The nearest community, Van Horn, is 28 miles to the north on U.S. 90 making for a 56 mile round trip for milk, bread and gasoline. Since there are no drug stores in Candelaria, Terlingua, Redford, Marathon and Van Horn, residents of these communities can travel a round trip distance of 226 miles to fill a prescription. In fact, like many basic health services, there are no pharmacies at all in Culberson, Hudspeth, and Jeff Davis Counties. Presidio County’s first pharmacy in two decades opened in Marfa in 2016. This remoteness characterizes most of the region. Table II displays driving distances between cities in the rural counties.

Table II: One-way distances in West Texas/El Paso region

	Alpine	Van Horn	Ft. Stockton	Odessa	Midland	El Paso
Candelaria	135	183	109	279	299	304
Presidio	87	135	154	231	251	256
Marfa	26	74	93	170	190	195
Alpine	-	100	67	166	186	221
Ft. Davis	26	98	86	149	169	219
Van Horn	100	-	118	164	184	121
Terlingua	82	182	171	270	290	303
Marathon	31	131	58	157	177	252
Sierra Blanca	133	33	152	196	218	88
Dell City	190	90	209	208	228	97

Source: Texas Department of Transportation

In addition to long distances, rural county inter-city travel usually involves remote, isolated and mountainous highways which can present a barrier for some drivers and a costly proposition for all. The low median income and high incidence of poverty in the rural counties suggests many residents may be unable to afford or properly maintain fuel-efficient cars able to comfortably and reliably make the long trips.

3. Population Density, Growth and Development Patterns

Lack of population necessarily limits much commercial development and lack of density presents challenges for public and private transportation providers. Only two taxi-cabs operate in the rural counties of the region and generally limit service to Alpine and cite low volume and high liability insurance costs as barriers to entering or expanding that service, neither of which is accessible to wheelchair users.

Table III displays the huge differences in population density between the urban El Paso (813.29 persons/sq mile) and the eastern counties (0.61 to 1.94) persons/sq mile). While several eastern county communities are growing more rapidly than the El Paso and state

rate, they are tiny by comparison and will not likely change much in absolute population for many years or generations to come. As such, no community in the eastern counties is expected to grow to become even a “small urban” population center for transportation funding purposes. Following the pattern of statewide change from 2010 to present, daily vehicle miles dropped slightly in every county in the region in spite of an increase in registered vehicles and population, suggesting a tendency to drive less.

Table III: Highway Infrastructure, Vehicles, Area and Population Density by County

County	Centerline Miles ¹	Lane Miles ¹	Daily Vehicle Miles ¹	Registered Vehicles ¹	Area in Square Miles ²	Population per Square Mile
Brewster	289	609	188,381	11,014	6,184	1.50
Culberson	321	751	637,752	2,291	3,813	0.61
El Paso	488	1,715	10,038,469	641,825	1,013	813.29
Hudspeth	340	826	1,282,736	3,894	4,571	0.73
Jeff Davis	227	469	167,225	2,971	2,265	1.01
Presidio	271	546	186,275	8,395	3,855	1.94
Regional Total	1,937	4,917	12,500,878	670,390	21,700	39.10
Statewide Total	80,423	195,767	487,020,004	24,093,838	261,230	95.5

Source: ¹Texas Department of Transportation

² U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 2010 Summary File 1

Rapid growth in San Elizario (30.0%) and Socorro (20.2%) along with the explosive growth of Horizon City (253%), all in southeast El Paso County, will continue to place demands on El Paso County’s rural transit services as will the 35.5% growth rate of Anthony in northwest El Paso County along the New Mexico State line. Annexations by the City of El Paso in recent years, particularly toward the east, allow Sun Metro to serve those areas but lines and service have not always kept pace with population growth and annexations. Estimates of El Paso city population growth of 18.8% are most certainly understated given the expansion of Ft. Hood and timing of the census.

The rapid growth and resultant densities of these exurban communities have created “urban gaps” and changed their classification from rural to urbanized areas (UZA). Since land area and its population are factors in the “need” portion of rural and urban federal transit funding, in the absence of any other offsetting factors, the effect of this rural-urbanization is to reduce rural transit formula §5311 funding and increase urban transit formula §5307 funding. Data from each decennial Census is used to determine urbanized area (UZA) designations. The impact of the 2010 Census on UZA changes is displayed in Table IV.

Table IV. Urban/Rural Population and Land Area, Census 2000 and 2010 for El Paso County

	POPULATION						LAND AREA (Sq. Mi.)					
	Census 2000		Census 2010		Change '00-'10		Census 2000		Census 2010		Change '00-'10	
	Number	% of County Total	Number	% of County Total	Number	%	Number	% of County Total	Number	% of County Total	Number	Percent
UZA	648,465	95.4%	772,374	96.5%	123,909	19.1%	204.04	20.1%	233.56	23.1%	29.52	14.5%

Rural	31,157	4.6%	28,273	3.5%	(2,884)	-9.3%	808.96	79.9%	779.14	76.9%	(29.82)	-3.7%
TOTAL	679,622	100%	800,647	100%	121,025	17.8%	1,013.00	100.0%	1,012.69	100	(0.31)	0.0%

Source: Texas Transportation Institute, Texas A & M University, 2016

Since some of the most rapid population growth in El Paso County is largely concentrated in a few communities outside of the El Paso city limits which is not served by the urban transit provider, Sun Metro, and for which the rural provider, El Paso County is losing federal transit formula funds, consideration should be given to a consolidated regional transportation system or mechanism whereby Sun Metro contracts for services to these UZAs.

4. Inter-Regional and Travel Dynamics and Patterns

In El Paso city and county, there is an enormous impact from border crossings with Juarez in addition to the large number of commuters between El Paso and Las Cruces and White Sands. Air quality continues to be of great concern in El Paso given its proximity to the relatively unregulated Juárez. Reducing the number of private autos crossing the border between the two cities is one way to minimize pollution. Customs and border enforcement practices exacerbated by national security concerns create long lines of idling vehicles. Increased use of public transportation either crossing the border itself or in close proximity to both sides of the ports of entry could go a long way to improving air quality and congestion in the area.

The small populations of the communities in the eastern counties deprives their residents of many large city amenities including medical specialists, complex medical treatments, commercial airports and much retail shopping. As a result, many rural residents must commute to El Paso or Midland-Odessa for many of these and other services. As their population grows and ages, more such travel will occur. In addition, the growing popularity of the rural communities as leisure and retirement destinations creates an opportunity for car-less and eco-tourism travel. The addition of §5311 funded general public transportation services in the five eastern counties adds an important element to the public transportation infrastructure, including frequent trips to the El Paso and Midland Airports, but most of the inter-regional trips provided by the current operator, Big Bend Community Action, have very early departures and do not operate on weekends. The only inter-city transportation alternatives are two inter-city bus lines, All Aboard America and Greyhound. All Aboard America operates two daily north-bound and south-bound trips between Presidio and the Midland-Odessa airport with stops in Marfa and Alpine. However, Greyhound's only stops in the region are in Van Horn and El Paso. Amtrak operates the Sunset Limited through the region with stops only in Alpine and El Paso. The addition of a Greyhound stop in Sierra Blanca was noted in the previous plan and a transportation coordination activity was undertaken to encourage the addition of a stop resulted in a statement from Greyhound that the service could likely be re-introduced. To date, Greyhound has not resumed service to Sierra Blanca and efforts to influence Greyhound or another provider to do so should continue.

5. The Population and Characteristics of El Paso and Far West Texas

An estimated 848,562 persons currently reside in the Far West Texas/El Paso region, a 20.5% increase of 144,244 persons from 2000. All but Culberson County experienced growth in that period, with Jeff Davis County and many individual cities growing at rates above the State's average. These positive growth rates are projected to continue into the future with a regional population exceeding one million persons in 2020. The strength of the region's economy and various border dynamics compel the area's population growth. The appeal of the rural counties for retirement drives much of the in-migration population growth in those counties, adding a disproportionate share of this more transit dependent population segment.

The region is largely Hispanic (81%) and young (42% under age 25) compared to Texas (36% and 37.7%) and the U.S. (15% and 34%). Nearly 75% of the region's residents report that a language other than English is spoken at home as compared to 31.2% for the state as a whole, with eight communities in the region reporting rates over 90%.

Although much younger than the state average as measured by median age, persons over 65 are also represented at a higher rate than the state rate of 9.9% in all but El Paso Counties with Marfa, Redford and Valentine at almost twice the state average. Older adults are the fastest growing segment of the population.

Most of the region's counties and cities also have an incidence of disability that exceeds the state average for most age groups. In El Paso, armed services members returning from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan are surviving with a higher incidence of disability and resulting mobility challenges.

Poverty rates in the region are high, with every county above and only Horizon City and Terlingua/Study Butte below the state average of 12%. Ten communities have poverty rates two times that of the state and five communities have poverty rates over three times the state average.

Youth between the ages of five and nineteen, persons over 65, persons with disabilities and persons with incomes below the federal poverty are most likely to be dependent on or more likely to use public transportation. The incidence of each of these groups is higher in the Far West Texas/El Paso region than in the rest of the state. Low incomes often suggest greater reliance on public health and human services and a higher percentage of disposable income spent on transportation. Table IV displays population and demographic data for the region and highlights those characteristics which exceed the state average.

Table V. Far West Texas/El Paso Transit Dependency Indicators

Census Designated Place	Population 2000 ¹	Population 2010 ²	Percentage Change 2000-2014	Population Projection 2014 ³	Persons Aged 65+ ³	Persons Aged 5-19 ³	Population Ages 5-19 and 65+ ³	Population with a Disability By Age ³			Veterans	Persons Below Poverty Level ³	Household with No Vehicle Available ³
					number percent	number percent	number Percent	number (percent of group)	5-17	18-64		65+	number percent
El Paso County	679,622	800,647	21.2	823,862	94,071 <i>11.4</i>	193,815 <i>23.5</i>	287,886 <i>34.9</i>	8210 4.7	53,639 <i>11.4</i>	39,640 <i>45.8</i>	49,163 6.0	189,586 <i>23.4</i>	20,093 <i>7.8</i>
El Paso	563,662	649,121	18.8	669,711	77,810 <i>11.6</i>	156,117 <i>23.3</i>	233,927 <i>34.9</i>	6183 4.6	42,033 <i>10.8</i>	34,238 <i>44.8</i>	44,734 <i>6.7</i>	142,155 <i>21.5</i>	18,353 <i>8.4</i>
Anthony	3,850	5,011	<i>35.5</i>	5218	351 6.7	1083 20.8	1434 27.5	60 6.4	268 <i>13.5</i>	170 <i>63.4</i>	262 5.0	984 <i>28.0</i>	49 4.6
Canutillo	5,129	6,321	18.8	6091	843 <i>23.8</i>	1240 20.4	2083 <i>34.2</i>	44 4.4	349 9.6	340 <i>40.3</i>	380 <i>6.2</i>	1887 <i>31.1</i>	85 5.1
Clint	980	926	-9.0	892	194 <i>21.7</i>	149 16.7	343 <i>38.5</i>	5 3.6	81 <i>16.3</i>	93 <i>47.9</i>	72 <i>8.0</i>	250 <i>28.0</i>	14 4.7
Fabens	8,043	8257	3.0	8282	785 9.4	2620 <i>31.6</i>	3405 <i>41.1</i>	209 <i>8.8</i>	779 <i>17.4</i>	585 <i>74.5</i>	176 2.1	4320 <i>52.5</i>	256 <i>12.1</i>
Horizon City	5,233	16,735	<i>253.1</i>	18,477	884 4.7	5765 <i>31.2</i>	6649 <i>36.0</i>	136 2.6	1114 <i>11.1</i>	392 <i>44.3</i>	911 <i>4.9</i>	3832 <i>20.8</i>	81 1.7
San Elizario	11,046	13,603	<i>30.0</i>	14,360	784 5.5	4537 <i>31.6</i>	5321 <i>37.0</i>	239 5.9	1187 <i>15.6</i>	451 <i>57.5</i>	96 0.7	6675 <i>46.6</i>	292 <i>8.6</i>
Socorro	27,152	32,013	20.2	32,623	2971 9.1	9140 <i>28.0</i>	12,111 <i>64.7</i>	479 6.1	3287 <i>16.9</i>	1538 <i>51.8</i>	706 2.2	11,373 <i>35.0</i>	542 <i>6.0</i>
Tornillo	1,609	1568	-13.7	1388	176 <i>12.7</i>	399 <i>28.7</i>	575 <i>41.4</i>	38 <i>10.6</i>	156 <i>20.6</i>	107 <i>60.8</i>	0 <i>0.0</i>	437 <i>31.7</i>	21 5.8
Vinton	1,892	1971	-19.2	1529	93 6.0	457 <i>29.9</i>	550 3.6	8 2.0	85 9.5	47 <i>50.5</i>	41 2.7	493 <i>32.2</i>	16 3.9
Texas	20,851,820	25,145,561	25.1	26,092,033	2,849,757 10.9	5,804,969 22.2	8,654,726 33.2	272,371 5.4	1,576,781 9.9	1,103,018 39.9	1,564,501 4.6	4,500,034 17.7	531,801 5.9

Source: ¹U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

² U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010

³ U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 – 2014 American Community Survey 5-Yr Estimates

Amounts in red represent values greater than State rate

Table V. Far West Texas/El Paso Transit Dependency Indicators, continued

Census Designated Place	Population 2000 ¹	Population January 2010 ²	Percentage Change 2000-2010	Population Projection 2014 ³	Persons Aged 65+ ³		Persons 5-19 ³	Population Ages 5-19 and 65+ ³			Population with a Disability By Age ³			Veterans ³	Persons Below Poverty Level ³	Household with No Vehicle Available ³	
					number	percent		number	percent	number (percent of group)			number				percent
										5-17	18-64	65+					
Brewster County	8,866	9232	4.6	9270	1634 17.6	1496 16.1	3130 33.8	95 7.1	868 15.2	829 51.9	818 8.8	1,182 12.9	199 4.9				
Alpine	5,786	5905	4.2	6026	840 13.9	1088 18.0	1928 32.0	40 4.4	496 13.1	361 45.0	473 7.8	804 13.6	161 6.4				
Terlingua	267	58	44.6	86	22 25.6	0 0.0	22 25.6	0 0.0	5 9.1	16 72.7	3 3.4	0 0.0	0 0.0				
Study Butte		233		300	34 11.3	91 30.3	125 41.7	0 0.0	5 9.1	52 29.9	14 4.7	100 33.3	0 0.0				
Culberson County	2,975	2398	-21.8	2325	343 14.8	463 20.0	806 34.7	11 2.8	328 23.1	224 65.3	125 5.4	670 29.1	102 11.8				
Van Horn	2,435	2063	-7.0	2264	334 14.8	463 20.5	797 35.2	11 2.8	305 22.3	224 67.1	125 5.5	658 29.4	102 12.4				
Hudspeth County	3,344	3476	0	3344	512 15.3	764 22.8	1276 38.2	56 8.4	415 25.9	294 57.4	168 5.0	1303 43.2	52 5.1				
Ft. Hancock	1,713	1750	-7.2	1590	230 14.5	448 28.2	678 42.6	5 1.3	177 21.5	125 54.3	12 0.8	695 43.7	46 9.3				
Sierra Blanca	533	553	2.6	547	51 9.3	90 16.5	141 25.8	27 39.1	78 29.9	42 82.4	57 10.4	189 44.1	2 1.6				
Dell City	413	365	-24.0	314	95 30.2	68 21.7	163 52.0	20 30.3	64 45.7	60 63.2	54 17.2	151 48.1	1 0.8				
Jeff Davis County	2,207	2342	3.4	2282	728 31.9	386 16.9	1114 48.8	3 1.1	254 22.1	367 50.4	225 9.9	162 7.3	38 3.6				
Ft. Davis	1,050	1201	7.8	1132	308 27.2	218 19.3	526 46.5	3 1.7	137 23.1	185 60.1	129 11.4	106 9.4	17 3.2				
Valentine	187	134	-35.3	121	27 24.0	17 14.0	44 36.3	0 0	12 17.1	20 74.1	4 3.3	11 9.1	8 0				
Presidio County	7,304	7818	2.4	7479	1442 19.3	1836 24.5	3278 43.8	42 2.8	700 18.0	927 64.3	301 4.0	1597 21.4	233 8.8				
Marfa	2,121	1981	0.1	2124	422 20.0	394 18.4	826 38.9	15 5.5	148 11.8	213 50.5	144 6.8	306 14.6	96 11.3				
Presidio	4,167	4426	1.7	4237	711 16.8	1310 30.9	2021 47.7	17 1.5	444 21.1	546 76.8	84 2.0	1304 24.4	124 9.1				
Redford	132	90	-81.1	25	7 28.0	0 0.0	7 28.0	0 0.0	18 100	7 100	0 0.0	7 28.0	7 43.8				
Texas	20,851,820	25,145,561	25.1	26,092,114	2,849,757 10.9	5,804,969 22.2	8,654,726 33.2	272,371 5.4	1,576,781 9.9	1,103,018 39.9	1,564,501 4.6	4,500,034 17.7	531,801 5.9				

Source: ¹U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

² U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010

³ U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 – 2014 American Community Survey 5-Yr Estimates

Amounts in red represent values greater than State rate

In almost every population category there is a high incidence of transit dependent persons across the region suggesting a need to tailor transportation services for that group. Also, there are several population groups in almost every community likely dependent on public transportation. For example, every community in El Paso County exceeds the state rate of persons below the poverty level for whom owning and operating an automobile, especially for multiple bread winners, poses a financial burden.

