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## FY 2019 BASE BUDGET – PROJECTED EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FY 2019 BASE</th>
<th>REVISED FY 2019 BASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$1,114,910</td>
<td>$894,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$64,980</td>
<td>$79,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware, Software, Licenses</td>
<td>$101,580</td>
<td>$115,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$150,313</td>
<td>$150,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Costs / Shared Services with SRTA</td>
<td>$197,026</td>
<td>$197,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO Agreement</td>
<td>$1,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout for 23rd Floor</td>
<td>$446,831</td>
<td>$643,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding Contract</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Contract</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,325,640</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,831,992</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Branding Contract, Planning Contract, and Professional Services are funded with 80% federal planning dollars and 20% match using one-time GRTA fund balance.
FY 2019 BASE BUDGET – PROJECTED REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FY 2019 BASE</th>
<th>REVISED FY 2019 BASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds (One-time GRTA fund balance for match)</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds (One-time FY 2018 Governor’s Emergency Fund)</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds (One-time Tenant Improvement Allowance)</td>
<td>125,640</td>
<td>131,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,325,640</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,831,992</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The AFY 2019 Governor’s Recommendation includes an additional $491,361 for three positions ($268,561) and associated expenses ($222,800).
Community Affairs, Department of

The following appropriations are for agencies attached for administrative purposes.

Payments to The Atlanta-region Transit Link Authority

Increase funds for three positions ($268,561) and associated expenses ($222,800).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor's Rec.</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>491,361</td>
<td>491,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$491,361</td>
<td>$491,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>REVISED FY 2019 BASE</td>
<td>CHANGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$894,127</td>
<td>$268,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Expenses</td>
<td>79,651</td>
<td>222,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware, Software, Licenses</td>
<td>115,467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>150,313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Costs / Shared Services with SRTA</td>
<td>197,026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO Agreement</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout for 23rd Floor</td>
<td>643,905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding Contract</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Contract</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,831,992</strong></td>
<td><strong>$491,361</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Branding Contract, Planning Contract, and Professional Services are funded with 80% federal planning dollars and 20% match using one-time GRTA fund balance.
### AFY 2019 Governor’s Recommended Budget – Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>REVISED FY 2019 BASE</th>
<th>CHANGES</th>
<th>AFY 2019 GOV. REC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFY 2019 Gov. Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$491,361</td>
<td>$491,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time GRTA fund balance for match</td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time FY 2018 Governor’s Emergency Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Tenant Improvement Allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td>131,992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$4,831,992</td>
<td>$491,361</td>
<td>$5,323,353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Affairs, Department of

The following appropriations are for agencies attached for administrative purposes.

Payments to The Atlanta-region Transit Link Authority

Provide state funds to establish operating support for operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor's Rec.</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,487,122</td>
<td>2,487,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,487,122</td>
<td>$2,487,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARTA’s ATL BRANDING IMPLEMENTATION

Jennifer Jinadu-Wright, MARTA
REGIONAL TRANSIT PLANNING PROCESS DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW
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Our Team

TRACY SELIN
Project Manager
• Performance management and project prioritization at state, regional, local level
• 2015 USDOT Transportation Planning Excellence Award – Balancing Multimodal Investments
• 20+ year history working in Atlanta region

HERBERT HIGGENBOTHAM
Transit and Shared Mobility
• National Practice Lead
• Oversees transit planning and technology applications portfolio across the country
• 20+ years experience in smart mobility, transit asset management, technology innovation, and organizational strategy

PAULA DOWELL
Economics and Return on Investment
• National Practice Lead
• Oversees economics practice and financial planning portfolio across the country
• 20+ years experience in economic benefits analysis in over 35 states and internationally

SARAH WINDMILLER
Transit and Technology Analyst
• Atlanta-based senior analyst
• Technical and policy support for multiple transit and technology initiatives in Atlanta and around the country
• Innovative data visualization and applications
Scope/Key Objectives

• The ATL requires a process for transit project evaluation and prioritization to be managed and administered by ATL staff that is:
  • Objective and performance-based;
  • Supportive of the region’s transit plans and objectives;
  • Transparent and credible among transit stakeholders;
  • Inclusive of both existing and new local and regional-scale transit planning projects;
  • Compliant with Federal and state funding and grant criteria;
  • Reflective of the ATL’s proposed governing principles for equity, economic development, mobility/access, innovation, and environmental sustainability; and
  • Aligned to existing regional planning programs, specifically the ARC’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
Schedule

