The ATL Transit Project
Prioritization Process

Recommendations

presented to
The ATL Board Planning Committee
(Committee of the Whole)

presented by
Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

May 10, 2019
Presentation Overview

- Process to Develop Prioritization Approach
- Recommended Prioritization Process
- Next Steps for Implementation / Regional Transit Plan
Schedule

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

- **Develop Performance Framework**
  - Work with technical staff to
    - Identify preferred technical methods (Workshop #1)
    - Vet proposed evaluation framework (Workshop #2)
    - Test and refine framework (Workshop #3)

- **Communicate and Document Process**
  - Develop framework executive summary and action plan
  - Communicate framework to local stakeholders
  - Seek stakeholder feedback
  - Seek Board input/feedback
  - Submit for Board Adoption 5/23

**Timeline**

- **December**
- **January**
- **February**
  - Workshop #1: February 1st
  - Board Meeting: January 24th
- **March**
  - Workshop #2: March 1st
  - Workshop #3: April 12th
  - Board Meeting: March 7th
- **April**
  - RTP Committee: May 10
- **May**
  - Board Meeting: May 23rd
Goals and Objectives for the ATL Prioritization Process

The objective of the ATL Transit Project Prioritization Process is to provide a methodology to **objectively and transparently** evaluate proposed transit projects in serving the **needs of the ATL region**.

The ATL Transit Project Prioritization Process must:

- Evaluate projects based on standardized criteria and objective data
- Support ARC/GDOT processes for transportation project programming
- Reflect Federal and state funding and grant requirements
- Aggregate all transit projects across the region regardless of funding
- Reflect the ATL’s governing principles
Governing Principles Define the Vision of Success for the Regional Transit Plan

OPERATIONALIZING THE GOVERNING PRINCIPLES FOR PROJECT PRIORITIZATION:

- Build process around: Market Potential, Performance, Deliverability
- Market, Performance, Deliverability considerations allow the ATL to:
  - Reflect best practice performance criteria that can be measured at project level
  - Integrate broader set of criteria to advance an actionable plan that the underlying market supports
- Intersection of Market, Performance, Deliverability supports prioritization of most cost-effective projects and an investment portfolio with greatest potential return
ATL Prioritization Technical Working Group

- Defined technical considerations for prioritization process
- Provided input at key decision points for prioritization methods
  - Prioritization model
  - Prioritization criteria, performance measures, and weights
  - Project ranking and tiering
  - Outcomes of project testing
  - Communicating and presenting results
- Provided input for plan-level evaluation
Prioritization Model

- **A** Everything Together
- **B** Projects by Type
- **C** Sequencing of Steps
Prioritization Criteria

KEY CRITERIA:
- Population/Employment
- Transit Supportive Land Use
- Economic Development
- Labor Access

KEY CRITERIA:
- Financial
- Political
- Physical

KEY CRITERIA:
- Productivity
- Reliability/Mobility Impact
- Asset Management
- Safety
- Environment
- Resiliency
- Efficiency
Performance Measures

MARKET POTENTIAL:
- Existing/Projected Population Density
- Existing Population – Communities of Interest
- Existing Employment Density
- Existing Low Wage Employment Density
- Existing/Planned Land Use Mix (+/- Community Impacts)
- (Re) Development Potential

DELIVERABILITY
- Financial Plan
- Documented Project Support
- Project Readiness – Schedule, Environmental Impacts
- Regional Integration

COST EFFECTIVENESS:
- Cost per Point

PERFORMANCE IMPACTS:
- Transit Trips
- Transit Reliability
- Increased Useful Life
- Elements to Improve Safety / Security / Environment
Project Ranking and Tiering