Since transportation by its nature operates in a geographical space, groupings of transit dependent populations in close proximity should be examined alongside location needs to determine their highest concentration. In El Paso County; Anthony, Vinton and Canutillo are located at approximately 5 mile intervals northeast of El Paso. In all three communities, the percentage of families living below the federal poverty level is nearly twice the state average. Anthony and Vinton have a lower percentage of persons over 65, but Canutillo has more than twice the state rate of older adults and all have higher or much higher rates of disabled older adults.

The communities of Socorro, San Elizario, Clint, Fabens, and Tornillo similarly lie along a line at short intervals southeast of El Paso along the Rio Grande and I-10. Only Clint had a relatively high percentage of persons over 65 years of age at twice the state rate, but all had a very high incidence of families living below poverty with Fabens and San Elizario at poverty rates at 52.5% and 46.6% respectively. Even Socorro's much lower poverty rate of 35% is still twice the state average. Ft. Hancock just a few miles south but in Hudspeth County had a higher poverty rate at 43.7%.

While only Clint had a high percentage of elderly persons, nearby San Elizario, Socorro and Tornillo have a very high percentage of the older adults with a disability at 57.5%, 51.8% and 60.8% compared to the state rate of 39.9%. San Elizario is also growing more rapidly than the state growth rate of 25.1%.

The community of Horizon City also southeast but north of I-10 has the highest growth rate in the region at 253.1%. Horizon City has a relatively low incidence of persons below poverty but is still above the state average of 17.7%.

The City of El Paso exceeds the state average for every transit dependent population except persons ages 5-17 with a disability. While its growth rate is estimated to be just three quarters of the state average, the absolute number of persons in all transit dependent groups is expected to rise. As the largest city in the region, El Paso experiences a much larger number of homeless persons, Supplemental Security Income recipients, and others attracted to urban environments and their services.

Each of the rural counties grew at a much slower rate between 2000 and 2014 than the state average and Culberson County lost 21.8% of its population in that period. The only community in the rural counties to grow rapidly was Terlingua-Study Butte, likely the result of a large number of Big Bend National Park employees moving into private housing in that community. Van Horn, Ft. Hancock, Valentine and Redford lost 7%, 7.2%, 24%, 35.3% and 81.1% of their population in the 2000–2014 period. This

significantly reverses a trend noted in the previous regional transportation plan, when all these communities were growing, many rapidly.

The communities of Study Butte, Van Horn, Ft. Hancock, Sierra Blanca, Presidio and Redford all exceed the state poverty rate. Alpine, Van Horn, Sierra Blanca, Dell City, Ft. Davis, and Marfa exceed the state's incidence of veterans. All the rural communities except Study Butte exceed the state average of adults and older adults with a disability. Most of these communities are also near or exceed the state incidence of older adults. Apart from their higher incidence in the population, long distances and the nature of rural poverty likely exacerbates the transportation challenges the elderly and poor families face, understating the impact of these statistics.

Table VI displays recent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), State Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) and Medicaid enrollment levels in the region along with related socioeconomic indicators and health resources. The data confirms much of the need identified in the Needs Assessment. Every county in the region exceeds the state rate of persons without health insurance and ratio of population to doctors and dentists. In addition, none of the eastern counties has family planning or Department of State Health Services Children's Services locally available. Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties have no hospitals so all hospital births to residents must occur outside of their county of residence. Although Culberson County has a small community hospital in Van Horn, its resident births in county ratio is only 2.2% compared with El Paso of 99.5%. The lack of in-county health resources combined with a high number of residents receiving public assistance indicates a lack of medical provider options and the need to travel often long distances to obtain medical services.

Table VI. Regional Socioeconomic and Health Resources

	Socioeconomic Indicators								Health Resources									
	Ave. Monthly TANF	Ave. Monthly SNAP	Unduplicated Medicaid	Ave. Monthly CHIP Enrollment	Medicaid Births	Without Health Insurance	Persons Below Poverty		Direct Care Physicians	Ratio of Population to D.C. MD	Dentists	Ratio of Population to Dentist	Ratio of Pharmacists to 100,000 Population	Acute Care Hospital	Hospital Staffed Beds	Licensed Nursing Home Beds	Birth Service Ratio (Resident Births in County)	Title V & XX Family Planning Available
Brewster	21	699	1,842	57	59 50.9%	2,449 32.9%	1,503 17.3%	10	905	2	4,527	233.8	1	36	56	74.8	No	No
Culberson	20	463	778	44	27 77.1%	881 42.6%	601 24.3%	3	945	0	<>	0	1	25	0	2.2	No	No
El Paso	9,381	143,905	210,741	13,316	9,025 62.6%	216,352 33.0%	204,927 28.4%	761	919	120	5,830	46.6	11	1,778	1,456	99.5	Yes	Yes
Hudspeth	1	423	874	52	18 36.7%	1,292 48.5%	1,055 32.4%	0	<>	0	<>	0	0	0	0	<>	No	No
Jeff Davis	0	42	346	20	9 56.3%	782 44.3%	287 13.1%	1	2,167	0	<>	0	0	0	0	<>	No	No
Presidio	99	2,118	2,564	95	89 53.9%	2,509 40.8%	1,820 24.4%	1	7,657	0	<>	0	0	0	0	<>	No	No
Texas	135,947	2,328,702	4,438,080	312,114	228,202 56.2%	26.80%	16.30%	32,281	661	7,561	2,820	78.7	470	56,898	125,864	78.4	n/a	n/a

Source: Texas Department of State Health Services, Center for Health Statistics – 2007, 2009

Ratio not calculated for a category with zero providers as indicated by <>

Amounts in red represent values greater than the state average or ratio

G. Health and Human Service Agency Survey of Mobility Needs

A significant element of this needs-assessment is the perspective of mobility needs of a wide range of health and human service agencies operating in the region that provide services to populations deemed to be transit dependent. The interviews sought to identify first-hand the transportation and mobility issues faced by clients of those organizations. Face to face interviews were held with leaders and key staff of these organizations and centered on the transportation needs of their clients both in terms of client or consumer access to agency services, but more broadly the extent to which transportation represented a barrier to client self-sufficiency and ability to lead a full and productive life. The interviews also sought to ascertain if and how the organizations provided or otherwise assisted with client transportation services and if not provided directly, on which resources or systems they were likely to rely and refer.

Amerigroup Inc., like El Paso First, Superior and Molina is a private managed care organization providing medical services coordination for Medicaid recipients and certain clients of the Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services. Amerigroup does not provide transportation assistance directly or indirectly to its enrolled participants but informs participants of and refers to the non-emergency free ride service managed by Project Amistad and often called the Medical Transportation Program (MTP). As the coordinator of medical care, Amerigroup hears of or directly encounters participant difficulties in using the MTP for transportation to medical appointments. The majority of the concerns expressed have to do with long wait times for both initial pick up and pick up after appointments. Amerigroup suggests the proactive identification and registration of individual drivers to serve as alternative to or back up for shared ride services and in cases known for chronic return trip delays, such as certain dialysis patients. Amerigroup also noted specific issues for certain intellectually disabled transitioning children and adults who should not be left alone on a bus while the driver assists other passengers and therefore precludes the use of services like Sun Metro's LIFT unless the passenger has an attendant.

Alpine Housing Authority (AHA) owns and operates multi-family housing units which are leased to qualifying low-income older adults and families. The organization's units are centrally located in Alpine and near various shopping amenities. Alpine does not have a fixed-route transportation service and the available general public demand-response service operated by Big Bend Community Action Committee (BBCAC) requires advance reservation which is used by some residents on occasion. BBCAC also provides midday transportation to Alpine's senior center which is also used by AHA residents. Occasions arise when a same day trip is needed or a future trip cannot be provided because BBCAC has no vehicles and/or drivers available.

Big Bend Community Action Committee (BBCAC) is non-profit community action agency that provides a range of services through their neighborhood centers in Alpine, Marfa, Presidio and Van Horn. Many of BBCAC's services are directed to low-income households to provide emergency financial relief, home weatherization and other services to assist clients achieve economic self-sufficiency. BBCAC is also the sole public transit provider for the five rural counties of the region operating the MTP as a subcontractor to

Project Amistad; the §5311 funded general public transportation provider as a subcontractor to West Texas Opportunities and provider of mid-day transportation for senior nutrition centers in Alpine, Marfa and Presidio with support from the Area Agency on Aging and TxDOT's §5310 funding program. BBCAC operates its transportation services using the TRAX branding and receives additional support from the VA's Highly Rural Transportation Grant Program and the Big Bend Regional Hospital District to provide free medical transportation for veterans and others that don't qualify for MTP. As the sole public transportation operator in the rural part of the region and scheduler of its own trips, BBCAC is able to easily connect its clients and members of the public or eligible groups to its transportation services. However, BBCAC continues to struggle with the challenge of employing enough drivers to meet transportation demand.

Big Bend Regional Hospital District (BBRHD) is a public taxing authority responsible with providing for indigent health care for Brewster and Presidio Counties which it accomplishes through a contract with a private health benefits management firm Boon-Chapman. BBRHD has also initiated a health outreach program in both counties and awards grants to other organizations aligned with its purpose. BBRHD contracts with BBCAC to pay for trips on its TRAX service for companions or other persons not eligible for MTP. BBRHD does not otherwise provide direct or indirect client transportation. BBRHD staff and outreach workers are aware of TRAX services and make frequent referrals but cite cost if not eligible for Medicaid, disability location and long trips as barriers for many clients, especially older adults. They also cite the lack of a provider willing to travel into the nearby Mexican community of Ojinaga as an issue. BBRHD outreach workers also state they were aware of many clients who were told by BBCAC staff that no drivers or vehicles were available for the day the client wanted to travel, often stating that not enough trips were already scheduled for that day. BBRHD staff recommended the use of prepaid gas cards that could be awarded to family or friends willing to drive clients in private automobiles and higher wages for TRAX drivers.

Big Bend Regional Medical Center (BBRMC) in Alpine is a private 25-bed hospital unit of Quorum Health Inc. and is the only hospital and emergency care provider in Brewster, Presidio and Jeff Davis Counties. BBRMC operates a 24/7 emergency trauma center, offers a limited range of surgical services and rehabilitative services including physical therapy. More severely injured or ill patients are transported to hospitals in Odessa-Midland or El Paso via air-ambulance. The Center was the previous recipient of §5310 funds which it used to purchase a bus to support its Senior Circle, breast health and other activities. BBRMC relinquished its vehicle in 2012 and does not offer any form of direct or indirect non-emergency patient transportation other than referral, often relying on BBCAC's TRAX service. Hospital social workers stated that the advance reservation requirement often creates mobility problems, especially when patients are released from emergency or other care with less than a day's notice. BBRMC participated in a voucher program run by the local Salvation Army, which paid for trips provided by TRAX or two limited taxi services. The voucher program ended, but according to hospital staff the need remains. In addition to the advance notice requirement, hospital staff also noted a transportation need outside the M-F 8-5 schedule of TRAX buses. The two Alpine based taxi companies operate only one vehicle each on a very limited, unpredictable schedule

and cannot be relied upon, particularly if limited advance notice is available. BBRHC staff showed support for the return of a voucher program to assist needy patients and a reliable volunteer or other program that could provide local trips with little advance notice or when TRAX is unavailable or otherwise unable to fulfill a trip request.

Culberson Hospital is a 14-bed public hospital in Van Horn also providing emergency critical care and limited surgical and care services for residents of Culberson and nearby Hudspeth counties. Culberson Hospital does not provide any direct or indirect non-emergency transportation services for its patients. Like its hospital neighbor in Alpine, Culberson Hospital is aware of and frequently refers patients to TRAX for either their MTP or general public transit services. Since BBCAC maintains an office and part of its TRAX fleet in Van Horn, service is generally available, but also like BBRMC after hours and same day trips can be problematic. There was no cab service in Van Horn until near the completion of this plan. Culberson Hospital staff also pointed to a need for some backup system, volunteer or otherwise that could prevent patients being stranded at the hospital which the new taxi service may be able to satisfy.

Department of Aging and Disability Services (DADS) is a division of the Texas Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) with offices in El Paso, Alpine and Presidio that provides services to older adults and persons with disabilities to allow people to remain in their homes to avoid or delay reliance on residential nursing care. Applicants do not have to come into DADS office to apply for services which are delivered primarily through in-home care providers who assist DADS clients with activities of daily living. DADS does not provide direct or indirect transportation assistance for its clients nor does it provide transportation assistance to its in-home care givers. Many DADS clients qualify for LIFT services in El Paso but only a few qualify for MTP. A significant percentage of urban DADS clients travel to dialysis treatment although many are largely home-bound. Some rural clients have used TRAX for shopping and other trips. However, rural DADS staff reported that clients complain of rough rides in the TRAX buses, very early trip departure times and being unable to schedule trips for days when there are no MTP trips scheduled or too few passengers. Urban DADS staff noted that cost, timeliness of service and a lack of Sunday transit service prevented some clients from attending Church.

DADS care-givers will often travel with clients as attendants on the LIFT, but timeliness of service can be critical if a care-giver must complete service to one client and report to another. The risk of a bus being late can limit a care giver's willingness to travel with a client and therefore limits client freedom of mobility.

In-home care givers are not highly paid and because they may be responsible for assisting multiple clients in a single day, usually in shifts lasting no more than four hours, they must commute to multiple client households on their own time and at their own expense. A form of shared ride service for care-givers could help to reduce this expense, but the scattered pattern of DADS client locations and care-giver assignments and schedules makes a vanpool or similar approach unrealistic, but some sort of cab/uber/volunteer driver program could be explored.

Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services (DARS) is a unit of HHSC with offices in El Paso, Alpine and Presidio and provides services to persons with disabilities to help them acquire skills, obtain employment and remain employed and productive. DARS provides transportation assistance through the issuance of bus passes, contracts for service with transit providers, reimbursement for private auto use and in very limited cases, reimbursement for auto repairs. DARS has also referred clients to Volar for fixed-route travel training and provided assistance for air travel. Both rural and urban DARS staff stated that clients reported cost, disability, time of service, and advance reservation requirements and awareness of available service as barriers to client initiated public transportation. Rural DARS staff also reported they had little success relying on the TRAX service when trying to secure trips for clients, being told by TRAX schedulers that there were no MTP trips scheduled for the day requested. Due to these frequent trip denials, rural DARS staff reported they no longer attempt to schedule trips with TRAX. Urban staff report that uncertain trip duration often precludes use of LIFT for employment trips and that clients have complained about bus upkeep and adequate tie-downs. Urban DARS staff suggested better on-going communications between the LIFT and human service organizations regarding operating procedures, service standards and program status as a way to improve referrals and manage expectations.

Department of State Health Services (DSHS) is a unit of HHSC and provides public health services ranging from clinical to outreach and education. Clinics exist in Alpine, Ft. Davis, Ft. Hancock, Marathon, Marfa, Presidio, Sierra Blanca, Study Butte and Van Horn and provide immunizations, health screenings and various well child services. DSHS also administers Medicaid in Texas and takes Medicaid, Children with Special Health Care Needs Service Program and related applications. DSHS does not provide direct or indirect client transportation but refers clients to the MTP program. Clients must travel to DSHS facilities for clinical services and rural clinics report few transportation barriers and some reliance on TRAX. Urban clinics are generally located near Sun Metro fixed-route routes and likewise do not report transportation issues. However, DSHS staff are aware of cases where clients reported arriving late to appointments due to late arriving MTP buses or other scheduled transit services.

Family Crisis Center of the Big Bend (FCCBB) is a private, non-profit organization providing services for children and victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. FCCBB maintains shelters in Alpine and Presidio and conducts extensive public awareness programs throughout Brewster, Jeff Davis, Pecos, and Presidio Counties. The FCCBB outreach office in Terlingua has evolved into a multi-purpose activity center and the organization's food distribution programs in Terlingua, Presidio and Candelaria put FCCBB at the forefront of human services delivery in those communities. FCCBB provides limited direct and indirect client transportation, primarily limited to emergency situations or for court appearances. Agency staff report that for some clients, transportation is a barrier to accessing their services and that the cost of TRAX rides, the advance scheduling requirement (especially for persons being released from the ER after hours) and clients without phones present mobility problems. FCCBB staff recommended a greater clarity on TRAX rules and operating procedures, willingness to accommodate same day service when resources are available and the availability of vouchers that agencies could purchase and issue to clients.

Gathering Place is a non-profit center for independent living which serves persons with disabilities in Alpine and surrounding communities. Gathering Place does not provide transportation services outside of its organized group activities. They report transportation barriers for clients due primarily to limited TRAX service hours, disability of attendant, denial of non-Medicaid trips and lack of service to Lubbock. Gathering Place staff also noted the difficulty of getting an MTP individual driver application and payment approved. They recommended extended TRAX service hours and regular scheduled fixed-route service to Ft. Stockton to connect with Greyhound service.

Opportunity Center for the Homeless (OCH) based in downtown El Paso provides day and overnight shelter, transitional and permanent housing and a broad range of services for homeless singles and families, including services that help homeless persons obtain employment and become self-sufficient. OCH provides direct transportation through the operation of two passenger vans and works closely with Sun Metro's Job Express service and the issuance of bus passes. The extensive passenger van program transports clients to various health and human service agencies as well as job training and employment. The transportation program has exhausted some of its funding but OCH staff consider its continuing operation important but a financial burden for an agency trying to address growing need.

Presidio County Health Services (PCHS) is a private, non-profit health provider operating clinics in Marfa and Presidio. PCHS does not provide direct or indirect transportation assistance. Their existence addresses a near unanimous need identified in the original transportation coordination plan for an operating clinic or practicing physician in Presidio County so area residents do not have to travel long distance to obtain those critical services. PCHS serves many Medicaid clients and therefore many use MTP to access services. The issues most noted by PCHS staff are the advance scheduling requirement and the lack of same day service. One physician practicing at the Presidio clinic said that some patients require x-rays or other diagnostic services not available at the clinic. Because of advance scheduling requirements patients are unable to obtain this important service stressing the need for some backup system in these circumstances. PCHS staff also noted that for non-Medicaid clients, TRAX will sometimes deny a trip if there is not an MTP passenger or a sufficient number of other riders scheduled for the requested day of if there are no drivers available.

Project Amistad is a 501 c 3 non-profit agency that provides a broad range of social services including court authorized Guardianship, Money Management, Veteran's Programs, Insurance Enrollment through the 2010 Affordable Care Act, and various Transportation Programs. Amistad's Veterans programs provide rental assistance, utility assistance, counseling, job training opportunities, transportation options, along with community information & referral. The Aging, Disability & Transportation Resource Center (ADTRC) of El Paso & Far West Texas provides professional resource coaches to help clients access a comprehensive array of services. Amistad is the Health and Human Services Commission designated Managed Transportation Organization for a 23-county region of far West Texas providing a range of transportation services for eligible Medicaid recipients, for Children with Special Health Needs and transportation for Indigent Cancer Patients (TICP) who are diagnosed with cancer or cancer-related illness

and who have no other means of transportation. Amistad provides transportation to thousands of persons through various contracts and partnerships with the City and County of El Paso, TxDOT, and various local agencies such as the Area Agency on Aging (AAA) clients. In addition, Amistad operates a fixed-route for Sun Metro and is the managing partner in a multi-agency collaboration providing enhanced demand-response transportation services throughout the El Paso urbanized area in partnership with Sun Metro, Viba Transportation and Sun City Cab.

As a significant transportation provider, Amistad maintains a fleet of 65 vehicles operates a highly automated call taker/reservation and dispatch center, performs vehicle maintenance and contracts with West Texas Opportunities, Midessa Transportation, and Big Bend Community Action Committee for services in 22 rural counties. Through this combination of human and transportation services, Amistad has extensive direct contact with other service providers, transit riders and many persons for whom mobility is a regular challenge. Managing its fleet assets and access to predictable sustained operations funding to meet continuous and growing demand are significant challenges for Amistad as is maintaining a reliable workforce. In addition, the ability to dispatch a sufficient number of vehicles each day that minimizes wait times and meets service standards while remaining efficient and cost effective service is an on-going challenge. This is especially true in the realm of dialysis related transportation and is consistent with the need to increase transit resources to meet growing demand and to effect technology, collaborative and other approaches that increase transit service delivery efficiency.

Project Bravo is a non-profit community action agency with offices in Eastside, Northeast, Upper Valley and Ysleta neighborhood areas of El Paso County. Dedicated to ending poverty for disadvantaged families, Project Bravo provides a variety of educational, emergency assistance, home weatherization and other services. Project Bravo does not provide direct client transportation, but provides limited indirect assistance through bus passes. All of Project Bravo's offices are on public transit fixed-routes and El Paso County recently reconfigured its Route 20 to stop at its Montana Vista office. Project Bravo staff noted that El Paso County fixed-routes were too distant for many residents of the areas served, especially for older adults and persons with disabilities.

Volar is a non-profit Center for Independent Living providing a range of services for persons with disabilities in El Paso County. Volar does not provide direct or indirect transportation services for its clients but does partner with Sun Metro to certify LIFT eligibility. Volar had also provided and would like to expand fixed-route travel training services but needs additional funding to do so. Volar staff reported that transit cost, location and time of service impede the mobility of some of its clients. Volar staff added that Sun Metro and Project Amistad drivers were very good (although all could benefit from sensitivity training), complimented Sun Metro's trip planning assistance and that ramps on buses are better than lifts. Volar staff further noted that some Gateway, Alameda and Montana stops are not accessible, that the headway between buses is too long, that some fixed-route drivers don't stop for persons using wheelchairs and that high paratransit driver turnover diminishes knowledge of the city. Volar also felt the community lacks sufficient accessible taxi cabs.

Volar staff suggested that bus stop poles should be square to distinguish them from other signs, should have Braille instructions and there is a need for non-emergency ambulance transportation. Volar staff also recommended a mobile phone app to report problems and a mechanism for Sun Metro or other providers to issue a case number when reporting an accessibility issue or complaint so that it can be tracked. Volar staff noted several issues related to dialysis transportation and suggested there needed to be better doctor and patient education about the impact of transportation on dialysis treatment and that a legislative solution may be needed to allow clinics to support transportation cost and facilitate doctor referral to clinics that are closer to patient homes. Volar staff also noted the need for a more reliable stop announcement system on Sun Metro's fixed-route buses.

Workforce Solutions Borderplex Area 10 (WSB) is non-profit organization that is part of the state and nation's workforce development system providing assessment, skills development, job search and employment related supportive services for the general public and applicants and recipients of public assistance and unemployment insurance. WSB maintains offices at several El Paso locations, including Ft. Bliss, and in Fabens, Socorro, Alpine, and Presidio. WSB provides indirect transportation assistance in the form of bus passes, and limited auto use reimbursement and auto repair. WSB refers clients to Sun Metro's Job Express when appropriate and notes that cost, some locations and reliability to reach destinations on-time are barriers to the use of fixed-route services. WSB staff recommended an annual assessment of Sun Metro's route alignment, coordination with planned housing development, expanded use of vanpools and greater employer use of employee transportation benefits or other compensations to better help workers afford transportation cost.

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs is a federal government agency providing health and related benefits to eligible veterans. The VA operates the Veterans Transportation Service, a two van program providing weekday trips to and from the VA health center, satellite clinics and VA approved private health care providers throughout El Paso County and Las Cruces. The program can also reimburse veterans for the use of a private auto if they have at least a 30% service related disability. The El Paso VA van service just completed its first year of operation and has seen ridership grow to its capacity.

1. Public and Transit Consumer Surveys

Members of the public and various transportation services consumers were surveyed through a two-page, twenty-five point questionnaire prepared in both English and Spanish. Questionnaires were collected throughout the region and sought information about respondents travel needs; use and experience with various public and private transportation services, and suggestions for how transportation services could better meet their mobility needs. The survey also collected limited information about the respondent's age, disability, student and veteran status, use of mobility devices, and car ownership. Copies of the survey instruments appear in Attachment II.

Completed questionnaires were received from 126 urban county residents (70 English, 56 Spanish) and 19 rural county residents (15 English, 4 Spanish), representing all age ranges. Respondents most frequently traveled within the county in which they lived, but

several travel into El Paso from rural El Paso County frequently or daily. The plurality of respondents used the MTP program, followed by Sun Metro and County fixed-route services. Many respondents were not regular transit users and more frequently used their own car, were driven by others, walked, biked, or used taxis. The majority of rural respondents used their own cars, but many had experience with TRAX. About 15% of respondents were students and only 5 reported being a veteran, four from the rural counties.

More than 85% of respondents did not have access to an automobile. Many respondents stated they did not drive and were dependent on some form of public transportation for their mobility. Over 90% also had some form of disability and 39% reported their disability limited their ability to drive a car. Nearly 6% required the assistance of another person to travel and about 22% used some form of mobility device, most commonly a wheelchair or cane.

More than half of urban respondents had occasions in which they were unable to reach a destination for lack of transportation. Numerous respondents cited the lack or distant location of rural El Paso County routes as a major impediment. Some urban residents noted that fixed-route stops were too far from their home or that the buses were too often late. Some stated that it took too long to get to their destination, especially if they had to cross town. Some reported that fixed-route service was difficult to use in harsh weather and for shopping. One respondent noted not feeling safe on a fixed-route bus.

Demand-response service users were satisfied with the service and several noted the “wonderful” drivers. The most common complaint was late arriving buses, some stating that it was a frequent occurrence and one respondent stating she had to wait 1 hour and 20 minutes on the day she completed the survey. A few stated that advance scheduling was an impediment, especially when doctors need to perform tests or procedures in the days following the initial visit.

Rural respondents uniformly reported that they had experiences of being told that TRAX did not have drivers available on the day they were requesting travel. Some stated they were told that unless there was an MTP trip scheduled that day, they would not be able to travel. One respondent expressed confusion and frustration with the scheduling procedures wondering why TRAX would not take their name should others later request travel for that same day. Another respondent stated he had given up on TRAX sensing they did not want to provide or were discouraging him from scheduling the trip.

2. Other Transportation Considerations

Adult diabetes rates have been increasing at an alarming rate in Texas which is among the states with the highest incidence rate for the disease. These increases have occurred across the board for all ethnic groups and all ages. There are especially dramatic increases among young adults, for who diagnosed diabetes rates more than doubled from 2004 to 2007. If people in their 20s are already having diabetes, the rates for this cohort may be dramatically higher in 20 years when the current generation of persons in their 20s reaches their 40s.

There is currently no cure for diabetes and those most likely to have diabetes, older and Latino populations, are the fastest growing populations in the state, accounting for most of the projected change. In addition, diabetes rates are highest in the border and rural counties which are more likely to have very low rates of insurance coverage, and low physician-to-population ratios. Texas Data Center projections indicated that these counties may lead the state in developing higher levels of diabetes

While not all persons with diabetes require dialysis treatment, low population densities in the rural counties also preclude nearby dialysis treatment clinics, meaning a growing number of persons may have to travel long distances for both primary care associated with diabetes and for dialysis treatment associated with end stage renal disease.

Table X Projected Number and *Percent* of the Population with Diabetes by County, 2010 to 2040

County	Diabetes 2010	Diabetes 2020	Diabetes 2030	Diabetes 2040	Change Rate
Brewster	1,075 14.1	1,574 20.0	1,841 23.4	1,979 26.7	84%
Culberson	417 16.6	608 23.1	691 27.2	720 31.2	73%
El Paso	79,057 14.4	118,613 19.5	152,108 23.0	179,599 26.5	127%
Hudspeth	471 15.7	794 22.2	1,039 27.9	1,202 33.3	155%
Jeff Davis	353 15.7	594 23.4	732 28.9	820 34.4	132%
Presidio	982 16.4	1,376 21.3	1,632 22.8	1,850 24.7	88%
State of Texas	2,221,727 11.9	3,903,995 17.1	5,783,481 20.8	7,980,225 23.8	259%

Source: Summary Report on Diabetes Projections in Texas, 2007-2040, Office of the State Demographer, University of Texas at San Antonio

3. Accessible Transportation Coalition

In early 2008, twenty individuals attended a two-day Easter Seals Project Action Accessible Transportation Coalition facilitated event to identify mobility “needs and urgent issues.” While the event occurred some years ago, several identified issues were confirmed by interviews, surveys or other research in this needs assessment and are presented again here. The identified needs were grouped by fixed-route, paratransit and accessible pathway issues listed below.

Fixed-Route Service

- Not all routes are fully accessible
- Fare increases unaffordable to some riders
- Service hours too limited
- Service frequency too limited

- Service coverage leaves some areas unserved or too distant to nearest stop
- Some routes seem inefficient with many dead ends
- Route announcements need to include landmarks and transfer points
- Accessibility limited for persons who are blind or visually impaired
- More passenger shelters are needed
- The system should attempt to broaden use by people of all income levels
- Services in rural areas inadequate: hours, frequency and coverage
- Printed Schedules too frequently not current
- There is not an easy transfer between county and city buses
- Bus stops signage should use square posts and Braille

Paratransit Service

- Drivers need more experience, sensitivity and training in the myriad issues faced by passengers with disabilities
- Scheduling process is difficult for some riders
- Advance notice process limits restricts mobility
- Improved statewide paratransit coordination could allow better mobility across service boundaries
- More accessible taxi cabs should be subcontracted to augment paratransit services

Accessible Pathways

- Not all sidewalks leading to bus stops are accessible
- Audible signals should be installed for persons with limited vision
- Not all shelters are fully accessible

While most of these issues focus on accessibility for persons with disabilities, many are universal in their applicability to mobility for all persons and underscore the fact that most persons at some point experience disability related mobility challenges and benefit from a fully accessible public transportation system.

