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ATL ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDIT

► Annual Report and Audit of nine of the transit systems operating in the ATL’s 13-county region

► Initial report includes data for the last five years (2015 to 2019) on transit planning, investments, and operations

► Report focuses on performance, particularly from a regional perspective

► Final report due to the legislature on December 1, 2019
Key Performance Indicators
ANALYSIS OF KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIs)

► Develops a baseline for future comparison

► Starting point to provide recommendations for improvements or future investments in the region

► Enables benchmarking to compare Atlanta to peer regions

- Ridership
- Level of Transit Investment
- On-Time Performance
- Equity
- Level of Service
- Operational Productivity
- Customer Satisfaction
- Financial Productivity
- State of Good Repair
- Safety
Total transit ridership in the region peaked in 2015 with 144 million trips, declining to 125 million by 2019.

Rail, bus, and vanpool saw losses; however, rail ridership was steady between 2018 and 2019.

Commuter bus and demand response ridership remained steady or increased.

Despite ridership declines, agencies have slightly increased the amount of service provided.
Ridership decline is consistent with national trends

Several factors are likely contributing to the decline:

• Low gas prices
• Increases in auto usage due to the strong economy
• New competition from TNCs and new micromobility services
Regional operating expenditures for transit totaled over $580 million in FY 2019.

In the region, there is a high reliance on sales tax revenues to fund transit.

State funding makes up a smaller portion of both operating and capital funding compared to national averages.
LEVEL OF INVESTMENT: OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER CAPITA

- Transit operating expenditures per capita have fluctuated year over year.
- Average growth between 2015 and 2019 is below inflation rate.
- By comparison, the average expenditures per capital in metro areas of 2 million or more people was $137 in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost per capita</td>
<td>$105.58</td>
<td>$111.33</td>
<td>$99.40</td>
<td>$105.37</td>
<td>$108.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On-time performance in 2019 ranged from 60 percent on some bus routes to 97 percent on rail.

On-time performance for some buses declined significantly between 2018 and 2019.

The region has 65 miles of express lanes and nearly 48 miles of heavy rail track.
STATE OF GOOD REPAIR

- Strong correlation between the state of an agency’s vehicle fleet and reliability

- 11 percent of vehicles region-wide are past their useful life benchmarks.

- The region’s commuter bus fleets need the most investment to bring to a state of good repair.
Access to fixed-route transit is strongly correlated with access to opportunity.

Within walking distance of fixed-route transit:
- Total population: 26%
- Minority population: 33%
- Low-income households: 38%

Within walking distance of **high-frequency** transit (15-minute average headways or better):
- Total population: 4%
- Minority population: 4%
- Low-income households: 6%
WORKSHOP FEEDBACK – WHAT WE HEARD

► Consider transit travel speeds and time competitiveness
► Consider perceptions of safety (crime)
► Interest in mode split, more accessibility analysis, and TNC and new micromobility impacts on ridership
► Consider the region’s density and need for coordinated land use and transportation planning
Economic and Regional Impact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify Sources of Value</td>
<td>How does transit support people and business in the ATL region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Effects</td>
<td>How do agency expenditures support regional jobs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Commuters</td>
<td>What industries depend on transit for access to workers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Value of Choice</td>
<td>How does transit help individuals and the region avoid costs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>How does access by mode compare across the region?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOURCES OF VALUE – WHAT MATTERS TO THE REGION?

- Address Population Trends
- Support Equity and Inclusive Growth
- Serve Commuting Needs
- Enhance Sustainability
- Support Business
**IMPACTS OF TRANSIT AGENCY OPERATIONS & EXPENDITURES**

**MULTIPLIER EFFECTS IN THE 13-COUNTY ATL REGION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Type</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Value Added</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>11,156</td>
<td>$689 M</td>
<td>$912 M</td>
<td>$1,578 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>$95 M</td>
<td>$141 M</td>
<td>$237 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In FY 18:

Source: Research team analysis using TREDTransit™ and budget information from individual transit agencies.
TRANSIT COMMUTERS AND THE REGIONAL ECONOMY

80,785 WORKERS
Can get to work because of transit

$2.9 BILLION
In annual wages brought home by transit commuters

$9.0 BILLION
In annual sales facilitated by transit commuters

4%
Transit commute share, regionwide

Source: 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Public Use Microdata Sample. Sales estimates are based on ratios from 2017 Regional IMPLAN Industry Detail and an adjustment factor from the BEA to translate wage and salary income into total compensation. Because of PUMA geographies, Newton County is included.
OUTLOOK FOR INDUSTRIES WITH LARGE NUMBERS OF TRANSIT COMMUTERS

