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ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Ostby called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m. Roll call was taken, and the presence of a quorum was confirmed.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda as proposed was made by Mr. Eberle, seconded by Mr. Karls, and carried unanimously by the Board.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 28, 2008, MEETING

A motion to approve the minutes as presented was made by Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Karls, and carried unanimously by the Board.

CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMENTS RECEIVED ON WEBSITE

Mr. Yunker referred the Board to the letter from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) that had been provided at the meeting (see Attachment 1) and stated that it had been received after the meeting agenda was sent out. He explained that the letter indicated that the Department had reviewed and approved the application submitted by the Commission on behalf of the RTA and the intergovernmental partnership of the Cities and Counties of Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine for a $100,000 grant under the State Commuter Rail Transit System Development Grant Program to support continued planning for the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee (KRM) commuter rail project. He noted that the application still needed to be approved by the Legislature’s Joint Finance Committee which would consider the funding request at its meeting on June 24, 2008, at 1:00 p.m. He indicated that, at the Department’s request, the Commission staff would attend that meeting. On a motion by Mr. Karls, seconded by Mr. Brandrup, and carried unanimously, the Board acknowledged receipt of the correspondence and placed it on file.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL TO CONTRACT WITH THE PUBLIC POLICY FORUM TO CONDUCT A FISCAL ANALYSIS OF THE RACINE BELLE URBAN TRANSIT SYSTEM AND KENOSHA AREA TRANSIT SYSTEM

Chairman Ostby directed the Board’s attention to the proposal received from the Public Policy Forum (see Attachment 2) to conduct fiscal analyses of the performance and condition of the Kenosha and Racine transit systems similar to the analyses conducted by the Forum for the Milwaukee County Transit System (MCTS). Mr. Brandrup noted that the two City transit systems have smaller budgets with different Federal and State transit funding circumstances than the Milwaukee County Transit System and that the WisDOT regularly reviews the performance of both systems. He noted that the Commission had initiated studies to prepare new short-range transit system development plans for both the Kenosha and Racine transit systems and those plans would include similar research and fiscal analyses to that being proposed by the Public Policy Forum. He did not want to duplicate the work that would be done under the Commission planning studies and suggested that the Board table the proposal submitted by the Public Policy Forum at least until the two Commission transit service plans were completed later this year. On a motion by Mr. Brandrup,
seconded by Ms. Taylor, and carried unanimously, the Board tabled the proposal by the Public Policy Forum.

Chairman Ostby indicated that he wished to convey his thanks to Rob Henken for the briefing on the Milwaukee County Transit System study and his subsequent proposal for conducting the Kenosha and Racine studies.

PRESENTATION OF THE PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF A MILWAUKEE TRANSIT FUNDING AND GOVERNANCE STUDY BEING CONDUCTED BY THE WISCONSIN POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND REASON FOUNDATION AND SPONSORED BY THE METROPOLITAN MILWAUKEE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

Mr. Tim Sheehy from the Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (MMAC) and Mr. George Lightbourn from the Wisconsin Policy Research Institute (WPRI) were introduced and provided information on the transit study being conducted for their organizations by the Reason Foundation. They indicated that the transit study was intended to help address the charges set forth in the State statute that created the RTA and that Phase I of the study was nearing completion. Mr. Sheehy asked that the RTA consider partnering with the MMAC and WPRI by funding the estimated $50,000 cost of Phase II of the study. Mr. Lightbourn introduced Mr. Tom Rubin of the Reason Foundation who presented the preliminary findings of Phase I (see Attachment 3). The major points of Mr. Rubin’s presentation were as follows:

- The Milwaukee County Transit System is the dominant system in the State of Wisconsin, carrying about two-thirds of the transit passengers in the State. The system is a very efficient system in comparison to other peer systems serving similar sized areas.

- The existing riders on the Milwaukee County Transit System are predominantly low-income and transit dependent persons.

- Budget limits placed on Milwaukee County funding since 2000 have resulted in significant service reductions and fare increases for the Milwaukee County Transit System. Fares have increased faster the general price inflation since 2000 and are too high.

- If additional funding for the transit system is not provided, the situation will become worse. Service reductions were already being developed by transit system staff for 2009 and significant service reductions are likely to occur by the year 2010 if limitations on local funding continue. Contributing to the funding problem are rising fuel prices and the need to shift federal funds from operating to capital expenses to cover the costs of purchasing replacement buses. Additional Federal funding to resolve the problem should not be expected.

- With a substantial new funding source, the service cuts and fare increases of the past several years could be reversed by reducing fares, restoring service cuts, and adding new services. This may be expected to result in a substantial increase in ridership.

- The KRM commuter rail proposal appears sound and may be the only way to provide a high quality transit system linking the lakeshore communities of Southeastern Wisconsin and northeastern Illinois. More work needs to be done to resolve several operational issues. The economic benefits of the KRM commuter rail should be more closely examined.

- The RTA needs to address organizational questions pertaining to its functions, governance, and funding. Consideration should also be given to whether the RTA should include the seven
counties in southeastern Wisconsin but the current three-county RTA may be the most feasible organization right now.

Mr. Rubin stated that Phase II of the study would include: analyses of potential alternatives for funding and governing public transit and commuter rail in southeastern Wisconsin; estimates of the revenue that could be generated through various taxes and fees; proposed political and organizational structure and funding mechanism for the RTA; review of the proposed KRM commuter rail; and preparation of a final report and the presentation of the study recommendations to the public, press, and decision makers. Mr. Sheehy stated that Mr. Rubin would represent an outside set of eyes to complement the work of the RTA and the Commission. Mr. Lightbourn indicated that the Reason Foundation had been selected to do the transit study in hopes that its conservative positions identified in past studies would help gain the support of the Legislature for the RTA’s recommendations. He stated that Phase II would be completed by October or November 2008, in time for study recommendations to be used for the next legislative session.