**Expansion Projects**
- Market Potential
- Performance Impacts
- Deliverability
  - Cost Effectiveness (CE)

**Enhancement Projects**

**Maintenance Projects**

**Project Level Evaluation**

**PROJECT RANK By Project Type (Project Points)**
- Tier I
- Tier II
- Tier III

**PROJECT RANK Across all Projects (Project Points)**
- Tier I
- Tier II
- Tier III

**PROJECT TIER (Points + CE)**
- Points (0-100)
- Tier I
- Tier II
- Tier III
- CE (cost per point)
Prioritization Process – Building the Engine

 Compiled, processed, reviewed data across all proposed performance measures
  » Data advances prioritization goals/objectives
  » Data is readily available
  » Data is consistent across 13 counties
  » Data is “stable”
  » Data yields discrete, relative distribution across projects
  » Data can be efficiently processed for scoring and ranking purposes

 Built GIS-based platform to evaluate quantitative metrics

 Refined project application details to support qualitative metrics

 Built scoring and ranking calculator
Prioritization Process – Taking a Test Drive

- 26 projects tested
  - Diverse project and program types
  - Geographic distribution
  - Combination of planned, programmed, and made-up
  - Varying scale and complexity

- Coded projects in GIS

- Compiled quantitative data for all projects and applied dummy qualitative data for all projects

- Ranked each project based on project score

- Tiered each project based on combination of project score and cost-effectiveness
Project Tiering Results

Initial Test

Total Score
(0-100 Points)

Cost Effectiveness (CE)
(Cost per Point)
Prioritization Test Results

Final Recommendation

Total Score
(0-100 Points)

Cost Effectiveness (CE)
(Cost per Point)

Tier 1

Tier 2

Tier 2

Tier 3

Prioritization Test Results

Final Recommendation

Total Score
(0-100 Points)

Cost Effectiveness (CE)
(Cost per Point)

Tier 1

Tier 2

Tier 2

Tier 3
Prioritization Test Results

Final Recommendation

Tier 1
Tier 2
Tier 3
Project Applicant Requirements

- Basic project information
  - Sponsor information
  - Impacted districts/jurisdictions
  - Project description
  - Map of project location
- Design documents, if available
- Applicable studies or plans that include the proposed investment
- Adopted land use, housing, design or other transit-oriented policies that will support the proposed transit investment
- Reference to relevant Transit Asset Management Plan
- Letters of support
- Anticipated schedule for opening
- Records of Decision or other documented FTA activities
Project Applicant Requirements (Financial Plan)

Total capital and (20-years) operations/maintenance costs
  » Plan, design, build, operate/maintain (by cost component)
  » Previously allocated funds versus remaining funding needs
  » Anticipated Federal, state, local/regional fund source(s) for capital and operations
    ▪ Committed
    ▪ Planned
    ▪ Speculative

Applicant input around potential risk to financial plan
  » Securing funds
  » Existing debt obligation that could increase risk for securing funds
  » Potential for project delay
Prioritization Process Recommendations

- Multi-Criteria Prioritization Model for project ranking
- Four Quadrant Matrix Model for project tiering

These two models combined:
- Advance the goals/objectives and key considerations initially established for the prioritization process
- Yield mix of priorities across investment type and across the region
- Yield project-level data that can be “rolled up” to plan-level evaluation for ATL Governing Principles
- Support targeted feedback to project sponsors to improve pool of projects and evolve plan process over time
Regional Transit Plan Performance Framework

- Expansion Projects
- Enhancement Projects
- Maintenance Projects

Project Level Evaluation
- Market Potential
- Performance Impacts
- Deliverability
- Cost Effectiveness (CE)

Project Rank By Project Type (Project Points)

Project Rank Across all Projects (Project Points)

Project Tier (Points + CE)

Plan Level Evaluation
- Systems-Level Travel Demand Modeling
- Plan-Level Performance
- Alignment with Governing Principles
- System ROI
Plan-Level Alignment to Governing Principles

**Systems Level ROI**
(Every $1 Invested = $ Return):
- Benefits: reduction in travel time, vehicle operating costs, crashes, emissions, state of good repair
- Costs: capital and operations

