



GDOT Follow Up to June 29th Presentation

Presented to
House Commission on Transit Governance and Funding
October 10, 2017



Overview of Follow Up Information

1. Georgia Counties Not Served by Public Transit
2. Use of Managed Lanes by Transit Riders
3. “Trending Urban” Transit Systems
4. Peer State Data on Sources of Transit Funding
5. Transit Services for Border Communities
6. Farebox Recovery Ratios for Transit Systems



1. Counties Not Yet Served by Public Transit

County Name	Population	County Name	Population	County Name	Population
Appling	18,391	Atkinson	8,287	Barrow	71,425
Candler	10,944	Charlton	13,044	Chattahoochee	12,350
Clinch	6,802	Coffee	43,129	Echols	3,997
Emanuel	22,861	Evans	10,813	Fayette	108,355
Franklin	22,044	Irwin	9,412	Harris	32,673
Houston	147,919	Jasper	13,543	Jeff Davis	14,986
Johnson	9,776	Lanier	10,398	Laurens	47,927
Madison	28,116	Marion	8,721	Monroe	27,005
Montgomery	8,973	Newton	102,201	Oconee	34,050
Oglethorpe	14,512	Schley	5,072	Stephens	25,595
Tatnall	25,477	Toombs	27,302	Treutlen	6,665
Washington	20,679	Webster	2,707	White	27,781
				Georgia Citizens Not Yet Served by Public Transit	1,003,932



1. Counties Not Yet Served by Public Transit

- 36 Counties with 1,003,932 people not served
- General Barriers
 - Perceived lack of need
 - Absence of sponsor agency to oversee transit
 - Constrained fiscal and human resources
 - Complexity of federal & state funding programs
- Statewide Transit Plan
 - Identifying strategies to reduce unserved population



2. Use of Managed Lanes by Transit Riders

Facility	Current No. of Transit Routes 2015	Current Annual Transit Boardings 2015	Estimated Transit Routes 2021	Estimated Annual Transit Boardings 2021	Projected Percent Change in Annual Boardings
I-85	5	335,000	7	376,000	12.2%
I-75/575 NW Corridor	4	204,000	6	498,000	144.1%
GA 400	1	67,000	2	72,000	7.5%

“Express buses on I-85 . . . constitute only 1.2% of vehicles using the HOT lane during the morning peak period, yet they carry 26% of the total HOT lane person throughput.” – Georgia Tech, 2013 HOT Lane Study





3. “Trending Urban” Transit Systems

- **At issue:**
 - Population growth adversely affecting FTA funding eligibility for rural county transit systems.
 - Urban designated areas in counties cannot be served by a FTA-funded Rural System.
 - No FTA funding programs to transition from Rural to Urban system
 - New Urban Systems can’t access FTA funding for two years
 - Must report service data to FTA NTD for two years
 - Estimated annual need of \$2.5 million to bridge the gap as these systems transition to urban
 - Impacts in Cherokee, Forsyth, Bartow, Henry and Columbia Counties
 - Reviewing population forecasts to identify future “trending urban” areas after the 2020 Census and prepare operators



4. Peer State Data on Transit Funding

State	FY 2015 State Transit Funding AASHTO	FY 2015 State Transit Funding NTD	Diff. Between AASHTO and NTD	2015 Pop. (in mils.)	2015 State Funding Per Capita	# of Rural & Small Urban Systems	State Transit Fund Source Details
GA	\$ 3.05 M	\$ 14.48 M	(\$ 11.43 M)	10.20	\$ 1.42	113	General Fund & Bonds
CO	\$ 14.00 M	\$ 6.86 M	\$ 7.14 M	5.45	\$ 1.26	36	100% from vehicle fees
FL	\$ 271.18 M	\$ 275.59 M	(\$ 4.41 M)	20.24	\$ 13.62	65	56% from gas tax, 26.7% from vehicle fees ⁴ ; 17.3% from rental car fees and state document stamps
IN	\$ 59.14 M	\$ 53.62 M	\$ 5.52 M	6.61	\$ 8.11	53	14.2% from general sales tax; 72% from general fund; 13.8% from personal property tax/electric rail fund
KS	\$ 11.00 M	\$ 8.94 M	\$ 2.06 M	2.91	\$ 3.07	105	100% from State Transp. Fund
KY	\$ 1.71 M	\$ 3.55 M	(\$ 1.84 M)	4.42	\$ 0.81	30	General Fund
LA	\$ 4.96 M	\$ 9.31 M	(\$ 4.35 M)	4.67	\$ 1.99	43	100% from gas tax

Source: AASHTO, Final Report 2017—FY 2015 Data Survey of State Funding for Public Transportation; FTA National Transit Database