The Board had the following comments and questions on the MMAC transit study:

1. Chairman Ostby commented that he also believed the current fares for the Milwaukee County Transit System were too high and asked how to determine what fares are appropriate. Mr. Rubin stated that there was no set formula and setting fares was up to each transit system. He suggested that it was time to stop raising fares for the Milwaukee County Transit System and start looking at reducing them.

2. Referring to the service reductions for 2009 identified on page 13 of Mr. Rubin’s presentation, Mr. Torres stated that the Milwaukee County Transit System was part of the Milwaukee County Department of Transportation and Public Works. He indicated that a decision on whether service reductions would be needed in 2009 would ultimately be made through the process followed to develop the Milwaukee County budget and that the Milwaukee County Board and County Executive will have the final decision on the budget.

3. Ms. Taylor believed that this report and its proposed Phase II could be helpful to the Board by providing an independent review from a conservative outside organization.

4. Ms. Robinson noted that consideration must be given to the economic impact of improved public transit in Southeastern Wisconsin and the State of Wisconsin. Mr. Sheehy noted that he and Ms. Taylor had attended a recent meeting of the Milwaukee County Board. A Board member asked if businesses would be willing to subsidize the extension of bus routes to business parks. He indicated that the business community considers public transit to be a basic public service that should be provided, and if it is not provided in Southeastern Wisconsin, businesses may likely choose to locate somewhere else.

5. Mr. Eberle stated that he liked what was presented in Phase I of the MMAC study. He added that Phase II may be helpful in providing an outside review, as some Racine County officials have questioned the validity of the data released by the RTA and the Commission.

6. Mr. Torres stated that the RTA should be cognizant of what has occurred with the Milwaukee Downtown Connector Study over the past 10-15 years with respect to producing reports with recommendations that have not been accepted. He believed that the funding needs of the KRM project, public transit, and the downtown connector all needed to be identified and addressed by the RTA, and that the RTA should be look first at funding issues, then at governance questions, and then at equity issues.
Chairman Ostby stated that the equity issue needed to be addressed by the RTA if its funding recommendations were to be accepted and acted upon. Mr. Brandrup and Mr. Evenson noted that the preliminary RTA recommendation made in December 2006—which called for each county in the RTA to determine the sales tax rate needed to support public transit based on the needs identified in transit service plans—addressed the equity issue well.

7. Mr. Karls suggested that working with the MMAC might be appropriate if the RTA believed it did not have the resources needed to fully address RTA governance issues. However, he stated that the MMAC study should focus on the main issues that the RTA needed to have addressed, noting that he had seen other legislation falter as a result of satellite issues that were of little importance to the main issue. He noted that funding for the KRM and public transit was the most important issue for consideration.

8. Mr. Brandrup noted that the RTA had already addressed some of the issues identified in Mr. Rubin’s presentation and identified for study under Phase II, and that the other issues had been looked at by the Wisconsin Alliance of Cities in its recent efforts to draft State legislation on RTAs. He suggested that the work scope for Phase II be provided to the RTA for its review and that the scope may need to be reduced to avoid duplicating work already completed.

9. Mr. Evenson indicated that the MMAC report could be useful if it would help gain support for the RTA recommendations. He added that staff would be willing to work with the MMAC and the WPRI to revise the scope of work to focus on only the issues important to the RTA. He reminded the Board that it needed to continue to prepare its own report to the Governor and Legislature.

10. Mr. Sheehy Stated indicated that the RTA would be provided with a draft copy of the scope of work for Phase II of the MMAC transit study. Chairman Ostby suggested that the Board schedule a teleconference meeting for Monday June 23, 2008, at 8:00 a.m. to review the scope and act on the MMAC’s request that the RTA fund Phase II. In response to a suggestion by Mr. Evenson, Mr. Lightbourn stated that he and his staff would try to adjust the scope to focus on the work that the RTA considered to be of most importance.


Chairman Ostby asked the Commission staff to review with the Board the draft of the first two sections of the RTA report to the Governor and State Legislature. Mr. Evenson stated that the Commission staff had tried to keep the initial sections brief and to the point, and that it was looking for the Board to provide it with some direction at this meeting on the amount and type of information that should be included as well as their comments on the identified findings.

[Secretary’s Note: The drafts of the first two sections of the RTA report to the Governor and State Legislature are currently available on the RTA website through links in the agenda for the June 16, 2008, RTA Board meeting at: www.sewisrta.org/pdfs/2008-06-16_agenda_rta.pdf.]

The following questions were raised and comments made by Board members on the draft sections of the RTA report:
1. In response to a question from Chairman Ostby, Mr. Evenson stated that staff could add appendices and cite other reports as necessary to provide the information the Board believed was needed to support its findings and recommendations. Mr. Yunker stated that the MMAC report and other supporting reports and papers would be referenced in the RTA report.

2. Mr. Brandrup indicated that a large amount of information on the public transit funding issue had been released by other sources and that some was inaccurate. He stated that he was concerned that those reading the Public Policy Forum’s report would accept the Forum’s proposal as the answer to the funding problems of the Milwaukee County Transit System. In particular, he noted that the sales tax for transit proposed in the Forum’s report would be inadequate to restore past service reductions and fare increases and would not provide any funds for the KRM commuter rail project. He believed the RTA report should make this clear. Mr. Yunker stated that information provided in the third section of the RTA report would address this point.

3. Ms. Robinson and Ms. Taylor indicated they believed it was important to have the RTA report discuss the potential positive economic development impacts of the KRM commuter rail project and public transit as that information could help support RTA recommendations.

4. Mr. Karls indicated that because the RTA report would be one of many reports submitted to the Legislature, it would be important to put the most critical information at the front of the report where officials would notice it. After that, the report should include whatever appendicies and supplemental information are needed to support its recommendation. Mr. Mueller suggested using an abbreviated report format similar to that used by the Legislative Fiscal Bureau. Mr. Brandrup suggested including a one- or two-page executive summary be made part of the RTA report. Mr. Yunker stated that staff would work to create an executive summary, appendices, and supporting materials for the report and that all would ultimately be available on the RTA website.

