Regional Transit Planning Committee Meeting
Thursday, January 7, 2021
Proposed Agenda

I. Call to Order – Charlie Sutlive, Chair
II. Approval of the Meeting Minutes for November 5, 2020
III. Approval of the Agenda for January 7, 2021
IV. Regional Fare Policy Project Update – Cain Williamson
V. 2021 ATL Planning Work Program – Cain Williamson
VI. ARC On Board Transit Survey – Mike Alexander, ARC
VII. Adjourn
FARE POLICY OVERVIEW

What is the goal of a regional fare policy?

“
To establish guidelines for setting a uniform, fair, and equitable areawide fare structure consistent with revenue-producing requirements and established budgets.

- Board Policy No. 29, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
Study potential fare policies to determine what works best for the region and its partners

Identify and mitigate disparate impacts of regional fare policy to EJ and ADA protected communities

Examine impacts of regional fare policy to varying farebox recovery targets of all partner agencies

Promote customer ease-of-use by simplifying fare media offerings and transfer policies between partner agencies

Implement a revenue reconciliation process associated with inter-agency transfers

Consider launch of one or more regional pass products for more flexible movement around region
Local Agency Review
- Current fare policies
- Current fare systems and equipment
- Internal and external transfer rules

National Peer Agency Fare Policy Review

Developed evaluation criteria for use in evaluating fare policy alternatives
Presented Detailed Information on National Peer Agency fare policies

- On-line research results
- Interviews with peer agency staff

Discussed key features from each national peer agency that could be adapted for the Atlanta region

Reviewed evaluation criteria weighting results
Reformatted Stakeholder Engagement

- Introduced idea of biweekly workshops with primary point of contact per agency
  - Enabling more frequent and more robust discussions, streamlined agency input, consistent agency representation, and continuous decision making
- Gathered information on approval processes, such as Board approvals, at each agency
  - Enabling a full understanding of timing around critical decision making
WORKSHOP 4 – DECEMBER 2020

Presented Existing Fare Collection Technology
- Breeze System
- MARTA Mobile Ticketing
- Token Transit Pilot

Presented Pros and Cons of Electronic and Visual Validation

Discussed Technology Options & Possible Paths Forward
- Shorter-term: Layer fare policy on existing technology
- Medium-term: Leverage upgrade to Breeze Mobile 2.0
- Longer-term: Collaborate with MARTA on procurement of AFC 2.0 to create integrated, regional system
- Hybrid approach: Layer + collaborate simultaneously

Launched Regional Fare Policy Survey to understand travel preferences
- Survey closes January 15
  www.surveymonkey.com/r/ATLFarePolicySurvey
NEXT STEPS

► Finalize decision regarding technology and path options
► Utilize fare policy survey results to inform fare policy options
► Present and finalize revenue reconciliation strategies
► Present fare structure and fare policy options that align and are compatible with technology options and customer sensitivity
► Evaluate fare structure and policy options against our stakeholder-driven evaluation criteria
► Select regional fare policy model
► Conduct Title VI equity analysis
Thank You.

Cain Williamson
470.630.0013 (cell)
cwilliamson@atltransit.ga.gov
www.atltransit.ga.gov
2021 ATL PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Cain Williamson
January 2021
2021 ATL WORK PROGRAM

• Annual Report and Audit
• ARTP Project Database
• 2022 ATL Regional Transit Plan Update
• ATL RIDES
• Regional Fare Policy Development
• ATL Brand Rollout
• Regional Transit Financial Modeling
• Local Planning Support
2021 ATL WORK PROGRAM

► Annual Report and Audit:
  • Update FY 2020 ARA
  • Enhance interactive dashboard

► ARTP Project Database:
  • Develop database
  • Populate with existing project data
  • Use database to manage:
    • Call for projects
    • Sharing project information w/public
    • Support project evaluation and financial modeling

► ATL Regional Transit Plan:
  • Initiate 2022 update of the ARTP
  • Issue NTP to consultant late Jan or Early Feb

► ATL RIDES:
  • Complete development of the application and initiate public demonstration phase
  • Pursue scope expansion to include GTFS Flex and Pathways
Regional Fare Policy:
- Develop consensus-based policy
- Collaborate with MARTA to ensure AFC 2.0 procurement supports policy and fare collection technology

Regional Transit Financial Modeling Tool:
- Update model with data from 2020 ARTP process
- Analyze 2020 ARTP financial performance

ATL Brand Rollout:
- Support partners in implementing HB511 requirements
- Develop consensus on ATL brand promise
- Develop style guides for brand rollout for each operator.