Review Existing Methods

- Assess initial progress
- Review local activities
- Research best practice
- Identify key process gaps and needs

Develop Performance Framework

- Work with key stakeholders’ technical staff to
  » Identify preferred technical methods and draft framework (Workshop #1)
  » Test and refine framework (Workshop #2)

Communicate and Document Process

- Develop framework executive summary and action plan
- Communicate framework to local stakeholders

December
January
February
March
April
May

Workshop #1
February 1st

Workshop #2
March TBD

Board Meeting
January 24th

Board Meeting
March 7th

Board Meeting
May 23rd
Workshop Series

Over the course of two half-day workshops, we will work alongside an ATL technical group to establish, test, and refine the concepts and framework for the project prioritization process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop #1 (Feb 1)</th>
<th>Workshop #2 (Mar TBD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Technical Methods/Drafting the Framework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Testing and Refining the Framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Confirm investment goals and objectives</td>
<td>➤ Review project-level evaluation outcomes of draft framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Review best practice transit prioritization models and methods</td>
<td>➤ Review region-level performance snapshot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Discuss process constraints and requirements</td>
<td>➤ Discuss options for ranking and tiering projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Discuss key considerations and decision points</td>
<td>➤ Discuss outcomes and potential refinements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Present several options for an evaluation framework</td>
<td>➤ Discuss process timeline and how to communicate results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Facilitate discussion toward a preferred technical approach</td>
<td>➤ Facilitate discussion toward finalizing evaluation framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Workshop Attendees

Workshop attendees will be technical staff versed in local transit projects and needs and familiar with general concepts of project prioritization

- ATL management team and staff
- ATL Board representation
- ARC representation
- GDOT Planning and Intermodal representation
- MARTA representation
- City of Atlanta representation
- Gwinnett Representation
- Cobb Representation
- Cherokee Representation
- Consulting team -- Cambridge Systematics and Deloitte
A Comprehensive, Performance-Based Framework

Potential factors to consider within the framework

- Local and regional benefits, Return On Investment (ROI)
- Investment types (expansion, enhancement, replacement)
- Funding types and sources (capital/operating)
- Geographic equity
- Data and tool availability
- Value-add to existing practice in the region

Initial thoughts on organizing structure

- Transit Market Conditions
- Anticipated Performance Impacts
- Deliverability (Financial, Physical, Political)
## Draft Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018
- **Initial Workshop Guiding Principles**
- **1st Board Meeting**
- **ARC RTP Update Initiated**

### 2019
- **Project Prioritization Process Developed**
- **ATL Adopts Governing Principles**
- **Transition Year**
  - ATL adopts 1st ATL Regional Transit Plan
  - ARC RTP Update (continued)
  - TIP Call for Projects Anticipated **Aug 2019**

### 2020
- **ARC RTP /TIP Adopted**
- **ATL Regional Transit Plan Updates (Schedule and Details TBD)**
How You Can Help

• Work with your district to understand key projects and process priorities
  • Projects programmed or planned by your district’s transit operators or governments
  • Local priorities for projects
  • Undefined transit projects or needs in your district

• Work with ATL staff to provide input for prioritization discussions

• Advocate for Regional Transit Plan
DISCUSSION: Governing Principles for Project Prioritization
## Proposed Governing Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development and Land Use</th>
<th>Mobility and Access</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Environmental Sustainability</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creates or enhances connectivity and access to job centers, activity centers and economic centers in line with the Unified Growth Policy (UGP)</td>
<td>Connects population centers, employment, recreation, using cross-jurisdictional services to create regional connectivity</td>
<td>Provides new or expanded service to and from low and moderate income areas to improve connectivity and focusing on investments that better enable people to meet their day-today needs</td>
<td>Offers new or enhanced services as alternatives to SOV travel, and promoting the use of alternative fuels to build environmentally sustainable communities</td>
<td>Uses innovative solutions to improve rider experience, fare collection, cost savings, integration with transit alternatives etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