H. Other Needs Assessments

The community action agencies serving the region, Project Bravo serving El Paso County and Big Bend Community Action serving the rural counties are required to conduct a needs assessment every two years and prepare a Community Action Plan (CAP). The needs assessment of both organizations is an open ended attempt to assess the broad range of issues faced by people in their service areas, particularly low income individuals and families. Even though the assessment was not focused on transportation, in both assessments adequate transportation was identified along with childcare as the top two priorities of low income residents. The Project Bravo needs assessment determined that 50% of the low income clients served by the agency report having no car available. Unfortunately, neither assessment explored the issue in any greater detail, but its identification as a top priority emphasizes the importance of transportation and suggests a significant unmet need among this population.

I. Assessment Conclusions and Implications for Regional Mobility and Coordination

The geographic and economic characteristics of the region and its population greatly influence demand for public transportation services. The region has a much higher proportion of transit dependent populations, with persons between the ages of 5 and 19 and over 65, persons with disabilities and persons living below the poverty line. In some locations, households without a car available represented are also represented at much higher rates than the state averages.

The geography of the region also impacts public transportation: the crowding of I-10 corridor in El Paso and the division of the city by the Franklin Mountains, the enormous Ft. Bliss military complex and proximity to Juarez, Mexico and the traffic it creates presents numerous logistical, land use and development and therefore transportation limitations for the urban area. Conversely, the sparsely populated rural counties have rather small populations concentrated in a handful of cities that are unable to support much retail activity and therefore require long trips to access basic services and amenities.

The mobility needs of persons in specific, often narrow service categories: victims of domestic violence unable to use unprotected public transit services; single parents with multiple young children; residents of extremely remote areas of low population density; persons intimidated by public transportation or who have a disability that requires special accessibility assistance represent special transportation delivery challenges. To this group should be added, those persons dependent on paratransit or other demand-response services who are required to schedule trips well in advance. Advance scheduling requirements are fundamental to the efficient operation of a demand-response service but necessarily limit personal mobility. Each of these special needs requires close examination and offers the potential for service innovation.

The issue of service awareness is common to both urban and rural systems was greatly improved, but a need to continually inform and involve the public about services and issues exists.

Finally, there are a variety of operational challenges public transportation providers face that directly impact the level and quality of transit services. Prominent among these is the recruitment and retention of qualified drivers, especially in the rural counties. The shortage reduces service capacity and impacts service reliability and ridership. In addition, operating costs continue to rise in an environment where ridership is also rising. While currently 20% below its recent peak, fuel costs are expected to fluctuate and likely increase as the national economy recovers and international demand continues to grow. Market uncertainty and inadequate refining capacity combined with a long term increase in demand will likely cause fuel prices to return to peak levels, straining transit operations and potentially limiting services. Fare increases are extremely unpopular and already limit the use of public transportation by persons with very low or extremely low incomes. Social service providers are seeing their budgets cut and will be hard pressed to increase or even retain transportation benefits in their budgets.

The following provides an abbreviated listing of the issues identified in this needs assessment:

Urban Fixed-Route Findings

The most commonly cited factors that limit use of the urban fixed-route system from both human service agency interviews and consumer surveys were distance to the nearest bus stop, hours of service, pathways to bus stops, frequency of buses, cost, and route location. Additionally, the surveys and interviews identified issues associated with route markings, stop announcements, difficult to read system map, and to a lesser degree driver attitude. Several respondents also identified the logistical difficulty many experience relying on the fixed-route system for commuting to work, especially if a parent or care giver must first get a child to childcare. Additionally, many of those surveyed identified areas in the rural parts of the county that they felt had no or inadequate services. Urban based fixed-route findings include:

- The distance to the nearest stop is too far in many areas of the city
- Bus service begins too late and ends too early
- Bus fares are too high resulting in a large share of disposable income devoted to transportation or inaccessible for lack of income
- Bus stop signs are difficult to see and the route system map is difficult to read
- Stop announcements provide too little orientation information for passengers with limited sight and automated stop announcement system not reliable
- The system route design requires many passengers to have to transfer to one or more other buses to reach destination resulting in extremely long trip times
- Use of fixed-route service leaves victims of domestic violence vulnerable to attack
- Use of buses for riders with strollers, diaper bags and multiple children is very difficult, especially with multiple stops or transfers
- Many persons inexperienced or intimidated by use of buses and require orientation or travel training which could be provided directly or through health and human service organizations
- Inadequate service hours and too long distance to nearest route in El Paso County rural communities which is site of many low-income families and housing placements
- Passenger shelters needed in more locations and should be lighted at night

Urban Demand-Response Findings

The most frequently expressed concern in both interviews and consumer surveys regarding demand-response service was late arriving vehicles. Many also cited the advance notice requirement as presenting a mobility barrier. Much less frequently, the respondents noted driver attitude (for which there were an equal number of complements of driver sensitivity and professionalism.) Urban based demand-response findings include:

- Late arriving vehicles
- Advance scheduling requirement limits mobility
- Long travel times
- Bumpy rides
- Driver difficulty securing tie-downs
- ID required for LIFT eligibility not always available

Rural System Findings

Nearly all public transportation services in Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis, and Presidio Counties are provided by Big Bend Community Action Committee under the TRAX name. Awareness of TRAX and BBCAC transportation programs has greatly increased since the last needs assessment in 2011 and most are grateful for that transportation option. BBCAC has secured additional resources to allow veterans and some non-Medicaid recipients to ride free, expanding service availability. Nevertheless, issues remain with service reliability, the early hours of trip departures followed by infrequency of trips, prior notice requirements, wait times for trip returns, cost and dispatcher attitude. Many were highly complimentary of the service stating that it was providing mobility for scores of persons that were previously dependent on others for their mobility and believed the cost to be very reasonable given the distance traveled. Rural findings include:

- Trip requests frequently denied if no MTP or insufficient other ridership exists or drivers unavailable for day requested
- Advance scheduling requirement limits mobility and precludes use of system for emergency or unanticipated needs or emergency room/hospital discharges
- Service too costly for some low-income residents not eligible for subsidized service on MTP, HRTG or BBHD subsidy programs
- Many trips begin too early and have long layovers precluding use for mid-day appointments or other purposes
- Too few time of service options to destination or return
- Service provider does not provide vouchers, passes or tokens for organizations to issue to eligible clients
- Scheduled service desired between Terlingua and Alpine and possibly other locations
- Very limited or no same day service

Each of the needs identified in this report will be included in the Updated Regional Transportation Coordinated Plan and compared to the Inventory of Transportation Resources. The resulting analysis will identify actions needed to address system gaps, growth, duplication, efficiency, and innovation. The Gap Analysis will attempt to determine other opportunities to address system reforms through coordination and identify specific regional transportation coordination priorities and projects for §5310, State Planning Assistance, Rural Discretionary, Rural Transit Assistance Program, and Inter-City Bus and other rural and urban discretionary funding programs.

IV. Regional Mobility Gaps and Duplication Analysis

The Far West Texas/El Paso regions prepared transportation coordination plans in 2006 and 2011 built on transportation inventories, needs assessment and gap analyses. This gap analysis relies on new transportation inventory and needs assessment data collected in 2015 and 2016. Nevertheless, regionally coordinated transportation planning has occurred on a continuous basis since 2006 and therefore many transportation needs and gaps identified in previous plans were reconsidered and are represented in this gap analysis if they remain relevant. Regional health and human services and public transportation coordination planning relies on a clear and comprehensive assessment of a region's mobility needs and a complete inventory of the region's transportation resources and assets. When compared, the needs assessment and inventory provide a picture of the extent to which those resources meet regional demand and identify gaps duplication in the broader public transportation system. This report identifies and provides analysis of the gaps and redundancies in the multi-provider system of transportation resources for the Far West Texas/El Paso Region. The inventory upon which this report and analysis is based includes traditional publically funded transportation resources as well as non-traditional and private resources that contribute to the mobility of persons in the region. The assessment of mobility needs also forming the basis of this analysis focused primarily on the needs of transit dependent populations and persons served by health and human services organizations.

Since the inventory of transportation resources and the assessment of mobility needs for the region are detailed in separate reports and will become major sections of the Far West Texas / El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Plan, they will not be included here. Therefore, a fuller understanding of the source of the information presented in this report may require the review of those documents. That said, most of the gaps and redundancies identified and discussed below are self-explanatory and easily understood. As will be noted, most arise from a lack of resources in a region experiencing rapid growth, a very high concentration of transit dependent persons and a system of varied providers serving a large and geographically diverse region.

A. Mapping of Needs to Inventory

1. Gaps in Regional Transportation System

In spite of its diverse transportation resources, there are many gaps in service that represent a barrier to mobility for many people of the region. There is however minimal duplication in transportation services which if redeployed could present the opportunity to increase service levels or fill a gap in service, if in part. Gaps in service were identified by comparing needs identified in the Needs Assessment with resources profiled

in the Inventory. While this process sometimes helped locate a resource to address a need, the Needs Assessment tended to elicit needs that remain unmet, at least from the perspective of the person identifying them, and therefore most of these needs represent gaps in service. Gaps exist throughout the urban and rural areas and in both fixed-route and demand-response systems. Gaps exist primarily as a result of insufficient transportation resources. Additionally, gaps result from certain approaches to service delivery, lack of adequate public information about available services, and practical barriers transportation providers face to maximize service levels and efficiencies. As with the Needs Assessment results, regional mobility gaps are presented for urban fixed-route and demand-response services and for rural fixed-route and demand-response services.

2. Geographic Distribution of System Gaps

Urban County Mobility Gaps

As noted in the Needs Assessment, El Paso is a geographically difficult city to serve. It is bisected by the southern tip of Franklin Mountain which extends to very near the central business district which itself sits immediately on the Rio Grande and international border with the Republic of Mexico. The city is further divided by Ft. Bliss, the nation's largest domestic military reservation, which also extends toward the central city, and when combined with Franklin Mountain, creates a three finger city layout. Interstate 10 is El Paso's most significant thoroughfare, running parallel to the Rio Grande and connecting the three fingers at their base. The heavily congested I-10 is also a major trucking route and carries the through traffic of I-10, I-20, I-25, US-54 and the Pan American Highway. Across the southern border, Ciudad Juárez is, Mexico's fifth largest city and the largest city on the U.S. border. El Paso and Juárez are closely tied culturally, socially and economically with thousands crossing daily and boarding Sun Metro buses or driving on El Paso's streets.

These conditions limit the fixed-route system's ability to provide speedy cross-town service and while Sun Metro's system is ranked very high in its proximity to residents, it is ranked very low in its ability to quickly transport residents to areas where employment is concentrated. Since urban fixed-route and demand-response services share crowded thoroughfares, arterials and local streets with local and through traffic, it is very much affected by these conditions, especially when cross town trips are required. Most survey respondents and interview participants identified the inconvenience or the distance to the nearest stops rather than wait times as the greatest barriers to the use of fixed-route service and excessive wait times as the greatest problem with demand-response services. As noted in the Needs Assessment, listed gaps were identified through consumer surveys, interviews with human service agency staff or other means and could appear on this list even if identified only once.

Urban County Fixed-Route Gaps:

- Early morning service begins too late and late night service ends too early to access employment on some routes
- Bus fares too high for some without assistance
- Distance to nearest stop too far in some locations
- Commute time too long on some routes or insufficient express service provided
- Fixed route service too dangerous for victims of domestic violence
- Bus stop signs difficult to see and system map difficult to read
- On-board stop announcements provide too little orientation information for passengers with limited sight and should be made more reliably
- Not all system stops have accessible pathways
- Insufficient travel training available or insufficient awareness of travel training prevents some potential riders from using fixed-route services
- Transfer required to reach areas outside city limits
- Transfer between El Paso County and Sun Metro fixed-route systems not facilitated by shared fares
- El Paso County commuter service provides insufficient neighborhood coverage making distance to nearest route too far
- El Paso County service lacks passenger shelters
- Sun Metro lacks passenger in some locations (Hunter @ Gateway East)
- Sun Metro passenger shelters should be lighted
- Local service should not be reduced too much on BRT lines
- Announcement should be made earlier that ID required to enter Ft. Bliss on lines 36 and 41 for passengers using transit to access VA medical facility

Urban Demand-Response Gaps:

- Buses arrive after scheduled pick up window
- Pick up window excessively long
- Travel time on bus too long
- Limited same day demand-response service
- Demand-response service needed for low-income parents who must commute to childcare then work
- Demand-response service for shelter residents or other human service program clients who must make multiple closely spaced daily appointments
- No ability to schedule, cancel or receive trip updates on smart phone
- Passenger expectations unrealistic and not fully trained and engaged to make system run more timely

- Limited awareness and availability of paratransit or equivalent service outside city limits
- LIFT services not available to otherwise eligible persons without photo ID

Rural County Mobility Gaps

Public transportation in the five rural counties is provided almost exclusively by Big Bend Community Action Committee through its TRAX service which has evolved considerably since the first transportation coordination plan was developed in 2006. The region now has \$5311 funded general public transportation services and has added subsidy programs for veterans and non-Medicaid but medically indigent individuals. The 2011 plan identified a need for scheduled fixed-route service in some locations, but a subsequent transportation coordination planning activity examined the issue much more closely and determined that there was both insufficient ridership and insufficient funding to support fixed-route service, particularly since BBCAC would still be required to provide demand-response service throughout the region.

TRAX serves an enormous geographical area and most trip requests are to distant destinations such as Ft. Stockton, Odessa or El Paso resulting in very long trips. BBCAC reports that attracting and retaining vehicle operators willing to drive long distances requiring very early morning starts is their most difficult challenge followed by rapidly accumulating vehicle mileage. Many riders understand the operational challenges these conditions present and appreciate the mobility option TRAX provides. Nevertheless, many users and potential users considered the availability of TRAX unreliable after repeatedly being informed there was no service for the date trips were requested. Others found the early departure times unworkable for their needs and lamented the absence of same day service, especially related to various health care provider and hospital discharge needs.

The only other transportation providers serving the rural counties is Amtrak's thrice weekly east and westbound service with a stop in Alpine, Greyhound's multi-daily service in Van Horn and All Aboard America's twice daily north and southbound service between Presidio and Midland-Odessa.

