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Development of the ARTP Performance Framework

**Develop framework executive summary and action plan**

**Communicate framework to local stakeholders**

**Communicate and Document Process**
- 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 performance framework (*Workshop #2*)
  - Test and refine performance framework (*Workshop #3*)

**Review Existing Methods**
- Identify preferred technical methods
- Vet proposed performance framework
- Test and refine performance framework

**Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Review Existing Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Develop Performance Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Work with technical staff to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Identify preferred technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>methods (<em>Workshop #1</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vet proposed performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>framework (<em>Workshop #2</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test and refine performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>framework (<em>Workshop #3</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Communicate framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to local stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workshops**
- **Workshop #1**: February 1st
- **Workshop #2**: March 1st
- **Workshop #3**: April 12th

**Board Meetings**
- **January 24th**: Board Meeting
- **March 7th**: Board Meeting
- **May 10th**: RTP Committee
- **May 23rd**: Board Meeting
Schedule
Applying the ARTP Performance Framework

**Transit Project Submittal**
- On-line application complete
- Project submittal window open
- Webform information sessions
- One-on-one meetings to communicate process

**Transit Project Review**
- Compile, review project submissions
- Apply ARTP performance framework
- QAQC with sponsors
- ATL Board Planning Committee review and input

**Outreach and Engagement**
- Complete plan-level analysis, plan narrative
- District outreach (*October*)
- Official 30-day public engagement period (*November*)
- Finalize plan for Board adoption (*December*)

June
- Webform #1 June 18
- Webform #2 June 20
- Webform #3 July 10
- Webform #4 July 24

July

August
- Board Meeting August 8th

September
- RTP Committee September 20
- Board Meeting November 7

October
- Board Meeting December 13

November
Transit Project Submittal

- 195 projects initially submitted through the ATL on-line application
- Project list refined to 192 based on review and QAQC with sponsors in August
  - 49 system/area-wide investments
  - 130 route/asset-specific investments
  - 13 projects not yet associated with specific geographic area, route, or asset type (very early in development)
All Submitted Projects by Type

- 30 State of Good Repair
- 57 Enhancement
- 105 Expansion
Transit Project Submittal
District Summaries

DISTRICT 1
- 18 total projects
- 5 tiered

DISTRICT 2
- 53 total projects
- 25 tiered

DISTRICT 3
- 75 total projects
- 38 tiered

DISTRICT 4
- 9 total projects
- 6 tiered

DISTRICT 5
- 96 total projects
- 43 tiered

DISTRICT 6
- 40 total projects
- 22 tiered

DISTRICT 7
- 48 total projects
- 15 tiered

DISTRICT 8
- 53 total projects
- 18 tiered

DISTRICT 9
- 42 total projects
- 13 tiered

DISTRICT 10
- 31 total projects
- 13 tiered

If a project enters any portion of a district, it is included in summary. Projects can cover multiple districts.
Transit Project Submittal

**Total Costs (By Project Type)**

- **Total**: $27B
  - SGR: $4.1B
    - Capital: $4.1B
    - O&M: $4.0M
  - Enhancement: $4.2B
    - Capital: $2.3B
    - O&M: $1.9B
  - Expansion: $18.7B
    - Capital: $14.2B
    - O&M: $4.5B
Transit Project Submittal

Total Project Costs (By Fund Source)

- **Total**: $27B
  - **Capital**: $20.6B
    - Local/Regional: $9.9B
      - Formula
      - Discretionary: $152M
    - State: $5.1B
    - Federal: $5.1B
    - Unaccounted: $5.4B
  - **O&M**: $6.4B
    - Local/Regional: $2.8B
    - State: $0
    - Federal: $235M
    - Unaccounted: $3.4B
Transit Project Review

- ALL projects reviewed according to ARTP performance framework
- ARTP performance framework supports feedback and discussion with sponsors on:
  - Project development needs at the local level
  - Plan development needs at the regional level
  - Next steps for advancing project and plan implementation
Projects with No Fed/State Discretionary Funding Identified