• Top 20 industries with the most transit commuters
• Projected employment growth (2017-2040)
• Service sector jobs whose workers often rely on transit are growing faster than regional average

722-Food Services and Drinking Places
611-Educational Services
541-Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
561-Administrative and Support Services
92-Public Administration (non-military)
23-Construction
52-Finance and Insurance
721-Accommodation
622-Hospitals
445-Food and Beverage Stores
624-Social Assistance
621-Ambulatory Health Care Services
452-General Merchandise Stores
812-Personal and Laundry Services
42-Wholesale Trade
448-Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores
517-Telecommunications
623-Nursing and Residential Care Facilities
481-Air Transportation
53-Real Estate and Rental and Leasing
All Industries

Source: Moody’s Economy.com.
VALUE OF CHOICE: TRANSIT AND ALTERNATIVE MODES

If bus and rail service were unavailable in FY 2019...

> 80 MILLION forgone trips (linked)

> 2.1 BILLION more vehicle miles on the road (4% increase)

Sources:
- Individual agency reported ridership
- 2009-2010 ARC Regional On-Board Survey
- APTA – Who Rides Public Transportation, 2017
- Select analysis of regions with survey data on TNCs as an alternative to transit
- *Conservative estimate – assumes no greater mileage for carpooling and no deadheading for taxis/TNCs
VALUE OF CHOICE: TRANSIT AND ALTERNATIVE MODES

Avoided Trip Costs

> Based on average transit trip of 9.4 miles
> Driving costs:
  > Low: operating costs such as gasoline, maintenance, tires, and depreciation
  > High: Additional fixed ownership costs
> Compare to MARTA Fare: $2.50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diverted Mode</th>
<th>Per Trip Cost</th>
<th>Trips Diverted</th>
<th>Total Cost to Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive (low)</td>
<td>$3.67</td>
<td>158.0 M</td>
<td>$579.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive (high)</td>
<td>$5.55</td>
<td>158.0 M</td>
<td>$876.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>$21.31</td>
<td>14.6 M</td>
<td>$310.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNC</td>
<td>$12.78</td>
<td>50.8 M</td>
<td>$649.1 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Sources: USDOT BCA Guidance, AAA, Taxifarefinder.com, Taxis-fare.com

Estimated avoided emissions (US tons) from avoided 2.1 B in VMT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>839,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated using the TREDIS® transportation economics suite using per mile emission rates applied to the avoided automobile VMT and to bus revenue miles. Emissions rates in TREDIS® are based on the U.S. Department of Energy’s (DOE) AFLEET 2018 model. MARTA rail emissions not included as these are dependent on emissions from the electrical generation process which vary based on fuel mix and geography.
VALUE OF CHOICE: TRANSIT AFFORDABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Percentage of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Ownership and Operations</td>
<td>$8,849</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Commuter Average Income</td>
<td>$35,655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Public transportation costs calculated as twelve 30-day MARTA passes ($95 each); Car ownership and operations from AAA at 15,000 miles per year. Transit commuter average income from research team analysis using 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Public Use Microdata Sample (Ruggles, et al., 2018).
REGIONAL ACCESS TO JOBS WITHIN 45 MINUTES – RATIO OF TRANSIT ACCESS TO JOB ACCESS

Job access by transit is at most 30% of that by car.
Population within a 45-minute commute:
- Driving: 1,771,570
- Transit: 307,219

Ratio of Transit Access to Drive Access: 0.17
LABOR MARKET ACCESS PERIMETER

Population within a 45-minute commute:
► Driving: 1,570,776
► Transit: 136,563

Ratio of Transit Access to Drive Access: 0.09
LABOR MARKET ACCESS AIRPORT

Population within a 45-minute commute:
► Driving: 1,235,321
► Transit: 213,925

Ratio of Transit Access to Drive Access: 0.17
Proactively managing growth through strategic transit investments will be key to sustaining and supporting Atlanta's regional economic development.
Recommendations and Observations
MOVING TRANSIT IN THE REGION FORWARD

- Regional Transit Plan
- Peer examples of success
- Key investment strategies
- Improvements to performance measurement, monitoring, and future reports