Rural Fixed-Route Gaps:

- Greyhound continues to lack stop in Sierra Blanca
- Amtrak continues to lack stop in Marfa
- All Aboard America schedule inconvenient
- No service linking southern Brewster County to Alpine

Rural Demand-Response Gaps:

- Service unavailable some days when MTP passengers or sufficient other riders are not already scheduled or when drivers are not available
- Same day service often not available
- Next day service not available if scheduling too late and no after hours scheduling technology in place
- No back-up system or alternative option when same day service is needed
- No mid-day service or service options outside of very early departures
- No mechanism for service organizations to purchase service for clients

3. Transportation Gaps for Older Adults

The share and number of the U.S. population over the age of sixty five is growing rapidly as is this group of older adults in the far west Texas region, especially in several rural counties and communities. Older adults are generally living longer, aging in place and many expect to maintain active life styles requiring the level of mobility that were accustomed to in younger years. Many older adults continue to own and operate automobiles, but a time may come for many persons who can or choose to no longer drive for age related reasons. A variety of existing public transportation modes or services address the mobility needs of this population; nevertheless an analysis of the transportation inventory and needs assessment of this plan revealed various gaps in service, including:

- Distance to nearest fixed-route bus stop too distant in some locations
- Passenger shelters do not exist in some locations or on some routes
- Passenger shelters may lack nighttime lighting
- Pathways no always fully accessible to bus stops
- Convenient transportation to senior centers or nutrition programs may be inadequate or non-existent in some communities
- Transportation cost too high for some older adults on fixed incomes
- Advance reservation requirement limits mobility for persons dependent on demand-response service
- Availability of transportation for group activities limited or non-existent in some communities

4. Transportation Gaps for Persons with Disabilities

As with older adults, the region generally has a higher proportion of persons with disabilities than the state of Texas. This is particularly true of older adults with

disabilities and both these populations possess many of the same mobility needs regardless of age. The needs assessment in this plan identified many such needs which affirmed a disability focused needs assessment conducted in conjunction with the 2006-2017 regional plan. A comparison of those needs with the current inventory of transportation resources, identified the following mobility gaps for persons with disabilities:

- On-board stop announcements provide too little orientation information, should be made more reliably and in multiple forms to serve broad range of disabilities
- Bus stop signs, transfer center monitors and system maps can be difficult to read
- Not all bus stops can be reached with accessible pathways
- Insufficient travel training is available and there is limited public knowledge of available travel training limiting potential of fixed-route services for persons with disabilities
- MTP and paratransit buses arrive outside of pick-up window or duration window is too long to be convenient for riders
- There is only limited same day service in both urban and rural systems
- There is limited dedicated paratransit service for rural El Paso County
- Sun Metro paratransit service required picture ID for eligibility determination
- There is no back-up same day service system for rural passengers

5. Transportation Provider Operational Challenges

The operational challenges transportation providers face on a daily basis affect their ability to deliver timely, reliable, convenient and comfortable service which can therefore directly impact the passengers that rely on that service for their mobility. While transportation providers will always face issues associated with traffic congestion, roadway conditions, vehicle maintenance and regulatory requirements, the following were identified as particular concerns:

- Recruitment and retention of qualified drivers
- Passenger readiness at scheduled pick-up time
- Managing passenger expectations and communicating service standards
- On-going driver training
- Predictable operating costs especially fuel cost

6. Duplication in Regional Transportation System

With rapidly expanding populations in El Paso and most of the eastern counties, no area or population is over-served and little redundancy exists. Several areas of duplication

identified in the 2011 Regional Plan were eliminated. Nevertheless, there are areas in which improved coordination or redeployment of transportation resources may yield a net gain in the overall service level or in service efficiency. For many specialized transportation services, especially in El Paso, providers are already coordinating to minimize duplication. In the eastern counties, one provider already operates integrated §5310, §5311, MTP, AAA, veterans and other transportation programs thereby eliminating much occasion for duplication. Unlike service gaps however, the elimination of system redundancies may inconvenience or displace riders who benefit from a particular service. Again, system duplication is best described in its urban or rural context given the vast differences in the region.

7. Geographic Distribution of Transportation Duplication

Urban Transit Duplication:

- Patient transportation to dialysis centers uncoordinated and ad hoc with dialysis providers not sharing costs
- Urban transportation providers do not coordinate driver recruitment, screening and training

Rural Transit Duplication:

- All Aboard America and TRAX both provide service between Presidio and Midland although the former is scheduled fixed-route and the latter is irregular demand-response

8. Consequences of System Gaps and Duplication

Most gaps in service are easily understood, but the general consequence of many is limited mobility and potentially lost opportunity or reduced access to important or critical services. In general, adequate transportation services translate into a more mobile population, more fluid labor markets with better access to both job and workers. Adequate, accessible and efficient transportation resources provide greater access to human and health services with improved social and health outcomes, less human isolation and a better quality of life. Gaps in service represent a failure of local public transportation systems to fully serve their constituencies or customers or to realize their potential as a fundamental public resource. It is a core purpose of this Gap Analysis and resulting Regional Plan to accurately identify, understand and successfully fill unacceptable gaps in regional transportation services.

Several transportation providers in the Far West Texas/El Paso region have already explored operating practices and have implemented various partnerships and

collaborations that yield greater efficiency, effectiveness or improved customer experience.

The Regional Plan also endeavors to establish mechanisms that identify, understand and address system gaps and duplication in an on-going way to continually maximize the level of transportation services. The recommended strategies which follow the gaps/duplication analysis include these planning processes, and while not presented in this report, recently adopted regional transportation coordination goals and objectives include a commitment to on-going self-evaluation of the planning process and continuous improvement.

B. Gap / Duplication Analysis

1. Implications for Regional Mobility and Coordination

Most system gaps are the result of inadequate resources to keep pace with growing demand or to provide the time and frequency of service that meets the demands of all users. Regional geographic and population realities, especially the uncounted influence of the large Juárez population just across the Mexican border will likely always result in the urbanized El Paso system receiving less §5307 formula funds than are necessary to meet optimum service levels. The rapid urbanization of communities outside the El Paso city limits reduces funding that would otherwise be available to the rural provider that serves those communities and increases funding for the urban provider that does not operate beyond the city limits. This condition should warrant a continued study of the feasibility of a regional transit system or in the near term, exploration of transferring funds or purchasing transportation to ensure adequate services for these gap urbanized areas or UZAa.

Likewise, the commuter service mode of the rural El Paso County system precludes the provision of complementary ADA paratransit service to this area in spite of the growing need. A §5310 collaboration addresses part of this need, but it is funded through an annual competitive process and therefore not assured into the future.

In the five rural counties, §5311 transit funding formula does not fully account for the very long and therefore costly trips provided by TRAX. As such, it is critically important to make every transportation resource count.

Same day service gaps are also present in both urban and rural demand-response systems and will require significant structural and resource changes to eliminate. However, the expanded recruitment and certification of MTP “individual drivers” could provide a same-day alternative for that system, particularly in remote rural communities where the service is more critical.

The mobility needs of special groups were identified and regional coordination efforts should encourage the development of programs to address them. Sun Metro's Job Express is still operating, and while there has been no discussion to end the service, its underlying funding source will soon end yet the service is critical for those that depend on it. Likewise, the transportation program operated by Opportunity Center for the Homeless continues to operate in spite of exhausting its HUD funding making its future less certain.

Numerous accessibility issues represent gaps in service. Regional coordination should consider these when setting priorities for the use of discretionary funds and endorsing projects. Regional coordination efforts may also look to the multiple advantages of encouraging use of fixed-route services when addressing accessibility issues.

Some gaps may require approaches to mobility and access to services inadequately addressed by typical transit services. Such non-traditional solutions may include car sharing, expansion of vanpools, leveraging idle vehicles and volunteer drivers and the use of mobile phone technology to link riders and drivers.

Finally, transportation providers continue to face mutual challenges associated with driver recruitment for which a coordinated approach may yield results. BBCAC in particular should consider partnering with the workforce system to explore and implement effective solutions.

Redundancies in the system are few, but regional coordination should play a central role to their on-going identification and the adoption of mechanisms that prevent or minimize their occurrence and ensure new resources are directed to unmet needs. Of particular interest in this regard is the on-going examination of dialysis related patient transportation.

2. Discussion of Strategies to Address System Needs / Gaps / Duplication

Greater Reliance on Fixed-Route Services

As noted in the previous transportation coordination plan, encouraging the fullest use of the urban and El Paso County fixed-route systems will reduce costs associated with the much more expensive paratransit system allowing cost savings to be redirected to increasing service frequency, the expansion of service hours and accessibility enhancements. The continuous identification and removal of accessibility barriers, if proactively approached, could itself result in a marginal increase in fixed-route ridership by users who might qualify for and otherwise use paratransit services. Improvements to fixed-route accessibility infrastructure should be accompanied by expanded and more widely marketed travel-training services.

Coordination Between Fixed-Route and Medical Transportation Programs

Given the capitated funding mechanism for the MPT, the diversion of eligible and appropriate clients to fixed-route services could potentially allow more vehicles to be deployed to improve service standards for MTP clients who do not have a demand-response alternative such as a shorter pick-up window and reduced wait and travel times.

Development of Targeted Programs to Address Special Needs

Ensuring the continuation of Job Express and the Opportunity Center transportation program is critical to addressing the needs of some currently served special populations. In addition, victims of domestic violence and low income parents with small children who rely on public transportation to access both child care and work, homeless and other persons who must daily access multiple services in quick succession, patients entering or leaving hospitals, the newly employed working before or after fixed-route service hours or persons living in more affordable but remote areas may need demand-response service tailored to their particular needs with these groups prioritized for existing and new transportation resources. Emerging employment opportunities and workforce needs in the eastern counties may also warrant targeted services.

Addressing Accessibility Related Gaps

Numerous accessibility-related gaps were identified in the needs assessment. Some relate to physical barriers and many related to operational practices and policies. Understanding these issues and partnering with affected providers to improve accessibility for persons with disabilities increases ridership and improves mobility.

Improved Public Awareness

The lack of public awareness was not identified in the needs assessment. However, public confusion of operating practices seems to be a growing concern for rural county residents who are told that trips occur only when an MTP passenger is scheduled. Urban county demand-response providers could benefit from efforts to better communicate passenger readiness and other ways passengers can contribute to system efficiency and in a reduction of wait and travel time for themselves and fellow passengers.

Same-day Service

The lack of same day service restricts mobility for those reliant on demand-response programs, both special and paratransit users in El Paso and all users in the eastern counties. Providers should make every effort to accommodate same-day requests where reasonably possible. Individual MTP drivers should be recruited and certified to address medically related same-day transportation needs in the rural counties.

Non-Traditional Services

In very remote communities, groups of low-income or other persons living in close proximity who require greater flexibility than traditional bus service affords, may benefit from car sharing or other alternative mobility approaches. Smart phone technology could be used to link riders with volunteer on-call drivers and could be a partial solution for dialysis patient return trips.

Regional Fixed-Route System

The issue of seamless transfer between El Paso County Rural Transit and Sun Metro was addressed through a previous transportation coordination project, but not all of the project's recommendations were implemented. Sun Metro and El Paso County should review the report and implement all appropriate recommendations. In addition, the region should pursue a serious study and consideration of the integration of the urban and rural systems.

Service Duplication

Service duplication identified in this plan should be examined and addressed as appropriate with service adjustments made where possible. Going forward, all new applications for funding from area providers should consider the adequacy of existing services. Regional coordination endorsements for proposals should only be awarded to projects that do not unnecessarily duplicate existing or planned services but address the region's mobility priorities identified in this plan. The funding of vehicle purchases at the expense of service levels is a duplication issue. Grant requestors and funders should seek to balance the use of capital and operating funds, especially in the targeted \$5310 program. Greater reliance on purchased transportation should be considered to increase the 40% operating cost ceiling of that program.

Strategies to Address System Gaps for Older Adults and Persons with Disabilities

Many of the strategies listed above are applicable to and are expected to improve both access to and transportation services for older adults and persons with disabilities. Nevertheless, given their greater likelihood of dependence on public transportation and their higher relative incidence in far west Texas, strategies designed to address the mobility needs of older adults and persons with disabilities are include:

- Removing physical and operational barriers that limit access to or convenient and productive use of fixed-route transportation services
- Expanding capacity and awareness of fixed-route travel training services
- Ensuring demand-response service is available to persons in rural El Paso County

- Expanding availability of same day service in both urban and rural areas through expanded demand-response capacity and/or designing and testing the concept of a same-day service back-up system
- Securing resources or undertaking activities that support the continuation of coordinated and integrated demand-response services in the rural counties that ensures daily reliable service regardless of passenger load

3. Capacity of Transportation System to Respond to Needs / Gaps / Duplication and Discussion of Regional Transportation Policy Issues and Alternatives

It is difficult to determine the capacity of the existing transportation system or individual transportation providers to respond to unmet needs, system gaps and duplication. Nevertheless, regional transportation coordination and cooperation is strong and has remained active since well before the submission of the original Regional Plan in 2006. Most of the activities identified in the 2006 and 2011 plans have been accomplished and work continues on those that have not. Regional Transportation providers meet on a regular and frequent basis and adopt practices that maximize service coordination. Much needs to be done and this plan is intended and expected to be a guidebook for future coordination efforts.

Funding uncertainties will certainly play a key role in what can be accomplished and regional transportation coordination has limited authority to direct or influence the operations of individual providers. Nevertheless, the Far West Texas / El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee has the unique opportunity to recognize coordination opportunities and create the mechanism and environment to facilitate cooperative solutions that maximize transportation resource efficiency and effectiveness.

V. Alignment and Integration with Transportation Planning Processes

Transportation coordination planning necessarily occurs in an environment of multiple variables including the planning of individual transportation provider organizations and contractors; state and local level planning of State human services agencies; service and strategic planning of non-profit organizations including those that provide transportation; business planning of for-profit transportation companies; and the planning of city and county level local governments that are significant transportation providers, especially in El Paso. In addition, the El Paso MPO plays a significant role in multi-modal transportation planning including public transportation, compounded by its role as the Designated Recipient of federal §5310 funds for the El Paso urbanized area and the administrator of area Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, both of which support vital transit programs in the region.

Fortunately, the Far West Texas/El Paso region has benefitted from sustained, active participation by all public, major non-profit and many private transportation providers in the region. The region likewise benefits from the active participation of many health and human service organizations and systems, especially those with an interest in client transportation for older adults, persons with disabilities, persons with low incomes, veterans and other transit dependent populations. That active engagement helps to ensure that all regional transportation coordination planning hears from and communicates to those stakeholders. This regional plan will be shared with those varied stakeholders who will be encouraged to incorporate its findings, analysis, goals and objectives in their own planning and to bring individual organization concerns to the Far West Texas/El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee (WTEP) for discussion, consideration and planning alignment.

An example of such a step is the creation of a standing Transit subcommittee to the El Paso MPO's Transportation Policy Board (TPB). The El Paso MPO has been a core WTEP stakeholder and hosts its Steering and Stakeholder meetings at its boardroom. The creation of the Transit committee will elevate transit issues to the TPB which is populated by numerous chief elected officials in the region. WTEP will formally ask to be represented on the Transit Committee and the Transit Committee will be represented on the WTEP stakeholder committee.

Additionally, several transportation organizations formed a "providers committee" independent of WTEP to address areas of common operational concern. The committee was often used to follow up on WTEP recommendations or activities including collaborative approaches to dialysis transportation and §5310 funded services.

WTEP will ask to be represented on other planning bodies that affect public transportation or services to targeted populations and will continue to invite and encourage the participation of organizations and individuals involved in transportation planning, service delivery or human services.

VI. Regional Transportation Priorities, Recommendations and Actions

A. Statement of Regional Transportation Coordination Vision

Early in its planning history, regional transportation coordination adopted the following guiding vision statement which it considered to be still relevant and timely and elected to retain for the 2017-2022 regional plan:

All persons of the six-county Far West Texas region will have access to customer-centered, dependable, convenient and safe transportation services and choices

B. Regional Transportation Coordination Mission

As with the statement of vision, regional transportation coordination stakeholders likewise elected to retain its current mission statement which is embedded in its governing bylaws and seeks to guide the overarching purpose of Far West Texas regional transportation coordination planning:

Proactively facilitate the planning and coordination between transportation providers, health and human service agencies and advocacy organizations in the six-county Far West Texas region to maximize mobility and the efficiency and effectiveness of public transportation resources

C. Regional Transportation Coordination Goals and Objectives

Regional transportation goals and objectives constitute the core of this plan. They identify regional priorities, outline what transportation stakeholders seek to achieve and categorize the objectives or strategies of how those goals might be achieved.

