The Irving to Frisco Corridor Project Advisory Committee meeting will begin shortly.

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

Thank you.
IRVING TO FRISCO PASSENGER RAIL CORRIDOR STUDY

Project Advisory Committee
10th Meeting

June 17, 2021
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 feedback is requested at specified times during presentation
Agenda

• Meeting Context
• Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines Report
• Governance/Implementation Options
  ▪ Characteristics of Governance and Funding
  ▪ Governance Options
  ▪ Roles and Responsibilities
• Questions for Committee
• Collin County Transit Study Update
• Next Steps
Meeting Context
Five Keys to Preparing for Transit

- Governance
- Transit-Supportive Land Use
- Transit Service Planning/Development
- Funding
- Community Support
Irving to Frisco Rail Corridor Transit-Oriented Development

- Updated version
- Specific TOD-related suggestions and recommendations for each station area
- Draft version provided soon to PAC for review and comment
Irving to Frisco/Celina Funding and Governance

- **Service To/From:**
  - 3+ counties
  - Multiple cities

- **Corridor Ownership:**
  - BNSF
  - DART

- **Key Regional Connections:**
  - DART LRT
  - TRE
  - DART Silver Line

- **Key Local Connections at Each Station Area:**
  - Local Bus Routes
  - First/Last Mile Connections (bike, walk, shuttle)
  - Microtransit
  - And more…

- **Potential Timeframe:**
  - TBD
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Governance

- Route is inherently multi-jurisdictional
- Transit service is ongoing – monitoring, adjustments over time are typical
- Find balance between service needs between jurisdictions, including phasing
- Multimodal connectivity to/from is critical – jurisdictional decisions in one area effect the entire line (land use, sidewalk infrastructure, related transit services, etc.)
- Conclusion: Ongoing coordination for governance structure is **essential**
Funding

- Capital and operating may be phased in over time
- Shared commitment to multi-year funding from all parties
- Funding allocation methodology requires early, thoughtful approach
- Like a roadway, regional rail is essentially a permanent commitment
- Conclusion: Ongoing cooperative funding approach is essential
# Capital Cost Allocation by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Name</th>
<th>Alternative #1</th>
<th>Alternative #2</th>
<th>Alternative #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of Trip Origins</td>
<td>Capital Cost Allocation by City</td>
<td>Percentage of Trip Origins*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>$121,091,000</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celina</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$76,977,000</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>$92,638,000</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Branch</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$11,247,000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>$564,890,000</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>$221,679,000</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>$194,173,000</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Colony</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>$168,078,000</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosper</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>$102,197,000</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,552,970,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alt 2 & 3 Trip Origin Percentages determined through station activity and interpolation. Further analysis required.

**Reminders!**
- Costs shown are for full-scale operations at maturity
- Federal matching funds may be available to support up to 50% of capital costs shown here
## O&M Cost Allocation by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Alternative #1</th>
<th>Alternative #2</th>
<th>Alternative #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of Trip Origins</td>
<td>O&amp;M Cost Allocation by City</td>
<td>Percentage of Trip Origins*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>$1,890,900</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celina</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$1,202,100</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>$1,446,600</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Branch</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$175,600</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>$8,821,300</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>$3,461,700</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>$3,032,200</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Colony</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>$2,624,700</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosper</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>$1,595,900</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,251,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alt 2 & 3 Trip Origin Percentages determined through station activity and interpolation. Further analysis required.*

Reminder!
- Costs shown are for full-scale operations at maturity.
# Funding and Governance – Achieving Desired Outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Government Annual Operating Budget (Independent Action)</th>
<th>Local Government Corporation (In Coordination with Existing Transit Agency)</th>
<th>Existing Transit Authority Membership – DART or DCTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Approach</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with RTC Policy</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Network Integration</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatible with BNSF Requirements</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Initial Implementation</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Funding Sources</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Stability</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Roles and Responsibilities

Irving to Frisco/Celina Regional Rail

- Local Government
  - Funder
  - Collaborator
- LGC
  - Funder
  - Collaborator
- Transit Authority
  - Funder
  - Collaborator
  - Service Provider
  - FTA Grantee
- County
  - Convener
  - Collaborator
  - Funder
- BNSF
  - Collaborator
  - Capital Cost Partner
  - Potential Service Operator
- Regional
  - Convener
  - Collaborator
  - Funder
- State
  - Funder
  - (Limited)
- Federal
  - Funder

June 17, 2021
Questions for Committee

Should corridor capital and operating costs be broken out differently than suggested by the project team?

What do you see as an equitable approach?
Questions for Committee

Given the big lift of funding and operating a full-service passenger line in this corridor, is your city/organization interested in phasing service?

For example, by operating limited peak-period only service on weekdays, operating special event-focused service on select weekends, or some other less costly approach.
Questions for Committee

Is your city/community already actively engaged or interested in initiating station area planning activities?

Are there specific areas where NCTCOG could provide additional support to help make progress in these efforts?
Questions for Committee

All things considered (service, cost/funding, governance), what do you see as the preferred path forward for your community?

What are the biggest barriers that you believe would need to be overcome?
Collin County Transit Study Update

- Study Focus – Implementation Timeline Characteristics
- Fixed-Route Bus between Multiple Jurisdictions
  - Route Funding
  - Governance Model Options
- Transit Service Phasing
  - Grow Service Over Time with Funding
- McKinney Line Extension – Regional Rail
  - Funding Options
- Potential Roles & Responsibilities of Each Entity (City, County, Region, Transit Authority, State, Federal)
Next Steps

- Presentations to Policy Officials as requested
- One on one meetings as requested
- Prepare Draft Final Report

Final meeting is in August; date and time TBD.
NCTCOG Team Contacts

**Project Management**

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

Dan Lamers, P.E.
Senior Program Manager
(817) 695-9263
dlamers@nctcog.org

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

**Stakeholder Engagement**

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

**Travel Demand**

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

**BNSF Coordination**

Donald Parker
Senior Transportation Planner
(817) 608-2380
dparker@nctcog.org

Jeff Hathcock
Program Manager
(817) 608-2354
jhathcock@nctcog.org
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