Local Planning Support:
- Forsyth County – complete transit plan
- Henry County – complete transit plan
- CAP & Grady Health Systems – Complete Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan
- Top End Transit Committee, MARTA, and GDOT – Transit in Express Lanes
Thank You.

Cain Williamson
470.630.0013 (cell)
cwilliamson@atltransit.ga.gov
www.atltransit.ga.gov
Atlanta Regional Transit On-Board Survey
Atlanta Regional Transit On-Board Survey

The Last Pre-COVID19 Travel Survey in the US

A Joint ARC & MARTA Effort

Summary of Findings
Today’s Agenda...

- Project Scope & Purpose Reminder
- Major Findings
- Brief QA / QC Overview
- Brief Data Expansion Overview
- Transit On-Board Survey Data Visualization
Transit Systems Surveyed

- Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)
- Cherokee Area Transportation System (CATS)
- Gwinnett County Transit
- Hall Area Transit (Gainesville Connection)
- Cobb Transit Service (CobbLinc)
- State Road and Tollway Authority (SRTA / GRTA / ATL / Xpress)
Project Scope and Purpose

- Update ARC’s Regional Activity-Based Travel Demand Forecasting Model.
- Provide valuable, current information on travel patterns and demographics for transit riders as well as service characteristics.
- Survey tasks involved developing a sampling plan, designing the survey instrument, conducting a pilot test, processing the data, expanding the data, analyzing the data, and reporting the results.
- The overall goal was to collect a 10% sample on all routes and rail. A total of 43,400 completed questionnaires were collected.
Tasks Accomplished

➢ Survey Training (February 2019 and August 2019)
➢ Survey Administration (February 2019 - June 2019 and continuation August 2019 - December 2019)
➢ Data Processing and QA/QC (February 2019 – February 2020)
➢ Initial Data Expansion (March- April 2020)
➢ Secondary Data Expansion (April - May 2020)
➢ Survey Documentation and Final Report (June - July 2020)
➢ QA/QC and Finalized Dataset (August – September 2020)
County of Residence
Household Size 2009-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One (1)</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2)</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four (4)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or More (6+)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Status 2009-2019

- Student Status 2009
  - Student: 14.1%
  - Not a student: 85.4%
  - Not Provided: 0.4%

- Student Status 2019
  - Student: 30.6%
  - Not a student: 69.4%
  - Not Provided: 0.0%
Employment Status 2009-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Driver’s License Status 2009-2019

Driver's License Status

- No: 2009 - 23.6%, 2019 - 29.0%
- Yes: 2009 - 76.4%, 2019 - 71.0%
Race / Ethnicity 2009-2019

- American Indian / Alaska Native: 0.4% (2009) vs. 0.8% (2019)
- Black/African American: 66.3% (2009) vs. 70.8% (2019)
- Asian: 3.5% (2009) vs. 2.1% (2019)
- White / Caucasian: 20.0% (2009) vs. 20.8% (2019)
- Mixed Race: 6.3% (2009) vs. 0.0% (2019)
- Hispanic: 0.0% (2009) vs. 0.0% (2019)
- Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander: 0.0% (2009) vs. 0.1% (2019)
- Other: 0.0% (2009) vs. 0.4% (2019) vs. 5.5% (2019)
Hispanic Latino Descent 2009-2019

Hispanic Latino Including MIXED Race

- Yes: 7.2% (2009) to 92.8% (2019)
- No: 93.6% (2009) to 6.4% (2019)

Regional impact + local relevance
Gender 2009-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Origin Place Types 2009-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your HOME</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Place / Retail Place</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University (Student only)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank or other office / Errands</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport (airline passengers only)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Hotel or Lodging</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital / Doctor</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Place</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Business</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Home</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (K-12) / Day Care (student only)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Worship</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access Mode

- Walk: 81.2%
- Drove alone and parked: 8.1%
- Was dropped off by someone going somewhere else: 5.2%
- Uber, Lyft, etc.: 1.7%
- Shuttle: 1.4%
- Wheelchair/Mobility Aid: 0.7%
- Personal Bike: 0.6%
- Drove or rode with others and parked: 0.4%
- E-scooter (e.g., Lime, Bird, etc.): 0.3%
- Taxi: 0.1%
- Bike share (Jump, Relay, etc.): 0.1%
- School Bus/Other Bus (e.g., Zipcar, etc.): 0.0%
Access Mode 2009-2019

Access Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove alone and parked</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was dropped off by someone going someplace else</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Bike</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Destination Place Types

