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May 6, 2021
Charlie Sutlive, Chair
Regional Transit Planning Committee
Thursday, May 6, 2021
Proposed Agenda

I. Call to Order and Roll Call – Charlie Sutlive, Chair
II. Approval of Minutes for March 4, 2021
III. Approval of Agenda for May 6, 2021
IV. TAQC Update – Paul Radford
V. ARTP, ARA and Priority List Update – Aileen Daney
VI. Fare Policy Update – Cain Williamson
VII. ATL Financial Modeling Presentation – Jonathan Ravenelle
IX. Adjournment
TAQC UPDATE

Paul Radford
May 6, 2021
ATL REGIONAL TRANSIT PLAN (2022) & ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDIT (2021) UPDATE
Aileen M. Daney
adaney@ATLtransit.ga.gov
May 6th, 2021
SUMMARY SCHEDULE & KEY TASKS

Winter ‘21
Project Management & Stakeholder Coordination:
Host project kickoff meeting, develop project management and stakeholder engagement plans

Spring ‘21
Vision and Goal Setting:
Forge a connection between the work of each subsequent task and specific plan objectives

Summer ‘21
Existing Conditions & Future Trends:
Analyze state of the region and share via report/presentation

Summer/Fall ‘21
Transit Network:
Analyze travel patterns, land use, environment and transit needs to create transit corridor typologies

Spring ‘22
Public Engagement and Performance Monitoring:
Establish metrics/targets to gauge implementation progress over time

Winter ‘22
Evaluation & Prioritization:
Assess how well projects perform and develop methodology for ranking projects for implementation

Fall ‘21
Project Development:
Identify project recommendations to close network gaps, maximize performance, and align with plan vision

Spring/Summer ‘22
Regional Funding Strategy:
Identify strategies to fill gaps and run funding scenarios for priority projects

Summer ‘22
ARTP Final Document:
Presented to the ATL Board for adoption
Finalized **Project Management Plan**

Finalized **Stakeholder Coordination & Engagement Plan**

Outlines our engagement approach with **three key stakeholder groups**:

A. ATL Board Members and State Legislatures

B. Transit Providers, CID's, and County Leaders (eligible project sponsors)

C. General Public
SPRING ‘21: VISION & GOAL SETTING

► Scheduling small group or one-on-one work sessions with ATL Board members to understand your vision (mid-May)

You will receive an invitation to participate in the next few days via email

► Scheduling vision and goal setting work session with transit provider and county leaders (end of May through early June)
TRACKATL & KEY TAKEAWAY

► TrackATL is our new project database
► We expect to launch in June and
demo with project sponsors ahead of
our next Call for Projects

► Plan to share draft ATL Regional
Transit Plan Vision and Goals with
the Board in July, laying the
foundation for how the rest of the plan
unfolds
REFRESHER: ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDIT

> Report covers transit performance, funding, and operations trends for 9 transit providers within the 13-county ATL region
> ATL is required to complete annually, as established by our enabling legislation

> Timeframe: ATL’s fiscal year
> July 2020 – June 2021

> Retain the same document structure and outline as last year
> New(ish): Special performance indicators related to the pandemic
APPROACH FOR THE 2021 ARA

> Shift to underscore access analysis over ridership trends
  > Ridership is declining for a variety of reasons (pandemic, land use, TNCs, gas prices, economic factors, etc.)

> Ridership is a useful measure partially because it helps to inform federal funding allocated to transit, but it is imperfect in measuring transit’s success
Approach for the 2021 ARA

> Shift to underscore access analysis over ridership trends
  > Ridership is declining for a variety of reasons (pandemic, land use, TNCs, gas prices, economic factors, etc.)

> Ridership is a useful measure partially because it helps to inform federal funding allocated to transit, but it is imperfect in measuring transit’s success

> Last year we asked: How does transit access across the region vary?

> New: How did pandemic service cuts affect access to essential destinations? What does access “currently” look like?

> Intuitive relationship: improving access leads to improved ridership

> Can help operators adjust service to reflect priorities
PRIORITIZED PROJECT INVESTMENT LIST:
APPROACH TO AFY 22 / FY 23G

Aileen M. Daney
adaney@ATLtransit.ga.gov
May 6th, 2021
The Priority Project Investment List provides state legislators with a simplified list of federal, state, regional, and local project priorities, reflecting a geographic balance across the region and a variety of project types, to support the strategic use of state resources.
WHAT DOES THE PRIORITY PROJECT INVESTMENT LIST INCLUDE?