Dedicated right-of-way

State of good repair

Integrated planning
MOVING TRANSIT IN THE REGION FORWARD

Peer examples of success

- Twin Cities
  - Bus-on-shoulder
  - Arterial Bus Rapid Transit
  - Light-Rail
- Seattle
  - Arterial Bus Rapid Transit
  - Light-Rail
  - Supporting policies (land use, active transportation, TDM)
### Areas for strategic investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invest in high capacity transit to meet the region’s demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in dedicated right-of-way for transit to improve on-time performance and travel speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the region’s transit network works in a coordinated and seamless way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the state of good repair for the region’s transit assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate land use and transportation planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MOVING TRANSIT IN THE REGION FORWARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas for standardizing performance monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand the number of agencies tracking on-time performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create regionwide questions related to customer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with transit providers to identify consistent means to track safety and crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opportunities for trends to track in future years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usage of transportation network companies and other micromobility solutions</td>
<td>Impacts that major transit investments have on ridership and the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts that major transit investments have on ridership and the economy</td>
<td>Deployment of low emissions and zero emissions transit propulsion technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment of low emissions and zero emissions transit propulsion technologies</td>
<td>Implementation of amenities to improve the rider experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps for future development

- The ATL will share with each agency detailed information about the data requested and a timeline for data submissions.
- Determining how to streamline the development process to minimize the burden on agencies.
Thank You!
ATL Regional Transit Plan Update

Lori Sand
November 7, 2019
ARTP PROJECT ALIGNMENT TO THE GOVERNING PRINCIPLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure Category</th>
<th>Project-Level Performance Measures</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>SGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market</strong></td>
<td>Existing, Projected Population Density</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Population - Communities of Interest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Employment Density</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Low Wage Employment Density</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Mix - Existing, Planned (+/- Community Impacts)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Re) Development Potential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>Transit Trips</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Reliability</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Useful Life</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elements to Improve Safety/Security/Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability</strong></td>
<td>Financial Plan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documented Project Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Readiness - Schedule, Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Integration / Connectivity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost-Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Cost per Point</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Economic Development and Land Use | • Regional Integration and Connectivity  
• Existing and Projected Population Density  
• Existing Employment Density  
• Land Use Mix and Community Impacts |
| Environmental Sustainability | • Transit Ridership Potential  
• Increased Useful Life  
• Safety, Security, and Environmental Impacts |
| Equity                       | • Existing Population – Communities of Interest  
• Low Wage Employment Density  
• Land Use Mix and Community Impacts  
• (Re) Development Potential |
## Individual Metrics by Guiding Principle

### Innovation
- Transit Reliability
- Safety, Security, and Environmental Impacts

### Mobility and Access
- Regional Integration and Connectivity
- Existing and Projected Population Density
- Existing Employment Density
- Transit Reliability

### Return on Investment
- (Re) Development Potential
- Projected Population
- Transit Reliability
- Land Use Mix and Community Impacts
# Project Level Alignment to the Governing Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Economic Development and Land Use</th>
<th>Environmental Sustainability</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Mobility and Access</th>
<th>Return on Investment (metrics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRT Project 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT Project 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT Project 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART Project 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRT Project 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART Project 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTP QUADRANTS
PROJECTS WITH IDENTIFIED FED/STATE DISCRETIONARY FUNDING ASSUMPTIONS

SCATTERPLOT FOR ARTP PROJECTS IDENTIFYING FEDERAL OR STATE DISCRETIONARY FUNDING

QUADRANT 1
Higher Impact / Lower Cost
- High impact (progress towards ARTP goals) at the least relative cost
- Investments that optimize both performance and funding
- 25 projects
- Projects average 59 points
- $1.7 billion (total cost)

QUADRANT 2
Higher Impact / Higher Cost
- High impact (progress towards ARTP goals) at a higher cost
- Investments that optimize performance
- 26 projects
- Projects average 60 points
- $13.8 billion (total cost)

QUADRANT 3
Lower Impact / Higher Cost
- Lower cost investments with less impact (progress towards ARTP goals)
- Investments that optimize funding
- 25 projects
- Projects average 43 points
- $0.5 billion (total cost)

Note: Three systemwide maintenance projects (with a total cost of $400 million) requesting discretionary funds could not be assigned to a specific geographic location by the project sponsor; therefore, they could not be evaluated and placed into a quadrant.
Quadrant Scatterplot Demonstration

Projects with Identified Fed/State Discretionary Funding Assumptions
Scatterplot for ARTP projects identifying federal or state discretionary funding

