Today’s Agenda

1. Where We Are
2. Existing Structure
3. Implications for Alternatives
4. Peer Review and Analysis
5. Next Steps
1. History of MDOT MTA and the LOTs System
2. Review of Current Status
3. Financial Review
4. Review of Peer Agencies / Regions
5. Review of Transit Funding Measures
6. Options for Governance and Funding

❖ Ongoing Stakeholder Engagement
Existing Structure
Existing Operating Structure

Governor appoints secretary

Funding allocations across modes guided by the Secretary and Governor

MDOT Secretary is also voting member of WMATA Board

Transportation Trust Fund
Fare Revenue
Federal

WMATA

Other MDOT Business Units
Existing Operating Structure
MDOT and MTA Budgeting Process
Annual CTP Process

- Initial revenue estimate
- Outreach with communities (CTP Tour)
- Priority Letters (from communities)
- Submitted to the Department of Management and Budget and Governor
- Presented to General Assembly
MDOT and MTA Budgets – FY2019

MDOT MTA Budgeting Priorities
- Debt Service
- Maintenance of Effort
- Contractual Commitments
- Emerging Needs

Annual Operating Budget (FY19)

Annual Capital Budget (FY19)

Source: National Transit Database 2019
MDOT and MTA Budgets – FY 2019

Source: National Transit Database 2019
LOTS Budget Process

Funding allocations across modes guided by the Secretary and Governor

Governor appoints secretary

MDOT Secretary is also voting member of WMATA Board

MDOT/MTA Operating Grant

MDOT/MTA Capital Grant

LOTS Staff guides Budget Development

City/County Proposed Budget

Policy Board City/County Council or Commissioners

Systems Operation

Fare Revenue

Local Match

Local Overmatch

Transportation Trust Fund

Fare Revenue

Federal

WMATA

Other MDOT Business Units
Existing Services
Demographic Context

Regional population
- ~3 million

Outside the Urban Core
- 700,000

Urban Core
- 2.3 million
  - Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Anne Arundel County, Howard County

- Younger, more diverse, lower income
- 30% zero vehicle households
- 18% commute by transit
- Losing population
- 65+ growing in all jurisdictions
MDOT-MTA Services

- Directly-Operated or Contracted
- Core area services:
  - BaltimoreLink Bus
  - Light RailLink
  - SubwayLink
  - MobilityLink
  - Taxi
- Core service:
  - FY 2019 Operating Cost $605,569,142
  - 1,216 Vehicles Operated
- Regional services:
  - MARC Commuter Rail
  - Commuter Bus
- Regional Service:
  - FY 2109 Operating Cost $230,457,411
  - 429 Vehicles Operated
• Eight separate City/County Systems
• Services operated or contracted by local governments
• City/County
• Service types/levels vary considerably
  • Fixed-route bus
  • Demand-response
  • Specialized Service
• 231 Vehicles in Peak Service
System Scale Differences

FLEET

1,647
MDOT MTA
Maximum Vehicles in Service

TRIPS

94M
MDOT MTA Annual
Unlinked Passenger Trips

231
LOTS
Maximum Vehicles in Service

3.8M
LOTS Annual
Unlinked Passenger Trips

Source: FY 2019 National Transit Database (NTD)
Operating Funding By Source

MDOT MTA
- Fares: 17%
- Federal: 2%
- State: 81%

LOTS
- Fares: 8%
- Federal: 7%
- State: 34%
- Local: 51%

Source: National Transit Database 2019
Capital Funding By Source

**MDOT MTA**
- Federal: 72%
- State: 28%

**LOTS**
- Local: 23%
- State: 16%
- Federal: 60%
- Other: 1%

Source: National Transit Database 2019
Implications for Developing Alternatives
HOW DOES THE CURRENT STRUCTURE MEET THESE GOALS?

- Improve Coordination
- Improve Service
- Increase Investment
- Regional Connections
- Enhance Decision Making
- Ensure Equitable Investment
GOALS FOR GOVERNANCE & FUNDING

Improve Coordination

Improve Service

Increase Investment

Regional Connection

Enhance Decision Making

Ensure Equitable Investment

How it works today

- LOTS local planning represent local vision and needs
- MDOT-MTA supports these local planning efforts
- BRTB and BMC provide regional planning/coordination
- Central Maryland Regional Transit Plan (CMRTP)

Implications for alternatives

- How does MTA coordinate with local planning efforts?
- How well are regional transit planning needs addressed?
GOALS FOR GOVERNANCE & FUNDING

Improve Coordination

Improve Service

Increase Investment

Regional Connection

Enhance Decision Making

Ensure Equitable Investment

How it works today
- BaltimoreLink improvements in service and reliability
- LOTS programs have visions for expanded/improved service, for example
  - Anne Arundel and Baltimore Counties—expanded coverage, new routes
  - Harford and Howard—route restructuring, expanded frequency and span
- Funding is a constraining factor for improving service

Implications for alternatives
- Has transit service improved in the Baltimore region?
- How much service is provided in Baltimore region?
- Understand mode share in the region
GOALS FOR GOVERNANCE & FUNDING