Goal 1	Maintain an inclusive and sustainable planning process that seeks and values public participation, communicates its goals and activities to the public and honors its Regional Plan and Priorities
Objective 1.1	Maintain viable steering and stakeholder committees and prepare and follow annual detailed workplans to guide regional coordination activities and achieve goals and objectives outlined in the Regional Transportation Coordination Plan
Objective 1.2	Maintain communications and joint planning with adjacent regions to ensure inter-regional coordination
Objective 1.3	Establish and maintain a working relationship with appropriate entities to enhance regional transportation coordination with Las Cruces, Chaparral, Sunland Park and other relevant South Central New Mexico public transportation planning efforts
Objective	Maintain www.gobusgo.org web site to communicate regional transportation

1.4	coordination purpose, goals, objectives, and past and current activities
Objective 1.5	Establish mechanism to define metric parameters, collect data and report results that measure the outcomes and impact of transportation coordination planning efforts
Objective 1.6	Participate in planning that facilitates aging in place and aging in community neighbor and transit design

Goal 2	Fill unacceptable gaps in service, especially for transit dependent populations, through the continuous identification and assessment of changing mobility needs, expansion of financial support, increased efficiency, redeployment of redundant resources and services innovation
Objective 2.1	Encourage the expansion of Sun Metro service hours to address early morning and evening commute needs
Objective 2.2	Identify resources and expand same-day options in both urban and rural demand-response systems
Objective 2.3	Study approach, identify resources and establish scheduled or other service that efficiently serves southern Brewster County
Objective 2.4	Develop plan to address duplicate use/scheduling of MTP, LIFT and New Freedom programs
Objective 2.5	Expand capacity to offer same day demand response services for priority trips where feasible in both urban and rural systems
Objective 2.6	Continuously monitor dialysis transportation needs and use and develop and pilot strategies that improve clinic-transit provider communications; that minimizes the impact of unpredictable return trip pick-up times; that improves clinic location referral/choice; and, that leverage additional funds to offset growing cost.
Objective 2.7	Develop partnerships with health and human service organizations to sustain/expand transportation services that address childcare/work commute and other challenges of low income and other special needs consumers

Goal 3	Provide technical assistance and training to transit providers and encourage linkages between providers and with organizations serving transit dependent populations to create a customer-centered and seamless public transportation system
Objective 3.1	Encourage human service agencies to offer or expand fixed route transportation assistance and establish mechanism for rural agencies to purchase transportation on rural system
Objective 3.2	Continue to identify and advocate for improvement in signage and system informational materials, the removal of pathway barriers and other design changes that make the urban fixed-route more accessible to persons with disabilities

Objective 3.3	Review operating standards and identify resources necessary to accept all trip requests within service schedule to improve perception of service reliability and build ridership in rural demand-response system
Objective 3.4	Develop capacity to identify backup drivers and establish protocols for their use to satisfy same day service needs in rural MTP system
Objective 3.5	Adopt use of smart phone technology to improve real time communications with consumers and improve passenger readiness and pick up efficiency
Objective 3.6	Encourage All Aboard America to study and adjust Presidio-Midland schedule as appropriate
Objective 3.7	Encourage and facilitate use of bicycles through the revision of rural counties' public transit policies and the purchase of bicycle racks and related facility improvements
Objective 3.8	Develop and implement strategy to address demand-response and rural system driver shortage by exploring national best practices, incentives, and service approach (adapted from 2006 plan)
Objective 3.9	Conduct forums or facilitate other means to inform transit providers, health and human service organizations and other stakeholders of transportation funding opportunities and encourage collaborative projects that are consistent with the Regional Plan and priorities

Goal 4	Ensure broad public knowledge of transit services and issues and maintain effective public awareness effort targeted to significant segments regarding specialized services and resources
Objective 4.1	Develop, pilot and implement transit consumer education and engagement program that better informs customer expectations about their role in passenger readiness and timely services
Objective 4.2	Use existing transit information resources and expansion of MyVetRide One Call/One Click to provide comprehensive transit information and inform public of §5310, travel training, Highly Rural Transportation Grant Program and other specialized transportation services

Goal 5	Work to eliminate physical, financial, regulatory and operational barriers to the delivery of seamless regional transportation
Objective 5.1	Identify best practices, develop pilot program and test approaches to further reducing demand-response wait times, pick up window and travel time
Objective 5.2	Develop and implement strategy to support on-going travel training programs that encourage greater use of fixed-route services by demand-response eligible persons

Objective 5.3	Advocate and support a metropolitan system that combines city and county transit services into a single integrated service design
Objective 5.4	Encourage study and adjustment to El Paso County commuter routes to increase neighborhood coverage and accessibility
Objective 5.5	Identify resources and erect passenger shelters at previously identified sites on County rural routes

Goal 7	Enhance the mobility of older adults and persons with disabilities through an inclusive and deliberative process that encourages coordinated services and the efficient use of limited §5310 funds to ensure the creation and continuation of mobility services where existing transportation services do not fully meet the needs of rural and urban communities
Objective 7.1	Sustain current rural counties' integrated demand-response service system to maximize use of transit vehicles, operating resources and management expertise through vehicle replacement, preventative maintenance and operating support
Objective 7.2	Continue support for vehicle acquisition and replacement to ensure older adults and persons with disabilities can access nutritional and other essential services
Objective 7.3	Support demand-responsive and/or subscription transportation services for older adults and persons with disabilities in areas where no public transportation alternative exists
Objective 7.4	Sustain coordinated service delivery enhancements that demonstrably reduce wait-times and/or allow same day scheduling, will-call and other services that afford greater independence to older adults and persons with disabilities

VII. Sustaining Regional Transportation Coordination Planning and Implementing Plan Elements

Regional transportation coordination planning has resulted in numerous improvements to the regional transit system including the successful award of discretionary federal, state and local resources that have allowed for the expansion of services, including those for targeted populations. Transportation coordination planning has also resulted in the changes to local operating practices and multiple collaborations that have improved or expanded transit services without the use of additional funds through improved efficiency and redirection of redundant services. Given this record of accomplishment and proven benefit, Far West Texas transportation coordination stakeholders have collectively expressed a commitment to on-going transportation coordination planning as reflected in its first goal to *maintain an inclusive and sustainable planning process* and in several related implementing objectives. This support for on-going planning is reflected in the Stakeholder Committee adoption of a sustainability plan at its March 20, 2014 meeting. While that plan was developed in a different funding environment than exists today, its core principles and multi-step approach can be invoked to support staffing and other costs associated with on-going transportation coordination planning.

Much stakeholder discussion has occurred in FY 2017 regarding the prospect of the possible end of TxDOT support for Lead Agency transportation coordination planning efforts. The concern has been a standing item on several of its 2016 and 2017 Stakeholder agendas and a key issue for its Steering Committee. As a result, several organizations have expressed an interest in continuing or assuming the Lead Agency role. While the issues has not reached a final resolution, the combination of stakeholder commitment, record of success, an adopted sustainability plan and interest among multiple stakeholder organizations suggests a high probability for continuing the planning effort at some level.

VIII. Measuring Regional Transportation Coordination Performance and Effectiveness

The measurement of transportation coordination performance is important to the determination of its effectiveness and the proper allocation of planning resources. That said, the actual measurement of planning efforts and outcomes is a complex matter given the large number of variables that impact public transportation access, ridership, service levels and other statistics. Nevertheless, Far West Texas Transportation Coordination Stakeholders are committed to coordination planning performance measurement and were briefed on TxDOT's recommendations, timetable and responsibility.

The Regional Stakeholder Committee will be prepared to develop data collection, analysis and reporting systems to measure the following:

COLLABORATION

- Number of active, formal partnerships in place during the reporting period to conduct regional transportation planning activities or to implement objectives or strategies called for in the coordinated plan
- Number of individuals who:
 - received information during the reporting period on how to participate in regional transportation planning activities
 - actively participated during the reporting period in regional transportation planning activities

IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS & INEFFICIENCIES

- Number of gaps and inefficiencies identified in the coordinated plan, including but not limited to gaps and inefficiencies concerning (a) individuals 65 and older, (b) individuals with disabilities, (c) individuals with low incomes, (d) people seeking employment, (e) children, and (f) veterans
- Number of identified gaps and inefficiencies for which there are recommended objectives or strategies in the coordinated plan for resolving these gaps and inefficiencies

RESOLUTION OF PROBLEMS

- Number of objectives or strategies identified in the coordinated plan that have moved from a planning phase to an implementation phase (this may be due to actions taken by any entity, not necessarily the lead agency)

- Number of objectives or strategies in the coordinated plan that have been fully achieved

The region may adopt additional measures more specific to individual regional projects that would not be adequately evaluated in the measures outlined above.

Attachment I
Inventory of Transportation Resources

**FAR WEST TEXAS/EL PASO TRANSPORTATION PROVIDER
INVENTORY SURVEY**

Transportation Provider Name	Mass Transit -Sun Metro		
Address	10151 Montana El Paso, Tx 79925		
Phone	915-212-3333	Fax	
Contact	Domingo Cordero,		
Email	CorderoDX1@elpasotexas.gov		
Website	http://sunmetro.net/		

Annual Total	FY 2014	FY 2015
Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)	12,524,850.00	13,449,700.00
Actual vehicle revenue miles (VRM)	9,820,007.00	9,819,411.00
Actual vehicle revenue hours (VRH)	711,553.00	716,372.00
Transportation Expenditures ¹	\$ 101,453,601.00	\$ 74,986,111.00

Transportation Services Provided

Program/Service Name	Service Mode ²	Service Days / Hours	Fare Range	Eligibility	Area Served	FY 2015 Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)	Program Expenditures FY15	Funding Source
Sun Metro	Bus Service/fixed route	365 Service Day M-F 4:10 to 23:32 Sa 4:10 to 23:32 Su&Holiday 5:00 to 22:45	0.30-1.50 Free for LIFT eligible	Everyone can use and enjoys also available to people with all types of disabilities.	Buses are serving the El Paso City Area.	13,148,051.00	\$ 65,785,176.00	
LIFT	Paratransit	M-F 4:00 to 23:00 Sa 5:00 to 23:00 Su&Holiday 5:00 to 20:00	2.50	ADA paratransit-eligible clients	Service area will extend 1.5 miles beyond Sun Metro's existing fixed-route service but within the El Paso city limits	301,649.00	\$ 9,200,935.00	

Active Fleet Description

Vehicle			Average for Vehicle Type				ITS Equipped			
Vehicle Type	Number	Number w/lift	Average Age	Average LTD Mileage	FY 2015 Miles	Passenger Capacity	GPS	MDT	2-way	Cell ³
Van	-	-	-	-	-	-				
Minibus	69		3	138,493.99	46,306.96	16				
Standard Bus	162		8	373,224.62	49,709.93	30				
Motor Coach	-	-	-	-	-	-				
Other	1		4	35,886.00	2,703.00	3				

Projected Capital Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Fleet Capacity

Projected Operating Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Service Levels

FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
\$ 8,013,810.00	\$ 8,414,500.50	\$ 8,835,225.53	\$ 9,276,986.80	\$ 9,740,836.14
\$ 70,721,606.55	\$ 74,257,686.88	\$ 77,970,571.22	\$ 81,869,099.78	\$ 85,962,554.77

Minibus (12-20 Passenger) -Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheelchairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2801	16	2	CNG	206180
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2802	16	2	CNG	214624
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2803	16	2	CNG	191658
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2804	16	2	CNG	197341
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2805	16	2	CNG	193154
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2806	16	2	CNG	184116
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2807	16	2	CNG	163768
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2808	16	2	CNG	204727
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2809	16	2	CNG	161250
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2810	16	2	CNG	205307
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2811	16	2	CNG	179214
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2812	16	2	CNG	212484
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2813	16	2	CNG	225311
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2814	16	2	CNG	188703
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2815	16	2	CNG	200565
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2816	16	2	CNG	181661
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2817	16	2	CNG	193678
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2818	16	2	CNG	200180
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2819	16	2	CNG	133862
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2820	16	2	CNG	185689
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2821	16	2	CNG	174670
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2822	16	2	CNG	159316
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2823	16	2	CNG	167873
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2824	16	2	CNG	174027
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2825	16	2	CNG	184352
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2826	16	2	CNG	202979
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2827	16	2	CNG	156479
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2828	16	2	CNG	160139
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2829	16	2	CNG	180760
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2830	16	2	CNG	168933
FORD	EIDorado National /FORD E450	2012	2831	16	2	CNG	190481

Minibus (12-20 Passenger) -Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheelchairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2901	16	2	CNG	114558
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2902	16	2	CNG	107127
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2903	16	2	CNG	72531
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2904	16	2	CNG	75080
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2905	16	2	CNG	113966
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2906	16	2	CNG	107036
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2907	16	2	CNG	113583
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2908	16	2	CNG	108634
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2909	16	2	CNG	119274
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2910	16	2	CNG	100748
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2911	16	2	CNG	81958
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2912	16	2	CNG	106793
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2913	16	2	CNG	113275
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2914	16	2	CNG	103395
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2915	16	2	CNG	97022
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2916	16	2	CNG	103879
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2917	16	2	CNG	112564
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2918	16	2	CNG	78900
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2919	16	2	CNG	85870
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2920	16	2	CNG	103859
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2921	16	2	CNG	93981
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2922	16	2	CNG	92319
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2923	16	2	CNG	80793
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2924	16	2	CNG	97577
GLAVALBUS	GLAVAL -Universal	2014	2925	16	2	CNG	98082

Minibus (12-20 Passenger) -Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheelchairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14201	16	2	CNG	61581
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14202	16	2	CNG	75890
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14203	16	2	CNG	65877
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14204	16	2	CNG	75640
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14205	16	2	CNG	78176
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14206	16	2	CNG	84214
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14207	16	2	CNG	83236
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14208	16	2	CNG	86629
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14209	16	2	CNG	84312
ARBOC	ARBOC-Universal	2014	14210	16	2	CNG	78586

Standard Bus (21+ Passenger) - Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheelchairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0401	30	2	CNG	528,505.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0402	30	2	CNG	482,735.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0403	30	2	CNG	506,618.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0404	30	2	CNG	427,482.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0405	30	2	CNG	492,073.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0406	30	2	CNG	489,005.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0407	30	2	CNG	490,627.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0408	30	2	CNG	532,699.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0409	30	2	CNG	508,257.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0410	30	2	CNG	548,518.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0411	30	2	CNG	488,927.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0412	30	2	CNG	494,825.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0413	30	2	CNG	519,380.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0414	30	2	CNG	484,846.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0416	30	2	CNG	514,458.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0417	30	2	CNG	453,776.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0418	30	2	CNG	493,042.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0419	30	2	CNG	472,615.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0420	30	2	CNG	503,536.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0421	30	2	CNG	509,964.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0422	30	2	CNG	505,319.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0423	30	2	CNG	468,994.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0424	30	2	CNG	487,108.00
NFI	35 FT New Flyers	2004	0425	30	2	CNG	485,960.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14401	38	2	CNG	163,102.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14402	38	2	CNG	141,984.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14403	38	2	CNG	136,737.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14404	38	2	CNG	98,363.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14405	38	2	CNG	142,985.00

Standard Bus (21+ Passenger) - Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheelchairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14408	38	2	CNG	164,595.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14409	38	2	CNG	147,338.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14410	38	2	CNG	116,123.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14411	38	2	CNG	86,080.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14412	38	2	CNG	139,483.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14413	38	2	CNG	162,358.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14414	38	2	CNG	148,224.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14415	38	2	CNG	152,400.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14416	38	2	CNG	138,494.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14417	38	2	CNG	143,963.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14418	38	2	CNG	144,948.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14419	38	2	CNG	149,899.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14420	38	2	CNG	151,269.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14421	38	2	CNG	143,513.00
NFI	NEW FLYERS XN40LF	2014	14422	38	2	CNG	113,754.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0601	39	2	CNG	479,618.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0602	39	2	CNG	470,452.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0603	39	2	CNG	440,986.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0604	39	2	CNG	476,670.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0605	39	2	CNG	465,797.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0606	39	2	CNG	505,223.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0607	39	2	CNG	490,950.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0608	39	2	CNG	469,584.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0609	39	2	CNG	474,250.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0610	39	2	CNG	458,971.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0611	39	2	CNG	474,128.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0612	39	2	CNG	485,229.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0613	39	2	CNG	448,870.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0614	39	2	CNG	461,029.00

