The Collin County Transit Study Project Advisory Committee meeting will begin shortly.

Please mute your microphones and enter your name and organization in the chat box.

Thank you.
COLLIN COUNTY TRANSIT PLANNING STUDY

Project Advisory Committee
10th Meeting

June 3, 2021
Agenda

• Meeting Protocols

• Meeting Context

• Study Focus Related to Implementation Timeline

• Levels of Investment
  ▪ Fixed-Route Example
  ▪ Transit Service Phasing Example

  ▪ Major Transit Investment Example
  ▪ Funding Levels of Investment

• Potential Roles

• Irving to Frisco Rail Corridor Update

• Next Steps
Meeting Protocols

- Please keep your microphone muted unless speaking
- Please enter your name and organization into the Chat Box
- Please utilize the Raise your hand feature to ask a question or make a comment; you may also use the Chat Box for questions and comments
- If joining by phone, please hold your questions and comments until specified times during presentation
Meeting Context

Collin County: Moving Transit Further to the North

- Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART)
- Cities Requesting Planning Assistance
- Transportation Management Association (TMA)
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Study Focus
Implementation Timeline
Study Focus – Implementation Timeline Characteristics

- Near-Term (1 - 5 years); Mid-Term (5 - 10 years); Long-Term (10+ years)
- Phasing of Low, Moderate, and High Investment Scenarios by Level of Investment Required
- Transit Service Type
  - Demand Response
  - Fixed Route
  - Premium Bus
  - Rail/Other High-Capacity Transit
### Study Focus – Implementation Timeline by Transit Service Type

#### Near-Term (1 - 5 years)
- **Level of Investment:** Low
- **City Type:** Basic Mobility, Emerging & High Growth, Developed & Mature
- **Transit Service:** Paratransit, Demand Response/Microtransit
- **Pilot Projects:** Fixed Route Bus

#### Mid-Term (5 - 10 years)
- **Level of Investment:** Moderate
- **City Type:** Emerging & High Growth, Developed & Mature
- **Additional Transit Service:** Fixed-Route Bus, Premium Bus
- **Pilot Projects:** Automated Shuttles

#### Long-Term (10+ years)
- **Level of Investment:** High
- **City Type:** Mostly Corridor-driven; Select Emerging & High Growth/Developed & Mature cities
- **Additional Transit Service:** Regional Rail, High-Capacity Transit, ATS/People Movers
Levels of Investment

Fixed-Route Bus between Multiple Jurisdictions
Route Funding and Governance Example

- **US 380 Cross-County Regional Connector**
- **Service To/From:**
  - Farmersville
  - Princeton
  - McKinney
  - Prosper
  - Denton(?)
- **Key Connections:**
  - I2F regional rail
  - Red Line extension
  - MOD and local fixed routes
  - Mobility Hubs
- **Potential Timeframe:** 2026-2031
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Route Governance Example

Governance Considerations:

- Route is inherently multi-jurisdictional
- Transit service is ongoing – monitoring, adjustments over time are typical
- Need and demand for service may vary between jurisdictions
- Multimodal connectivity to/from is essential – jurisdictional decisions in one area effect the entire line (land use, sidewalk infrastructure, related transit services, etc.)

Conclusion:

Ongoing coordination for governance structure is **highly desirable**
Funding Considerations:
- Same considerations as Governance
- Both operating costs and capital costs must be accounted for
- Cost-sharing:
  - % of route miles or hours
  - % of route stops/stations
  - % of ridership
  - Some combination of above
- Multi-year funding commitment from all parties is ideal

Conclusion:
Ongoing cooperative funding approach is **highly desirable**
### Funding and Governance – Achieving Desired Outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Government Annual Operating Budget (Independent Action)</th>
<th>Local Government Annual Operating Budget (Consortium) – Example- Collin County Transit</th>
<th>Local Government Corporation* w/ DART or DCTA</th>
<th>Existing Transit Authority Membership – DART or DCTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Approach</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Funding</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Local Trip Needs</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Countywide / Regional Trip Needs</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Implementation</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with RTC Policy</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☹</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*May require legal terminology within LGC agreement with Transit Authority to ensure seamless transit service connections with DART and DCTA services*
Levels of Investment

Transit Service Phasing
Potential Transit Service Phasing City of Frisco Example

• Due to funding and acceptance challenges, a city may elect to improve transit service over time in phases

• Phase 1 – Continue with On-Demand Response Service via contract for next 2 - 3 years to test public acceptance and ridership levels

• Phase 2 – Improve to Fixed-Route Bus Service for following 3 - 5 years as city continues to grow and public acceptance matures

• Phase 3 – Become member city of existing transit authority and join partnership in implementation of Irving to Frisco Regional Passenger Rail Project within next 8 - 10 years
Levels of Investment

Long-Range Transit/McKinney Line
Mobility 2045 Transit Recommendations
Long-Range Transit Planning

• Not an Imminent Focus, but needs Incorporating in Short-Term Planning Efforts

• Mobility 2045 Future Rail Corridors in Collin County
  ▪ Irving to Frisco Line
  ▪ McKinney Line
  ▪ Cotton Belt East Extension