5. Mr. Karls suggested that a special webpage be added to the RTA website specifically for the RTA report and supporting documents. Mr. Yunker stated that a webpage for the RTA report would be developed after the RTA report was further along.

CONSIDERATION OF NEXT MEETING DATE AND PLACE

Chairman Ostby stated that the next meeting would be a teleconference meeting at 8:00 a.m. on Monday, June 23, 2008, to discuss the scope of work and RTA funding for Phase II of the MMAC Transit Study. Mr. Evenson indicated that the Commission would host the meeting, and Board members and the public could attend at the Commission offices if they desired. The Board agreed that the following meeting would be at 8:00 a.m. on July 21, 2008, at a location to be determined. Mr. Torres stated that he had requested that staff for the Milwaukee Downtown Connector Study provide a briefing on that study at that meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 a.m. on a motion by Mr. Karls, seconded by Mr. Eberle, and carried unanimously by the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth R. Yunker
Recording Secretary
June 6, 2008

The Honorable Mark Miller, Senate Chair
Joint Committee on Finance
409 South, State Capitol
P.O. Box 7882
Madison, WI 53707-7882

The Honorable Kitty Rhoades, Assembly Chair
Joint Committee on Finance
309 East, State Capitol
P.O. Box 8953
Madison, WI 53708-8953

Dear Senator Miller and Representative Rhoades:

Summary of Request
Per Section 9148 (9u) of 2007 Wisconsin Act 20, the Department of Transportation is requesting the transfer of $100,000 from the Joint Committee on Finance (JFC) supplemental appropriation (s. 20.865(4)(u), Wis. Stats.) to the passenger railroad station improvement and commuter rail transit system grants appropriation (s. 20.395(2)(ct), Wis. Stats.) for the purpose of providing a Commuter Rail Transit System Development Grant to continue the planning efforts for the proposed commuter rail corridor between Kenosha and Milwaukee.

Background of Request
The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), acting on behalf of the cities and counties of Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Transit Authority (SEWRTA), has applied for a grant under the State Commuter Rail Transit System Development Program as specified under s. 85.064, Wis. Stats. The grant was requested to continue planning efforts for the proposed Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee commuter rail corridor.

Specifically, the project includes the advanced technical and planning work necessary for an application to be submitted to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for their consideration and approval. FTA's approval is required for the proposed commuter rail project to move to the preliminary engineering stage of the New Starts federal funding program process. The proposed scope of work would include: completing the project financial plan; updating and refining capital, operating, and maintenance costs; enhancing coordination with railroad operators; analyzing and refining the commuter rail operations and the fleet management plans; reviewing transit-oriented development around stations; analyzing the sensitivity of ridership forecasts; and updating the draft environmental impact statement as needed.
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I RECEIVED
The amount of the grant requested is $100,000 and reflects 10 percent of the anticipated $1 million project cost. Federal funding of $600,000 will support 80 percent of projects costs with the remaining 10 percent funded through local resources.

**How the Request Meets Statutory Criteria**

Under section 85.064 of the statutes, the Department is to administer a Commuter Rail Transit System Development Grant Program. The purpose of the program is to award grants for the development or extension of commuter rail transit systems in the state from the appropriation under s. 20.395(2)(ct), Wis. Stats. Under the statute, the Department is responsible for establishing criteria for the program, reviewing and evaluating grant applications for eligibility, and awarding grants for approved projects. As directed by this statute, the Department has established processes and criteria for applications, review, and evaluation of commuter rail transit system development grants. The statute also requires that funding of the grant is limited to one-half of the non-federal share or 25 percent of the total project cost, whichever is less.

2007 Wisconsin Act 20 allocated up to $800,000 for grants under the Commuter Rail Transit System Development Grant Program. Act 20 placed the $800,000 of funding in the supplemental appropriation of the Joint Committee on Finance under s. 20.865(4)(u) of the statutes. Further, Section 9148(9u) of 2007 Wisconsin Act 20 provided that the Department could request that the Committee supplement the appropriation under s. 20.395(2)(ct) of the statutes by up to $800,000 during the 2007-09 biennium from the appropriation under s. 20.865(4)(u) of the statutes for grants to further develop the proposed Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee commuter rail extension project.

The Department has reviewed SEWRPC’s application, on behalf of the cities and counties of Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee and the SEWRTA, and found it to be in the prescribed form and provided the required information. A three-member panel of Department staff reviewed and evaluated the application based on the established criteria. The panel determined that the project meets the eligibility criteria and the established program guideline standards. In addition, the amount requested by SEWRPC meets the statutory limitations related to share of project cost. Therefore, the Department requests that the Joint Committee on Finance provide a supplement of $100,000 to the appropriation under s. 20.395(2)(ct) of the statutes from the appropriation under s. 20.865(4)(u) of the statutes for the purposes of awarding a grant for the further development of the proposed Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee commuter rail system.

**Planned Activities**

Upon approval by the Joint Committee on Finance, the Department will enter into a grant agreement with the appropriate local entity. At that point, the project will begin on the remaining technical and planning work required to allow the proposed Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee (KRM) commuter rail system to be considered by the FTA for approval to enter into the preliminary engineering stage.
Senator Mark Miller  
Representative Kitty Rhoades  
June 6, 2008  
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Thank you for consideration of the Department's request to transfer spending authority for the KRM grant. Please contact Casey Newman, Director of the Department's Office of Policy, Budget, and Finance at 267-9618 if the Committee requires additional information. Appearing at the JFC hearing to answer Committee questions will be Casey Newman, Director.