Improve Coordination

Enhance Decision Making

Ensure Equitable Investment

Improve Service

Increase Investment

Regional Connection

How it works today

- Transit funding constrained by revenue available to the Transportation Trust Fund—flat, COVID declines
- MDOT-MTA capital requirements identified in Transit Asset Management (TAM)plan and 10-Year Capital Needs Inventory
- MDOT-MTA operating needs complicated by existing contracts, labor agreements
- LOTS capital needs identified by MDOT-MTA TAM, local Transit Development Plans (TDPs), Office of Local Transit Support (OLTS) capital prioritization
- LOTS use of local funds

Implications for alternatives

- How well are transit capital needs addressed?
GOALS FOR GOVERNANCE & FUNDING

Improve Coordination

Enhance Decision Making

Ensure Equitable Investment

Increase Investment

Regional Connection

How it works today

- MDOT-MTA Regional Services Link the Baltimore region, other parts of the state
- But regional connectivity hampered by
  - individual fare payment systems, structures and levels;
  - unconnected transit information
  - Lack of shared stops
  - Limited LOTS span and frequency
- BRTB plan for shared/improved stops a positive step
- CMRTP call for integrated fares a positive step

Implications for alternatives

- How easy is it to travel throughout the region?
- How well do services connect?
GOALS FOR GOVERNANCE & FUNDING

- Improve Coordination
- Improve Service
- Increase Investment
- Regional Connection
- Enhance Decision Making
- Ensure Equitable Investment

How it works today

- State executive has key decisions
- No state-level advisory or policy board other than the General Assembly
- MDOT-MTA decision making is staff driven within MDOT budget/program constraints
- Local decision-making by the LOTS through City/County Budget processes

Implications for alternatives

- How transparent are transit planning and funding decisions?
- Do locals have input into MDOT and MTA decisions?
GOALS FOR GOVERNANCE & FUNDING

Improve Coordination
Improve Service
Increase Investment
Regional Connection
Enhance Decision Making

Ensure Equitable Investment

How it works today
• LOTS data shows difference in investment levels across the region
• Major differences in transit needs/need demand
  • Urban core
  • Inner suburbs
  • Outlying areas
• MDOT-MTA services needed to be included in assessment of transit equity

Implications for alternatives
• How is state and local funding distributed?
• Has funding increased over time?
Peer Selection
Previous Peer Review

Central Maryland Regional Transit Plan

Eno Report: Transit Reform for Maryland

- Metro Transit (Minneapolis - St. Paul region)
- Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (Boston region)
- Port Authority of Allegheny County (Pittsburgh region)

Strong state involvement, but no single point of control
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 study goal

2. Then, refine to ensure relative likeness to the Baltimore region (population, system size, etc.)
## Peers by Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Potential Peers Systems and Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Coordination</td>
<td>Raleigh/Research Triangle, Washington, DC Area, Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Service</td>
<td>Minneapolis, Charlotte, Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Investment</td>
<td>Austin, Salt Lake City, Charlotte, Denver, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Connections</td>
<td>Philadelphia, Charlotte, Seattle, Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Decision Making</td>
<td>St. Louis, Philadelphia, Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Equitable Investment</td>
<td>Puget Sound Region, New Orleans, Vancouver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommended Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Potential Peers Systems and Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Coordination</td>
<td>Raleigh/Research Triangle, <strong>Washington, DC Area</strong>, Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Service</td>
<td>Minneapolis, Charlotte, <strong>Salt Lake City</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Investment</td>
<td>Austin, Salt Lake City, <strong>Charlotte</strong>, Denver, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Connections</td>
<td><strong>Southeast Michigan</strong>, Charlotte, Seattle, Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Decision Making</td>
<td>St. Louis, <strong>Philadelphia</strong>, Charlotte, Southeast Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Equitable Investment</td>
<td>Seattle, <strong>St. Louis</strong>, Southeast Michigan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparable to Baltimore Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>State Role</th>
<th>Multiple Modes</th>
<th>Area Population</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
<th>Per Capital Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore (MDOT MTA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.8m</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$43,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte (CATS)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.6 m</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$36,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia (SEPTA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.1 m</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$40,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Michigan (SMART)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3 m</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>$35,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis (Metro Transit)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.8 m</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$37,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (UTA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$34,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Region (WMTA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.2 m</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$51,437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparable to Baltimore Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Governance Structure</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore (MDOT MTA)</td>
<td>Agency Management</td>
<td>Fares, State, Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte (CATS)</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit Commission (Enterprise Fund within City of Charlotte)</td>
<td>+ Maintenance of Effort and Sales Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Regional Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia (SEPTA)</td>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>+ Local/Regional Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared State and Regional Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Michigan (SMART)</td>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>+ Regional (Property Tax Millage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Regional Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis (Metro Transit)</td>
<td>Interstate Compact</td>
<td>+ Sales Tax and Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared State and Regional Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (UTA)</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>+ Sales Tax and Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Regional Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Region (WMTA)</td>
<td>Compacts</td>
<td>+ Parking and Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared State and Regional Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps
Next Steps

1. Technical Memo 2: Existing Structures
   Comments due by Friday, February 26
   • Draft will be posted on
   • website week of March 1

2. Recommended Peers
   Email or call with changes or ideas by Friday, February 26

   Available in mid-March

4. Stakeholder interviews
   Ongoing
Thank You!

Bethany Whitaker
bwhitaker@nelsonnygaard.com