- Travel time savings
- System-wide delay reduction
- Access to jobs
- Geographic distribution and improved access to regional system

**Plan-Level Alignment to Governing Principles**

- **Jobs served**
- **Travel time cost savings**
- **(Re)development potential**

- **VMT reduction**
- **Emissions reduction**
- **State of Good Repair**
- **Fuel savings**

- **Percentage population served** – communities of interest
- **Affordable mobility benefits**
- **Low-wage industry benefits**

- **Introduction of new transit mode or technology**
- **Creative use of technology**
- **Technology or other modern applications to lower capital and/or O&M costs**
Project-Level Alignment to Governing Principles

Project XYZ

TIER 1

| Project Number | | |
|----------------|------------------|
| Project Type   | | |
| Jurisdiction   | | |
| District       | | |
| Cost           | | |
| Anticipated Open to Traffic Year | | |

Governing Principles quantified for each project by sorting against most relevant project-level performance criteria for each Principle and breaking into quartiles.
Next Steps

- April-May: Vet prioritization process with stakeholders, provide (draft) application hard-copy in advance
- April-June: Develop on-line application portal
- May 10: ATL Regional Transit Plan Committee meeting
- May 23: ATL Board adoption
- June-July: CALL FOR PROJECTS/APPLICATION WINDOW OPEN
- July-Sept – Regional Transit Plan development
- October - Public and stakeholder review and comment
- November 7 – ATL Board adoption
### Regional Transit Plan Process Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC / GDOT / GRTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATL</td>
<td>Compliance and Completeness Review</td>
<td>Systems-Level Modeling</td>
<td>RTP Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Agencies / Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Project Evaluation</td>
<td>Prioritized Projects</td>
<td>TIP/STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-Yr Project List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-Yr Project List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transit Plan</td>
<td>Local Referendum Project Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Implementation phase and Letter of Support process/timing differs for CIG Projects*
Regional Transit Plan Process Flow (cont.)

CIG Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARC / GDOT / GRTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adoption | Project Development | Engineering/Environment

- **Adoption**
  - Regional Transit Plan – CIG Projects
  - Letter of Support
  - Project Planning (e.g., Feasibility Study, AA)
  - FTA Submission
  - Project Development Activities for FTA

- **Project Development**
  - 2 Years
  - LPA TIP
  - Letter of Support

- **Engineering/Environment**
  - Approval for Project Development
  - Approval to Enter Eng.
  - Project Engineering / Final Design
Plan Development Schedule

**MARCH 2019**

**UNIVERSE OF PROJECTS**
A list of transit improvements will be developed that identify potential corridors, modes, and other enhancements such as mobility hubs, increases in frequency, etc.

**MARCH 2019**

**FINANCIAL FORECASTING**
Revenue forecasts will be projected for the 30-year planning horizon.

**APRIL 2019**

**PROJECT EVALUATION**
Each project identified will be evaluated and scored in 4 areas: ridership, land use and economic development, cost and equity.

**MAY 2019**

**SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT**
A list of proposed projects will be developed for 2 scenarios: full penny and ½-penny revenue forecasts.

**JUNE – JULY 2019**

**FINAL PLAN**
The final report will be published in July.
Plan Development Process

1. Current MARTA Tax
2. Previously Adopted
3. DeKalb System Full-Penny
4. DeKalb System Half-Penny
Transit Survey Results

Is the level of transit service in DeKalb County sufficient?

- Yes: 11%
- No: 89%

Do you support additional sales tax to expand transit?

- Yes: 77%
- No: 23%

If we were to improve transit service in DeKalb County, which is most important to you?

