Transit Routes & Stops

Rutas y paradas de tránsito

转乘线路&车站

Salesforce Transit Center San Francisco

Image: Second state Image: Second state

MTC's Public Transit Coordination Authority & Linkage to Transit Transformation Action Plan

October 27, 2021

Action Plan's Desired Outcomes Are Closely Aligned with MTC's Current Authority

- Fares & Payment MTC is required by state law to adopt rules to promote coordination of fares and requires operators to have joint fare revenue agreements with connecting systems
- Customer Information MTC is required to adopt a Regional Transit Connectivity Plan
- Transit Network MTC is required by state law to adopt rules to promote coordination of schedules
- Accessibility MTC is required by federal law to produce and regularly update a coordinated human services transportation plan
- Funding MTC, as the Bay Area's metropolitan planning organization (MPO), is responsible for prioritizing and distributing state and federal transit funds as well as bridge tolls and express lane revenue. MTC is the assumed agency to place a future regional transportation measure on the ballot.

Long History of Transit Connectivity Legislative Efforts and Studies

- Since the 1970's, many laws, studies and projects have taken aim at improving the Bay Area's transit connectivity
- MTC has played a key role in these efforts and been granted various types of authority



60040

MTC's Authority Over Transit Funding & Coordination Evolved Over Decades

1970s

1970: MTC's enabling statute establishes responsibility for coordination of public transit

1972: SB 325 established Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding sources and authorized MTC to play a funding role in STA

1977: AB 1107 authorized MTC to allocate 25% of BART sales tax and required MTC to establish a **Transit Operating Coordinating Council (TOCC)**, to set regional transit service objectives and standards.

<u>980s</u>

1989: SB 602 enacted requiring MTC to adopt **rules and regulations to promote fare and schedule coordination** and required each agency to have a revenue sharing agreement with other agencies.

1990s

1996: SB 1474 authorized MTC to:

- 1) identify functions that could be consolidated;
- 2) recommend functional consolidation and reductions to duplicative service in regional transit corridors; and
- 3) condition STA funds on compliance with MTCestablished transit coordination requirements related to fares and schedules.

2000s

2003: SB 916 authorized RM 2 and required MTC to develop and adopt a Regional Transit Connectivity Plan and funds for an Integrated Fare Structure study.

2015: Last update to MTC **Res. 3866** which sets forth requirements to implement a regional transit network and applies to all funds subject to programming or allocation by MTC.



Direct Transit Connectivity Authority:

Statute allows MTC to establish and coordinate transit connectivity requirements and performance standards – and requires MTC to condition STA funds on compliance with rules to promote coordination of fares and schedules.

Indirect Authority: Control over Funding Decisions

 MTC's discretionary funding investments in Clipper, 511, Hub signage, etc. have helped achieve connectivity outcomes.

MTC Resolution 3866: Current Components

Contains three key elements:

- 1. Transit coordination implementation requirements
 - Clipper implementation
 - 511 transit program requirements
 - Regional transit hub signage
 - Maintenance of existing coordinated services, including paratransit and emergency response
 - Transit rider survey program
- **2.** Fare and schedule coordination
- **3.** Transit information at facilities



ACTION PLAN

MTC Resolution 3866: Transit Coordination Implementation Plan

- Last updated in 2015
- Transit agencies are required to comply as a condition of eligibility for transit funding administered by MTC.
- MTC covers regional costs while operators are expected to cover the cost to implement their own coordination roles and responsibilities.
- Funds may be withheld with fair warning where an operator fails to meet requirements or fails to exhibit good faith in trying to meet them.

Applies to all funds subject to programming or allocation by MTC including, but not limited to:

- ✓ State Transit Assistance (STA)
- ✓ Transit Development Act (TDA)
- ✓ Regional Measure 2 (RM2)
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality/Surface Transportation Program (STP/CMAQ)
- ✓ Federal transit formula funds

MTC Resolution 3866: Example Fare Migration From Paper Tickets To Clipper

- A clear timeline for when paper fare media was to be phased out was incorporated into Resolution 3866 in 2010.
- MTC issued warning letter when BART missed a deadline and subsequently withheld funds while working out an updated timeline.

