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Overview

• One of several USDOT agencies
• Primary federal funding source for public transportation – 49 USC Ch. 53
• HQ/ten regional offices ~500 employees
• ~$11-15B in grants obligated annually ( ~$1.2-1.7B via 400+ grants in R5)

Region 5-Chicago

• Planning and Program Development
  – FHWA/FTA oversee state/metropolitan transportation planning process
  – Planning Partners: State DOTs, MPOs, and transit operators
  – Transit Grants: Operating assistance, capital improvements, planning
• Program Management Oversight – Monitor grantees use of funds
Economic Development
Measuring Tools

• Economic Impact Analysis – Effect of policy or project in terms of direct/indirect impact on employment, income, GDP.

• Cost-effectiveness Analysis – Compares alternatives and the direct costs of each to achieve a particular outcome.

• Positives/Negatives
  – Rational methodologies to compare value of projects/alternatives
  – Does not determine if overall society is better-off

• Alternative – Wider Economic Benefits
  – FHWA Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP2)
  – National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP)

* FHWA Web Site http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/economic_development/
Economic Development
Measuring Tools – Benefit-Cost Analysis

• Monetized comparison over the lifetime of a project from planning through construction and operation for an extended period of ~20-30 years

• Costs: design, engineering, NEPA, construction

• Benefits/Disbenefits: M&O, ecological, VMT, noise, emissions, travel time, accidents, residual value

• Discount Rate: Enables cash flow comparison over time

• Benefit/Cost Ratio: + generally indicates society better off

• Net Present Value (NPV): reflects monetized +/- value based on B/C ratio

• U.S. DOT TIGER: [http://wwdotgov/tiger/guidance](http://wwdotgov/tiger/guidance)
Economic Development
Measuring Tools – HUD/DOT Location Affordability Portal

- Combined costs of housing and transportation
- Transportation Cost Calculator
  - Users enter basic housing and travel data for particular areas
  - Use for cost comparisons
- Location Affordability Index
  - Download data by block groups, tracts, places, counties, CBSA for customized analysis.
  - Census ACS, TIGER, LEHD, LODES files; BLS-CES; NTD
  - Example scenarios on how to use the portal and data.
  - Other resources on housing/transportation interrelationship
- U.S. DOT TIGER: [http://www.locationaffordability.info/](http://www.locationaffordability.info/)
## Economic Impact of Public Transportation Investment

### Total Potential Long-term Impact per $1B Invested in Transit over 20 Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Economic Impact</th>
<th>Value of Economic Impact</th>
<th>Wage Equivalent</th>
<th>Job Equivalent</th>
<th>Corresponding Tax Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Spending Effect</td>
<td>$1.7 billion</td>
<td>$1.3 billion</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>$432 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Cost Savings Effect</td>
<td>$2.0 billion</td>
<td>$1.5 billion</td>
<td>28,931</td>
<td>$310 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Economic Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.7 billion</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.8 billion</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>$742 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference in impact between the “Base Case” scenario and higher transit investment scenario, expressed as a ratio per $1B of added annual investment in public transportation.

* Economic Development Research Group for American Public Transportation Association, May 2014

Economic Impact of Public Transportation Investment

Productivity Impacts

• Travel/vehicle ownership cost savings - consumer spending shifts (HH reduction of 1 car saves up to $10,000 annually)
• Reduced traffic congestion – further travel cost savings
• Business operating cost savings – worker reliability from reduced congestion
• Business productivity gains – access to broader labor markets
• Additional regional business growth – improved competitiveness

* Economic Development Research Group for American Public Transportation Association, May 2014
Conflicting Research on Urban Form

Auto-Centric Development

• **Driving the Economy**
  – Historic GDP and energy use growth are nearly identical across 177 countries
  – Bi-directional relationship between growth of VMT and GDP but primary from VMT to GDP
  

• **Sprawl: A Compact History**
  – Not new or just in the U.S.
  – Correlated with prosperity and improved quality of life
  – Discounts value of cities in Improving civic engagement
  – Reduces housing, congestion costs
  – Plenty of land, why restrict development?