- Quadrant 1: Higher Impact/Lower Cost
  - High-impact (Progress toward ARTP goals) at the lowest relative cost
  - Investments that optimize value for performance and funding
  - 25 Projects
  - Project average 50 points
  - $1.7 billion (total cost)

- Quadrant 2: Lower Impact/Lower Cost
  - Lower-cost investments with high-impact (Progress toward ARTP goals)
  - Investments that optimize funding
  - 25 Projects
  - Project average 45 points
  - $0.5 billion (total cost)

- Quadrant 3: Lower Impact/Higher Cost
  - Higher-cost investments with low-impact (Progress toward ARTP goals)

- Quadrant 4: Higher Impact/Higher Cost
  - High-impact (Progress toward ARTP goals) at a high cost
  - Investments that optimize performance
  - 25 Projects
  - Project average 50 points
  - $13.6 billion (total cost)

*Condensed axes
2019 ARTP Plan Performance
Tracy Selin,
November 7, 2019
2019 ARTP Plan-Level Evaluation

► Evaluate collective impact of 2019 ARTP on transportation system

► Applied to ALL projects proposed for inclusion in the ARTP

► Combination of quantitative and qualitative evaluation:
  – Plan-level metrics that directly align with Governing Principles
  – Summary of the nature and type of investments that advance each Governing Principle
  – Alignment of projects seeking federal or state discretionary funds to their relative impact on each Governing Principle
Jobs served by transit
Average annual delay reduction (across plan horizon)
Travel time cost savings

Transit ridership
Emissions reduction
Fuel reduction
Crash reduction

Benefits: Reduction in travel time, vehicle operating costs, crashes, emissions, state of good repair
Costs: Capital and operations

Percentage population served—communities of interest
Improved access to low-wage jobs
(Re)development potential

Introduction of new transit mode or technology
Creative use of technology
Technology or other modern applications to improve transit reliability
### 2019 ARTP Plan-Level Evaluation

**Process and Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Impacts (Transit)</th>
<th>Direct Impacts (Highway)</th>
<th>Indirect Impacts (All)</th>
<th>Cumulative Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Primary benefits for transit users</td>
<td>► Primary benefits for highway users</td>
<td>► Secondary, broader public benefits</td>
<td>► Aggregated and monetized benefits (direct + indirect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Improvements at the trip origin (populations served)</td>
<td>− Delay savings</td>
<td>− Air pollutant emissions</td>
<td>► Across 2050 plan horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Improvements at the trip destination (jobs served)</td>
<td>− Cost savings</td>
<td>− Carbon emissions</td>
<td>► Monetized benefits reflect county level wage rates (value of time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− (Re)development potential</td>
<td>► Evaluated with ARC travel demand model (88 out of 192 projects)</td>
<td>− Crashes</td>
<td>► Monetized costs reflect capital plus 20 years O&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► GIS-based analysis across all projects</td>
<td>− 2015 base year</td>
<td>► Benefit-Cost Assessment (BCA) tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− 2050 Existing + Committed (E+C) / No Build</td>
<td>− Travel data from ARC model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− 2050 Transit Build</td>
<td>− Tailored emission factors, crash rates, fuel rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2019 ARTP Plan-Level Evaluation - Level Evaluation Process and Methods**

- **Direct Impacts (Transit):**
  - Primary benefits for transit users
    - Improvements at the trip origin (populations served)
    - Improvements at the trip destination (jobs served)
    - (Re)development potential
  - GIS-based analysis across all projects

- **Direct Impacts (Highway):**
  - Primary benefits for highway users
    - Delay savings
    - Cost savings
  - Evaluated with ARC travel demand model (88 out of 192 projects)
    - 2015 base year
    - 2050 Existing + Committed (E+C) / No Build
    - 2050 Transit Build

- **Indirect Impacts (All):**
  - Secondary, broader public benefits
    - Air pollutant emissions
    - Carbon emissions
    - Crashes
  - Benefit-Cost Assessment (BCA) tool
    - Travel data from ARC model
    - Tailored emission factors, crash rates, fuel rates

- **Cumulative Impacts:**
  - Aggregated and monetized benefits (direct + indirect)
  - Across 2050 plan horizon
  - Monetized benefits reflect county level wage rates (value of time)
  - Monetized costs reflect capital plus 20 years O&M
Results by Governing Principle

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE

► 100,000 more jobs within walking distance of low-capacity transit
► 420,000 more jobs within walking distance of high-capacity transit
► 4 million vehicle-hours delay saved each year (despite vehicle travel remaining relatively constant between the 2050 Build and 2050 No Build)
► $652 million in cost savings each year resulting from reduced delay
Results by Governing Principle