25.000.000 20,000,000 15,000,000 **Transition of** 10.000.000 **43 Paper Passes** to Clipper Only 5,000,000

2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019

Monthly Clipper Transactions

Resolution 3866: Comparison with MTC Authority

| Statutory Authority | In Resolution 3866? | Comments |
|---|------------------------|--|
| Regional Transit Connectivity Plan (improved fare collection, minimize transfer times at hubs, schedule coordination, trip planning) | Included | Authority includes any item that improves transit connectivity New provisions may be warranted, such as related to real-time and mapping/wayfinding |
| Adopt rules to promote coordination of fares and schedules for all public transit systems within MTC's jurisdiction | Limited | Clipper-related rules are included but very limited on fare policy No provisions related to schedule coordination |
| Require joint fare revenue sharing agreement with connecting systems | Limited | Requires every operator to have a "joint fare revenue sharing agreement with connecting systems" (i.e., a transfer policy) |



Resolution 3866: Comparison with MTC Authority

| Statutory Authority | In Resolution 3866? | Comments |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Coordinated transfers between systems | Not included | No provisions related to transfers included |
| Recommend functions that could be consolidated to improve efficiency; improvements to reduce duplicative service and improve coordination across transit system boundaries | Not included | New provisions may be warranted related to service coordination and efficiencies MTC's Transit Sustainability Project of 2012 focused on efficiency and service performance; its recommendations were incorporated into Resolution 4060. |

Successes, Limitations, and Opportunity

Some Successes: MTC has delivered some meaningful, long-lasting transit connectivity successes, most notably with Clipper, 511 and Hub Signage.

•1 L **Limitations:** No specific policies have been adopted on fares, transfers, revenue sharing or schedule coordination. Enforcing coordination requirements is challenging for many reasons. Currently, **implementation** depends on cooperation of operators.



Opportunity: MTC hasn't fully utilized its transit coordination authority to date. The consensus and trust built among transit operators and MTC during Blue Ribbon process creates a unique **opportunity (arguably, a responsibility)** to update Resolution 3866 with new policies to provide riders with a simpler, more unified, and more equitable Bay Area transit experience.

Risks if Policies are Not Aligned to Support Action Plan

- Lack of clear benchmarks and timelines may delay or prevent implementation of Action Plan items.
- Lack of rapid progress on the customer-facing changes needed to win back and expand the region's transit riders will suppress fare revenue and erode political support needed to secure future funds, ultimately jeopardizing transit service that existing riders depend upon.



Resolution 3866: Moving From Consensus to Commitments

Potential Additions

- Deadlines to implement selected fare integration options
- Milestones for incorporation of regional mapping & wayfinding standards
- Milestones and standards for availability of reliable real-time transit information
- Set new requirements to help ensure improved schedule coordination among operators (e.g. syncing up "sign-ups") begun during COVID is sustained over long run
- Sustain hub transfer optimization efforts



Statutory Authority Benefits from Cooperative Partnerships

- For example, changes to Resolution 3866 require consultation with transit operators when defining new coordination requirements or updating existing ones.
- Blue Ribbon effort has further evolved this collaboration

Resolution 3866 Update Process



Image: Constraint framework Image: Constraint framework

Spotlight: Fare Coordination and Integration

Fare Integration Tiers

The fare integration business case assessed the benefits, costs, and requirements associated with increasing tiers of fare policy integration in the Bay Area.



Spotlight – Fare Integration Case Study

Scenario: No-cost local transfers and reduced cost regional transfers for riders transferring between systems.

Most operators support implementation of Tier 2 but are concerned about revenue impacts; would like to secure new funding to offset impacts. A few don't consider this as a priority for riders of their local routes. There is an urgency to deliver the benefits to riders and not delay the Next Generation Clipper schedule.

| Benefits and | Outcomes |
|--------------|----------|
|--------------|----------|

+27,000 new daily transit riders

Investment of \$2.25 per new rider

More cost effective than all but two transit projects in Plan Bay Area 2050

A Big Win for Low-Income Households

52% of riders who transfer live in households with ≤ \$50,000 income

71% in households with ≤ \$75,000 income

How Does Policy Measure Up Against Key Elements Necessary for Successful Implementation?

Public Support

• Strong public and political support; rigorous analysis and business case

Technical Capacity

- Feasible on Clipper
- Mechanics require operator expertise

Financial Resources

- Feasible in near-term, pending approval
- Longer term sustainability more uncertain

Authority

 Shared – MTC has clear authority over transit fare policy; transit agency boards retain fare setting authority

Approaches For Implementation



- Proceed with willing operators
- Delay deployment until all operators agree
- Link participation in program with regional discretionary (e.g. STA, TDA, AB 1107, RM 2) funds; funding availability subject to compliance with Resolution No. 3866 (coordination requirements)

Mandate



Discussion Questions

- How should the Commission use its authority to help implement the Action Plan?
- Should Resolution 3866 be updated to support the Action Plan?
- Is it reasonable to expect transit operators to share the cost of achieving a customerfocused policy, such as the Tier 2 proposal?

TRANSIT TRANSFORMATION

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/TransitActionPlan