(rank from highest priority to lowest priority, with 1 being the highest)

- Go more places: 4.21
- More frequent service: 5.13
- Faster trips (less time to get to your destination): 4.00
- Better amenities (bus shelters, improved rider information, more vending, etc.): 2.53
- More paratransit service (such as MARTA Mobility): 2.07
- Encourage economic development (growth and job creation): 2.78

No: 89%
Yes: 11%
Financial Forecasting and Scenario Development

Existing MARTA Sales Tax Scenario

**Full Penny Sales Tax**
Previously Adopted Scenario

DeKalb System Scenario

**½ Penny Sales Tax**
DeKalb System Scenario

---

**Potential Sales Tax Revenue**
(over 30-years in 2019 dollars)

- **Full Penny** $3.65 B
- **Half Penny** $1.85 B
Financial Assumptions for Scenario Development

Key Financial Assumptions

Total operations and maintenance costs assumptions over the 30-year planning horizon:

**ART and BRT**
Revenue service in 5-10 years–23 years O&M costs

**LRT and HRT**
Revenue service in 10-15 years–15 or 20 years O&M costs (project specific)

**35%**
Of capital costs coming from federal sources (consistent with ARC and ATL assumptions)

**CAPITAL COSTS BREAKDOWN BY PHASE**
- 70% CST
- 20% ROW
- 10% PE
Universe of Projects

40 Potential Projects

3 HRT, 9 LRT, 13 BRT, and 15 ART Projects

$20 B in Capital Costs

$4.8 B in O&M Costs*

$25 Billion

*includes sustaining capital funding
Universe of Projects
Evaluation Categories

- Land Use Compatibility
- Equity
- Economic Development Potential
- Performance (Ridership)
SketchTransit land use score

- Score shows route compatibility with land use densities
- Indicates whether development patterns are supportive of high-capacity, moderate-capacity, or local bus service
- Based on underlying trip densities sourced from the ARC’s Activity Based Model (ABM)
Equity Analysis

- ARC’s Equitable Target Areas (ETAs)
- High concentrations of minority and low-income populations
- Evaluation Measure: Project alignment miles that serve designated ETAs
Project Evaluation–Economic Development Potential

Evaluation Measure
Acres of economic development zones served by project

Economic Development Zones
- Empowerment Zones
- Enterprise Zones
- Emerging Employment Centers (based on County’s Strategic Economic Development Plan)
- Community Improvement Districts (CIDs)
- Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) Areas
- ARC-designated Activity Centers
Project Evaluation – Performance (Ridership)

**Project Performance (Ridership) Measure**

- Ridership estimates were developed through a sketch model calibrated for each transit mode
- Model inputs include:
  - Existing (2015) and projected (2040) population and employment within project service area
  - Alignment miles
  - Number of stations
- Station dwell times
- Average travel speeds
- Headways
- Hours of peak and off-peak service
- Evaluation Measure: Number of riders per mile of project alignment
Current Unmet Rider Needs

Paratransit Expansion
Improvements to Popular Corridors
Mobility Centers
Expanded Local Bus Service, Bus Circulators, and On-Demand Service
Bus to Rail Transfer Improvements
Last Mile/First Mile Connectivity
Current Unmet Rider Needs

Paratransit Expansion

To serve significant aging-in-place and disabled populations

Could be provided via MARTA Mobility and/or mobility-on-demand contracted services
Current Unmet Rider Needs

Expanded Local Bus Service, Bus Circulators, and On-Demand Service

To persons in areas of County which are currently unserved or underserved—South and East DeKalb

Improve mobility and circulation in town centers such as Decatur, Stonecrest, Tucker, and Brookhaven
Increased frequency of service, higher capacity buses, extended hours of operation, and improved shelters and rider amenities on:

**ROUTE**

- 39 Buford Highway
- 186 I-20 East/Rainbow Drive
- 21 121 Memorial Drive
- 15 Candler Road
- 19 Clairmont Road
- 75 Lawrenceville Highway
- 116 Redan Road
Current Unmet Rider Needs

Mobility Centers

South DeKalb Mall, Tucker, Northlake and Stonecrest

- Facilitate bus-to-bus transfers
- Provide covered shelter, Breeze card kiosks, restrooms, vending, bike racks, waste bins
- Real-time bus arrival information
- Curb space for ride-sharing (Uber, Lyft), bike-share and scooter-share
Current Unmet Rider Needs