• Do these governing principles, as defined, reflect the region’s values?
• Do these governing principles effectively guide the prioritization process?
• Are any of these considerations more important than the others?
• Does your thinking differ when considering investment at district or regional level?
Next Steps

• Workshop #1 (February 1)
• Continued discussions with key stakeholders on process and schedule alignment
• Refine universe of projects to test for Workshop #2 (March TBD)
BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) OVERVIEW

Chris Tomlinson
The Basics of Bus Rapid Transit
Why Bus Rapid Transit?
Flexible
Comfortable
Reliable
Convenient
Recognizable
Bus Rapid Transit
What is BRT?

- HIGH QUALITY
- HIGH-CAPACITY
- FAST, RELIABLE
- COST-EFFECTIVE
- CUSTOMER-ORIENTED
- RUBBER TIRE-BASED
- PUBLIC TRANSIT SYSTEM

Key rail-like attributes:
- Speed, reliability, frequency
- Dedicated (or preferential) guideway
- Stations
- Level boarding
- Off-board fare payment
- Branded identity and image
Optimal BRT

- Dedicated guideway
- Transit signal priority
- Off-board fare payment
- Distinctive vehicles
- Distinctive station design and location, with:
  - Advanced technology (real-time arrival info)
  - Level platform and precision boarding
- Unique branding
- Supportive connections to other transit service/modes:
  - Mobility connections (bikeshare, rideshare)
- 5-10 minute frequency during peak
- Higher Reliability
  - Running speeds = or > cars operating in the same corridor during peak
BRT Core Elements
Great System = Great Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideways</th>
<th>Rapid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations &amp; Stops</td>
<td>Convenient/Comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>Recognizable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Plans</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BRT Core Elements

- Covered Stations
- Guideway
- Signal Priority
- Brading
- Vehicles
- Level Boarding
- Off-board Fare Collection
BRT Guideways
Guideways: Can be one or a combination of...

With or without Traffic Signal Priority

Express Lanes
HOV Lanes
BAT Lanes

Dedicated aka “Fixed” – Physically separated transit only guideway

Most Desirable
Fastest
Most Reliable
Most Expensive

Less Desirable
Slowest
Less Reliable
Least Expensive

Vehicle Speed
Capital and Operating Cost

MIXED TRAFFIC
MPH
$$$

PREFERENTIAL GUIDEWAY
MPH
$$$

DEDICATED GUIDEWAY
MPH
$$$

Dedicated Guideway
Managed Lanes
Mixed Traffic with TSP
Mixed Traffic

ATL
Guideways: Dedicated

TransMilenio BRT Bogota, Columbia

Median-Running Dedicated Transit Lanes

Mobilien BRT Paris, France

Physically Separated Dedicated Transit Lanes
Guideways: Managed Lanes

Bus Rapid Transit in Managed Lanes, Minneapolis, MN
Guideways: Mixed Traffic

MetroRapid Austin, TX
BRT Stations
Stations

- Real-time travel information
- Off-board ticket machine
- Pedestrian Accessibility
  - Raised curb, level boarding, station ramps and crosswalks
- Weather protection
- Safe and Secure
- Public art
- Iconic or context-sensitive architecture
- Placemaking
Station Type: Full BRT Station

Taichung BRT, China

Rendering of a Potential Inline Station in Highway Median
Station Type: Enhanced Bus Stop

Alum Rock- Santa Clara Bus Rapid Transit corridor, San Jose, CA
Station Type: Existing Local Bus Stop

Local Bus Stop

Local Bus Stop with Shelter

BRT Station

Enhanced Stop

Local Bus Stop
Managed Lanes with inline, at-grade BRT station and pedestrian bridge access to surrounding areas
Managed Lanes with inline, Direct Access Ramp to BRT station located on cross-street bridge
Station Access: Direct Access Ramps

Park-and-Ride w/ connecting service to BRT

BRT stops

Direct Access Ramps

Access Road

Managed Lane

GP Lanes

HOV Direct Access Ramps serving Eastgate Park-and-Ride, Seattle, WA
Station Access: Arterial

