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Study Purpose

Identify, analyze, prioritize and develop a comprehensive approach to planning and implementing transit services outside of transit authority services areas.

- Implement Strategic and Near-Term Strategies
- Review Transportation Options
- Identify Funding Options
Area of Focus:
• Non-Trinity Metro Service Area
## Study Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Focus</th>
<th>NCTCOG Region</th>
<th>NCTCOG Region</th>
<th>Tarrant County (outside Trinity Metro service Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Focus</td>
<td>All Users</td>
<td>Vulnerable Users</td>
<td>All Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Types</td>
<td>Car, High Intensity Bus, Commuter Rail</td>
<td>Bus, Demand Response, and Paratransit</td>
<td>Bus and Demand Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Long Range</td>
<td>Short-Medium Range</td>
<td>Short-Medium Range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mobility 2045**

**Access North Texas**

**Tarrant County Transit Study**
Study Progress

Existing Conditions

Scenario Development

Funding & Finance

Implementation

Public Engagement
Study Progress

- **Existing Conditions**: What transit and shared mobility options are currently available in Tarrant County?
- **Scenario Development**: Based on demographics and travel patterns, what new types of shared mobility options are feasible?
- **Funding & Finance**: What types of funding options are available in communities not served by Trinity Metro, DCTA, or DART?
- **Implementation Plans**: What are the next steps for communities to increase the number of shared mobility options available?
SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS
Area of Focus:
- Non-Trinity Metro Service Area

Baseline Budget Target
- $18.0 to $18.5 million
- Based on current per capita Trinity Metro and Arlington Via transit expenditures
Baseline Budget Target

Upper Bound
Trinity Metro O&M Cost per Capita
$25.59

Lower Bound
Arlington Via O&M Cost per Capita
$5.48


Total Tarrant County Unserved Population & Employment
1,200,000

Target Annual Budget
$18.5 M
Annual per Pop+Emp
$15.54

Scenario Development

- **Local Priorities** (served by local fixed-route, circulators, on-demand modes)
  - Population / Employment Density
  - Transportation Disadvantaged Communities

- **Regional Priorities** (served by regional & commuter express modes)
  - Employment Density
  - Key Activity Centers
  - Regional Trip Flows
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tarrant County Transit Study Service Type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Local Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Mobility-On-Demand</td>
<td>Connects lower-density areas; can provide connections to rail or express services</td>
<td>ZipZones, Via, GoLink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Fixed-Route</td>
<td>Connects close medium-density areas, for all trip purposes</td>
<td>Trinity Metro local routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Fixed-Route</td>
<td>Connects far-apart medium-density areas, especially job centers</td>
<td>Trinity Metro express routes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL SERVICE
Local Services Needs
Approach

Categorize transit service needs potential based on:

- Population and employment densities
- Equity population (minority population and low-income household) densities
Local Services Needs Approach

Combined Population and Employment Density Characteristics
- Tarrant County Average: 5 per acre
- Unincorporated areas: <1 per acre
- White Settlement, Watauga, Bedford: >10 per acre

Highest priority focus is on high density areas currently not served by transit
High Service Needs

- Bedford
- Burleson
- Euless
- Everman
- Forest Hill
- Grand Prairie
- Haltom City
- Hurst
- Mansfield
- Richland Hills
- River Oaks
- Sansom Park
- Watauga
- White Settlement

Existing MOD Zones

Existing Svc. Area

Does Not Meet Threshold
High + Medium Service Needs

**HIGH NEEDS**
- Bedford
- Burleson
- Euless
- Everman
- Forest Hill
- Grand Prairie
- Haltom City
- Hurst
- Mansfield
- Richland Hills
- River Oaks
- Sansom Park
- Watauga
- White Settlement

**MEDIUM NEEDS**
- Azle
- Benbrook
- Pantego
- Saginaw

- Existing MOD Zones
- Existing Svc. Area
- Does Not Meet Threshold
High + Medium + Low Service Needs

**HIGH NEEDS**
- Bedford
- Burleson
- Euless
- Everman
- Forest Hill
- Grand Prairie
- Haltom City
- Hurst
- Mansfield
- Richland Hills
- River Oaks
- Sansom Park
- Watauga
- White Settlement

**MEDIUM NEEDS**
- Azle
- Benbrook
- Pantego
- Saginaw

**LOW NEEDS**
- Colleyville
- Keller
- Lake Worth
- Southlake

Existing MOD Zones
Existing Svc. Area
Does Not Meet Threshold
REGIONAL SERVICE
Regional Service Needs

- Mobility 2045 Rail Corridors
  - Mansfield to Fort Worth
  - Southwest TexRail
  - Cleburne Line to Fort Worth
- Mobility 2045 High Intensity Bus Corridors
  - IH30 from Fort Worth to Dallas
  - IH35W from Fort Worth to Denton
Major Tarrant County Employment Centers