► At a minimum, the list includes regionally and state significant projects the ATL is statutorily required to annually submit to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget (OPB) and General Assembly for potential inclusion in the state bond package.

► The list also includes projects recommended to receive the newly created rideshare fees which provide a dedicated opportunity to fund transit.

The list meets the ATL’s statutory requirement but also has an additional benefit of including projects recommended for rideshare fees.
HOW ARE PRIORITY PROJECTS SELECTED?

1. Project **meets administrative requirements**

2. Project is **included in adopted ATL Regional Transit Plan (ARTP)**

3. Project **performed well in the ARTP Project Performance Framework**

4. Project reflects **local, regional, state, or federal priority**
WHAT ARE ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS?

- **Regulations associated with the apportionment of the funding**

  - Row A & Row B, for example, highlight that priority projects recommended for the state bond package and rideshare fees can **only be used for capital transit projects**

  - Row C highlights the **timely expenditure for bond proceeds**, a federal requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Administrative Requirement</th>
<th>Priority Projects Recommended for State Bond Package</th>
<th>Priority Projects Recommended for Ride Share Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Appropriated for Capital Projects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Appropriated for Planning Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Spend Down Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**REFRESHER ON PROJECT PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK**

2020

**ATL Regional Transit Plan**

**Project Evaluation**

1. **Regional Significance**
   Does the project meet 3 of 6 criteria to be considered regionally significant?

2. **Relative Cost-to-Impact**
   Does the project have a higher impact relative to other projects?

3. **Six Governing Principles**
   Does the project meaningfully advance the ATL's governing principles?

**Criteria:**
- Return on Investment
- Mobility & Access
- Innovation
- Equity
- Economic Development & Land Use
- Environmental Sustainability
Goal: Enable legislators to easily understand how projects would advance and what benefits they offer with the State’s investment.
**PRIORITY PROJECT INVESTMENT LIST: KEY SCHEDULE STEPS**

- **MAY**
  - Understand Local, Regional, State, & Federal Priorities

- **JULY**
  - Review + Tweak Project Selection Methodology
  - Discuss and Refine List with Stakeholders and Project Sponsors

- **AUGUST**
  - Create Draft Priority Project Investment List
  - Discuss Draft Priority Project Investment List with ATL Board
  - ATL Board to Take Action on Priority Project Investment List
REGIONAL FARE POLICY STUDY UPDATE

Cain Williamson, Chief Planning Officer
May 6, 2021
Current Project Phase:

Identify Possible Regional Fare Collaboration Standards
Seamlessness of fare charges to the regional transit rider will be an objective of every partner, with particular attention to multi-agency trips and transfer connections.

Seamlessness of rider’s fare payment process will be an objective of every partner.

Partners will maximize each other’s read access to fare revenue, fare collection, and fare administration data.

Partners will plan procurement with each other and coordinate during RFP/RFQ development.
Pillar #1: Fare Structures that Are Convenient for Riders

Candidate Fare Structure/Policy Principles

- Inform each other of proposed changes
- Multi-agency products available
- Rider classes (age, etc.) standardized
- Transfer rules standardized
- Multi-ride products are shared and standardized
- Time/distance-based charges standardized
- Sub-mode definition standardized
- WHAT ELSE?
Fare Collection Technology Principles

• Technology should function across & interface between all systems as efficiently as feasible

• All partners share fare collection technology planning

• Open account-based systems will be an objective of every partner

• Use of open APIs in collection and administration technology will an objective of every partner

• Partners may jointly procure technology using capital procurement agreements

• WHAT ELSE?
Pillar #3: Fare Administration that Cost-Effective

**Fare Administration Principles**

- Partners will cooperate in reasonable fare data audits requested by other partners.
- Fare revenue reconciliation shall be administered in collaborative and communicative way.
- Policies related to revenue reconciliation shall be reviewed by partners on a regular basis.
- Fare tables established as inputs to fare collection systems will be readable to all partners with revenue derived from the tables; data entry will be as cost-effective as possible.
- Partners will cooperate in providing data for fare-related complaint investigation by any partner for its riders.
- Partners will reimburse operating expenses allocable to fare collaboration (shared data entry, software maintenance, etc.) through operations funding agreements.
- WHAT ELSE?
Pillar #4: Fare Procurements that Are Cost-Effective

Fare System Procurements Principles

• Any fare technology procurement solicitation will be made available with reasonable notice to partners for comment.