HealthLine, Cleveland, OH

LTD, EmX, Eugene, OR
BRT Service Planning
Service Plan: Frequency & Reliability

- **Frequency**
  - Peak = 5-10 minutes
  - Off-peak = 10-20 minutes

- **Service Hours**
  - Weekdays = 21 hours
  - Weekends = 19 - 21 hours

- **Faster Service**
  - Off-board fare collection
  - Use multiple doors
  - Infrastructure improvements

- **Connectivity to other transit services & last mile destinations**
Service Plan: Station Stop Spacing
BRT Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
Intelligent Transportation Systems

Real Time Information

Real time information mobile applications

Real time information at Stations or Stops
Intelligent Transportations Systems: Transit Signal Priority
BRT Vehicles
Vehicles: Premium

- Comfortable & premier seating
- Low floor boarding
- Standard (40’) or Articulated (60’) Bus
- Open standing areas
- Doors on both sides
- Environmentally friendly fuel sources
- Amenities
  - Bike racks, WiFi, wheelchair accommodations
BRT Branding
Branding: Local vs. BRT
Branding: Systemwide

Example: King County Metro, RapidRide, Seattle, WA
BRT Federal Funding
Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Improvement Grant (CIG) Funding

**Small Starts**
Corridor-based or Fixed Guideway BRT
Capital Cost < $300 M

**AND**
Seeking < $100 M in funding
80% Max Fed share for Small Starts

**New Starts**
Dedicated Fixed Guideway BRT
Capital Cost >= $300 M

**OR**
Seeking >= $100 M in funding
60% Max Fed share for New Starts

Historically 50% Federal Match
Recently 30 – 35% Federal Match
## Federal Transit Administration (FTA) BRT Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Corridor-Based BRT</th>
<th>Fixed Guideway BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>&gt;50% of corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial investment in a specific corridor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, on a single route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined stations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signal priority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short headway times</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidirectional services</td>
<td>Yes, for a substantial part of weekdays</td>
<td>Yes, for a substantial part of weekdays and weekends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BRT Case Studies & Planned Projects
### BRT System Variations vs. Local Bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideway</th>
<th>Station Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Off-Board Fare Collection</th>
<th>Level Boarding</th>
<th>Signal Priority</th>
<th>Branding</th>
<th>Cost per mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Dedicated Station</td>
<td>5-10 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$25-50 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway BRT</td>
<td>Dedicated or Managed Station</td>
<td>5-10 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$10-35+ M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Dedicated or Preferential Enhanced Bus Stop</td>
<td>5-15 minutes</td>
<td>Depends</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$4-8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>Local Street Pole or Stop</td>
<td>15-30 minutes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$600K per vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **BRT (Bus Rapid Transit)**: Dedicated or Managed Guideway, Dedicated Station, Frequency 5-10 minutes, Off-Board Fare Collection Yes, Level Boarding Yes, Signal Priority Yes, Branding Yes, Cost per mile $25-50 M.
- **Highway BRT**: Dedicated or Managed Station, Frequency 5-10 minutes, Off-Board Fare Collection Yes, Level Boarding Yes, Signal Priority Yes, Branding Yes, Cost per mile $10-35+ M.
- **ART (Advanced Rapid Transit)**: Dedicated or Preferential Enhanced Bus Stop, Frequency 5-15 minutes, Off-Board Fare Collection Depends, Level Boarding Possible, Signal Priority Yes, Branding Yes, Cost per mile $4-8 M.
- **Local Bus**: Local Street Pole or Stop, Frequency 15-30 minutes, Off-Board Fare Collection No, Level Boarding No, Signal Priority No, Branding No, Cost per mile $600K per vehicle.
## Case Studies: Existing Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pittsburgh East Busway</th>
<th>Cleveland Healthline</th>
<th>San Diego Rapid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guideway</strong></td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Dedicated, Curb and Median running</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle</strong></td>
<td>Articulated</td>
<td>Articulated, Floor aligns with platforms (at some stations)</td>
<td>Articulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stations / Average Spacing</strong></td>
<td>9/0.97 mi</td>
<td>37/0.50 mi</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Connections</strong></td>
<td>Amtrak, Greyhound</td>
<td>RTA Rapid Transit Bus and Trolley</td>
<td>SuperLoop Rapid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>2 min. peak, 15-20 min. off-peak</td>
<td>10-15 min. peak, 30 min. off-peak</td>
<td>15 min. peak, 30 min. off-peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong></td>
<td>$740 Million along East Busway corridor</td>
<td>$4.3 Billion along corridor</td>
<td>Around stations and corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branding</strong></td>
<td>Same as local service</td>
<td><strong>HealthLine</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rapid</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case Studies: MARTA Planned Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GA 400 BRT</th>
<th>Summerhill BRT</th>
<th>Roosevelt Highway BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guideway</strong></td>
<td>Express Lanes</td>
<td>A mix of general purpose lane, dedicated lane and signal priority</td>
<td>A mix of general purpose lane, dedicated lane and signal priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle</strong></td>
<td>Articulated with platform level boarding</td>
<td>Articulated with level boarding</td>
<td>Articulated with level boarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stations</strong></td>
<td>5 stations (3 inline, 2 end of the line)</td>
<td>30 enhanced stops</td>
<td>Mix of enhanced stops and stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Connections</strong></td>
<td>MARTA Red line, potential BRT/ART routes, local bus</td>
<td>MARTA Rail, Streetcar, regional express bus, local bus</td>
<td>MARTA Rail, potential BRT/ART routes, local bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>5 min. peak; 12-20 min. off-peak</td>
<td>5-10 min peak, 12-20 min off peak</td>
<td>5-10 min peak, 12-20 min off peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong></td>
<td>TOD opportunities at station locations</td>
<td>Anticipated redevelopment of stadium area</td>
<td>Some TOD opportunities along the corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branding</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The BRT system may have a resiliency effect. Where the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area as a whole lost jobs between 2004 and 2010, jobs were actually added within 0.25 miles of BRTs stations. “