Standard Bus (21+ Passenger) - Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheelchairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0618	39	2	CNG	472,341.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0619	39	2	CNG	477,219.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0620	39	2	CNG	474,978.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0621	39	2	CNG	477,031.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0622	39	2	CNG	463,655.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0623	39	2	CNG	463,378.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0624	39	2	CNG	475,270.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0625	39	2	CNG	471,579.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0626	39	2	CNG	470,103.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0627	39	2	CNG	457,215.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0628	39	2	CNG	468,314.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0629	39	2	CNG	478,058.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0630	39	2	CNG	387,580.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0631	39	2	CNG	456,125.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0632	39	2	CNG	472,468.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0633	39	2	CNG	459,351.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0634	39	2	CNG	485,024.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0635	39	2	CNG	478,352.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0680	39	2	CNG	502,521.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0681	39	2	CNG	468,282.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0682	39	2	CNG	439,958.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0683	39	2	CNG	429,472.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0684	39	2	CNG	506,085.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0685	39	2	CNG	514,935.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0686	39	2	CNG	492,013.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0687	39	2	CNG	503,077.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0688	39	2	CNG	503,897.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0689	39	2	CNG	484,836.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0690	39	2	CNG	504,269.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0691	39	2	CNG	506,567.00

Standard Bus (21+ Passenger) - Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheelchairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0694	39	2	CNG	497,511.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0695	39	2	CNG	480,832.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0696	39	2	CNG	499,811.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0697	39	2	CNG	486,970.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0698	39	2	CNG	494,959.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-35-02	2007	0699	39	2	CNG	501,609.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0901	39	2	CNG	310,373.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0902	39	2	CNG	292,069.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0903	39	2	CNG	283,054.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0904	39	2	CNG	307,873.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0905	39	2	CNG	292,535.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0906	39	2	CNG	276,617.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0907	39	2	CNG	278,033.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0908	39	2	CNG	496,650.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0909	39	2	CNG	489,060.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0910	39	2	CNG	484,271.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0911	39	2	CNG	481,510.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0912	39	2	CNG	490,924.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0913	39	2	CNG	494,915.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0914	39	2	CNG	474,381.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0915	39	2	CNG	504,346.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0916	39	2	CNG	484,589.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0917	39	2	CNG	487,301.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0918	39	2	CNG	481,448.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0919	39	2	CNG	486,456.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0920	39	2	CNG	496,414.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0921	39	2	CNG	470,769.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0922	39	2	CNG	497,434.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0923	39	2	CNG	455,162.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0924	39	2	CNG	498,301.00

Standard Bus (21+ Passenger) - Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheelchairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0927	39	2	CNG	505,251.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0928	39	2	CNG	505,448.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0929	39	2	CNG	477,965.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0930	39	2	CNG	477,819.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0931	39	2	CNG	445,566.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0932	39	2	CNG	495,674.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0933	39	2	CNG	509,237.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0934	39	2	CNG	498,612.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0935	39	2	CNG	469,856.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0936	39	2	CNG	464,024.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0937	39	2	CNG	475,918.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0938	39	2	CNG	476,529.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0939	39	2	CNG	455,336.00
NABI	NABI 40LFW-43	2008	0940	39	2	CNG	503,257.00
NABI	NABI 35LFW	2010	1001	39	2	CNG	283,489.00
NABI	NABI 35LFW	2010	1002	39	2	CNG	248,718.00
NABI	NABI 35LFW	2010	1003	39	2	CNG	271,823.00
NABI	NABI 35LFW	2010	1004	39	2	CNG	288,709.00
NABI	NABI 35LFW	2010	1005	39	2	CNG	285,217.00
NABI	NABI 35LFW	2010	1006	39	2	CNG	291,381.00
NABI	NABI 35LFW	2010	1007	39	2	CNG	293,766.00
NABI	NABI 35LFW	2010	1008	39	2	CNG	289,233.00

Standard Bus (21+ Passenger) - Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheelchairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14601	48	2	CNG	69,636.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14602	48	2	CNG	65,260.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14603	48	2	CNG	65,614.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14604	48	2	CNG	62,681.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14605	48	2	CNG	63,343.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14606	48	2	CNG	65,767.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14607	48	2	CNG	63,651.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14608	48	2	CNG	67,117.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14609	48	2	CNG	65,100.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14610	48	2	CNG	60,253.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14697	48	2	CNG	122,143.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14698	48	2	CNG	138,629.00
NFI	NEW FLYER XN 60FT	2014	14699	48	2	CNG	113,202.00

**FAR WEST TEXAS/EL PASO TRANSPORTATION PROVIDER
INVENTORY SURVEY**

Transportation Provider Name:	Project Amistad		
Address	12100 Esther Lama, El Paso TX 79936		
Phone	915-298-6991	915-533-7201	
Contact	Frank Liano		
Email	fliano@projectamistad.org		
Website	projectamistad.org		

Annual Total	FY 2014	FY 2015
Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)		
Actual vehicle revenue miles (VRM)		
Actual vehicle revenue hours (VRH)		
Transportation Expenditures ¹		

Transportation Services Provided

Program/Service Name	Service Mode ²	Service Days / Hours	Fare Range	Eligibility	Area Served	FY 2015 Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)	Program Expenditures FY15	Funding Source
MTP	Demand-Response	Mon - Sat 0500-1900		HHSC	Region 10			

Active Fleet Description

Vehicle			Average for Vehicle Type				ITS Equipped			
Vehicle Type	Number	Number w/lift	Average Age	Average LTD Mileage	FY 2015 Miles	Passenger Capacity	GPS	MDT	2-way	Cell ³
Van	7.00	7.00	5.00	109,436.00	278899	4	yes		yes	no
Minibus	49	49	6	220560	1,952,294	12	yes		yes	no
Standard Bus	0									
Motor Coach	-									
Other										

Projected Capital Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Fleet Capacity

Projected Operating Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Service Levels

FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
2342752	2459890	2582884	2712028	2847630

¹Include all projected and un-inflated administrative, operating and capital expenses

²Indicate if demand-response, fixed-route, single-ride, or other service mode

³For non-moving communications

Minibus (12-20 Passenger) -Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheel-chairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2007</u>	<u>1011</u>	16	2	Gasoline	243920
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2008</u>	<u>1017</u>	16	2	Gasoline	323439
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2009</u>	<u>1022</u>	16	2	Gasoline	262966
<u>CHEVY</u>	C5500	<u>2008</u>	<u>1028</u>	20	2	Diesel	314701
<u>CHEVY</u>	GOSHEN COACH	<u>2009</u>	<u>1029</u>	20	2	Diesel	219697
<u>GOSHEN-THOR GCII</u>	GOSHEN COACH	<u>2007</u>	<u>1030</u>	14	2	Diesel	255654
<u>NC CHAMPION</u>	CHALLENGER	<u>2009</u>	<u>1040</u>	12	2	Gasoline	316961
<u>NC CHAMPION</u>	CHALLENGER	<u>2009</u>	<u>1041</u>	12	2	Gasoline	345027
<u>NC CHAMPION</u>	CHALLENGER	<u>2009</u>	<u>1044</u>	12	2	Gasoline	314011
<u>NC CHAMPION</u>	CHALLENGER	<u>2009</u>	<u>1045</u>	12	2	Gasoline	328652
<u>NC CHAMPION</u>	CHALLENGER	<u>2009</u>	<u>1046</u>	12	2	Gasoline	264032
<u>NC CHAMPION</u>	CHALLENGER	<u>2009</u>	<u>1048</u>	12	2	Gasoline	286288
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2010</u>	<u>1049</u>	12	2	Gasoline	274341
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2010</u>	<u>1051</u>	12	2	Gasoline	233606
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2010</u>	<u>1052</u>	12	2	Gasoline	228714
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2010</u>	<u>1053</u>	12	2	Gasoline	174412
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2010</u>	<u>1054</u>	12	2	Gasoline	244041
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2010</u>	<u>1055</u>	12	2	Gasoline	280862
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1061</u>	12	2	Gasoline	244492
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1062</u>	12	2	Gasoline	238587
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1063</u>	12	2	Gasoline	259179
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1064</u>	12	2	Gasoline	236107
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1065</u>	12	2	Gasoline	237107
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1066</u>	12	2	Gasoline	309309
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1067</u>	12	2	Gasoline	372202
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1068</u>	12	2	Gasoline	239571
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1070</u>	12	2	Gasoline	241299
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1071</u>	12	2	Gasoline	162011
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1072</u>	12	2	Gasoline	212132

Minibus (12-20 Passenger) -Active Passenger Operating In-Service Fleet

Vehicle Make	Model	Year	Vehicle Number	Seats	Wheel-chairs	Fuel	Current Mileage
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1073</u>	12	2	Gasoline	235324
<u>CHAMPION</u>	CH230FP	<u>2010</u>	<u>1074</u>	12	2	Gasoline	297019
<u>FORD BUS</u>	BUS	<u>2006</u>	<u>1085</u>	12	2	Gasoline	175658
<u>FORD BUS/E450</u>	E450	<u>2007</u>	<u>1087</u>	16	2	Gasoline	207137
<u>EL DORADO BUS</u>	BUS	<u>2009</u>	<u>1088</u>	18	2	Gasoline	177184
<u>FORD</u>	BUS	<u>2011</u>	<u>1089</u>	12	2	Gasoline	158721
<u>FORD</u>	GCI	<u>2003</u>	<u>1090</u>	16	2	Gasoline	163092
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2008</u>	<u>1091</u>	17	2	Diesel	120865
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2008</u>	<u>1092</u>	17	2	Diesel	92335
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1093</u>	14	2	Gasoline	188211
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1094</u>	14	2	Gasoline	151201
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1095</u>	14	2	Gasoline	133437
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1096</u>	14	2	Gasoline	184057
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1097</u>	14	2	Gasoline	123825
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1098</u>	14	2	Gasoline	161692
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1099</u>	14	2	Gasoline	149429
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1100</u>	14	2	Gasoline	178995
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1101</u>	14	2	Gasoline	157379
<u>GOSHEN</u>	GCII	<u>2013</u>	<u>1102</u>	14	2	Gasoline	162420
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2014</u>	<u>1106</u>	16	2	Gasoline	80945
<u>FORD</u>	E450	<u>2014</u>	<u>1107</u>	16	2	Gasoline	65750

**FAR WEST TEXAS/EL PASO TRANSPORTATION PROVIDER
INVENTORY SURVEY**

Transportation Provider Name:	BIG BEND COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE, INC.		
Address	1412 W. BERLIN, P O BOX 265, MARFA, TX 79843		
Phone	432-729-4908 / 432-729-1992	432-729-3435	
Contact	Mr. Adan Estrada-Executive Director/Mary Tita Nuñez-Trans. Director		
Email	aebbcac@sbcglobal.net / mnbccac@sbcglobal.net		
Website	www.bbcac.com		

Annual Total	FY 2014	FY 2015
Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)		8,754.00
Actual vehicle revenue miles (VRM)		716,668.00
Actual vehicle revenue hours (VRH)		27,904.03
Transportation Expenditures ¹		

Transportation Services Provided

Drop Down not working all programs demand-response

Program/Service Name	Service Mode ²	Service Days / Hours	Fare Range	Eligibility	Area Served	FY 2015 Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)	Program Expenditures FY15	Funding Source
Medical MTO Transportation	Demand-Response	Monday-Saturday-8AM-5PM	MTO FARES	MEDICAID	5 COUNTIES: BREWSTER, PRESIDIO, JEFF DAVIS, CULBERSON, HUDSPETH	3,058.00		
Public Transportation	Demand-Response	Monday-Friday-8AM-5PM	\$.50 - \$150.00 (1 WAY)	BIRTH-ELDERLY	5 COUNTIES: BREWSTER, PRESIDIO, JEFF DAVIS, CULBERSON, HUDSPETH	1,749.00		
HRTG Veterans' Transp.	Demand-Response	Monday-Friday-8AM-5PM	VA GRANT	Veterans & dependants	5 COUNTIES: BREWSTER, PRESIDIO, JEFF DAVIS, CULBERSON, HUDSPETH	163.00		
BBRHD (Hospital District)	Demand-Response	Mon.-Fri.-8AM-5PM	HOSPITAL GRANT	BIRTH-ELDERLY	5 COUNTIES: BREWSTER, PRESIDIO, JEFF DAVIS, CULBERSON, HUDSPETH	37.00		
Rio Grande Council of Govt. Area Agency on Aging (AAA)	Demand-Response	Mon.-Fri.-8AM-5PM	GRANT	60 YEARS OR OLDER	5 COUNTIES: BREWSTER, PRESIDIO, JEFF DAVIS, CULBERSON, HUDSPETH	3,747.00		

Active Fleet Description

Vehicle			Average for Vehicle Type				ITS Equipped			
Vehicle Type	Number	Number w/lift	Average Age	Average LTD Mileage	FY 2015 Miles	Passenger Capacity	GPS	MDT	2-way	Cell ³
Van	13.00	10.00	0-100	500.00		5 PASS, 1 WHCHAIR	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
Minibus	12	10	0-100	500.00		10-12 PASS. 1-2 WHCH	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
Standard Bus	0	0	0							
Motor Coach	-									
Other	0	0	0	-						

Projected Capital Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Fleet Capacity
Projected Operating Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Service Levels

FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
512,641	\$ 520,000.00	\$ 520,000.00	\$ 520,000.00	\$ 520,000.00

¹Include all projected and un-inflated administrative, operating and capital expenses

²Indicate if demand-response, fixed-route, single-ride, or other service mode

³For non-moving communications

FAR WEST TEXAS/EL PASO TRANSPORTATION PROVIDER INVENTORY SURVEY

Transportation Provider Name:	City of Socorro		
Address	901 N. Rio Vista		
Phone	915-860-8615		
Contact	Victor Reta		
Email	Vreta@ci.socorro.tx.us		
Website	www.ci.socorro.tx.us		

Annual Total	FY 2014	FY 2015
Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)		1,803 Trips
Actual vehicle revenue miles (VRM)		2,180 Miles
Actual vehicle revenue hours (VRH)		1,392 Hours
Transportation Expenditures ¹		\$ 62,900.00

Transportation Services Provided

Program/Service Name	Service Mode ²	Service Days / Hours	Fare Range	Eligibility	Area Served	FY 2015 Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)	Program Expenditures FY15	Funding Source
Rio Vista Community Center	DEMAND RESPONSE	M-F 8 AM - 8PM	Socorro City Limits	Age 55+	Socorro, TX	1,803 Trips	\$ 62,900.00	City Operation Budget

Active Fleet Description

Vehicle		Average for Vehicle Type					ITS Equipped			
Vehicle Type	Number	Number w/lift	Average Age	Average LTD Mileage	FY 2015 Miles	Passenger Capacity	GPS	MDT	2-way	Cell ³
Van										
Minibus	1	1	6 Mos.	2,180.00	2,180.00	14	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Standard Bus										
Motor Coach										
Other										

--

Projected Capital Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Fleet Capacity
 Projected Operating Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Service Levels

FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
65,274	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 60,000.00
28,000	\$ 28,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 32,000.00

¹Include all projected and un-inflated administrative, operating and capital expenses
²Indicate if demand-response, fixed-route, single-ride, or other service mode
³For non-moving communications