Jobs estimates from Remix
High Service Needs Regional Service Expansion

- Mansfield-Fort Worth
- SW Tarrant-Fort Worth
- West Tarrant-Fort Worth
- Arlington-Fort Worth
High + Medium Service Needs
Regional Service Expansion

- Mansfield-Fort Worth
- SW Tarrant-Fort Worth
- West Tarrant-Fort Worth
- Arlington-Fort Worth
- North Tarrant-Keller-Grapevine
High + Medium + Low Service Needs
Regional Service Expansion

• Mansfield-Fort Worth
• SW Tarrant-Fort Worth
• West Tarrant-Fort Worth
• Arlington-Fort Worth
• North Tarrant-Keller-Grapevine
• Mansfield-Arlington-Centreport
• **Scenario 1**
  • **Local**: High Service Needs
  • **Regional**: High + Medium + Low Service Needs

• **Scenario 2**
  • **Local**: High + Medium Service Needs
  • **Regional**: High + Medium Service Needs

• **Scenario 3**
  • **Local**: High + Medium + Low Service Needs
  • **Regional**: High Service Needs

Scenario 1  Scenario 2  Scenario 3

More Regional Service

More Local Service
FINAL DRAFT SCENARIOS
Scenario 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>34,300</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279,300</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approx. Cost = $18.1 million
(74% local/26% regional)
### Scenario 2

#### Service Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>271,100</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295,200</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approx. Cost = $18.4 million**  
*(82% local/18% regional)*

**Legend:**
- Blue: On-Demand
- Striped: Existing MOD Zones
- Green: Fixed-Route + On-Demand
- Purple: Regional
### Scenario 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>276,100</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>292,200</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approx. Cost = $18.3 million**  
**(88% local/12% regional)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azle</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benbrook</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleson</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleyville</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euless</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everman</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Hill</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haltom City</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantego</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Hills</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oaks</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sansom Park</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southlake</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watauga</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Settlement</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
<td>On-Demand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Recommendations by Scenario**

- **On-Demand**
- **Fixed Route**
- **Regional**
SCENARIO COMPARISONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Question Answered</th>
<th>Measurement Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Where are routes and services located?</td>
<td>Population near transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs near transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>How well do routes and services reflect trip patterns?</td>
<td>Percent of trips completable (start to finish) on transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>How many people might use the service?</td>
<td>Estimated ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Are trips made by equity groups well-represented?</td>
<td>Percent of equity groups in access and coverage metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>Measurement Used</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Population near transit</td>
<td>ReMix; derived from American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs near transit</td>
<td>ReMix; derived from LEHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Percent of trips (start to finish) completable on transit</td>
<td>Location-based services data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>Estimated ridership</td>
<td>NCTCOG Model &amp; Pilot Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Percent of equity groups in access and coverage metrics</td>
<td>Location-based services data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mobility on Demand Zone
New Accessibility

(74% local/26% regional) (82% local/18% regional) (88% local/12% regional)
Local Fixed Route New Accessibility

Scenarios:

1. (no new local fixed-route services)
   - Population: 0
   - Employment: 0
   - (74% local/26% regional)

2. Scenario 2
   - Population: 12,700
   - Employment: 3,200
   - (82% local/18% regional)

3. Scenario 3
   - Population: 97,000
   - Employment: 25,100
   - (88% local/12% regional)
Local Fixed Route Transit
New Equity Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Pop.</td>
<td>Low Inc. Pop.</td>
<td>Minority Pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no new local fixed-route services)</td>
<td>(74% local/26% regional)</td>
<td>(82% local/18% regional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Employment Center Accessibility

New Express Service Access to Downtown Ft. Worth (46,800 jobs)

Existing Population with Express Transit Service Accessibility = 482,000

New Express Service Access to Central Arlington (36,900 jobs)

Existing Population with Express Transit Service Accessibility = 0
Regional Employment Center Accessibility

New Express Service Access to DFW Airport (55,000 jobs)

Existing Population with Express Transit Service Accessibility = 205,400

New Express Service Access to Centreport (48,900 jobs)

Existing Population with Express Transit Service Accessibility = 97,400
Other key performance metrics:

- Of all the trips taken from a region, how many can be taken on proposed fixed route and shared mobility services?
- Of all the trips taken by equity groups, how many can be taken on proposed fixed route and shared mobility services?
- How many people do we expect to use the new services?

- Demand Response
- Local Fixed Route
- Express Fixed Route
Other key contexts:

What is the **purpose** of the service?

To enhance access? Equity? Economic development?

How well do these services **connect** to existing and future regional transit options?

How well do these services provide **right-sized** options to non-urban areas of Tarrant County?
FUNDING AND FINANCE
Funding and Finance

What types of services make sense for local needs? What partnerships are needed?

What funding mechanisms are available to pay for transit and shared mobility services?

How much money can be expected from fares and state/federal sources?