“The HealthLine delivered more than $4.3 billion in economic development along the Euclid Corridor -- a staggering $114 gained for every dollar spent on creating and launching the new service.”

-Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority: riderta.com
Open *Regional* BRT Questions

- What are the minimum requirements for a project to be considered BRT?
- How should regional standards be applied?
- How will station designs be standardized for cohesiveness while allowing flexibility?
TITLE VI PLAN OVERVIEW

Jonathan Ravenelle, Transit Funding Director
Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

Specifically, Title VI provides that "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."
The objectives of the Title VI program as set forth in FTA Circular 4702.1B are:

- Ensure that the level and quality of public transportation service is provided in a nondiscriminatory manner.
- Promote full and fair participation in public transportation decision-making without regard to race, color, or national origin.
- Ensure meaningful access to transit-related programs and activities by persons with limited English proficiency.

On December 14th the ATL Board approved moving forward with the FTA approval process to become a direct recipient of federal funds.

Under FTA Circular 4702.1B and 49 CFR 21.23(f), each recipient of federal funds must comply with the Civil Rights Act and adopt a Title VI Program every 3 years.
REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF TITLE VI PROGRAM

- Notice to the Public
- Complaint Forms and Procedures
- Public Participation Plan
- Limited English Proficient (LEP) Plan and LEP Access Plan
- ATL Board Structure/Demographics
- Subrecipient Monitoring
NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

► Includes a Statement of Policy.

► Includes complaint filing instructions and where complaints can be filed:
  ▪ Complaint must be filed in writing to either the ATL or Federal Funding Agency.

► Includes call instructions for obtaining Title VI Program information in Spanish, Korean, Chinese, and Vietnamese.

► Includes the Notice to the Public which is displayed in public facing areas and ATL website.
Title VI complaint forms can be found on the ATL’s website.

The complainant is required to complete and submit the form or required information found on the ATL website within 180 days of the last alleged incident.

The complaint must include the following information:

- Name, address, and telephone number of the complainant.
- The basis of the complaint, i.e., race, color, or national origin.
- The date or dates on which the alleged discriminatory event or events occurred.
- The nature of the incident that led the complainant to feel discrimination was a factor.
- Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of persons who may have knowledge of the event.
- Complainant's signature and date.
If the complainant is unable to write a complaint, the ATL Civil Rights Officer will assist the complainant. If requested by complainant, the ATL Civil Rights Officer will provide a language or sign interpreter.

Complainants have the option to file with EEOC, FHWA, FTA, GDOT, USDOT, or the ATL.