  * R. Bruegemann, University of Chicago Press, 2005
Conflicting Research on Urban Form
Compact Development

• The Relationship Between VMT and Economic Activity*
  – Studied VMT-GDP relationship in 98 urban areas
  – In well-developed areas, reasonable to assume that VMT-reduction policies would not lead to significant drops in economic activity
  – In small urban/rural areas VMT-reduction might lead to less GDP
  * B. Starr McMullen, Oregon State University, Portland, OR, 2011

• Does Accessibility Require Density or Speed?*
  – Studied 50 largest metros-relation of density & accessibility by car
  – Time + $ cost of travel: Mobility-per mile:Accessibility-per destination
  – Used MPO trip flow tables to develop accessibility score
  – Density exerts a + accessibility effect via proximity more than 10X the negative effects of slower speeds/congestion related to density
Economic Benefits of Compact Urban Form

Reduced Transport Costs

- Study of 77 MSAs, including 88 UZAs in states of IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI (2000 and 2010 data).
- 12,000 total Census tracts
  - Calculated population density for each
  - Weighted each tract by proportion of pop. in individual MSA
- Purpose: Any WPD correlation with quality of life metrics?
- General Findings - Weighted population densities have statistically significant positive relationships and stronger correlation than standard densities with higher:
  - Education
  - High-tech Jobs
  - Transit Use
  - PCGDP
  - PCPI

Economic Benefits of Compact Urban Form

2010 Region 5 MSA PCVMT and PCPI

\[ y = -0.3822x + 38935 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.0191 \]
Economic Benefits of Compact Urban Form

2010 Region 5 MSA PCPI and Transportation Costs
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Economic Benefits of Compact Urban Form

Reduced Transport Costs

Weighted Population Density (clustering): 1% increase =

- +1.6% and +1.4% PCPI/PCVMT Ratio
- -1.4% and -1.3% transport cost as a proportion of PCPI (includes 100% personal vehicle and transit operating costs).
- Changes 2000 to 2010 insignificant.
- Most areas continued reductions in clustering.
- Difficulty in changing past development

*R. Arkell, Weighted Population Density as a Transportation Performance Metric, September 2014.*
### 2010 Average U.S. Household Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Average</th>
<th>2010 Region 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles per HH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles per Car</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita VMT</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>5,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA Cost Per Mile $0.6</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Costs</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Vehicle Costs</td>
<td>$5,769</td>
<td>$3,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HH Car Expense Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$6,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2010 Region 5 UZA Transit Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Average</th>
<th>2010 Region 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating/Capital Costs</td>
<td>$6,200,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>38,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Annual Transit Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$163</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CTA Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HH Transport Cost Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Performance Metrics
GRP and Per Capita Kilometers in Global Cities

Figure 3.9. Car use per capita (VKT) in 1990 and wealth (GRP per capita in 1990 U.S. dollars).

GRP and Per Capita Kilometers in Global Cities

37 Global Cities PCVMT and PCGRP Comparison - 1990 Data

\[ y = 3 \times 10^{-7}x^3 - 0.0044x^2 + 20.704x - 3459.4 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.4626 \]

Economic Efficiency Challenges

- Job and GDP increases confused with improving economic efficiency & quality of life – “If the goal is job creation, don’t give them shovels – use spoons.”
- Locally-based growth and development decision-making not taking into account regional impacts.
- Research shows people are attracted to more compact human-scale development but zoning often disallows it.
- Misperception that more “rooftops” and geographic expansion will solve economic woes. Transportation affordability not usually a performance measure.
- Misperception that declining densities are due to market-driven forces. Development patterns are due to the above elements and:
  - Transportation funded significantly by general revenues, i.e. subsidies or non-user fees – Roads ~50% (nation); Transit ~80% (Region 5).
  - Users not getting pricing signals to move closer to employment/amenities.
  - Lack of political will to fully charge users directly through higher fuel taxes, congestion pricing, or VMT charges.
Conclusions

Higher population densities, particularly higher polycentricity

• Lower combined housing/transportation costs as proportion of income.
• Not necessarily conducive to higher proportion of income for housing.
• The marginal benefits of increasing per capita VMT are not worth the costs much beyond about 4,000-6,000.
• Land use matters significantly in improving economic efficiency of the built environment and reducing unnecessary transportation.
• Access to at least one vehicle per household provides strong positive economic benefits, particularly for low-income families.
• HHs with two vehicles or more add little value to the economy.
• All proposed major local/regional development should be analyzed through comprehensive BCA and coordinated with MPOs. Generally, projects should be implemented when the following are evident:
  • Substantively positive B/C ratios, highest for chosen alternative
  • Increases in weighted population/employment densities
  • Reductions in PCVMT accompanied by PC increases in other modes
Solvency of Highway Trust Fund (HTF)