Sincerely,

Frank J. Busalacchi,  
Secretary  

cc: Members of the Joint Committee on Finance  
    Secretary Michael Morgan, DOA  
    Legislative Fiscal Bureau  
    Casey Newman, DOT Budget Director  
    Beth Nachreiner, DOT Federal Legislative Director  
    Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

SEWRPC Doc #137732
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Fiscal Analysis of Racine Belle Urban and Kenosha Transit Systems
A Project Proposal
Submitted by the Public Policy Forum
May 30, 2008

Summary

In May 2008, the Public Policy Forum released a comprehensive analysis of the Milwaukee County Transit System (MCTS). The report, entitled “Milwaukee County’s Transit Crisis: How Did We Get Here and What Do We Do Now?”, describes in detail the circumstances that have produced a monumental fiscal crisis for MCTS, quantifies the dimensions of the crisis, and describes a range of policy options for addressing it. It also provides perspective on who is riding MCTS and how the local economy might be impacted by severe cuts in transit service, and on the cost efficiency and effectiveness of MCTS as compared to peer systems.

As intended, the Forum’s report has attracted significant attention from the local news media and policymakers. Also, as intended, several elected officials and community leaders have cited the report as a “call to action” to address the problem, and the report’s findings are being taken into account as part of deliberations over related transit issues, such as potential creation of a Regional Transit Authority, establishment of a Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee (KRM) commuter rail line, and completion of the Downtown Connector study.

Now, as Milwaukee considers long-term solutions to its transit funding dilemma and regional policymakers consider collaboration and potential transit enhancements, it is essential that the challenges facing other transit systems in the region be taken into account. In particular, it is clear that several of the circumstances that have produced Milwaukee’s crisis – including relatively flat State operating assistance, local property tax levy caps and significant increases in the cost of fuel and employee benefits – also have produced significant issues for the Racine Belle Urban and Kenosha transit systems. Those challenges are directly relevant to the work of the Regional Transit Authority board that is considering creation of a three-county (Milwaukee, Racine and Kenosha) RTA, and they similarly merit analysis and quantification in order to better inform discussions on regional solutions.

The Public Policy Forum proposes a short-term research project designed to produce a similar analysis of the Racine Belle Urban and Kenosha transit systems as that performed for MCTS. The project would analyze the recent funding history of the two systems and how they have addressed fiscal challenges to date; project the size of potential budget holes for the next three to five years; and identify and discuss potential solutions. If desired, the project also could analyze and discuss ridership data and provide comparisons with other peer transit systems.

Our Credentials

The Forum Board of Trustees has committed the organization to playing a key supportive role in monitoring and strengthening local government performance. For the past 95 years, we have served as a citizen’s watchdog organization for the city and county of Milwaukee, ensuring our
local governments are committed to providing taxpayers with good value. Over the past decade, our mission has expanded to include policy analysis of issues important to all of southeastern Wisconsin.

Since 1913, the Forum has cultivated our reputation for trusted research as a non-profit, non-partisan organization that helps improve the quality of public policymaking in Southeastern Wisconsin. Our mission is to encourage informed public policy and effective use of public resources. We achieve our mission by conducting high-quality research on civic issues of local, state, and national concern. Fiercely independent and widely respected for unbiased research, the Forum is prized by area leaders seeking to participate effectively in public policy debate.

Key Personnel

The Forum’s permanent staff consists of seven people: Rob Henken, president; Anneliese Dickman, J.D., research director; Ryan Horton, senior researcher; Jeffrey Schmidt, researcher; Melissa Kovach, researcher; Jerry Slaske, communications director; and Catherine Crother, administrative support.

Mr. Henken will provide overall project direction and guidance. Mr. Horton and Mr. Schmidt will team up with Mr. Henken to conduct data compilation and analysis and to write the report. The project team’s extensive experience in policy research in Southeastern Wisconsin, and its expertise in state, county and municipal budget issues, makes it ideally suited to conduct the project.

Project Timeline

The fiscal analysis and projections portion of the report could be completed within six to eight weeks of project initiation. If additional components involving ridership analysis and peer comparison are desired, then that effort would take an additional four weeks. The project could be structured so as to produce two reports on a phased basis (i.e. phase one on fiscal analysis released first, followed by phase two four weeks later), or to produce one report.

Project Budget

We estimate the research, analysis and written findings for the fiscal analysis component will take 120 hours, billed at a rate of $100 per hour for researcher time. Printing, dissemination and indirect costs are estimated at $2,000. The total project budget for that component is $14,000. If the additional components of ridership and peer comparison analysis are added, that would add an additional $6,000 to the cost for a total of $20,000.
Milwaukee Transit Study: Preliminary Phase 1 Findings

Thomas A. Rubin
Reason Foundation
June 2008
Presentation Outline

- Objectives of study
- Current status and trend
- Transit options
- Transit-related economic development
- RTA organization options
- Recommendations
Objectives of Study

- Review transit history, status, trends, and options in greater Milwaukee area
- Review major transit options
  - Milwaukee County Transit System
  - Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee commuter rail
- Study RTA organization/funding options
- Make recommendations for further study and actions
Current Status and Trends I

- MCTS is the dominant transit operator in seven county SE Wisconsin area
  - Overall, good peer comparisons – but terrible trend line
  - Without dedicated funding source(s), MCTS passengers have suffered through several years of funding reductions, service cuts, and fare increases
  - Most transit operators in major urban areas are not part of a municipal government; many of those that are have dedicated transit taxes and/or contract operations


Not counting MCTS, eleven of the Federal Transit Administration’s “Top 50” transit operators are part of a municipal government, but many of these are significantly distanced from the general purpose government in one of two major ways:

Broward County (Fort Lauderdale, Florida)
Detroit Department of Transportation
City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services contracts out for 100% of its transit services and has a dedicated excise tax surcharge (similar to a sales tax) for transit.
King County Metro (Seattle) has a dedicated sales tax.
City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation contracts out for 100% of the operations of its services and is funded primarily from County-wide sales tax and other funds that are provided to it by formula.
Miami-Dade Transit Authority has a dedicated sales tax.
Montgomery County (Maryland) Ride-On contracts for 100% of its transportation services.
City of Phoenix Public Transit Department contracts out for all of its transit services and is funded largely through a regional sales tax.
San Francisco Municipal Railway reports to an separate governing board from the County Board of Supervisors and has a dedicated sales tax.
City of San Juan (Puerto Rico) has responsibility for the oversight of the Publico (jitney) operations.
Westchester County (New York) DOT contracts out 100% of its service.
MCTS is one of the Federal Transit Administration's "Top 50" U.S. transit operators, as reported in the National Transit Database for 2005, and approximately the 25th largest bus system in the U.S. Since I had done a lot of work to put together this analysis and these graphs for another client, I also utilized them for peer review statistics for MCTS.