Bus to Rail Transfer Improvements

- Better align bus and train arrivals to reduce transfer time
- Increase bus bay loading capacity at key transfer stations (e.g., Doraville, Decatur, and Indian Creek)
- Improve real-time passenger information and wayfinding
- Improve passenger amenities such as restroom access and vending
Current Unmet Rider Needs
Last Mile/First Mile Connectivity

Improvements to active transportation
Walking and biking connections to and within transit corridors and stations

UNMET NEED: MISSING SIDEWALKS AT BUS STOPS

STATION WAYFINDING

NEW SIDEWALK CONNECTIONS

BICYCLE FACILITIES
Scenario Development
Existing MARTA Penny Scenario
No New Funding

- No moderate or high-capacity transit projects
- Focus on State of Good Repair and sustaining capital improvements:
  - MARTA station rehabilitation – up to $10 M to $12 M per station (near-term - Indian Creek in 2021 and Kensington in 2025)
  - Track and systems rehabilitation $232 M (systemwide)
  - Traction power/aux power rehabilitation $375 M (systemwide)
  - $3.7 M (near-term $1.9 M) for DeKalb upgraded bus shelters, benches, and train station bathrooms
  - Railcar replacement program $650 M (systemwide)
  - Bus replacement program $230 M (systemwide)
  - High-capacity buses on I-20 East/Rainbow Dr (Rt. 186) and Memorial Dr. (Rt. 121)
  - Potential funding for mobility centers in DeKalb County
Previously Adopted Full-Penny Scenario
30-year Investment Plan

- Based on adopted MARTA LPAs for I-20 East and Clifton Corridor
  - 4 Projects
  - 1 HRT, 1 BRT (Express Lanes), and 2 LRT Projects
  - 37 Total Project Miles
  - $200 M in County Discretionary Transit Fund
  - Total Capital Costs (Local Contribution) – $3 B
  - Federal Share – $1.6 B
  - Total O&M Costs – $882 M*
  - $453 M over projected funding level with BRT in HOV/express lane
  - $1.7 B over projected funding level with BRT in exclusive ROW per MARTA Board approved LPA

* Includes sustaining capital funding
DeKalb Full-Penny System Scenario
30-year Investment Plan

$5 Billion (includes Federal participation)

$200 M – County Transit Discretionary Fund

17 Projects Total

4 LRT, 5 BRT, and 8 ART Projects

176 Project Miles

Total Capital Costs - $2.4 B (Local Contribution)

Federal Share - $1.3 B

Total O&M Costs - $1.1 B*

* Includes sustaining capital funding
DeKalb System
Half-Penny Scenario
30-year Investment Plan

$2.2 Billion (includes Federal participation)

$120 M – County Discretionary Transit Fund

14 Projects Total

1 LRT, 5 BRT, and 8 ART Projects

139 Project Miles

Total Capital Costs - $910 M (Local Contribution)

Federal Share - $490 M

Total O&M Costs - $817 M*

* Includes sustaining capital funding
Scenario Evaluation

Financial modeling and analysis

Conveyal accessibility analysis of scenarios

FTA's Simplified Trips-on-Project Software (STOPS) ridership analysis on high capacity projects
Next Steps

MAY 20  PMT Review of System Evaluation
MAY 21  DeKalb Committee of Whole Presentation
MAY 29  Stakeholder Committee Meeting
EARLY JUNE  Public Meetings
JUNE  Final Documentation
JUNE/JULY  Adoption by Cities and County
SUMMER  Coordination with The ATL
Discussion
Thank You
FTA Regional Formula Funds & Policy Updates

ATL Regional Transit Planning Committee

Jon Ravenelle / May 10, 2019
FTA Regional Formula Funds & Policy Updates - Goals

1) Provide history and status update on Regional Formula Fund Policies

2) Provide overview of FTA Formula Fund Programs

3) Provide overview of ATL & ARC proposed policy updates
DESIGNATED RECIPIENT OVERVIEW