**FAR WEST TEXAS/EL PASO TRANSPORTATION PROVIDER
INVENTORY SURVEY**

Transportation Provider Name:	Viba Transportation		
Address	4100 Rio Bravo St #210		
Phone	915-544-8422	915-544-8425 Fax	
Contact	Roberto Wallace		
Email	manager@vibatransport.com		
Website	www.vibatransport.com		

Annual Total	FY 2014	FY 2015
Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)		
Actual vehicle revenue miles (VRM)		
Actual vehicle revenue hours (VRH)		
Transportation Expenditures ¹		

Transportation Services Provided

Program/Service Name	Service Mode ²	Service Days / Hours	Fare Range	Eligibility	Area Served	FY 2015 Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)	Program Expenditures FY15	Funding Source
Managed Care Transportation	Demand-Response	Weekdays 5 AM- 9 M	Free	Referral by MCO	El Paso County			

Active Fleet Description

Vehicle			Average for Vehicle Type				ITS Equipped			
Vehicle Type	Number	Number w/lift	Average Age	Average LTD Mileage	FY 2015 Miles	Passenger Capacity	GPS	MDT	2-way	Cell ³
Van	5	-	5 Yrs	180,758.00						
Minibus	9	9	8 Yrs	197,233.00						
Standard Bus	None			-						
Motor Coach	None			-						
Other	None			-						

Projected Capital Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Fleet Capacity
 Projected Operating Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Service Levels

FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020

¹Include all projected and un-inflated administrative, operating and capital expenses
²Indicate if demand-response, fixed-route, single-ride, or other service mode
³For non-moving communications

**FAR WEST TEXAS/EL PASO TRANSPORTATION PROVIDER
INVENTORY SURVEY**

Transportation Provider Name:	Sun City Cab		
Address	2930 Maggofin Avenue, El Paso, Texas 79901		
Phone	915-544-2211	Fax	915-544-2511
Contact	M. Ivan Garza		
Email	suncitycab@sbcglobal.net		
Website	www.suncitycab.com		

Annual Total	FY 2014	FY 2015
Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)		
Actual vehicle revenue miles (VRM)		
Actual vehicle revenue hours (VRH)		
Transportation Expenditures ¹		

Transportation Services Provided

Program/Service Name	Service Mode ²	Service Days / Hours	Fare Range	Eligibility	Area Served	FY 2015 Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)	Program Expenditures FY15	Funding Source
Sun City Cab	Demand-Response	365/24/7	\$2.25/mile	Public	El Paso Metro Area	50,000		
Ft. Bliss	Demand-Response	365/24/7	Discounted Zone	Base Personnel	Ft. Bliss	25,000		
New Freedom	Demand-Response	365/24/7	\$2.50	Elderly/Disabled	El Paso City	25,550		
Don't Drink and Drive	Demand-Response	365/24/7	Free upon request	Public	El Paso Metro Area	N/A		
Jobs Express	Demand-Response	Weekdays 24/7	Free by referral	Referred by Sun Met	El Paso Metro Area	N/A		

Active Fleet Description

Vehicle			Average for Vehicle Type				ITS Equipped			
Vehicle Type	Number	Number w/lift	Average Age	Average LTD Mileage	FY 2015 Miles	Passenger Capacity	GPS	MDT	2-way	Cell ³
Van	6	6	7	300,000	36,500	1 wheelchair/3 seats	w/cell		•	•
Minibus										
Standard Bus										
Motor Coach										
Other - sedan/van cabs	50	0	7.5	150,000.00	36,500.00	7-May	w/cell		•	•

Projected Capital Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Fleet Capacity

Projected Operating Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Service Levels

FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020

¹Include all projected and un-inflated administrative, operating and capital expenses

²Indicate if demand-response, fixed-route, single-ride, or other service mode

³For non-moving communications

FAR WEST TEXAS/EL PASO TRANSPORTATION PROVIDER INVENTORY SURVEY

Transportation Provider Name:	El Paso County Transit - First Transit		
Address	3411 SUNBOWL DR		
Phone	915-533-4731	915-533-4781	
Contact	Sylvia M Ancira		
Email	sylvia.ancira@firstgroup.com		
Website			

Annual Total	FY 2014	FY 2015	
Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)		72,655.50	Route 10-40 only
Actual vehicle revenue miles (VRM)		413,908.00	Route 10-40 only
Actual vehicle revenue hours (VRH)		16,610.66	Route 10-40 only
Transportation Expenditures ¹			

Transportation Services Provided

Program/Service Name	Service Mode ²	Service Days / Hours	Fare Range	Eligibility	Area Served	FY 2015 Unlinked passenger trips (UPT)	Program Expenditures FY15	Funding Source
El Paso County General Transit	Commuter Fixed-Route	M-Sat/	\$2.00	general Public	Route 10 Anthony/Canutillo		\$ 1,181,050.31	
Mission Trail (Route 50)	Commuter Fixed-Route	M-Sun	\$2.00	general Public				

Active Fleet Description

Vehicle			Average for Vehicle Type				ITS Equipped			
Vehicle Type	Number	Number w/lift	Average Age	Average LTD Mileage	FY 2015 Miles	Passenger Capacity	GPS	MDT	2-way	Cell ³
Van										
Minibus	15	15	7	144,348.00	2,165,224.07	256	Yes	No	Yes	No
Standard Bus										
Motor Coach										
Other										

Projected Capital Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Fleet Capacity
 Projected Operating Expenditures Required to Maintain Current Service Levels

FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020

¹Include all projected and un-inflated administrative, operating and capital expenses
²Indicate if demand-response, fixed-route, single-ride, or other service mode
³For non-moving communications

Attachment II
Transportation Consumer Survey Instrument

Far West Texas/El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee Transit Needs Survey – Consumer Questionnaire

Please take a few moments to complete this brief confidential survey. The results will be used for transportation coordination planning and to inform the investment of public transportation resources in our region.

Where do you live? Brewster County Culberson County El Paso County Hudspeth County
 Jeff Davis County Presidio County Dona Ana County Juarez Other _____

Please indicate your zip code:

Where do you most often travel? Within the county indicated above From rural El Paso County into El Paso City
 Into El Paso from where I live Into Midland/Odessa from where I live From El Paso to a rural area
 Other

At most, how often do you travel away from your neighborhood? Multiple times each day Once daily
 Every few days Once each week Few times each month Monthly Less than monthly
 Other:

Do you travel to the same destinations weekly or more frequently? Yes No

To what zip codes or locations do you travel on this regular basis?

How do you currently travel? Check all that apply: Drive my own car Public Transit Fixed Route Bus
 Sun Metro LIFT Paratransit Medicaid Transportation Program Driven by friend or family member
 Taxi Bicycle Walk Transportation provided by service agency TRAX rural transit service
 Other:

On what form of transportation do you most depend and use the most? Check only one: Drive my own car
Public Transit Fixed Route Bus Sun Metro LIFT Paratransit Medicaid Transportation Program Driven by
friend or family member Taxi Bicycle Walk Transportation provided by service agency TRAX rural
transit service
 Other:

Has there ever been an occasion in which you were unable to reach a destination because of a lack of transportation? Yes No **How often?** _____
Why?

Are there ever circumstances in which you are uncomfortable or unable to drive yourself? Yes No
Why?

Have you ever used fixed-route public transportation? Yes No
If no, why not? Not aware of services available Not sure how to use it Does not go where I live
 Does not go where I need to travel Not convenient Too Expensive Does not run time I need to travel
 Would need assistance to use the bus Cannot access bus stops Disability prevents use
 Other

Explain what changes would cause you to use fixed-route public transportation more:

Have you ever used demand-response public transportation? Yes No

If no, why not? Not eligible or have a qualifying disability Don't know my travel needs in advance
 Not aware of services available Not sure how to use it Does not go where I live Trips take too long
 Does not go where I need to travel Not convenient Too Expensive Does not run time I need to travel

Other

Explain what changes would make demand-response public transportation better suited to you transportation needs:

What is your age? Under 18 18-55 56-60 61-65 66-70 71-75 76-80 81-85 85+

Do you have a disability? Yes No Does your disability ever limit your ability to drive a car? Yes No

Do you use a mobility device? Yes No If yes, what devices do you use Wheelchair Walker Cane
 White Cane Service animal
 Other:

Do you require the assistance of another person when you travel? Yes No

Are you a veteran? Yes No Do you have a service related disability Yes No
Is the Veterans Administration your common health care provider? Yes No
Do you use any VA provided transportation services? Yes No

Are you a student or in a training program? Yes No How do you get to school or program? Drive a car
 Informal carpool Organized vanpool School bus City bus Bicycle Walk
Other:

Do you own a licensed car van or truck? Yes No

Please use this space to register concerns with transportation services or offer suggestions that would improve your personal mobility/transportation situation:

If you would be willing to participate in a brief interview about this survey and your transportation needs, please provide: Name: _____ Phone: _____

Email: _____

Please return survey to: Bob Schwab, Regional Transportation Coordinator
P.O. Box 1081 Marfa, Texas 79843-1081
rschwab@epcounty.com 915-474-5116

1/06/16

THANK YOU

Comité de Coordinación de Transporte Regional de Tejas de lejano oeste

Encuesta de Necesidades de Tránsito-Cuestionario de Consumidor

Por favor, tómese unos minutos para completar esta breve encuesta confidencial. Los resultados se utilizarán para la planificación de la coordinación de tránsito y la inversión de los recursos públicos en nuestra región.

En qué Condado vive usted? Brewster Culberson El Paso Hudspeth
 Jeff Davis Presidio Dona Ana Juarez
 Otro: _____

Por favor, indique su código postal

Donde viaja mas seguido? dentro del condado indicado; desde el rural condado de El Paso a la ciudad de El Paso; entrando a la ciudad de El Paso de donde vivo; entrando a la ciudades de Midland/Odessa de donde vivo; de El Paso a una zona rural;

Otros: _____

En la mayoría, con qué frecuencia viaja lejos de su sector? Varias veces al día; Una vez al día; Cada pocos días; Una vez por semana; Pocas veces cada mes; Mensual; Menos de mensual;

Otros: _____

Usted viaja a sus mismos destinos durante la semana o con mas frecuencia? Si No

A que código postal o destinos viaja con la misma regularidad?

Como viaja actualmente? Marque todas las respuestas que apliquen: Conducir mi propio auto;
 Tránsito público –autobús de ruta fija;
 Paratránsito de Sun Metro; Programa de Medicaid Transporte;
 Llevado por amigo o miembro de la familia;
 Taxi Bicicleta De pie Transporte proporcionado por una agencia de servicio;
 Servicio de transporte rural de TRAX

Otros: _____

Que forma de transporte más depende y utiliza? Marque solo una : Conducir mi propio auto;
 Tránsito público-autobús de ruta fija;
 Paratránsito de Sun Metro; Programa de Medicaid Transporte;
 Llevado por amigo o miembro de la familia;
 Taxi Bicicleta De pie Transporte proporcionado por una agencia de servicio;
 Servicio de transporte rural de TRAX

Otros: _____

Ha habido una ocasion en la cual no pudo llegar a su destino por falta de transporte? Si No
Con que frecuencia? _____

Por que?

Hay circunstancias en las que está incómodo o incapaz de conducir a si mismo? Si No

Por que?

Has usado transporte público de ruta fija? Si No

Si no, por que? No se da cuenta de los servicios disponibles; No está seguro de cómo usarlo;
 No llega donde vive;
 No llega donde necesita viajar; No es conveniente Demasiado caro No funciona hace tiempo que necesito para viajar
 Necesita ayuda para utilizar el autobús; No hay acceso a paradas de autobús; Incapacidad impide el uso
 Otro:

Por favor explique qué cambios son necesarios para que usted utilice más el transporte público de ruta fija

:

Ha usado transporte público a petición del servicio de transporte? Si No

Si no, por que?

No poder, o tiene una discapacidad
 No saber mi necesidades de viaje antes
 No dar me cuenta de los servicios disponibles;
 No estar seguro de cómo usarlo;
 No va el camion donde vivo; Los viajes se toman demasiado tiempo
 No hay viajes donde necesito ir No es conveniente Muy caro No corre en el tiempo que necesito
 Otro:

Por favor, explique qué cambios haría de transporte publico a petición del servicio de transporte para mejor adaptar a sus necesidades de transporte:

Cuantos años tiene? bajo 18 18-55 56-60 61-65 66-70 71-75 76-80 81-85 85+

Tiene alguna discapacidad? Si No Su discapacidad nunca limita su capacidad para conducir un auto?

Si No

Usa un dispositivo de movimiento? Si No Si su respuesta es Si, que clase es? Silla de Ruedas

Handador Baston
 Baston blanco Animal de Servicio
 Otro:

Necesita la asistencia de otra persona cuando viaje? Si No

Es usted un veterano? Si No Tiene un servicio relacionado con la discapacidad Si No

Es la administración de veteranos el medico común? Si No

Usa algunos servicios de transporte proporcionados por VA? Si No

Es un estudiante o esta en un programa de entrenamiento? Si No Como llega a la escuela o programa?

Conducir mi propio auto
 Viajes compartidos, informal Viajes compartidos, organizado Autobús de escuela Autobús público
 Bicicleta De pie

Other: _____

Tiene un auto, van, o camion autorizado? Si No

Por favor, utilice este espacio para registro de preocupaciones con los servicios de transporte, o ofrecer sugerencias que mejoren su situación de movilidad/transporte personal:

Si usted estaría dispuesto a participar en una breve entrevista sobre esta encuesta y sus necesidades de transporte, proporcione:

Nombre: _____ Teléfono: _____

Su correo electrónico:-

Por favor, devuelva la encuesta a: Bob Schwab, Coordinador Regional del Transporte
P.O. Box 1081
Marfa, Texas 79843-1081
rschwab@epcounty.com
915-474-5116

1/06/16

MUCHAS GRACIAS

Attachment III
Health & Human Service Organization Interview Guide

**Far West Texas / El Paso Regional Transportation Coordination Committee
Mobility Needs Assessment Survey**

Organizational Information

Agency Name:	
Address (list each location where your agency receives application for or provides services):	
Phone:	Fax:
Contact Person:	
Email:	
Website:	
Agency Mission:	
Client Description or Population(s) Served:	
Services Provided to Clients:	

Agency Provided Transportation Services

Do you assist clients with transportation? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please check all that apply and explain if necessary:
<input type="checkbox"/> Transport clients in agency operated vehicles:
<input type="checkbox"/> Reimburse clients for use of personal auto:
<input type="checkbox"/> Purchase and issue vouchers, tokens, or passes for client use of local public transit system:
<input type="checkbox"/> Contract with public or private transportation operator to provide transportation for clients:
<input type="checkbox"/> Agency staff provide client transportation in personal autos as necessary:
<input type="checkbox"/> Connect clients with volunteer drivers:
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide training to clients in how to use public transit system. Please describe your program:
<input type="checkbox"/> Other transportation service:
<input type="checkbox"/> Number of clients your agency directly provides transportation services to in a year.

Did any of your clients have difficulty accessing your facility or services for lack of transportation?

Did any of your clients have difficulty accessing other destinations for lack of transportation?

Did any of the following factors affect your clients' ability to access public transportation?

What factors limit the ability of your clients to use fixed route transit?

<input type="checkbox"/> [] Cost	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Location
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Age
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Language	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Literacy
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Awareness / Knowledge of Transit Services	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Time of Service
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Other, explain:	

Is what ways would you say the current public transportation system is working well for clients you serve?

In what ways would you say the system is not working well?

What suggestions do you have for local/regional transportation improvement:

What suggestions do you have for alternatives to the existing transportation system:

In what ways could your agency collaborate with a transportation provider or other organization to create or improve a transportation solution?