Upon a complaint being filed, the ATL will acknowledge receipt of the complaint and then:

- Open an investigation within 15 business days and contact the complainant within 30 days of receipt of the complaint if additional information is required.
- Complete a written investigation report within 90 days of a completed complaint.
- The respondent and complainant have 5 days to respond; if no response is received the investigation is closed.
- Once closed, provide the investigation report, with recommendations and corrective actions taken, to the appropriate federal agency, the complainant, and the respondent.
Federal requirements governing ATL’s Public Participation Plan:

- FTA C 4702.1B, Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients.
  - Chap. 3, par. 8, Promoting Inclusive Public Participation
  - Chap. 2, par. 9, Requirement to Provide Meaningful Access to LEP Persons
- 49 U.S.C. Sections 5307(b):
  - Requires programs of projects to be developed with public participation.
  - Requires that recipients shall take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are limited-English proficient (LEP).
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

► ATL engages in public outreach to ensure that its stakeholders receive information regarding the status of relevant project or program changes and participate in the decision making and planning process.

► ATL’s Public Participation Goals:

  ▪ To provide meaningful opportunities for the public to assist staff in identifying social, economic, and environmental impacts of proposed transportation decisions. This includes input from low-income, minority and LEP populations.

  ▪ To ensure that the comments it receives are useful, relevant and constructive and contribute to better organizational plans, projects, strategies and decisions.

  ▪ To ensure that opportunities to participate are accessible physically, geographically, temporally, linguistically, and culturally.
ATL will strive to proactively promote public involvement and to inform the public of current initiatives, programs, and issues.

The following are examples that ATL may use to inform, reach out to invite participation, and to seek public input:

- Printed Materials Produced by ATL
- ATL Website
- Media Targeted to Ethnic Communities
- Informational Open Houses and Public Meetings
- Translation and Interpretive Services
ATL must comply with USDOT regulations and 65 FR 50121 (August 2000) to ensure individuals who are limited-English proficient (LEP) have meaningful access to benefits, services, information, and other important portions of its programs and activities.

ATL is most likely to directly interact with LEP populations when:

- Developing a Regional Transit Plan
- Developing Regional Transit Policies and Policy Implementation Plans
- Conducting community outreach and attending transit agency partner events
- Interacting with existing and/or new regional transit operators
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) ACCESS PLAN

► Four factor Analysis (conducted in development of LEP Access Plan):
  ▪ LEP persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by the program or recipient.
  ▪ Frequency with which LEP persons come into contact with the program.
  ▪ Nature and importance of the program, activity, or service provided.
  ▪ Resources available to the recipient for LEP outreach, as well as associated costs.

► Access Plan Resources:
  ▪ Telephone: automated system with English or Spanish assistance, staff trained to assist LEP populations, LEP Language line.
  ▪ In-person: “I speak” cards, staff access to translated materials via Google Translate.
  ▪ Website: Translation in Spanish, Vietnamese, Korean, and Chinese.
ATL Board Structure and Demographics:

- The ATL board consists of one individual appointed by the Governor, two individuals appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, two individuals appointed by the Speaker of the House, and ten individuals elected from the ATL’s ten transit districts.

Subrecipient Monitoring:

- The ATL will monitor subrecipients, contractors, and subcontractors for compliance with Title IV per FTA Circular 4702.1B, Chap. III, Part 12 requirements.

- ATL’s subrecipient monitoring procedures will include the following:
  1) Requesting and maintaining files for subrecipient Title VI programs.
  2) Annual reviews of subrecipient/contractor Title VI programs to determine compliance with FTA requirements including on-site reviews to ensure compliance as necessary.
  3) Developing a corrective action plan to address any deficiencies and assist as applicable to achieve compliance as required by FTA Circular 4702.1B Chapter III 12.
ATL TITLE VI PROGRAM NEXT STEPS

► Title VI Program Overview Presentation (January 24th)

► Public Participation and Comment Period
  ▪ Public comment period from January 28th through February 26th
  ▪ Public Meeting on February 13th

► March Board Meeting (March 7th)
  ▪ Proposed Resolution for Board Adoption of ATL Title VI Program
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Chris Tomlinson
ADJOURN!