• On October 1, 2018, Designated Recipient status was transferred to ATL

• The ATL’s responsibilities as the Designated Recipient include:
  • Suballocation of formula funds to eligible recipients in Atlanta UZA in accordance with national apportionment formula
  • Coordination with ARC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Atlanta UZA
  • Communication and coordination with FTA
  • Providing regional technical support to eligible recipients and analysis of federal transit funding
**DESIGNATED RECIPIENT vs. ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS**

**Designated Recipient**
- Receives and suballocates formula funding from FTA to eligible recipients
- Can also be a direct recipient

**Eligible Recipients**
- Receive a suballocation from the Designated Recipient
- Can apply for use of suballocated federal funds directly or indirectly depending upon status as an FTA direct recipient
Process to suballocate FTA formula funding through the national apportionment formula is outlined by Atlanta UZA’s Regional Formula Fund Policies.

Policies provide timeline and details regarding how suballocation is transmitted to eligible recipients.

Policies developed by Designated Recipient and MPO (ARC) in coordination with eligible recipients.

MARTA and ARC’s most recent draft policies were posted for review in December 2017.

- Full review and adoption was postponed by MARTA and ARC due to changes made to regional transit governance structure in HB 930.
ATL and ARC have been working to update the Regional Formula Fund Program Policies.

Policy updates include:

- Adjustments to reflect the change in Designated Recipient
- Adjustments to reflect the role of the ATL’s Regional Transit Plan and HB 930
- Majority of administrative components of previous policies remain the same with some updates related to Program of Projects (POP) public engagement to strengthen FTA compliance

Updated policies will go into effect October 1, 2019 (start of Federal fiscal year 2020) with the existing suballocation methodology being used for Federal fiscal year 2019.
### Regional Formula Fund Policy Update Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 11th</td>
<td>- Provide TOS Update and coordinate with FTA for feedback on POP process and make necessary revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 18th to Mar. 14th</td>
<td>- ATL &amp; ARC finalize proposed policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 15th</td>
<td>- Send proposed policies to regional operators/TOG group for review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mar. 15th to Apr. 25th | - ARC & ATL conduct joint meetings with operators/locals.  
                           - ARC & ATL receive and review feedback on proposed policies - answer any questions.                                               |
| Apr. 26th          | - ARC & ATL present proposed policies during TOG meeting and gather recommendations related to policies.                                      |
| Apr. 29th to May 10th | - Continue to receive and review feedback on proposed policies - answer any questions.  
                           - Continue to conduct meetings with operators/locals.  
                           - Update/adjust proposed policies as necessary.                                                  |
| May 10th           | - ATL Regional Transit Planning Committee receives presentation on proposed areas of change.                                                |
| August Board Adoption | - ATL & ARC Board adoptions in August meetings.                                                                                          |
Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Fund Program:
- Formula is based on population and operating statistics
- Funding eligible for planning, engineering, capital maintenance, capital expansion and some operating expenses

Section 5337 State of Good Repair Formula Fund Program:
- Formula is based on Fixed Guideway and High Intensity Motorbus (HOV/HOT service) operating statistics
- Funding eligible for capital maintenance and replacement, as well as State of Good Repair planning and preventive maintenance

Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Fund Program
- Formula is based on population and bus service operating statistics
- Funding eligible for capital projects to replace, rehabilitate, and purchases buses, vans, and related equipment, as well as bus related facilities.
5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA FUND PROGRAM
5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA FUND PROGRAM

Formula is based on:
- Population
- Population Density
- Bus Revenue Vehicle Miles
- Fixed Guideway Directional Route Miles
- Ratio of Passenger Miles to Operating Costs (incentive tier)