- Congress voted to transfer $10.8B into Highway Trust Fund (August 2014).
- This same bill also extends MAP-21 programs and policies through May 31, 2015.
- U.S. DOT remains committed to long-term funding for Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transit Account.
GROW AMERICA Act

- A four-year, $302 billion surface transportation authorization to replace MAP-21, which expires 9/30/14.
- Invests $72 billion in public transportation over 4 years—nearly a 70% increase over MAP-21.
- Builds on MAP-21 and strengthens commitment to safety, SGR, efficiency, performance, and underserved pop.
  - $87B transit SGR backlog
  - 65% of roads and 1 in 4 bridges needs significant repair
- Supplement Hwy Trust Fund/Transit Acct w/$150B via tax reform.
- Addresses the challenges of a nation expected to grow by 100 million residents by 2050.
Highlights of Program Changes

**New**

- Fixing and Accelerating Surface Transportation Program (5602)
- Rapid Growth Area Transit Program (5341)
- Local Hiring Provisions

**Modified**

- Bus and Bus Facilities (5339)
- State of Good Repair (5337)
- Human Resources and Training (Workforce Development) (5322)
- Metropolitan Transportation Planning (5303)
- Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (5310)
- Formula Grants for Rural Areas (5311)
- Public Transportation Safety (5329)

**Repealed or Consolidated**

- No MAP-21 programs are repealed or consolidated in the proposed GROW AMERICA Act
## Program Funding Levels Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 2014 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2015 President's Budget</th>
<th>GROW AMERICA TOTAL (FY 15-18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT FORMULA GRANTS (TF)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>$8,595,000,000</td>
<td>$13,914,400,000</td>
<td>$57,036,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>10,234,449</td>
<td>42,500,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Programs</td>
<td>128,800,000</td>
<td>131,819,706</td>
<td>547,410,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area Formula Grants</td>
<td>4,458,650,000</td>
<td>4,563,182,694</td>
<td>18,949,620,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities</td>
<td>258,300,000</td>
<td>264,355,823</td>
<td>1,097,800,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula Grants for Rural Areas</td>
<td>607,800,000</td>
<td>622,049,823</td>
<td>2,583,198,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Testing Facility</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,070,335</td>
<td>12,750,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Transit Institute /Public Transit Institute</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,117,225</td>
<td>21,250,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Transit Database</td>
<td>3,850,000</td>
<td>3,940,263</td>
<td>16,362,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Good Repair Grants</td>
<td>2,165,900,000</td>
<td>5,719,000,000</td>
<td>23,216,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus and Bus Facilities Grants</td>
<td>427,800,000</td>
<td>1,939,000,000</td>
<td>7,822,005,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing States and High Density States Formula</td>
<td>525,900,000</td>
<td>538,229,684</td>
<td>2,235,116,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Expenses 1/</td>
<td>105,933,000</td>
<td>114,400,000</td>
<td>492,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS (GF/TF) 2/</strong></td>
<td>1,942,938,000</td>
<td>2,500,000,000</td>
<td>10,775,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT RESEARCH AND TRAINING (GF/TF)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>48,000,000</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td>251,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM 3/ (TF)</strong></td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>80,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast (TF)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Growth Area Transit Program (TF)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>500,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$10,841,871,000</td>
<td>$17,649,400,000</td>
<td>$72,337,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Administrative Expenses under Transit Formula Grants account in FY 2015. Was previously funded from General Fund.
2/ FY 2014 enacted level assumes using at least $190 million of prior year balances to fully fund President’s request of $2.132 billion.
3/ Represents balance of funds available after sequestration and transfers.
# FTA Discretionary Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOFA</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
<th>Ending</th>
<th>Eligible Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-4-14</td>
<td>Bus/Bus Facilities-Ladders of Opportunity*</td>
<td>$100M</td>
<td>8-4-14</td>
<td>Buses, stations, maintenance facilities, BRT, &amp; other capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-4-14</td>
<td>TOD Planning Pilot Program</td>
<td>$20M</td>
<td>11-3-14</td>
<td>Projects accepted into FTA’s CIG program, PD phase OR initiated NEPA with CIG PD application forthcoming. Requires land use authority prtnr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-5-14</td>
<td>Innovative Public Transportation Workforce Dev Ladders of Opportunity</td>
<td>$7.9M</td>
<td>11-4-14</td>
<td>Focus on training for disadvantaged persons to enter transit workforce. Partner w/school, labor org, non-prof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*24 Projects Selected in 19 states
- City of Detroit – $25.9M for up to 50 hybrid buses
- Met Council/Metro Transit - $3.3M bus passenger/stop facilities
- Springfield IL MTD - $0.76M buses to expand service
- Bloom/Normal Transit - $2M to replace/expand buses/service
Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER)