116 projects

» Projects still under development; funding assumptions still unconfirmed

» Projects to be completed exclusively with local and/or formula funds and do not meet the definition of regionally significant

Note: Systemwide and areawide projects are not shown
Transit Project Review
Projects Seeking Federal/State Discretionary Dollars

Total $27B

- Capital $20.6B
  - Local/Regional $9.9B
  - State Discretionary $152M
  - Federal $5.1B
  - Unaccounted $5.4B

- O&M $6.4B
  - Local/Regional $2.8B
  - State Discretionary $0
  - Federal $235M
  - Unaccounted $3.4B
Projects with Fed / State Discretionary Funding Identified

- 76 projects, $16.1B
  - 40% by count
  - 60% by $-amount

- Any project seeking federal or state discretionary funding was placed into 1 of 3 project quadrants

- Project quadrants support project development discussions for the ARTP and RTP/TIP
Transit Project Review
Multi-Criteria Prioritization Model

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

PERFORMANCE IMPACTS:
• Transit Trips
• Transit Reliability
• Increased Useful Life
• Elements to Improve Safety / Security / Environment

Deliverability
Market Potential
Performance Impacts
Transit Project Review
Four-Quadrant Matrix Model

Quadrant 1
Higher Impact / Lower Cost

- High impact (progress towards ARTP goals) at the least relative cost
- Investments that optimize both performance and funding

Quadrant 2
Lower Impact / Lower Cost

- Lower cost investments with less impact (progress towards ARTP goals)
- Investments that optimize funding

Quadrant 2
Higher Impact / Higher Cost

- High impact (progress towards ARTP goals) at a higher cost
- Investments that optimize performance

Quadrant 3
Lower Impact / Higher Cost

- Higher cost investments with less impact (progress towards ARTP goals)

Total Project Score (0-100 pts)
Cost per Point ($Millions)
Transit Project Review
Projects Seeking Fed/State Discretionary Funding

Scatterplot for all 76 ARTP projects requiring federal or state discretionary funding
Quadrant 1
Higher Impact/Lower Cost

- High impact investment, lower cost
- Optimizes both performance and funding
  - 26 projects
  - Projects average 59 points
  - $1.8 billion (total cost)
Quadrant 2
Higher Impact/Higher Cost

- High impact investment, at higher cost
- Optimizes performance
  - 25 projects
  - Projects average 60 points
  - $13.4 billion (total cost)
Quadrant 2
Lower Impact/Lower Cost

- Lower cost investment with less impact
- Optimizes funding
  - 25 projects
  - Projects average 43 points
  - $0.5 billion (total cost)
Quadrant 3

No projects fell into Quadrant 3 – our higher cost projects are maximizing performance

This quadrant should capture projects where additional development or refinement is needed:

» Project scoping components that better align with market, performance and/or deliverability considerations

» Project cost considerations

Projects that fall into Quadrant 3 need additional work to move them into one of the other quadrants; should trigger a conversation between sponsor and the ATL around if/how best to advance
Transit Project Review

Initial Findings

Healthy distribution of projects by type; however, geographic distribution leaned towards areas with recently completed transit plans
  » Over time a “top-down” planning approach will help balance this initial “bottoms-up” process

Project data inconsistent across submissions
  » Scope details
  » Project cost and funding assumptions
  » Supporting materials

Projects yielded a reasonable distribution of points across ARTP performance framework criteria and cost-effectiveness

Process is “stable” in that it can flex projects in or out without drastically restructuring results
### Transit Project Review

#### Project Level Alignment to Governing Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Filter</th>
<th>Criteria 1</th>
<th>Criteria 2</th>
<th>Criteria 3</th>
<th>Total Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development and Land Use</td>
<td>Regional Integration / Connectivity</td>
<td>Land Use Mix (+/- Community Impacts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Elements to Improve Safety / Security / Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Communities of Interest Population</td>
<td>Low Wage Employment Density</td>
<td>(Re)Development Potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Transit Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility and Access</td>
<td>Transit Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment</td>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarize across projects for each Governing Principle:

- Investments that are most directly advancing each principle
- Summary impact assessment for each principle (plan analysis)
Next Steps
Plan-Level Evaluation

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

- Benefits: reduction in travel time, vehicle operating costs, crashes, emissions, state of good repair costs
- Costs: capital and operations

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

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

- Travel time savings
- System-wide delay reduction
- Access to jobs

- Introduction of new transit mode or technology
- Creative use of existing/new technology
- Technology or other modern applications to lower project capital and/or O&M costs
Next Steps
Plan-Level Evaluation

Planned Transit System

GIS Spatial Analysis
- Percentage population served – communities of interest
- Affordable mobility benefits
- Low-wage industry benefits

Regional Travel Model
- Jobs served
- Redevelopment potential
- Travel time cost savings

Reduction in VMT, Delay
- Travel time savings
- System-wide delay reduction
- Access to jobs

Economic Model
- Emissions reduction
- State of Good Repair
- Fuel savings
- ROI

Introduction of new transit mode or technology
- Creative use of technology
- Technology or other modern applications to cost

Jobs served
- Redevelopment potential
- Travel time cost savings
- Emissions reduction
- State of Good Repair
- Fuel savings
- ROI
Next Steps
Outreach and Engagement

- Draft ARTP narrative
- District outreach/Engagement
Questions
ARTP OUTREACH PLAN

Scott Haggard
ATL Regional Transit Planning Committee
September 20, 2019
ARTP OUTREACH PLAN IN SUMMARY

Percentage of Total Projects Submitted By District

- District 10: 16%
- District 9: 22%
- District 8: 28%
- District 7: 25%
- District 6: 21%
- District 5: 50%
- District 4: 5%
- District 3: 39%
- District 2: 28%
- District 1: 9%

► ATL Board seeks public input on the Draft ARTP prior to Board adoption
► 10 public information sessions, one per ATL district, will reach a wide range of stakeholders and citizens
► Venues were selected based on public familiarity with and accommodations for this type of meeting, and in areas of each district convenient to major population centers
ARTP OUTREACH PLAN FORMAT

► All information sessions will be held at a consistent time (6:30-8:30 pm), and are open to anyone

► Specific invitations will be sent to elected officials (federal/state/local), CIDS, transit operators, project sponsors, and other interested stakeholders

► Sessions will include a brief presentation, in conjunction with information boards and staff to answer questions, similar to recent county approaches

► Comments on the draft plan will be collected and presented back to the Board in November
MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS

ALL INFO SESSIONS OCCURRING FROM 6:30 – 8:30 PM

Tuesday, October 8 – District 8, Douglasville, Douglas County Courthouse

Wednesday, October 9 – District 9, Stockbridge, Merle Manders Center

Monday, October 21 – District 3, Sandy Springs City Hall

Tuesday, October 22 – District 10, Jonesboro, Clayton Performing Arts Ctr.

Wednesday, October 23 – District 7, Lithonia, Lou Walker Center


Monday, October 28 – District 4, Marietta, Sewell Mill Library

Tuesday, October 29 – District 1, Alpharetta City Hall

Wednesday, October 30 – District 5, Atlanta, ATL Office**

Monday, November 4 – District 2, South Forsyth Co., Sharon Forks Library

* in conjunction with a meeting of the Gwinnett Transit Review Committee
** will also function as federally-required Title VI public hearing
NEXT STEPS: TIMELINE

Present draft at ATL Planning Committee Meeting September 20

Present results of public meetings at ATL Board meeting November 7

Present final plan to ATL Board December 13

Present draft at 10 district public meetings October 8 – November 4

Present final draft plan to ATL Planning Committee December 5
Thank You.

Scott Haggard
404.893.2055 (office)
shaggard@srtala.gov
www.atltransit.ga.gov