Today’s Agenda

1. Study Overview
2. History of MDOT, MTA, LOTS
3. Goals, Metrics, and Evaluation
4. Peer Review Approach
5. Feedback and Insights
Study Overview
### PROJECT SCHEDULE

Our proposed schedule is detailed below with estimated project completion at the end of June 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Study Purpose &amp; Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Internal Project Kickoff Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Research, Data Collection and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Prepare Technical Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda, and Facilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Public and Community Engagement (Webinar, Virtual Town Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>History of MOU, MTA, and the DFR System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Collect and Compile Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Prepare Technical Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda and Meeting Facilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review of Current Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Collect and Compile Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Prepare Technical Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda and Meeting Facilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Financial Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Collect and Compile Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Prepare Technical Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda and Meeting Facilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review of Peer Agencies/Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 Collect and Compile Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Prepare Technical Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Organize and Convene Panel Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda and Meeting Facilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Review of Transit Funding Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 Collect and Compile Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Prepare Technical Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda and Meeting Facilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Options for Governance &amp; Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1 Collect and Compile Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Prepare Technical Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda and Meeting Facilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Final Documentation and Project Wrap-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.1 Draft Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are here
History of MDOT, MTA, and LOTS
History and Development of Transit in the Baltimore Region

How the existing organizational structure came into being

State leadership for transit services in Baltimore (Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Anne Arundel County)

What services exist, and how they evolved

Local leadership for local services in all the Counties and the City.

Why some services are provided by MDOT-MTA and some by the LOTS
How did the state end up running Baltimore’s transit system?
SETTING THE STAGE

The Role of the State

1908
Creation of the State Roads Commission to build a road network—members appointed by the Governor

1910
Creation of the Public Service Commission to regulate transportation (fares and services) statewide—including Baltimore
The 1950s

Transit Becomes an Issue

Post-war transit ridership declines lead to strikes, rate cases, official inquiries into adequacy of service.

Context: the privately-owned (National City Lines) Baltimore Transit Company serves Baltimore City, portions of Baltimore County and Anne Arundel County.

Its rates and services are regulated by the Maryland Public Service Commission.
Baltimore City Mayor D’Alesandro calls for either new local owners or public ownership by the City
The 1960s

**Baltimore Turns to the State**

- **1961**
  - Bill passes creating the Metropolitan Transit Authority (the first MTA), includes Baltimore City, Baltimore County but not Anne Arundel

- **1963**
  - Streetcar operation ends
  - Legislation introduced into the General Assembly for Legislative study commission—commission members appointed by the Governor
  - The MTA takes over regulation of BTC and suburban bus companies

City council and business community reject City ownership, issues continue
Rapid Rail Plan for Baltimore

- Developed by Mass Transit Steering Committee appointed by the Governor
- 71-miles, $1.7 billion
- Anticipated federal contribution of 2/3 of capital cost
1968-73
State Takeover, Plan for Rapid Rail Emerge

1968
Baltimore Transit Company strike

1969
MTA
General Assembly reforms the MTA (second MTA)
- To own and operate the former BTC bus system
- To plan, construct and manage a $1.7 billion rapid transit system serving Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Anne Arundel County

1970
Creation of Maryland Department of Transportation and the Transportation Trust Fund
MTA included as a modal administration—now the Mass Transit Administration

1973-74
MTA begins providing assistance to local transit systems
1973-2017

MTA Develops As a Multi-Modal Agency

- **1973**: Private suburban bus lines incorporated into MTA
- **1974**: MDOT (not MTA) begins subsidizing commuter rail service on the B&O
- **1978**: MTA begins offering paratransit services
- **1980**: BWI Rail Station opens
- **1983**: Baltimore Metro Subway initial segment opens
- **1983**: MARC commuter brand created—commuter rail under State Railroad Administration

Public Transportation Development Division begins administering statewide transit grant program

**STATE**

**CITY**
MTA Develops As a Multi-Modal Agency

1973-2017

1987 to 1990
MTA initiates commuter bus subsidy program

1992
Initial segment of MTA Light Rail opens

1992
State Railroad Administration becomes part of MTA

2015 to 2017
MTA Baltimore services restructured and rebranded as BaltimoreLink
### MDOT-MTA Today

**TRIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIXED-ROUTE BUS: CityLink, LocalLink, ExpressLink</td>
<td>63,988,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTRAILLINK</td>
<td>6,966,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROSUBWAYLINK</td>
<td>7,275,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILITYLINK</td>
<td>2,992,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARC COMMUTER RAIL</td>
<td>9,180,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA COMMUTER BUS</td>
<td>3,623,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All trip FY19*
How did the Locally-Operated Transit Systems (LOTS) develop?
1974 to 1975
Public Transportation Development Division begins administering statewide transit grant program

1975
Interagency Committee on Specialized Transportation created by Governor, MTA administers Section 16(b)2 program providing funding to local non-profits

1977
Federal Section 18 rural transit program initiated, administered by MTA

1980
MTA reorganized, statewide program under Program Development Division

1980
Statewide Specialized Transportation Assistance Program (SSTAP) provides state funding to counties, administered by MTA