- USDOT annual discretionary grant program since 2009
- $473.847M, FY2013; $600M FY2014
- Targets innovative highway/transit capital infrastructure projects
- $35M of $600M in FY2014 for planning projects
- Eligible Recipients: State/Local Governments
  - Pre-registration required; [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov)
  - September 12, 2014 Selections Announced
- Criteria
  - State of Good Repair – Improve condition/existing facilities
  - Economic Competitiveness – Improve efficiency/cost effectiveness/employment
  - Livability – Facilitates transport modal options (especially disadvantaged persons)
  - Environmental Sustainability – energy efficiency/reduction; avoid adverse impacts
  - Safety
  - Project Readiness - Technical/financial feasibility, NEPA/Design Completion
  - Innovation – Pricing, Technology, Congestion Management, etc.
- Partnerships – Public, Private, Non-profits
Reggie Arkell, AICP - Community Planner
U.S. DOT, Federal Transit Admin, Region 5
200 W. Adams Street, Suite 320
Chicago, Illinois  60606
312-886-3704
reginald.arkell@dot.gov
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## FTA Rulemakings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/3/13</td>
<td>National Safety Program and Asset Management</td>
<td>1-2-14 end</td>
<td>Safety: National and transit agency plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comment</td>
<td>SGR: Define metrics/processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2-14</td>
<td>Guidance on MPO Representation by Transit</td>
<td>10-1-14 in place</td>
<td>Must include transit rep. on MPO Policy Board. Exempt if MPO est. per state leg. Prior to 12-18-91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide/Nonmetro. &amp; Metropolitan Planning</td>
<td>10-2-14 end</td>
<td>Updated planning rules per MAP-21. Integrates performance-based planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comment</td>
<td>Oversight by FHWA/FTA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5303 / 5304 Planning

• Funds apportioned by state; $126M/FY2013; $129M/FY2014 (national)
• Eligible Recipients
  – States / Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO)
  – Sub-recipients: Local Governments
• Eligible Activities
  – Development of Required State/MPO Planning Documents:
    Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
  – Corridor Studies, Transportation Plans, Origin/Destination Surveys
  – Comprehensive Plans (land use plans) with transportation components
  – Project Environmental Reviews
Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program

- Funds apportioned by UZA; $4.8B in each FY2013/14 (national)
- Core public transportation investment program in urban areas
- Designated Recipients in urban areas
- Capital (80% federal)
  - Transit Stations, maintenance facilities, vehicles, paratransit service
  - Equipment, preventive maintenance, telecommunications, security
- Operating Assistance (50% federal)
  - 76-100 buses in peak (large UZAs): 50% of funds max.
  - <75 buses in peak: (large UZAs): 75% of funds max.
  - Small UZAs unlimited
- Transit Enhancements (80% federal)
  - Bus shelters, benches, signage, landscaping
  - Sidewalks within ½ mile of transit stops; Bike paths within 3 miles of transit stops
- Job Access/Reverse Commute
  - Targets low income/welfare recipients; Public/non-profits via designated recipient
  - Operating assistance: Shuttles, late night/weekend service, guaranteed ride home, demand response. Mobility management, equipment.
  - Coordinated Planning Process

Planning – Corridor studies; asset management/maint. plans; surveys; NEPA
Section 5311

- **Rural Areas Formula Program; Apportioned by state; $618M FY2014 (nat.)**
  - Core public transportation investment program in non-urban areas
  - 83.15% based on rural land area and population
  - 16.85% based on rural land area, vehicle revenue miles, number of low income persons
  - Rural Transit Assistance Program - Additional $10.6M
  - Designated Recipients – States
  - Sub-allocate per PMP to public/non-profits and intercity bus

- **Indian Reservations**
  - Formula - $25M
    - Vehicle Revenue Miles
    - Number of low-income persons
  - Discretionary - $5M

- **Appalachian Development - $20M Formula**

- **Capital, Operating and Planning**
Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities

- Funds apportioned by UZA; $421M/FY2013; $428M/FY2014 (national)
- Replaces discretionary (competitive) program with formula funds
- Public transportation capital projects (not preventive maintenance)
- 80% federal share
- Designated Recipients in large UZAs; States for small UZAs
- Operators agree on funding split
- Capital
  - Transit Stations/maintenance facilities (new & rehabilitated), vehicles
  - Equipment, telecommunications, security
5309 New Starts/Core Capacity Expansion

- New/expanded fixed Guideway Capital Investments
  - Rail
  - Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) – Separated ROW
- 10%+ Core capacity expansion projects now eligible
- Competitive Program $1.8B/FY2013; $2.1B/FY2014
- State and local government agencies eligible
- Process
  - Project Development/NEPA two year max.; AA eliminated
  - Establish local funding source/amount (~20-50% or more of project cost)
  - Project added to metropolitan transportation plan
  - FTA approves into engineering
- Rating Criteria
  - Mobility improvements – overall and transit-dependent ridership
  - Environmental benefits – air quality improvements from reduced VMT
  - Existing/future transit-supportive land uses
  - Annualized capital/operating cost per trip
  - Economic development – Transit supportive plans/policies/demonstrated success
Section 5309 New Starts

- **Small Starts**
  - Must have net capital cost of < $250M
  - Seek a federal share of < $75M

- **Very Small Starts**
  - Frequent Service: 10 min peak / 15 min off-peak
  - Service: Offered at least 14 hours/day
  - Existing corridor ridership: Exceeding 3,000/day
  - Total project cost: < $50M
  - Cost/Per Mile: < $3M (excluding vehicles)
Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors & Individuals with Disabilities

- The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) - Assures equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self sufficiency of individuals with disabilities.
- Funding targets special needs of transit dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation and ADA complementary paratransit.
- $257M each in FY2013 and FY2014
- Designated recipients: Large UZA operators/states; Sub.: Non-profits
- Min. 55% Capital; 45% Operating Assist.
- Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan
  - Call for projects
  - Vehicles, equipment, facilities, mobility management, operating
Section 5337 State of Good Repair

- Funds apportioned by UZA; ~$2.1B/FY2013; $2.2B FY2014
- Maintain fixed guideway infrastructure in urban areas
- Recipients – Operators of fixed guideway rail and BRT
- Replaced Fixed Guideway Modernization Program
- 80% Federal Share
- Transit Asset Management Planning
- Capital
  - Transit Stations, maintenance facilities, vehicles
  - Track, roadbed, bridges, catenary wire systems
Other FTA Grant Programs

- Section 5312 – Research, Development, Demonstration, & Deployment Projects
- Section 5314 – Technical Assistance and Standards Development
- Section 5324 – Emergency Relief Program
- Section 5329 – Safety
- Section 5331 – Alcohol and Controlled Substances Testing
Joint Development

• Use of FTA funds for a type of transit-oriented development (TOD) with non-transit components that have a physical or functional relation to public transportation.

• Public/Private Partnerships

• Provide for Revenue to Enhance Transit

• Activities
  – Planning/Environmental Review
  – Land Acquisition
  – Construction

• Potential Projects
  – Transit Mall
  – Renovations of Historic Transit Stations
  – Streetscaping – Sidewalks/Sidewalk Furniture/Shelters
  – Open Space
  – Integration of Daycare/Healthcare/Commercial/Retail
  – Parking
Kent Central Gateway Multi-Modal Facility
Portage Area Regional Transportation Authority
Kent, Ohio

- $20M DOT TIGER Grant
- 10-Bus Transfer Facility
- Joint Development – Retail Shops, Office Space
- LEED Silver Certified (Solar Panels & Geothermal)
- 300 Parking Spaces – Park-n-Ride
Normal Illinois Multimodal Transportation Center

- $22M DOT TIGER Grant
- 68,000 square foot, four story structure
- Joint Development – Food Court, Municipal offices
- LEED Silver Certified
- Amtrak, Bloomington-Normal Public Transit System, Intercity Buses, Taxis
Bloomington Transportation Center

- $8.96M project including $7.5M FTA 5307, 5309 and ARRA funding
- 10,000 sq. ft. including Monroe County emergency services dispatch on 2nd floor
- Opened August 20, 2014
Indianapolis Downtown Transit Center

- FTA approved a documented categorical exclusion environmental review.
- The $19.5M project includes $13.5M in FTA funding.
- Groundbreaking 9/25/14.