Per unit of transit service supplied (an hour of bus revenue service on the street), MCTS does very well compared to the transit systems in other major urbanized areas.
MCTS does surprisingly well on the percentage of operating costs paid by transit riders.
MCTS is average, or a little better, in these cost-effectiveness measures.

One thing that is happening here is that, since MCTS's service area is fairly small — because Milwaukee County is fairly small — and because most of these agencies serve larger geographic jurisdictions, the average MCTS trip length is fairly short – 2.7 miles vs. the simple average of 3.7 miles for the peers.

Overall, this is a very strong level of performance. From other work I have done, it is obvious that the key driver is an emphasis on economy of operation. Unfortunately, this has been overdone, as it has produced significant reductions in transit services supplied and consumed.
The limited County budget since 2000 has resulted in significant reductions in service provided to the public.
Fares have been increasing very rapidly since 2000, far faster than inflation.

Given that the median bus rider household income was under $28,000 for those responding to the question (2007 survey, 18% did not respond), this increase had a huge financial impact on lower-income riders. For a two-transit rider, $28,000/year household, the $16 weekly pass now requires 6% of annual income.

($16/week x 2 weekly passes x 52 weeks/year = $1,600/year for transit passes. $1,664/$28,000 = 5.94%.)

NOTE: The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Transit Authority - Draft Report to Governor Jim Doyle and the Wisconsin Legislature, November 2008, shows a 30% fare increase for Milwaukee County over what I believe is the same period, 2000 to 2007. I have not been able to research why this difference exists. Note that the metric above is average fare revenue collected per boarding, what the customer actually pays each time (s)he gets on a bus, and the metric in the Report may be measuring the change in some other fare data. Also, the data above is for fixed route motor bus service; the data in the Report may include Demand-Responsive and/or Vanpool operations.
The reductions in services operated and the rapid increase in fares have produced a reduction in ridership of over one-third from 2000 to 2007 – and First Quarter 2008 ridership was down 5% over the comparable period in 2007.
Current Status and Trends II

- As bad as the recent trends has been, the outlook for the future is worse:
  - Due to the unavailability of County "general funds," MCTS has been drawing down the reserve of Federal funding it built up - this will soon be exhausted
  - MCTS estimates that fuel costs will increase by $4 million next year and negotiated labor increases will be another $1 million
These only show the route alignments that existed in 2000 that will likely not exist on January 1, 2010, if current funding trends hold. This does not comprehend:

- “Turnbacks” – where some of the bus trips no longer go all the way to the end of the line.
- Lengthening of “headways” – Where there used to be a bus every 20 minutes, now it is every 40 minutes.
- Shorter hours of service.
- Reduced days of service.
Current Status and Trends III

- MCTS is already planning substantial additional service reductions for next year—there simply does not appear to be any alternative without more funds.
- MTCS will also have significant bus replacement and other capital costs within the next few years, with no funding source identified other than additional service reductions and fare increases.

MCTS had been in a place in its bus replacement cycle where purchases have been relatively low for several years; none at all for 2007 and 2008. However, from 2010 to 2017, the current plan shows a requirement for approximately $13-14 million a year for replacement buses at the current level of service provided.
The Difficulties in Increasing Funding for Transit

- Greater Milwaukee residents have one of the “best” commutes in the U.S.
- Most SE Wisconsin counties and cities are not looking at transit as a regional priority requiring a regional approach
- Transit is seen as something for “them,” not “us”
- No enthusiasm for new taxes
- Federal operating subsidy bailout unlikely

Of the 69 U.S. urbanized areas with a population in excess of 500,000 at the 2000 census, Milwaukee tied for the twelfth-shortest home-to-work commute time (20.8 minutes) and tied for the 18th lowest Texas Transportation Institute Travel Time Index (1.13, which, in short, means that the travel time during peak periods is 13% than during off-peak periods) for 2005. *Forbes* recently rated the Milwaukee commute as the third best in the U.S. As a result, transit is simply not given the priority treatment that is common in many other major U.S. urbanized areas.

Moreover, the greater Milwaukee peak hour commute has actually been getting slightly *better* in recent years; the TTI value was 1.15 from 1999 to 2002.

To the extent that there is likely to be more Federal funding for transit, it is likely that most of it will go for capital projects and I know of no one who is expecting, or even asking for, the types of increases in funds that can be utilized for operating subsidies that would make a difference locally.
MCTS Passenger Demographics I

- Gender – 69.3% female – and increasing
- Age – Average age 47.2 – and increasing
- Ethnicity:
  - 50.5% Non-Hispanic Caucasian
  - 41.3% African-American
  - 5.3% Hispanic
- Education – 87.0% High School graduates, 47.7% at least some post-HS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCTS Passenger Demographics II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Employment – 40.5% full-time, 17.0% part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Household Income – Median &lt; $28,000 for those stating income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Driver’s License – 48.5% hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Choice – 61.6% have choices “rarely” (19.3%), “some” (28.5%), or “half” (13.8%) of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trip Purpose – 43.3% home-to-work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frequency – 30.5% &gt;five times/week, 31.5% 1-5 times/week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Options

- MCTS bus/demand-responsive service
- MCTS rail/BRT service
- KRM commuter rail
- Other
MCTS Bus/Demand-Responsive Service I

- There are only two real options:
  - A substantial new funding source, soon, to stop the hemorrhaging and, one might hope, to allow restoration of services that have been eliminated, fare structure improvements, and expansion of new service
  - If there is not a substantial new funding source, the result will be disastrous for transit users
MCTS Bus/Demand-Responsive Service II

