

## MEMORANDUM

TO MTC, Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force

FROM Tamim Raad (Access Planning), Kate Howe (VIA)

DATE June 25, 2021

SUBJECT Regional Network Manager Structures and Evaluation Criteria

### Purpose

This memo provides a brief summary of the Consultant Team's proposed structures and criteria for the Regional Network Manager (RNM) Evaluation. This memo accompanies a slide presentation to be given 06-28-2021 to the Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force which contains more specific detail on the draft Network Management Structures to be considered and criteria for their evaluation.

### Background

The consultant team outlined a [method and approach for undertaking an evaluation of Regional Network Management Structures](#) at the BTRTF meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> of May. Following this approach, the Consultant team has continued to build upon the work that the Task Force has done to identify, group, define, and prioritize regional network management roles and responsibilities.

Since the May meeting, the Consultant Team has undertaken an evaluation of the work to date, including a review of Task Force and stakeholder documents. The Team also had discussions with a range of Task Force participants to understand their interests and ideas for better regional network management.

One of the activities the Consultant Team undertook was to further probe the delineation of specific decision accountabilities within the various areas of network management responsibility. Within each of the functional areas' roles and responsibilities (e.g., bus transit priority) there are a range of actions and decisions that need to be made at the network management level, operator level and municipal level to implement. Understanding who does what, is important because it has implications for the structures and authorities needed to deliver network management.

These dimensions of decision responsibility were explored at the ad-hoc workshop on the 16<sup>th</sup> of June. The outcomes from this workshop helped to clarify what, and resolve where, decision authority might rest in when developing proposed structural options. Out of these discussions, and combined with our earlier information gathering, the consultant team identified two recurring ***dimensions of distinction*** common to the various submitted proposals for network management structures. These dimensions are:

- The degree to which the structure formalizes Network ***Management*** activities within a collective group, or whether a ***Network Manager*** centralizes authority within an identifiable entity; and
- Whether or not the RNM roles and responsibilities lie with an ***independent operator*** group, or whether they are closely associated with, or housed within ***MTC***.

### Network management structure options

The consultant team has used these dimensions of distinction to synthesize common aspects of submitters proposals into four conceptual proposals with the following contrasting distinctions:

1. **Operator-based Network Management body**, that works *within the operators'* existing legislative and authority framework, under primary direction of the Bay Area' operating entities.
2. **MTC-based Network Management body** works *within the MTC's* existing tools and authorities, with decisions guided by a RNM Council and decisions made by the MTC.
3. **New Network Manager, aside MTC** – *an altogether new organization* with direct accountability, legal authority, and organizational resource to implement full suite of RNM activities.
4. **New Network Manager, within MTC** – *a new organizational unit within the MTC* with MTC providing direct accountability, legal authority, and organizational resource to implement full suite of RNM activities.

### Design options and derivatives

Each structure option allows for the possibility of multiple design refinements. These may include and are not limited to:

- Refining to the specific number, or composition of board representatives
- For options not requiring legislation at inception (options 1 or 2), the opportunity for specific legislative 'tweaks' to augment authorities if/when possible; or
- The possibility of incorporating some operating responsibilities (owner-operator role) at a later stage either through new operating functions within the entity or through partial or full operational inclusions with the RNM.

For the purposes of evaluation, the multiple refinements and permutations will not be attributed to a specific option but will be evaluated for forward-compatibility as part of this assessment and scored appropriately.

### Evaluation Criteria.

The network management structures will be evaluated against a set of criteria to assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of each structure. These criteria have been designed to support comparative assessment of options against key RNM structure objectives, and support dialogue related to consequences and trade-offs. The proposed list of criteria is contained within the presentation accompanying this memo.

### Assessment and next steps

With a confirmed set of alternative structures and assessment criteria, the Consultant Team will conduct an analysis focusing on the respective decision accountabilities required to achieve against the identified activities and priorities. The consultant team will present an initial high-level qualitative comparison of the alternatives against the evaluation criteria, including trade-offs at the July Task Force Meeting.