Categories of areas funds can be used for:
- Planning, engineering, design and evaluation of transit projects
- Capital investments in bus and bus-related activities
- Security related projects – capital and planning
- Capital investments in new and existing fixed guideway (rail or BRT) systems
- Preventive maintenance and ADA paratransit operating
## 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Fund Program – Calculation Flow Chart

### Total 5307 Apportionment
- **Low Income Set-Aside**: $2,682,964
- **Total Remaining 5307**: $66,427,259

### ARC Percentage (0.5%)
- **Remainder**: $66,095,123

#### Fixed Guideway
- **33.29%**: $22,003,066

#### Bus
- **66.71%**: $44,092,056

#### Total
- **100.00%**: $66,095,123

### Fixed Guideway
- **Primary**: 95.61% $21,037,132
  - **Revenue Miles**: 60.00% $12,622,279
  - **Route Miles**: 40.00% $8,414,853
  - **Total**: 100.00% $21,037,132

- **Incentive**: 4.39% $965,935

#### Total
- **100.00%**: $22,003,066

### Bus
- **Primary**: 90.80% $40,035,587
  - **Revenue Vehicle Miles**: 50.00% $20,017,794
  - **Population**: 25.00% $10,008,897
  - **Population X Density**: 25.00% $10,008,897
  - **Total**: 100.00% $40,035,587

- **Incentive**: 9.20% $4,056,469

#### Total
- **100.00%**: $44,092,056

### Total 5340 Funds for the Atlanta UZA:
- **Remainder**: $4,505,904
  - **Population**: 50.00% $2,252,952
  - **Population X Density**: 50.00% $2,252,952
  - **Total**: 100.00% $4,505,904
RESERVING FUNDS FOR PLANNING ENTITIES - HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 5307 Apportionment</td>
<td>$69,110,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Set-Aside</td>
<td>$2,682,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Remaining 5307</td>
<td>$66,427,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Percentage (0.5%)</td>
<td>$332,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>$66,095,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARC annually receives a set-aside of one-half of one percent (0.5%)

- Used for regional transit planning or other regional projects
- Funding ranges from $300,000 to $330,000 annually

ARC has funded the following projects with these funds:

- Fulton County Master Transit Plan
- Remix Transit Planning Software Licenses (utilized by MARTA, Cobb, Gwinnett, and Henry)
- On-Board Travel Survey (2001 and 2008)
- Regional Fare Policy Study
- Regional General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) Coordination work (transferred to ATL)
### RESERVING FUNDS FOR PLANNING ENTITIES - PROPOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 5307 Apportionment</strong></td>
<td>$69,110,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Income Set-Aside</strong></td>
<td>$2,682,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Remaining 5307</strong></td>
<td>$66,427,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARC Percentage (.25%)</strong></td>
<td>$166,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATL Percentage (.75%)</strong></td>
<td>$498,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remainder</strong></td>
<td>$65,762,986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed policies include set-aside of one percent (1.0%):

- .25% for ARC
- .75% for ATL
- Overall set-aside increase of $332,136 based on FFY 19 dollars

► ATL funding will be utilized for regional projects and planning including:

- General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) coordination activities
- Regional Fare System and Policy studies
- Regional Transit Signal Prioritization studies
- Regional On-Board Survey
- Regional capital projects – i.e. regional bus stop signage type projects
5337 STATE OF GOOD REPAIR GRANT PROGRAM
5337 STATE OF GOOD REPAIR FORMULA FUND PROGRAM

► Formula is based on:
  - HOV & HOT Bus Directional Route Miles
  - Bus Vehicle Revenue Miles
  - Fixed Guideway Directional Route Miles
  - Fixed Guideway Vehicle Revenue Miles

► Categories of areas funds can be used for:
  - Passenger stations and terminals
  - Maintenance facilities and equipment
  - Operational support equipment, including signals, communication equipment, computer hardware and software
  - Preventive maintenance
  - Purchase or rehab of rolling stock for either bus or rail
State of Good Repair Grant Program
$59,121,918

Fixed Guideway (FG)
$55,464,725

High Intensity Motor Bus (HIMB)
$3,657,193
High Intensity Motor Bus Component

HIMB
$3,657,193

Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM)
$2,121,070

Directional Route Miles (DRM)
$1,536,123
HIGH INTENSITY MOTORBUS SEGMENTS
Current suballocation is based on which operator first reported segment to NTD which is based exclusively on who operated in segment first.