• If requested, fare technology procurements and contracts shall name partners with options, as assignees, or with similar user rights.

• As appropriate for partner agency options, partner needs shall be listed and quantified.

• Partners included with such user rights shall cooperate to make the procurement as timely and cost-effective as feasible.

• Where feasible, partners will have the same intellectual property rights as the contracting agency.

• WHAT ELSE?
Fare Committee

Breeze partners
- CobbLinc
- Gwinnett County Transit
- MARTA
- Xpress

Non-Breeze partners
- Bartow County Transit
- CPACS
- Connect Douglas
- CATs
- Coweta County Transit
- Forsyth County Dial-A-Ride
- Henry County Transit
- Paulding Transit

Funding agencies
- Atlanta Regional Commission
- Georgia Department of Transportation
Fare Committee

► Settings
  • What are the existing settings for inter-agency collaboration?
  • What potential new settings could be created
  • How can staff and boards be involved?

► What kinds of activity should a fare committee undertake:
  • Teach new developments
  • Exchange information
  • Recommend principles
  • Recommend specific fare structures, technology, or administrative process
  • Adopt binding fare structures, technology or administrative processes, with delegated authority
Next Steps and Schedule
Workshop #4: Develop/Rank Collaboration Standards

► Partner’s to-do’s
  ▪ Revise and add principles of collaboration in fare structure, fare technology, fare administration, and fare system procurement
  ▪ Select most promising principles and processes
  ▪ Bring notes to Workshop #4 or e-mail scott.baker@aecom.com

► Next meeting: May 13, 2021

Next Meeting topics:
► Review of workshop #3 topics/decisions
► Presentation and discussion on work completed since previous workshop
► Discussion items:
  ▪ Development of Regional Fare Committee
  ▪ Poll to measure consensus
  ▪ Development of Regional Fare Collaboration Standards
  ▪ Poll to measure consensus
Schedule: Overview

- **Workshop #3**: March 12, 2021
- **Workshop #4**: May 13, 2021
- **Workshop #5**: July 15, 2021

**2021**
MARTA AFC 2.0 RFP Development and Posting

**2022**
MARTA AFC 2.0 Contract Award

**2023**
MARTA Breeze Mobile 2.0

Implementation of Regional Fare Collaboration Committee and Principles
Thank you!
2020 ARTP FINANCIAL MODELING UPDATE

Jonathan Ravenelle, Transit Funding Director
May 6, 2021
Developing the 2020 ARTP Baseline Financial Model

- Developed with consultant support and in partnership with InfraStrategies
- Updated 15 existing projects with 2020 ARTP data, including project timelines
- Added five new project sheets to the model
- Refined key programmatic assumptions, including CIG Program shares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>2019 ARTP → 2020 ARTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC Financial Model</td>
<td>More MARTA Technical Memorandum and Approved Sequencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>Publicly Available Project Fact Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the 2020 ARTP Baseline Financial Model

► Capital cash flow modeling tool that estimates annual capital costs, revenues, and funding gaps

► 2020 Model includes:

• 20 projects with a total capital costs greater than $100M (in base year dollars):
  – Projects submitted to 2020 ARTP with construction and open to revenue service dates
  – Projects submitted without dates, but were segments of larger corridor that had other segments with dates provided

• All remaining projects with costs greater than $100M aggregated into four larger project categories with a placeholder delivery assumption of 2050:
  – Gwinnett Projects over $100M
  – DeKalb Projects over $100M
  – City of Atlanta Projects over $100M
  – City of Brookhaven Projects over $100M
Benefits of 2020 ARTP Financial Modeling Project

► Allows staff to identify additional needs for future data gathering as part of the 2022 Major ARTP Update

► Develops baseline model that will be utilized as starting point for financial modeling work in 2022 ARTP Update

► Helps to support and inform broader regional conversations on funding strategies

► Provides initial insights into funding strategy elements such as:
  
  o CIG Program Funding Assumptions
  
  o Project Phasing and Timelines for Funding Needs
CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANT (CIG) PROGRAM