• If there is substantial new funding:
  – Restore service reductions (entire bus lines eliminated, lines combined and shortened, headway lengthening, service hours shortened, days of service eliminated)
  – New service
    • Wholly within Milwaukee County
    • Into neighboring counties to major trip generators on both sides of the borders
  – Fare reductions
MCTS Bus/Demand-Responsive Service III

• With substantial new funding, doubling MCTS ridership over five years is not at all unreasonable (getting back to 2000 ridership would be a 80% increase as of today's ridership level)

• Costs:
  – Hiring new operators/mechanics/support
  – Fare reductions
  – Buying new buses
  – Planning/marketing/administration
MCTS Bus/Demand-Responsive Service IV

- Costs will be relatively low, compared to other ridership increase options
  - When cutting service, cost reduction is far less than service reduction – *BUT*, when adding service, the opposite is true
  - Reducing fares is relatively inexpensive when it produces increased ridership
- Best plan will be to increase service and reduce fares in phases
- More bus service will mean fewer DR trips

In studies for other transit agencies, I have generally found that the “marginal” cost of adding or deleting fixed route bus service is approximately 55-65% of the “fully allocated cost.”

For example, if there is a reduction in bus service, the bus operators that are laid off, or are not replaced, are not the highest compensated bus operators or even the average compensated operators, but the lowest compensated, particularly part-time operators that are very important to cost-efficient transit service. When service increases, the operators that are hired start at the bottom of the pay scale.

Similarly, when there are reductions in service operated, there are many positions that simply cannot be eliminated, or the functions cannot be totally transferred: the CEO will still be there, the payroll department is still going to be required, the graveyard shift on maintenance will still need a leader; etc. Conversely, when service is added, there are many departments and positions where little or no increase in staffing or budget will be required.

With more extensive fixed route bus service, Americans with Disabilities Act-eligible riders will be more likely to take the bus, rather than go through the hassle of scheduling demand-responsive there-and-back trips a day in advance. From 2006 MCTS NTD “Profile,” Demand Responsive trips’ average operating subsidy was $16.12, almost ten times the average operating subsidy per motor bus trip of $1.70.
MCTS Rail/BRT Service

- BRT/LRT – Various routes under study
- Streetcar:
  - "Square" route from Amtrak/commuter rail station (St. Paul/4th St./Juneau/Jackson-Van Buren)
  - UWM to I-94 West corridor via Prospect/ Wisconsin Avenues
- At this point, strongly recommend against promising any specific corridor or technology in most cases

It is preferable to avoid making specific commitments for major capital projects at this point in RTA development for several reasons.

First, most such projects will require extensive additional work before they can be implemented, particularly if the use of Federal "new starts" (49 USC 5309) funding is contemplated, and making decisions on technologies and alignments can only be done through the NEPA/EIS process.

If this is seen as the beginning of the competition, and decisions – or anything that can be seen as a "commitment" – are made at this point, there will be "winners" and "losers;" you will want to avoid making these decisions before the data and analysis is complete. For example, there are at least two different streetcar proposals through the Milwaukee CBD; if one is given preference at this point, there is a strong possibility that the "losing" side will either oppose the creation of the RTA, or at least lessen its enthusiasm.

I suggest instead a position that there are multiple candidate transit improvement candidates that will be considered, the standards for technical evaluation to provide "the greatest good for the greatest" number in compliance with applicable Federal and State requirements will be followed, and if "your" project is the best, it will go to the top of the list for implementation.

(There will be, of course, practical political considerations that must be recognized and responded to. For example, turning to a three-county or seven-county RTA proposal, a commitment to a higher-speed guideway transit mode in the KRM corridor will likely be a necessity to get the RTA adopted – BUT, it would be improper to make any commitment between commuter rail and BRT prior to the EIS process.
From Milwaukee Connector Study
From Michael J. Cudahy
KRM Commuter Rail

- Can be reasonably seen as the most practical and productive means of faster transportation in Lakeside corridor N-S between Milwaukee and Northeastern Illinois
- Numerous operational issues that will require significant work to resolve, but similar concerns have been successfully addressed elsewhere — BUT, do not underestimate the importance and effort

I-94 and Amtrak are is the only other higher speed ground transportation options in this corridor. For trips with a beginning and/or end along the Lakeshore to go inland, E-W, to access either for a N-S trip is simply not very viable. Increasing Amtrak service, or other commuter rail service on the same freight railroad alignment, would be problematic.

Issues include:

- Getting use of the alignment with two freight RR's (UP and CP).
- Coordination of freight service on UP Kenosha Sub, particularly coal unit trains to Oak Creek Power Plant.
- Coordinating service into Milwaukee Station with Amtrak.
- Feeder/Collector transit service in Milwaukee and in Racine and Kenosha.
- Getting GUARANTEED times to operate commuter rail service.
- Track upgrades – Passing Sidings on UP-Kenosha Sub.
- Coordination of service and fares/fare media with Metra.
- Muskego Yard Bypass so that the Milwaukee Station is no longer a main freight line.
- Assuring that studies are performed professionally and realistically, not to justify pre-determined decisions.
- Avoiding cost increases.
- Not attempting to negotiate with very patient freight railroads in a hurry.
KRM Commuter Rail Cost-Benefits

- Approximately 7,400 daily (one-way) trips projected for 2035, 4,800 more than TSM
- $186.1 million in Capital Costs
- $18.0 million in annual Operating Costs
- Annualized Cost Increase: $21.8 million
- Cost per New Passenger (over TSM): $18

Ridership: EarthTech Inc. et al, Ridership Forecasting Report, September 2007, Table 32, "Year 2000 and 2035 Forecasts for TSM and KRM Rail Alternatives," page 95, rounded from 7,392 and 2,575. ("TSM" is "Transportation Systems Management," which is essentially the best that can be done without a major capital project.