What requirements are there to qualify for external funding sources?
Municipal Typology

Purpose for Typology

• Identify similar regions
• Determine coordinated funding mechanisms and programs
• Determine potential cost share by municipal type
A municipality that is currently not served by public transportation. Typically, not adjacent to current transit-served areas.

**Municipalities:**
- Azle
- Everman
- Haslet
- Lakeside
- Newark
- Pelican Bay
- Reno
- Trophy Club
A municipality that has self-managed public transportation within the municipal boundaries. Municipality is not a member of a transit authority.

**Municipalities:**

- Arlington
A municipality served by transit provided by Trinity Metro. Maybe a member city or utilizing a subscription of services through Trinity Metro.

**Municipalities:**
- Fort Worth
- Blue Mound
- North Richland Hills
- Grapevine
- Forest Hill
- Crowley
A municipality that borders a central city where public transportation is easily extended due to close proximity to the system.

Municipalities:

- Bedford
- Benbrook
- Dalworthington Garden
- Edgecliff Village
- Euless
- Haltom City
- Hurst
- Kennedale
- Lake Worth
- Pantego
- Richland Hills
- River Oaks
- Saginaw
- Sansom Park
- Watauga
- Westworth Village
- White Settlement
- Grand Prairie
- Keller
- Westlake
- Southlake
- Flower Mound
- Colleyville
A municipality that contains a walkable urban place, which will be a priority link in the transit system. Currently undergoing a rail or bus transit planning process.

Municipalities:
- Burleson
- Mansfield
Analysis Process for Funding Mechanisms

1. **Level of Appropriateness** (based on current financial standing)
   - Local option sales tax available
   - Fiscal constraints

2. **Level of Partnership** (in order to realize transit funding)
   - Transit-specific special development needs
   - Potential for transit-oriented development

3. **Qualitative Assessment** (special circumstances)
   - Political constraints
   - Development potential constraints
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rural Community</th>
<th>Self-Sufficient Community</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Fringe System</th>
<th>Future Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Municipality, Transit Authority or County)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Contributions</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Increment Reinvestment Zone</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Reinvestment Zone</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Contributions</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll Fee Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for Service (VIA, ZipZone, etc.)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fees / Impact Fees</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds/CIP programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Improvement Districts</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Potential Funding Mechanism by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rural Community</th>
<th>Self-Sufficient Community</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Fringe System</th>
<th>Future Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local (Municipality, Transit Authority or County)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Participation (Sponsorship by Corporations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Participation (Sponsorship by Institutions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Motor Vehicle Registration Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Fare Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Development Agreements/Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Transportation Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Transit Revenues (Advertising &amp; Concessions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Auxiliary Transit Revenues (Advertising & Concessions) is a County-wide initiative in coordination with State and Regional entities.*
Analysis Per Scenario

Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Cost
Farebox Revenue

Gap
Financing Need

Traditional Funding Solution
Innovative Funding Solution

Sales Tax
General Funds
Subscriptions

TIRZ & PID
Development Fees
Sponsorships
Analysis Per Scenario

Traditional Funding Solution

- Subscriptions
- Sales Tax
- General Funds

Innovative Funding Solution

- Development Fees
- Sponsorships
- TIRZ & PID

Qualitative Analysis of Impact (equity, value capture, etc.)

Recommended Funding Solution By Municipal Type
IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING
Implementation Plan: Overview

- Establish **menu of options** for shared mobility services including:
  - Direct operation by cities
  - Contracting with companies (like Lyft and Via)
  - Purchased service agreement with agencies like Trinity Metro

- Identify **legal requirements and best practices** for providing service

- Provide cities and towns with tools to **match options with local needs**
Implementation Plan: Next Steps

- Conduct **peer interviews** to draw from examples in the region:
  - Trinity Metro ZipZones
  - DART GoLink
  - Arlington/VIA partnership

- **Review** policies, practices, and standards

- **Build** menu of options

- **Connect** with cities
Next Steps

- Complete Scenario Comparison Analysis (March)
- Final meetings with stakeholders (April)
- Layout and review (May)
- Final report – to be available on website (June)
Q1: Are you more interested in:

1. Local travel options to reach destinations in your immediate community, or
2. Regional travel options to reach more distant destinations around the metroplex?
Q2: Would an on-demand ride to the nearest train station (TRE, TexRail, DART) cause you to use those services more?
### Scenario 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>34,300</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279,300</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approx. Cost = $18.1 million**  
(74% local/26% regional)

- **On-Demand**
- **Existing MOD Zones**
- **Fixed-Route + On-Demand**
- **Regional**
Scenario 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>271,100</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295,200</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approx. Cost = $18.4 million (82% local/18% regional)
### Scenario 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>276,100</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>292,200</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approx. Cost = $18.3 million
(88% local/12% regional)
Thank you!

www.facebook.com/tarrantcotransit

www.tarrantcountytransitstudy.com