Overview + Model Assumptions
FTA Capital Investment Grant Program - Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Starts</th>
<th>Small Starts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost Requirement</td>
<td>Allows for project costs greater than $300M YOE</td>
<td>Limited to projects under $300M YOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development Timing</td>
<td>Limited to 2 years to complete PD upon entry</td>
<td>No PD timing requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIG Share</td>
<td>Allows for higher CIG share</td>
<td>Caps grants at $100M, which limits CIG share for projects approaching the $300M cost cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Requirements</td>
<td>Over 50% of the route operating in separate right-of-way dedicated to transit use during peak periods with turning movements allowed in the right-of-way</td>
<td>Projects are not required to operate in a separate right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Service Requirements</td>
<td>Projects must operate 30-minute headways on weekends with at least 10 hours of service</td>
<td>No weekend service requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and Schedule Sensitivity</td>
<td>Design and engineering should exceed 30% before entry into PD, with goal of exceeding 60% during PD to reduce risk</td>
<td>As costs near $300M YOE, risk of lower CIG share and/or becoming ineligible for Small Starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation</td>
<td>Allows for earlier delivery of larger segments</td>
<td>Requires segmented delivery of smaller segments under $300M YOE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **FTA CIG Program is a discretionary grant program that funds major transit capital investments**
- **Funding for significant investment in project types that include heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, streetcar, and bus rapid transit projects**
- **Federal transit law requires transit agencies seeking CIG funding to complete a series of steps over several years**
- **Federal law requires projects to be rated by FTA at various points and will compete for funding with other projects nationally**
New Starts CIG Program Assumptions - 2020 ARTP Financial Model

New Starts CIG Share By Year

- New Starts CIG Share has consistently averaged 50% or less over the last 6 years

New Starts CIG Share By Project Cost

- As New Starts total project cost increases, federal participation tends to decrease

Source: InfraStrategies LLC, 2020
New Starts and Core Capacity Projects Awarded FFGAs (FY14 – Present)
### Small Starts BRT CIG Program Assumptions - 2020 ARTP Financial Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Cost ($M)</th>
<th>CIG Funds ($M)</th>
<th>CIG Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany River Corridor</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque Rapid Transit</td>
<td>133.7</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett, WA Swift</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids Laker Line</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Red Line</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville East</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville SW</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Prospect Avenue</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Orange Line</td>
<td>150.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Division Street</td>
<td>174.8</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno Virginia Street</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Central City</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Montana Rapid Transit</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg Central Avenue BRT</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade South Corridor</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee East BRT</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: InfraStrategies LLC, 2020
Adapted from FTA signed and anticipated Capital Investment Grant (CIG) Funding Agreements, 1/20/2017-12/17/2020

- Small Starts BRT projects CIG share is generally higher for projects with lower overall project costs
**2020 ARTP Financial Model – CIG Program Assumptions**

### New Starts

- **35% CIG Share** for all projects > $3B in YOE dollars
- Projects < $3B in YOE dollars
  - **40% CIG Share** for LRT, HR, or CR projects
  - **50% CIG Share** for BRT or Bus projects

### Small Starts

- Small Starts projects were assumed to receive a max grant of **$100M** or **50%** of the project costs, whichever was less
- Small Starts projects must keep YOE project costs under **$300M** threshold to maintain eligibility

### Model

- Model applies programmatic CIG assumptions based on recent FTA awards and each project’s cost and design eligibility
  - Some BRT projects received similar or higher shares compared to ARTP submission
  - Some LRT or CRT projects received lower federal shares compared to ARTP submission to align with recent federal awards for peer rail projects
  - Some projects did not meet Small Starts and/or New Starts requirements and were adjusted accordingly
Year of Expenditure (YOE) cost inflation can have significant impacts on whether a project qualifies for New Starts vs. Small Starts

- FTA CIG baseline inflation assumption is 3.5%
- Projects forced to upgrade to New Starts because of YOE cost inflation could have impacts on project design and project timeline
  - Must have at least 50% dedicated right-of-way during peak periods
  - Must operate high frequency service at headways defined by FTA

Managed lane projects (Georgia 400 BRT, I-285 Transit in Express Lanes projects) are not eligible for New Starts

- The statutory definition of “fixed-guideway BRT” requires a project to operate in a separate right-of-way during the peak hour
- If the project costs for a managed lane bus project increase to over $300M in YOE dollars, the project is no longer eligible for CIG funding.
Key Takeaways - Future CIG Opportunities