Cost per New Passenger: ($21.8 million annualized cost increase)/(4,800 added passengers x 254 working weekdays/year) = $17.88. This is a simplified methodology, but reasonably close to the results from the "official" methodology.

Although it is still required to be reported, "cost per new rider" is no longer the FTA cost-effectiveness metric for 49 USC 5309 "new start" project evaluations, having been replaced by cost per user benefit, which is basically an hour of transportation time saved. The cost per new passenger metric is, however, still widely used, in part because the newer metric has not yet fully matured and in part because the older metric is easier for lay personnel to understand.

$18 cost per new passenger is a very competitive value, particularly for commuter rail, which tends to have very long trip lengths and, therefore, higher costs per rider.
Other Potential Transit Improvements

- KRM Corridor:
  - Expand I-94 Park-and-Ride
  - I-94 Contra Commute Freeway Flyer
  - Increase E-W service
- Ozaukee/Walworth/Washington/Waukesha Counties:
  - More service to Milwaukee CBD and other trip generators
  - “Ring” service “around” Milwaukee
  - Other inter-county connectors
  - Expand non-large bus fixed route service

These “other” options (many of which are already in use in at least some of the seven-county SE Wisconsin counties) could include:

1. Use of smaller fixed-route vehicles and shorter headways
2. Route and Point Deviation “Fixed Route” service (where the bus can deviate from the fixed route to pick up or drop off passengers)
3. “Timed Transfer”/“Surge”/“Pulse” fixed route service (where all buses in an area reach the same point at the same time to ease transfers)
4. More utilization of contracted transit service
5. More employer-sponsored/government-facilitated “club bus” service to suburban employment sites
6. More utilization of demand-responsive service, including non-ADA service
7. Expanding vanpooling, both public and private (employer) sponsored
8. Taxi vouchers as an alternative to ADA demand-responsive service
Transit-Related Economic Development

- Guideway transit cannot “create” real estate development, but it *can* relocate it
  - Moving development from I-94 corridor to the Lakeshore may not add to regional wealth for the seven-county area
  - Moving development from NE Illinois to SE Wisconsin likely will
- Focus less on economic multipliers, more on how money spent on transit would have been otherwise been expended

The idea that huge expenditure on large-scale a public sector project is economically desirable in and of itself – “the cost *is* the benefit” – is highly questionable. The key questions are:

- If the money were not being spent on this project, where would it have been spent? In many cases, most of the money would have been otherwise expended in the local area.
- How valuable will the project be, what will be its benefits beyond the expenditure of funds? Most good transportation projects will have obvious “real” benefits; paying for make-work – dig a hole, then fill it in, repeat – will not.
Transit-Related Economic Development II

- External funding – Federal, State – for major guideway projects sounds impressive, but comes with major strings and delays – and much of the spending isn’t local
- Transit, by itself, generally does not have much impact; but it can be a useful component of a broader-based trend – and the Lakeshore, downtown Milwaukee, and other parts of the region are already doing well and can do better

Much of the real estate development claimed for transit guideway projects does not stand up to analysis; it is often the case that zoning, real estate tax abatements, floor-area-ratio bonuses, parcel accumulation by the public sector using eminent domain, sale of publicly-owned land at below market prices, provision of parking by public agencies, and other factors have far more impact than the existence or not of a guideway transit line.

To the extent that transit does have an impact, logically, the impact will be proportional to the number of trips. At places like the Washington, D.C. central business district stations of Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority MetroRail, where many stations have tens of thousands of boardings/deboardings daily, there is consensus that proximity to a MetroRail station is a key factor for real estate development. However, most of the guideway transit projects currently under discussion in the Greater Milwaukee region would not have this level of passenger traffic for the entire line.

Discussion of the “permanence” of guideway transit projects as a spur to development is a very poor attempt to turn very real disadvantage – high costs and difficulty to change – to a supposed advantage. If a transit line has high ridership, it will almost certain continue to operate. If it does not, if it does not meet its original projections and/or industry/agency standards, then it questionable if it should continue to operate – why should public sector dollars continue to pay to operate a transit line that was a mistake to begin with, or where ridership has dropped significantly? If there are changes in land use – such as major construction projects a few blocks off of an established transit route – than it may very well be a good idea to change the route of the line – and having to spend years, and tens of millions of dollars, to do so, is a disadvantage, not a “benefit.”

Last time I checked, there were not a lot of steel rail production plants in the Milwaukee area, nor transit bus manufacturers; much of the capital spending for transit, particularly guideway transit projects, will simply not be in Southeastern Wisconsin.
Transit-Related Economic Development III

- Transit operations can have far more direct economic impact than major capital projects:
  - There is far less delay in commencement
  - Most of the spending is labor – and local
  - Operating fare revenues means each tax dollar's impact is multiplied

- Only transit operations moves people to jobs, education, retail, and recreation – the real economic impact of transit

If, for example, a transit agency has a 25% farebox recovery ratio, then an expenditure of $75 dollars in public funds for transit will produce $100 dollars in expenditures.

Best practice: Make transportation decisions on the basis of what produces the most direct transportation benefits – and give economic development considerations based solely on the expenditure of public sector dollars less importance.
RTA Organization Options

- Powers
- Governance
- Taxation
- Allocation of Funds
RTA Powers

- Combined with MPO? (Rare in U.S.)
- Planning:
  - Transit
  - Transportation?
- Funding
- Construction
- Operations

Basic Question: Is the RTA to be a “Doer” Organization, a Funder and Facilitator – or Both?

In most large U.S. metropolitan areas, the MPO does not directly receive major tax revenues, but the MPO is responsible for the distribution of many Federal funding sources (CMAQ, STP, 49 USC 5307 Transit “Formula,” 49 USC 5309 “Fixed Guideway Modernization”) and, in many cases, state funding. (Exception: Metropolitan Planning Commission, San Francisco Bay Area, which receives and distributes toll bridge and other funds.)

It is more common to have a transit/transportation entity, or entities, with taxing powers, or as the recipient of state-imposed taxes – such as the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and the Orange County Transportation Authority within the six-county Southern California Association of Governments area, or the RTA in the Greater Chicago area.