In 2017 eligible HIMB operators identified concerns with current suballocation method.

Does not reflect amount of service being operated in each shared segment by each operator.
### List of Segments and Operators by Segment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Segment Mileage</th>
<th>Xpress</th>
<th>GCT</th>
<th>CobbLinc</th>
<th>MARTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-85 HOV SB</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-85 HOV NB</td>
<td>18.74</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 SB</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 NB</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75/I-85 SB</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75/I-85 NB</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 NB</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 SB</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 EB</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 WB</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 EB</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 WB</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = Currently reports and receives funding for segment
X = Currently operates in segment but receives no DRM funds
Suballocate funding amount attributable to each segment based on amount of service provided on each segment by each operator

- Example - Segment 1: $100 for Federal fiscal year 2050
  - Operator A: 50 trips = 38% of service on Segment 1
  - Operator B: 80 trips = 62% of service on Segment 1

- $100 value of Segment 1 is divided:
  - Operator A: based on 38% share of service on Segment 1 = $38
  - Operator B: based on 62% share of service on Segment 1 = $62
### SHARED SEGMENT SERVICE BREAKDOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Details</th>
<th>Share of Service Operated on Segment by Each Operator (October 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segment Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Segment Mileage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-85 HOV SB</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-85 HOV NB</td>
<td>18.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 SB</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 NB</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75/I-85 SB</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75/I-85 NB</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 NB</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 SB</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 EB</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 WB</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 EB</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 WB</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **= Currently reports and receives funding for segment**
- **= Currently operates in segment but receives no DRM funds**
Suballocation amounts will be based on amount of service provided by each operator within each segment.

As a result, suballocation will fluctuate as service levels change year-over-year.

New proposed methodology to be phased in over a two-year period to reduce impacts of adjusting methodology.

Proposed approach is fair and equitable for both now and in the future as transit expands.
5339 BUS AND BUS FACILITIES FORMULA PROGRAM
5339 BUS & BUS FACILITIES FORMULA FUND PROGRAM

► Formula is based on:
  o Bus Vehicle Revenue Miles
  o Population
  o Population Density
  o Ratio of Passenger Miles to Operating Costs (incentive tier)

► Categories of areas funds can be used for:
  o Capital projects to replace, rehabilitate, and purchases buses, vans, and related equipment
  o Construction/rehabilitation of bus-related facilities
  o Technology changes or innovations to modify low or no emission vehicles or facilities.
REGIONAL FORMULA FUND POLICY UPDATES

Next Steps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 11th</td>
<td>- Provide TOS Update and coordinate with FTA for feedback on POP process and make necessary revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 18th to Mar. 14th</td>
<td>- ATL &amp; ARC finalize proposed policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 15th</td>
<td>- Send proposed policies to regional operators/TOG group for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 15th to Apr. 25th</td>
<td>- ARC &amp; ATL conduct joint meetings with operators/locals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ARC &amp; ATL receive and review feedback on proposed policies - answer any questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 26th</td>
<td>- ARC &amp; ATL present proposed policies during TOG meeting and gather recommendations related to policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 29th to May 10th</td>
<td>- Continue to receive and review feedback on proposed policies - answer any questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continue to conduct meetings with operators/locals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Update/adjust proposed policies as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10th</td>
<td>- ATL Regional Transit Planning Committee receives presentation on proposed areas of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August Board Adoption</td>
<td>- ATL &amp; ARC Board adoptions in August meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You.

Jon Ravenelle
404.893.3010 (office)
jravenelle@srtag.gov
www.atltransit.ga.gov
ADJOURN