REGIONAL TRANSIT INITIATIVE

Mid-Course Workshop
Welcome and Progress of Transit Planning Efforts

10:00 a.m. Monday, May 24, 2004
Omni Mandalay, Irving
www.nctcog.org/rrcs
VISION STATEMENT

To provide a bottom-up process for the exchange of information and ideas among elected representatives, policy officials, and the general public regarding options for the implementation of a seamless transit system for North Central Texas.
Transportation Authority
Service Area
Rail System

Legend
- Future Light Rail
- Existing Light Rail
- Future Regional Rail
- Existing Regional Rail
- Future Rail
- Special Events
- Future Intercity Rail
- Existing Intercity Rail
- North Crosstown Corridor Study *
- Possible Eastern Terminus
- Roadway
- Existing Rail Corridors
- Dallas Area Rapid Transit
- Denton County Transportation Authority
- Fort Worth Transportation Authority

Corridor specific design and operational characteristics for the Rail System will be determined through ongoing project development.

New facility locations indicate transportation needs and do not represent specific alignments.

All existing railroad rights-of-way should be monitored for potential future transportation corridors.

Refined rail forecasts are necessary to determine technology and alignment in Future Rail corridors.

Institutional structure being reviewed for the region.

The need for additional rail capacity within the Dallas CBD, Fort Worth CBD, DFW International Airport, and other Intermodal centers will be monitored.

* NORTH CROSSTOWN CORRIDOR STUDY AREA
At a minimum, evaluate the engineering feasibility and environmental implications of:
- rail along the KCS line and the Burlington Northern line, including the feasibility of an alternative connection along U.S. 380;
- rail along the full Cotton Belt Corridors, from Parker Road to DFW Airport; and
- rail along the Cotton Belt Corridor from DFW Airport with an eastern transition to light rail along I-820 Freeway at an Addison Intermodal Center.
RAIL TYPES

**Light Rail**
- Station Spacing: ½ to 2 miles
- Max. Ops. Speed: 55 – 65 mph

**Regional Rail**
- Station Spacing: 2 – 5 miles
- Max. Ops. Speed: 60-90 mph
- Not Compatible with Freight Traffic

**Bus Rapid Transit**
- Station Spacing: ½ – 5 miles
- Max. Ops. Speed: 30 - 60 mph
- Compatible with Freight Traffic
## 2025 PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Within Transportation Authority</th>
<th>Outside Transportation Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,722,774</td>
<td>4,229,296 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>3,325,156</td>
<td>1,617,807 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Miles</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150 (43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL TRANSIT INITIATIVE
Challenges

1. Respond to Previous Legislative Proposals
2. Plan for Regional Institutional Capability
3. Land Use Efficiency of Three Million New Customers
4. Today – 82 Transit Providers
5. Washington – one voice - Regarding “Rail Starts”
6. Phased Implementation of Service

⇒ SEAMLESS AND BALANCED
REGIONAL TRANSIT INITIATIVE
Schedule

Transit Summit – March 2002
Transit Challenge, Irving – August 2003
Colorado Railcar Events – September 2003
Mid-Course Workshop – May 24, 2004
Transit Summit – August 13, 2004
Judges/Mayors North Texas Legislative Conference – Summer/Fall 2004
Legislative Proposal – Fall 2004
CONSENSUS PROCESS: A “Bottom-Up” Approach

- PROVIDE OPTIONS TO LEGISLATURE
  - David Cain
- EVALUATE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES
  - Lee Jackson
- MATCH REVENUES TO NEEDS
  - IDENTIFY CAPITAL AND OPERATING COSTS
    - TRANSIT RELATED NEEDS
  - EVALUATE FINANCING OPTIONS
    - Wendy Davis
FINANCIAL COMMITTEE MISSION

Determine How Much Revenue Is Needed to Implement the Entire Metropolitan Plan Transit Element

Investigate the Likely Sources of Revenues to Provide Those Funds

Recommend Likely Candidate Revenue Sources
FINANCIAL ANALYSIS PROCESS (2004 $)
# COST SUMMARY

(2004 $)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Scenarios</th>
<th>Annualized Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regionwide Rail and Bus</td>
<td>$791M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Area Rail and Bus</td>
<td>$167M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Area Rail Only</td>
<td>$123M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REVENUE ANALYSIS SUMMARY
(2004 $)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tax</th>
<th>Average Annual Yield *</th>
<th>Rate Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$819M</td>
<td>7/8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$831M</td>
<td>17% per gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Tax</td>
<td>$793M</td>
<td>$201 per employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$791M</td>
<td>$.203 per $100 valuation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To Allow for Implementation of Entire Metropolitan Transportation Plan Transit Element
# CANDIDATE FUNDING SOURCE PRINCIPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Available Collection Mechanism</th>
<th>Equitable</th>
<th>Adjusts to Inflation</th>
<th>Already Used for Transit</th>
<th>Used by Others</th>
<th>Legal or Political Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Option Gas Sales Tax</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ *</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Property Tax</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Tax</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