Minneapolis/Saint Paul’s Metropolitan Council is perhaps the best-known Metropolitan Planning Organization that also actually operates transit (and wastewater) service.
RTA Governance

- Distribution of Board Members – Fear of Central City/County Dominance is Key in All Such Organizations – Supermajority?
- Elected Officials or “Public” Members?
- How Board Members “Appointed:”
  - Directly Elected (rare, only three in U.S.)
  - Statutory – LA Mayor to LA MTA Board
  - Selected by Participating Governments, such Each Member County Appointing a Member
  - Governor Appoints All (rare) or Some
  - Term Limits?

Virtually every RTA has its own methodology for coming up with Board members, although there are a number of common patterns. It is almost universal that no RTA Board will be structured to allow the representatives of the central city (or central county in a multi-county RTA) to dominate; either the “collar” counties are given a majority of the votes, even where the allocation of transit usage or funding might appear to indicate otherwise (Metrolink) or there are supermajority voting requirements for key measures, such as budgets (Greater Chicago RTA).

Note that “one man, one vote” does not apply to entities such as MPO’s and RTA’s except where there is direct election of governing board members.

The two most widely utilized patterns for appointment of Board members are: (1) elected officials from a local city or county, or group thereof, being “seconded” to the RTA Board, and (2) non-elected “public” members being appointed by designated general-purpose local governmental units or collections of general purpose governmental units. (An example of this is that the Los Angeles County cities other than the City of Los Angeles are split into four geographic groups and each group selects a mayor or city councilperson from their group to represent them on the Los Angeles MTA Board, the election requiring a majority of the cities and a majority of the population of the cities.)

The only three transit agencies in the U.S. with directly elected Board Members are the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (Oakland, California), the Regional Transportation District (Greater Denver area), and the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District.

It is not at all uncommon for governors to appoint members of RTA boards, but, in most cases, these are are ex officio members. There are a small number of transit agencies, generally State, as opposed to local, agencies, where the Governor appoints a majority or even all of the members.
RTA Direct Taxation

- Source: Sales, Property, Payroll, Motor Vehicle Registration, Hotel, Rental Car, Real Estate Transfer/Mortgage, Tolls, etc.
- Limited Term or "Evergreen"
- Rate Fixed by Legislation and/or Referendum – or Set by Governing Board

Sales tax is by far the most common, particularly for newer RTA’s. Property Tax is rare, particularly for newly-formed agencies. The others listed do exist, but are not widely utilized.

There is something of a divide on the terms of transit taxes; most are enacted as “permanent,” but there are a good number that are for a limited term only, generally between 15 and 30 years.

Note that limited term taxes can present major difficulties in bonding for major capital projects; it will not be possible to issue revenue bonds for terms longer than the underlying tax.
What Can Make an RTA/Transit Tax Desirable for a “Collar County?”

• “Subarea Equity” – Designated large percentage of taxes collected in each county must be spent in county of collection

• “Local Return” – Designated percentage of funds returned to cities/unincorporated areas of service/tax collection area

• “No Unmet Transit Needs” – Funds can be utilized for other purposes, such as roads

Sound Transit (the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority) incorporated the concept of “subarea equity” – the promise that a designated large percentage of funds collected in each of five “subareas” would be spent in each subarea – its is promise to the electorate that produced the ballot box approval of it coming into existence. (Unfortunately, large overruns on projects such as the Central Link light rail project through Seattle has produced a number of transactions that have resulted in heavy criticism of Sound Transit’s implementation methodology for subarea equity.)

The Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (subsequently merged into the Los Angeles County Municipal Transportation Authority) placed Proposition A, a ¼¢ sales tax, on the ballot in November 1980. It included a return of 25% of the tax collections (after various state and LACTC percentages “off the top”) to the incorporated cities within in the County on the basis of population, and to the five County Supervisors for their respective unincorporated areas of the County. These funds can be utilized by each entity for any purpose allowed by the Proposition. In 1990, Proposition C, a second ½¢ sales tax, had a 20% “local return.”

The California Transportation Development Act of 1971 is a ¼¢ sales tax, implemented by the State, with the funds returned to the county of collection. These funds are designated for transit use but, if the designated responsible agency in each county holds a public hearing and then finds that there are no unmet transit needs in the County or an area within the County, the “unneeded” TDA funds can be utilized for road purposes.
Recommendations

- Continue to build consensus for seven-county RTA
- If necessary, consider a three-county RTA (including, but not limited to, the KRM corridor)
- Study methodologies to counter the objections of existing elected officials in key positions with effective veto power
Phase II Tasks/Deliverables I

- Costs, coverage, capacities, and benefits of transit alternatives
- Compute revenue generation of various taxes/fees in each jurisdiction
- Analysis of potential legal structures of entities for planning, funding, construction, operations, and oversight
- Merge transportation alternatives, funding options, and governance
Phase II Tasks/Deliverables II

- Recommend political organization structure and funding
- Prepare draft final report, review and revise, issue final report
- Assist, as desired, in publication and presentation of report and recommendations to public, press/media, and decision-makers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Heavy Rail</th>
<th>Light Rail</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>Chicago Transit Authority</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DART</td>
<td>Dallas Area Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCRTA</td>
<td>Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC-DOT</td>
<td>King County Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-MTA</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-MTA</td>
<td>Maryland Transit Administration</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit District</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDT</td>
<td>Miami-Dade Transit</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td>Minneapolis-Saint Paul</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA-HC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNI</td>
<td>San Francisco Municipal Railway</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJTC</td>
<td>New Jersey Transit Corporation</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCT</td>
<td>MTA-New York City Transit</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>Orange County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>Port Authority Transit</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>Regional Transportation District</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SacRT</td>
<td>Sacramento Regional Transit District</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTA</td>
<td>Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation Authority of Oregon</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMATA</td>
<td>Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Several of the above also operate other modes of transit and have other transportation roles.)