4. Peer State Data on Transit Funding

State	FY 2015 State Transit Funding AASHTO	FY 2015 State Transit Funding NTD	Diff. Between AASHTO and NTD	2015 Pop. (in mils.)	2015 State Funding Per Capita	# of Rural & Small Urban Systems	State Transit Fund Source Details
MI	\$ 263.77 M	\$ 201.64 M	\$ 62.13 M	9.92	\$ 20.33	87	32% from vehicle rental fees; 27.2% from gas tax; 33.6% from other vehicle fees ⁴ ; 0.1% from interest income; 4.2% from general fund; 0.7% from bond proceeds; and 2.2% from other sources
MS	\$ 1.61 M	\$ 2.24 M	(\$.63 M)	2.99	\$ 0.75	21	100% from general fund
MT	\$ 0.33 M	\$ 0.75 M	(\$ 0.42 M)	1.03	\$ 0.73	45	22.4% from gas tax and 77.6% from vehicle fees ⁴
NE	\$ 4.87 M	\$ 5.30 M	(\$ 0.43 M)	1.89	\$ 2.80	65	100% from the general fund
NH	\$ 1.00 M	\$ 0.66 M	\$ 0.34 M	1.33	\$ 0.50	15	27.5% from bond proceeds and 72.5% from transportation development credits, i.e. toll credits



4. Peer State Data on Transit Funding

State	FY 2015 State Transit Funding from AASHTO	FY 2015 State Transit Funding from FTA NTD	Diff. Between AASHTO and NTD	2015 Pop. (in mils.)	2015 State Funding Per Capita	# of Rural & Small Urban Systems	State Transit Fund Source Details
NC	\$ 84.84 M	\$ 68.32 M	\$ 16.52 M	10.04	\$ 6.80	104	100% from trust fund
ND	\$ 6.45 M	\$ 5.90 M	\$ 0.55 M	0.76	\$ 7.77	34	100% from vehicle fees
OH	\$ 7.30 M	\$ 11.13 M	(\$ 3.83 M)	11.61	\$ 0.96	46	100% from general fund
OR	\$ 37.44 M	\$ 139.31 M	(\$101.87 M)	4.02	\$ 34.64	48	0.1% from income interest; 12.6% from general fund; 21.6% from bond proceeds; and 65.7% from misc. taxes
SC	\$ 6.00 M	\$ 10.65 M	(\$ 4.65 M)	4.89	\$ 2.18	25	100% from gas tax
TN	\$ 47.22 M	\$ 38.57 M	\$ 8.65 M	6.60	\$ 5.84	22	100% from gas tax
TX	\$ 30.34 M	\$ 49.41 M	(\$ 19.07 M)	27.43	\$ 1.81	67	100% from state highway funds
WI	\$ 110.73 M	\$ 119.19 M	(\$ 8.46 M)	5.77	\$ 20.67	65	100% from other fees and revenues
WY	\$ 2.60 M	\$ 0.39 M	\$ 2.21 M	0.59	\$.66	44	42.2% from interest income and 57.8% from statutory fees
AVG	\$ 46.17 M	\$ 48.87 M	(\$ 2.70 M)	7.06	\$ 7.16	55	--

FY15 Peer State Transit Funding											
State	FY15 Funding	General Sales Tax	Vehicle Rental & Sales Tax	Gas Tax	Vehicle Registration, License, Title Fees	Diesel Tax	General Fund	Trust Fund	Bonds	Lottery	Other
Arizona	\$11 M									✓	FY16 for AZ only
California	\$2.9 B	✓				✓			✓		Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund
Colorado	\$14 M				✓						
Florida	\$271 M			✓	✓						Rental Car Charge and Doc. Stamps
Georgia	\$13 M						✓		✓		\$75 M GO Transit Bond
Illinois	\$3.5B	✓							✓		
Minnesota	\$403M		✓				✓				\$102M General Fund
N. Carolina	\$85M		✓	✓	✓						
Ohio	\$7M						✓				
Tennessee	\$47M			✓							
Texas	\$30M							✓			
Virginia	\$299M			✓				✓			
Washington	\$86M		✓		✓	Source: AASHTO, Final Report 2017—FY 2015 Data Survey of State Funding for Public Transportation					Recordation Tax



5. Transit Services for “Border Communities”

- **The Challenge:** transit service typically stops at state borders, even in “border communities” like Chattanooga, Augusta, Columbus, and Savannah
- GDOTs Statewide Transit Plan will coordinate closely with bi-state MPOs and adjacent states to identify solutions





6. Farebox Recovery Ratios for Transit Systems

- Measures the extent to which user fares cover the total operating cost of the service
- Transit agencies report farebox recovery ratio to FTA by mode

Mode	National Average 2014		Georgia Average 2014	
	Farebox Recovery Ratio	No. of Transit Systems Reporting	Farebox Recovery Ratio	No. of Transit Systems Reporting
Commuter Bus	43%	84	37%	3
Local Bus	16%	687	19%	14
Commuter Rail	40%	17	--	--
Heavy Rail	39%	10	35%	1
Light Rail	26%	16	--	--

Source: National Transit Database, 2014



Questions?

For More Information:

**Carol L. Comer
Director, Intermodal Division
Georgia Department of Transportation
ccomer@dot.ga.gov
404-347-0573**