- **Environmental Sustainability**
  - 20% increase in transit ridership (between the 2050 Build and 2050 No Build)
  - 24 tons VOC, NOx, PM2.5 reduced each year
  - 12 million gallons fuel saved each year
  - 10,000 tons carbon emissions reduced each year
EQUITY

- 95,000 more low-income, minority, and zero car households with walk access to low-capacity transit
- 394,000 more low-income, minority, zero car households with walk access to high capacity transit
- 239,000 more low wage jobs within walk access to high capacity transit
- Targeted investment in areas with significantly lower property values and higher concentrations of low income, minority, and zero car households
  - South Fulton
  - Beltline/West
  - Clayton County
  - Eastern DeKalb County
Results by Governing Principle

INNOVATION

- 104 of 192 projects include components that advance a modern, innovative and more reliable system
  - 62 projects include advanced transit design
  - 96 projects advance transit-friendly technologies
  - 11 projects introduce technology innovation to increase rider safety
**2019 ARTP Plan-Level Evaluation**

**MOBILITY AND ACCESS**

- Year 2050 (Build compared to No Build):
  - 3.1% delay reduction for automobiles
  - 2.3% delay reduction for trucks

- By functional class:
  - 0.3% reduction interstates
  - 1.0% reduction principal arterials
  - 16% reduction minor arterials
  - 8% reduction for major collectors
  - 5% reduction local roads
RETURN ON INVESTMENT

- Every $1 Invested = $1.25 Return:
  - Benefits: reduction in travel time, vehicle operating costs, crashes, emissions, fuel
  - Costs: capital and operations

RETURN on Investment
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2019 ARTP Plan-Level Evaluation
Key Take-Aways

► **A more efficient system** that can support the same level of travel demand in a rapidly growing urban area, but with less wasted time spent in congestion

► **A more equitable system** with high-performing investments across the region

► **A complimentary investment package** to the state Major Mobility Investment Program (MMIP) which targets significant (managed) roadway capacity to the interstate system

► **A system that performs** with benefits demonstrated across all ATL Governing Principles
ATL Regional Transit Plan: Branding Component

Chris Tomlinson
November 7, 2019
THE LAW
AND
GENESIS OF THE ATL LOGO/BRAND
1. HB 930: “On and after January 1, 2019, the (MARTA) board shall utilize a logo and brand upon any newly acquired capital asset worth more than $250,000 that is regularly visible to the public which shall include the acronym ‘ATL’ as a prominent feature.”

2. HB 930: The ATL logo and brand must appear on “any property” of MARTA by Jan. 1, 2023

3. HB 930: ATL Regional Transit Plan (ARTP) must “include the creation of a unified brand to encompass all transit service providers within the jurisdiction of the authority.”
Cobranding vs. Rebranding

Cobranding
Co-branding utilizes two or more brand identities on a good or service as part of a strategic alliance or partnership.
- Brand names, symbols & designs remain the same
- Each brand contributes its own identity to combine their respective market strength, brand awareness, and positive associations.
- Cobranding strategy utilizes established content, graphic designs, and is integrated with existing marketing and advertising campaigns to support the partnership.

Rebranding
Rebranding changes the public-facing image of an entire agency, product or service.
- New name, symbol, or change in design for an already-established brand.
- Creates a different and singular identity for a brand, from its competitors and partners, in the market.
- Requires funding for a creative rebranding strategy, new content, graphic design, as well as marketing and advertising campaigns to support the rebrand.
IMPLEMENTATION TO DATE:
ATL CO-BRANDING WITH MARTA & XPRESS
“CO-BRANDING” ATL: MARTA & XPRESS

- MARTA implemented co-branding on its new buses starting Jan. 1, 2019
- MARTA plans to implement co-branding for other transit assets (Rail, Paratransit, Streetcar, etc.) in Spring 2020
- Xpress began co-branding July 2019
- 88 current coaches cobranded and 77 replacement coaches will have ATL logo upon receipt from the manufacturer
- 1 of the 11 state-owned Xpress Park & Ride lots has ATL logo; new Park & Rides will have logo upon construction
ATL held a meeting on February 8, 2019, of marketing and communications leaders of fixed transit operators and partner agencies (MARTA, Xpress, Cobb, Gwinnett, Douglas, ARC and ATL) to discuss:

- Intent of HB 930’s provisions and timeline for any required actions under the law
- Work associated with adding ATL co-branding to existing fleets, and educating public on its purpose
- Impact on transit providers’ existing brand recognition and reputations
- Entities and services that are covered under the law
- Potential customer confusion
BRANDING DISCUSSIONS MOVING FORWARD

► ARTP before the ATL Board in December will include language reflecting current co-branding approach

► Regional discussions will continue in 2020, with a focus on tying co-branding rollout to education on, or rollout of, new benefits or regional connectivity

► ATL to work with transit operators to identify regional features that can be associated with co-branding rollout

► 2020 ARTP update would discuss planned timing of co-branding rollout by other transit providers (beyond MARTA and Xpress)

► Value of expanded transit network for the region, as demonstrated by ARTP evaluation, furthers ATL brand

► Goal is to implement the branding requirements of the law, in a way that respects existing branding, yet also moves closer to the vision of a unified regional transit network that is easily navigated and understood
Thank You.
ATL Transit District
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Attendance  Comments

ATL Transit District
“Great display boards. Having people answer questions at each board was helpful.”

“I would prioritize a common payment platform so that all various operators could offer a seamless payment experience.”

“Great way to bring transit communities together with uniform assessment criteria.”

“Questions were answered. Hopefully can get more citizens involved. Some how advertise on the TV.”

“I am glad to see there are active plans for expansion and moving to mass transportation”

“Great information to build our community.”
### ATL DISTRICT DOWNLOADS: KEY STAKEHOLDERS ATTENDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Alpharetta</td>
<td>Chris Speed</td>
<td>Field Representative, Congresswoman Lucy McBath’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Alpharetta</td>
<td>John Hipes</td>
<td>Member, Alpharetta City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Cumming</td>
<td>Cindy Jones Mills</td>
<td>Member, Forsyth County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Cumming</td>
<td>Dennis Brown</td>
<td>Member, Forsyth County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Cumming</td>
<td>Eric Christ</td>
<td>Member, Peachtree Corners City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Sandy Springs</td>
<td>Rusty Paul</td>
<td>Mayor, Sandy Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Sandy Springs</td>
<td>Terry Nall</td>
<td>Member, Dunwoody City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Sandy Springs</td>
<td>Jim Riticher</td>
<td>Member, Dunwoody City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Sandy Springs</td>
<td>Antrell Tyson</td>
<td>District Director, Congresswoman Lucy McBath’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Sandy Springs</td>
<td>Al Pond</td>
<td>Member, MARTA Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Marietta</td>
<td>Mike Boyce</td>
<td>Chairman, Cobb County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Marietta</td>
<td>Michael Paris</td>
<td>Executive Director, Council for Quality Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Marietta</td>
<td>Slade Gulledge</td>
<td>Director of Government Affairs, Cobb Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Atlanta</td>
<td>Patti Garrett</td>
<td>Mayor, Decatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Lawrenceville</td>
<td>Randy Meacham</td>
<td>Executive Director, Gwinnett Municipal Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATL District Downloads: Key Stakeholders Attending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 – Lawrenceville</td>
<td>Kelly Kelkenberg</td>
<td>Member, Duluth City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Lawrenceville</td>
<td>Matthew Lee</td>
<td>Executive Director, Tucker-Northlake CID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Lawrenceville</td>
<td>Joe Allen</td>
<td>Executive Director, Gwinnett Place CID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Lithonia</td>
<td>Delores Crowell</td>
<td>Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, DeKalb County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Douglasville</td>
<td>Dr. Romona Jackson Jones</td>
<td>Chair, Douglas County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Douglasville</td>
<td>Kelly Robinson</td>
<td>Vice Chair, Douglas County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Douglasville</td>
<td>Tarenia Carthan</td>
<td>Member, Douglas County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Douglasville</td>
<td>Ann Jones Guider</td>
<td>Member, Douglas County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Stockbridge</td>
<td>Becky Evans</td>
<td>Member, Georgia House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Stockbridge</td>
<td>El-Mahdi Holly</td>
<td>Member, Georgia House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Stockbridge</td>
<td>Anthony Ford</td>
<td>Mayor, Stockbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Stockbridge</td>
<td>Neat Robinson</td>
<td>Member, Stockbridge City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Jonesboro</td>
<td>Rhonda Burnough</td>
<td>Member, Georgia House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Jonesboro</td>
<td>Dr. Tim Hynes</td>
<td>President, Clayton State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Jonesboro</td>
<td>Jerry Griffin</td>
<td>Member, MARTA Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>