√ Funding source is consistent with principle
X Funding source is not consistent with principle
*If only collected outside existing transit authorities
## Sales Tax Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Scenarios</th>
<th>Percentage Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regionwide Rail and Bus</td>
<td>7/8% Regionwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Area Rail and Bus</td>
<td>1/2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Area Rail Only</td>
<td>3/8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LOCAL OPTION GAS TAX ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Scenarios</th>
<th>Percentage Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regionwide Rail and Bus</td>
<td>17% Regionwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Area Rail and Bus</td>
<td>4% Regionwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Area Rail Only</td>
<td>3% Regionwide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEXT STEPS

Develop Funding Scenarios Using Combined Revenue Options

Incorporate Institutional Committee Direction Into Financial Analysis

Recommend Appropriate Funding Options and Legislative Actions
REGIONAL TRANSIT INITIATIVE

Mid- Course Workshop
Committee 9: Institutional

10:00 a.m. Monday, May 24, 2004
Omni Mandalay, Irving
www.nctcog.org/rrcs
BRIEFING AGENDA

Review of Committee’s Mission
Review of Guiding Principles
Review of Institutional Structures “Families”
Elimination of Some Families
Options Recommended for Further Investigation
Committee’s Next Steps
INSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEE’S MISSION

“To investigate fully institutional structure options that implement the unfunded transit elements of the metropolitan transportation plan.”
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Maintain three existing transit authorities with funding, responsibilities and commitments (DART, DCTA, FWTA)

2. Encourage transit service through regional cooperation

3. Provide seamless service to customer

4. Avoid extra layers of bureaucracy and duplicative services

5. Fair sharing of costs for transit services received

6. Governance representation should be structured fairly

7. Equity issues should be addressed; East and West
## DELIVERING MODES OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Element</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Sub-Regional</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“FAMILIES” OF INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES

#1 - Single regional transit authorities that serve the entire region, or most of it

#2 - Authorities that provide single mode service (only regional rail, only bus)

#3 - Regional authorities that only provide planning and funding; but do not operate service

#4 - Subregional authorities that work together through agreement

#5 - Transit agencies that serve one city
“FAMILIES” OF INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES

#1 - Single regional transit authorities that serves the entire region, or most of it

#2 - Authorities that provide single mode service  
(only regional rail, only bus)

#3 - Regional authorities that only provide planning and funding; but do not operate service

#4 - Subregional authorities that work together through agreement

#5 - Transit agencies that serve one city
CURRENT STATUS

Considered Five “Families” of Possible New Institutional Structures

Eliminated Three “Families” from Further Consideration

Two “Families” Remain for Further Consideration

Study and Define Further Two Remaining “Families”
FAMILY #2 OPTION
Regional Rail Transit Authority (RRTA)

1. New Regional Agency created to “focus” on single mode (Regional Rail)
2. RRTA would plan, design, construct, operate, and fund Regional Transit Service
3. Would have independent source of local funding (Committee #8 Financial)
4. Would have its own governance board representing six-county service area
5. Bus service provided by:
   - RRTA through use of its funds
   - Contracted by city through private provider
   - Contracted by city through DART, DCTA or FWTA
FAMILY #4 OPTION
Regional Cooperation By Agreement

1. DART, DCTA, and FWTA responsibilities and commitments maintained
2. Regional Rail in each corridor provided by agreement by transit agency and non-member cities served
3. Right-of-way purchased by existing transit agency
4. Planning, Design, Construction, and Operations provided by one of existing transit agencies
5. Agreement provides for construction and operating funding support by non-member cities served
NEXT STEPS

Study Further Remaining Options
Consider Geography of the Election
Address Relationships with Existing Authorities
Analyze Non-Rail Services for those Cities Desirous
Determine What Happens to Trinity Railway Express (TRE)
REGIONAL TRANSIT INITIATIVE

Mid-Course Workshop
Committee 10: Legislative Communication

10:00 a.m. Monday, May 24, 2004
Omni Mandalay, Irving
www.nctcog.org/rrcs
PRIMARY FOCUS OF COMMITTEE TO DATE

Monitor Special Session

Communicate Initial Position to Legislature
SPECIAL SESSION

Daily Updates Provided by E-mails From James McCarley

Selected to Issues Raised During Session

- Expansion of Sales Tax Base to Additional Businesses
- Increase in Sales Tax Cap
- Property Tax Reduction/Caps
- Video Slots/Poker
- Expansion of Sales Tax Base for all Existing Entities
NEXT STEPS FOR SCHOOL FUNDING

Legislative “Working Groups” Established After Special Session

Next Special Session
LETTER TO LEGISLATURE

Effort in North Texas to Address Our Own Regional Issues

Highlight “Guiding Principle” of Taxable Goods and Services That Should Have a “Common Base”
NEXT STEPS

Continue to Monitor State School Funding Efforts:
   Working Groups
   Any Special Session

Real Work of Committee 10 Starts With Committee 8 and 9 Completion
NEXT STEPS

Committee 8 (Financial)

Develop Funding Scenarios Using Combined Revenue Options
Incorporate Institutional Committee Direction Into Financial Analysis
Recommend Appropriate Funding Options and Legislative Actions

Committee 9 (Institutional)

Refine Remaining Two Options
Consider Geography of the Election
Address Relationships with Existing Authorities
Include Non-Rail Services Where Desired
Review Home Agency for Trinity Railway Express (TRE)

Committee 10 (Legislative)

Continue to Monitor State School Funding Efforts:
   Working Groups
   Any Special Session
Real Work of Committee 10 Starts With Committee 8 and 9 Completion