- Your HOME: 41.1%
- Work: 31.3%
- Bank or other office/Entertainment: 4.6%
- College or University: 3.1%
- Other home: 2.4%
- Recreation: 2.3%
- Personal business: 2.2%
- Restaurant: 2.1%
- Hospital/Doctor: 1.9%
- Hotel/Lodging: 1.6%
- School/K-12/Day Care: 1.5%
- Place of Worship: 0.7%
- Other: 0.2%
Destination Place Types 2009-2019
Egress Mode

- Walk: 81.8%
- Get in a parked vehicle and...: 8.9%
- Be picked up by someone: 3.8%
- Uber, Lyft, etc.: 1.6%
- Shuttle: 1.3%
- Get in a parked vehicle and...: 0.8%
- Personal Bike: 0.6%
- E-scooter (e.g. Lime, Bird, etc.): 0.6%
- Bike share (Jump, Relay, etc.): 0.3%
- Taxi: 0.1%
- School Bus / Other Bus: 0.1%
- Skateboard: 0.0%
- Car share (e.g. Zipcar, etc.): 0.0%
Egress Mode 2009-2019

- Walk: 81.8% (2019), 80.6% (2009)
- Get in a parked vehicle and drive alone: 8.9% (2019), 8.6% (2009)
- Be picked up by someone: 3.8% (2019), 8.6% (2009)
- Personal Bike: 0.6% (2019), 0.3% (2009)
- Other: 4.9% (2019), 2.0% (2009)
Total Transfers

Number of Transfers Used

- (0) None, 38.9%
- (1) One, 39.9%
- (2) Two, 20.0%
- (3) Three, 1.2%
- (4+) Four or more, 0.1%
Most Common Fare Method

Top Five

➢ One-Way Trip 30.9%
➢ Seven-Day Pass 27.6%
➢ Thirty-Day Pass 19%
➢ Employer Partnership Program 7%
➢ One-Day Pass 6.6%
Breeze Card Use 2009-2019
Transit Use Frequency

- 5 or more days a week, 68.8%
- 2 to 4 days a week, 21.2%
- About once a week, 2.8%
- 2 to 3 times a month, 2.1%
- About once a month, 1.0%
- Several times a year, 2.3%
- Once a year, 0.6%
- First time, 1.2%
The first quality checks are conducted by ETC’s survey program allowing the surveyor to validate the trip path. The tablets that were used to collect the Origin Destination (OD) survey data contained an on-screen mapping feature that allowed for real-time geocoding of locations using either address, intersection, or place searches. The respondents then confirmed the geocoded location based on the on-screen map that showed the searched address/location via a Google Map indicator icon.
Online Visual Review

- ETC Institute created an online visual review tool that allows for the review of all completed records within the database. This tool shows all components of each individual trip as well as a series of preprogrammed distance and ratio checks. Field Supervisors reviewed all survey records using this tool in real time and a secondary office review occurred to finalize the record.
Data Expansion Overview

ARC interviews were expanded by route, direction, time-of-day, and by segments containing the boarding and corresponding alighting location of the passenger. Stop/station-level expansion was used for rail lines as passengers more typically remember the stop they got on and off the rail.
**Type 1 Expansion**

APC → On-to-Off Counts → Origin Destination Survey (OD)

Routes Segmented into thirds by APC Boarding Totals

IPF is conducted using On-to-Off counts and APC Boarding and Alighting Totals. Expansion Factors are determined based on IPF estimate of ridership and main survey records collected.

**Type 2 Expansion**

APC → Origin Destination Survey (OD)

Routes Segmented in half by APC Boarding Totals

IPF is unnecessary because when there are only two segments there are only a maximum 3 possible boarding to alighting segment pair options. Expansion Factors are determined based on APC segment paired ridership and corresponding main survey records collected.

**Type 3 Expansion**

On-to-Off Data → Origin Destination Survey (OD)

Routes Segmented into thirds by the number of stops on a route (express routes are typically broken into two equal segments)

IPF is not available because there is no APC data to “balance” On-to-Off counts. So, the percentage distribution from the On-to-Off is taken and multiplied by the ridership for that time period and direction. Expansion Factors are determined based on this multiplied estimate and main survey records collected.

**Type 4 Expansion**

Type 4 expansion occurs when routes have OD survey data and ridership is only available at the route level.
Questions?

Mike Alexander, AICP
Director, Center for Livable Communities
Atlanta Regional Commission
malexander@atlantaregional.com

http://www.atlantaregional.org/

http://www.neighborhoodnexus.org/

http://33n.atlantaregional.com/
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