1983 to 1984
MTA reorganized, statewide program now in Planning and Program Development Division
1974-2020

MDOT-MTA Development of the Statewide Program

1991 to 1992
MTA reorganized, statewide program now Capital and Statewide Programs

1993
Statewide programs now under Office of Planning and Programming

2004
Senior Rides Demonstration Program enacted, administered by MTA

2009
Office of Local Transit Support (OLTS) created

2018
Maryland Jobs Access Reverse Commute program enacted, administered by MTA
Evolution of the LOTS in Baltimore Region

• Except for City of Annapolis, LOTS origins are in locally-provided human service transportation (primarily transportation for seniors and persons with disabilities)
  o Baltimore CountyRide operated by County Office on Aging until July 2020
  o Anne Arundel Department of Aging and Disabilities comes under Office of Transit in 2018
  o Queen Anne’s County Ride still operated by county Department of Aging
  o Carroll County also began under Bureau of Aging
  o Harford transit begins in Office on Aging, 1989 begins public routes
  o Howard transit has origins in private non-profit URTA

• Unique situations:
  o Transit service in new city of Columbia evolves into today’s RTA after efforts at developing a regional system to link eastern Howard, western Anne Arundel and northern Prince George’s counties
  o Baltimore City identifies needs for specialized circulator and ferry service
  o The independent system in the City of Annapolis is continued

• Larger fixed-route systems developed where MDOT-MTA service has been limited—Howard, Harford
LOTS in each jurisdiction

TRIPS

- 413,457: Annapolis Transit
- 295,177: Anne Arundel County Office of Transportation
- 1,400,238: Baltimore City Charm City Circulator
- 332,561: Harbor Connector
- 38,533: Baltimore CountyRide
- 161,867: Carroll Transit
- 358,500: Harford Link
- 751,434: RTA
- 26,662: Queen Anne’s County Ride

Locally Operated Transit Systems (LOTS)
Findings and Implications

Historical Insights

• The strong state role in Maryland is historic, it has developed over nearly one hundred years
• State involvement created stability for transit services
• Local transit services have developed with state support, but are driven by local needs
• Two key expansions in MTA scope:
  o Statewide programs—administrator of federal and state funds provided to local systems
  o Provider of regional services beyond the Baltimore region—MARC commuter rail, commuter bus
Findings and Implications

Different Approaches to Governance

- Dual approach—state run vs. local services
- Fragmented transit network
- Different funding models a challenge for governance
- State provision of non-federal share for MDOT-MTA services a major benefit to regional governments
- Level of funding and priorities determined by a state agency under the executive with limited local input
Goals and Evaluation Framework
Goals and evaluation framework

How will we measure and evaluate new models?

1. Establish Goals
2. Develop Key Performance Indicators for each Goal
3. Understand Today’s Structure
4. Develop Future Options

Measured against KPIs
BRTB Goal setting exercise

What are the most important reasons for doing this study?

- Local investment
- Improved coordination
- Local control
- More local control
- Local funding
- Project rating
- Local involvement
- More local control in
- Improved coordination
- Equity
- Coordination
- Improve cooperation
- Better support local plan
- Local investment funding
- More local input
- Support local plans
- Emphasis local plans
- Consistency
- Local investments
- Decision making
- Regionalism
- Project selection and
BRTB Goal setting exercise

What should a potential new governance structure accomplish?

1st: Improve the quality of public transportation (access, speed and reliability)
2nd: Create a seamless, integrated regional transit system (fares, connections, schedules, services, facilities)
3rd: Increase local input in transit decision-making
4th: Increase investment in transit infrastructure
5th: Improve the cost-effectiveness of managing and delivery transit services
Setting measurable goals

- Address state of good repair needs
- Improve service quality
- Improve service reliability
- Reduce traffic congestion
- Improve safety
- Create seamless intermodal and intersystem connections
- More regional connectivity
- Improve regional coordination on mutual transit needs
- Reduce sprawl with TOD investment
- Support economic development
- Address climate change
- Support economic justice
- Prioritize state transit investment
- Provide equitable funding
- Address historic underinvestment
GOVERNANCE & FUNDING GOALS

Improve Coordination
- Support local planning efforts
- Improved regional planning

Improve Service
- More service hours and frequency
- Better transit reliability
- Better service quality

Increase Investment
- Address State of Good Repair needs
- Invest in major transit infrastructure
- Increase funds for transit operations

Regional Connections
- Better meet regional travel needs
- Seamless connections between services

Enhance Decision Making
- More local input and support
- More regional decision-making framework
- Promote transparency & accountability

Ensure Equitable Investment
- Expand funding sources
- Consider distribution of funding
- Improve cost effectiveness of delivering services
## Sample Goals & Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Coordination</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Service</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Investment</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Connections</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Decision Making</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Equitable Investment</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer Review Approach

Why do a Peer Review? Helps to understand relative performance and think about what’s possible. Two-step approach:

1. First identify systems that stand out for each of these goals

2. Then, refine to ensure relative likeness to the Baltimore region (population, land use, etc.)
Thank You!

Bethany Whitaker
bwhitaker@nelsonnygaard.com