• City of Lavon Inquiry
  ▪ Previous analysis shows little demand
  ▪ Review regional demand with Plan Update (next update 2022)
  ▪ TOD Guidelines Report
## McKinney Line – Mode Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>High-Intensity/ Premium Bus</th>
<th>Regional Rail</th>
<th>Light Rail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Can leave exclusive ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Slightly lower cost than rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers economic operations of rail at lower cost than LRT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No transfer at Parker Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>High-Intensity/ Premium Bus</th>
<th>Regional Rail</th>
<th>Light Rail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Requires transfer at Parker Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expected demand by 2045 may make bus less economical than rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May require transfer at Parker Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extension of current system not economical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unit Cost per Mile* | $30M - $40M | $40M - $50M | $75M - $100M |
| Total Cost* | $600M - $700M | $700M - $900M | $1,350M - $1,800M |

*Capital costs based on high-level comparative analysis
McKinney Line Regional Rail

• Regional rail line connecting McKinney to DART Red Line in downtown Plano
• 18 miles
• Ridership forecasts are 7k - 8k riders per weekday by 2045
# McKinney Line Regional Rail – Funding Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Est. Cost</strong></td>
<td>$700M - $900M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Funds (CIG)</strong></td>
<td>$350M - $450M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Match</strong></td>
<td>$350M - $450M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Match Funding Options:
- Sales Tax
- Bonding
- Joint Venture
- General Funds

Operating & Maintenance Cost Funding:
- Sales Tax
- Dedicated Funding Source
McKinney Line – Next Steps

Governance

• Join DART?
• Pay to contract service?
• Corridor-wide partnership between cities

Needs Detailed Corridor Analysis

• Modes
• Detailed ridership/operations
• Corridor improvements
• Funding
• Phasing
Levels of Investment

Funding Layering
## Cities by Transit Propensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Type</th>
<th>Basic Mobility</th>
<th>Emerging &amp; High Growth</th>
<th>Developed &amp; Mature</th>
<th>DART Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Names</td>
<td>Blue Ridge Lowry Crossing New Hope St. Paul Weston*</td>
<td>Anna Celina Farmersville* Josephine* Lavon* McKinney Melissa Nevada* Princeton Prosper Royse City</td>
<td>Allen Fairview* Frisco Lucas* Murphy Parker* Sachse Wylie</td>
<td>Dallas Plano Richardson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tier 2 Cities*
## Approximate Annual Operating Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Type</th>
<th>Demand Response Tier 1</th>
<th>Demand Response Tier 2</th>
<th>Fixed Route Tier 1</th>
<th>Fixed Route Tier 2</th>
<th>Premium Bus Tier 1</th>
<th>Premium Bus Tier 2</th>
<th>TOTAL COST (EST) TIER 1</th>
<th>Total Cost (Est) Tier 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Mobility</td>
<td>$1,882,200</td>
<td>$941,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,882,200</td>
<td>$941,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging &amp; High Growth</td>
<td>$1,882,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,994,000</td>
<td>$997,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,876,200</td>
<td>$2,879,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed &amp; Mature</td>
<td>$1,882,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,994,000</td>
<td>$997,000</td>
<td>$1,329,800</td>
<td>$664,900</td>
<td>$5,206,000</td>
<td>$3,544,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Level of Investment – Tier 1 City Example

Near-Term (1 - 5 years)

Level of Investment: $1.9M for all Tier 1 city types (Basic Mobility, Emerging & High Growth, Developed & Mature)
Transit Service: Paratransit, Demand Response/Microtransit

*Costs shown are annual operating costs

Mid-Term (5 - 10 years)

Level of Investment: $1.9M + $2.0M = $3.9M for Emerging & High Growth
$1.9M + $2.0M + $1.3M = $5.2M for Developed & Mature

Additional Transit Service: Fixed-Route Bus, Premium Bus

Long-Term (10+ years)

Level of Investment: High
City Type: Mostly Corridor-Driven; Select Emerging & High Growth/Developed & Mature Cities

Additional Transit Service: Regional Rail, High-Capacity Transit, ATS/People Movers
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Potential Roles
Potential Roles and Responsibilities

Transit Service in Collin County

Local Government
- Funder
- Collaborator
- Service Provider

Transit Authority
- Funder
- Collaborator
- Service Provider

County
- Convener
- Collaborator
- Funder

Regional
- Convener
- Collaborator
- Funder
- FTA Grantee

State
- Funder (Limited)

Federal
- Funder

Note: A local government corporation or multi-jurisdictional consortium could also play a role
Irving to Frisco Rail Corridor Update

- Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines
  Specific TOD-related suggestions and recommendations for each station area
- Review of Capital Cost and Operations & Maintenance Cost Estimates
  - Review of Capital Cost Estimates
- Review of O&M Cost Estimates
- Potential Cost Allocations to Cities
- Recognition of DART Member Cities vs. Non-Member Cities
- Funding for Rail Investments
  Options for Dedicated Revenue Sources for Capital and O&M
Next Steps

• Continue Development of Draft Final Report for PAC Review and Comment
• Distribute Collin County Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines for PAC Review and Comment
• Develop Transit Implementation Action Plan and Recommendations
• Complete Final Report by August
NCTCOG Team Contacts

**Stakeholder Engagement**

Rebekah Hernandez  
Communications Supervisor  
(682) 433-0477  
rhernandez@nctcog.org

**Project Management**

Michael Morris  
Transportation Director  
(817) 695-9241  
mmorris@nctcog.org

Brendon Wheeler  
Senior Transportation Planner  
(682) 433-0478  
bwheeler@nctcog.org

**Travel Demand**

Ying Cheng  
Principal Transportation Planner  
(817) 608-2359  
ycheng@nctcog.org
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