► Potential for future policy changes by new Administration could impact region’s CIG strategy:
  o Increasing CIG shares above recent awards (35-50% New Starts, 50-60% Small Starts)
  o Increasing Small Starts maximum grant award above $100M (previously proposed $200M)
  o Increasing Small Starts maximum total project cost above $300M (previously proposed $400M)
  o Expanded New Starts eligibility to certain corridor-based BRT projects (e.g., Transit in Express Lanes)

► Increasing Small Starts project caps or expanding New Starts eligibility definition would allow project sponsors to collapse multiple project segments into one project
  o Reduced number of times project sponsors will be required to go through CIG process
  o Potentially streamlines funding strategies for major projects such as I-285 Top End ELT

► ATL Government Affairs staff is actively engaged with Congressional delegation on each of these CIG items
PROJECT TIMELINES + PHASING
Model Phasing Assumptions (based on 2020 ARTP submissions)
Model Phasing Assumptions
Capital Investment Grant (CIG) Program Eligibility

North Ave BRT
Clayton Bus Maintenance Facility
Clayton Commuter Rail
Clayton BRT
GA 400 Transit Initiative BRT
Atlanta Streetcar Extension East
South Fulton Parkway Rapid Transit
I-285 Transit in Express Lanes - Eastside
I-285 Transit in Express Lanes - Top End East
Campbellton Road HCT
Atlanta Streetcar Extension West
I-285 Transit in Express Lanes - Top End West
I-285 Transit in Express Lanes - Westside
BeltLine SW LRT
Clifton Corridor Phase I with Segment 1b
BeltLine NE LRT
BeltLine SE LRT
BeltLine West LRT
Clifton Corridor Segment II
Northside Drive BRT

Gwinnett County 2020 ARTP Projects (>$100M)
DeKalb County 2020 ARTP Projects (>$100M)
City of Atlanta 2020 ARTP Projects (>=$100M)
Brookhaven 2020 ARTP Projects (>=$100M)
Regional CIG Program Utilization

► Significant number of projects with costs greater than $100M planned/eligible for CIG (New Starts and Small Starts over the next 15-20 years:

  o 12 projects with ARTP assumptions of New/Small Starts from now through 2035
  o 16 projects eligible for funding through CIG from now through 2035
  o Does not include additional projects less than $100M as well as projects coming through current Cobb CTP process, future Gwinnett transit expansion planning, as well as potential future DeKalb and Fulton Transit SPLOSTs

► Highest level of CIG utilization by UZA’s has generally ranged from 5-6 projects over a 15-year period
Key Project Phasing/Timeline Takeaways – 2020 ARTP Financial Model

► Will be necessary to support **regionalized strategies for developing funding approaches** that look to take the place of CIG funding for some projects

  o Opportunities to develop strategies that leverage State investment, FHWA Flex Funding, and other fed. discretionary funding that helps take place of CIG funding

  o Approaches should be coordinated so projects/project sponsors can identify whether to either focus on CIG process or alternative funding stacks specifically

► Future Surface Transportation Bill changes to CIG project definitions and project cost/award caps could have **significant positive impacts for Atlanta region**

  o Potentially will allow project sponsors to collapse multiple project segments into one project reducing total number of projects relying on CIG
### 2020 ATL Regional Transit Plan Financial Summary in YOE $M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YOE $M</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS</strong></td>
<td>$10,811</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIG (New Starts/Small Starts) Grants</td>
<td>$2,975</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal Funding</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funding</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Sales Tax Revenue (Existing)</td>
<td>$4,221</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Capture Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM REVENUE ($M YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$7,341</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING GAP ($M YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$3,470</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Totals are shown in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars and may not sum due to rounding.
OVERALL KEY TAKEWAYS
Key Takeaways – 2020 ARTP Financial Model

► Strong need for a **coordinated regional funding strategy** around delivering capital program of transit projects in Atlanta region
  
  o Critical for regional funding strategy development to be done in a collaborative manner that brings all partners to the table (GDOT, MARTA, ARC, Cobb, Gwinnett, and others)

► Although funding gaps exist there are **substantial opportunities** to tap into other funding streams with significant impact on project delivery:
  
  o State Investment
  o FHWA Flex Funds
  o Innovative Funding/Financing/Value Capture

► 2022 ARTP Process will help **further refine and develop programmatic funding strategy** for regional priority transit network
  
  o Projects will need to be robustly analyzed to ensure assumptions are valid and consistent (on a per mile and YOE basis) in order for the region to make funding decisions on strategic approaches