The main focus of this study will be:

- Existing conditions
- Governance structure
- Peer Analysis: Identification and evaluation of peer regions to understand the range of possibilities for transit governance. Results will inform recommendations on options for transit governance.

2 Scope of Work

Task 0. Kickoff Meeting and Project Management

The AECOM Team will prepare for a virtual kickoff meeting with TJPDC to set the course of the work assignments and provide feedback and guidance on the objectives, key issues, constraints, and needed actions under this contract. The purpose of the kickoff meeting is to coordinate the planning processes with the project partners and to create project control procedures for the duration of this project.

The objectives of the meeting are to:

- Identify the member roles of the project team and the project stakeholders.

- Discuss the elements of the work plan, milestones, and schedule.

- Discuss the project goals, objectives, and study expectations.

- Identify any previous studies, data needs, resources, and methods to collect additional data.

- Identify the preferred methods of communication with TJPDC

Our experience indicates that frequent communication is vital to the success of the project. We recommend weekly or bi-weekly virtual meetings. These meetings will be attended by TJPDC and key project staff.

AECOM has strong internal controls and project management tools in place to support the completion of quality products on-time and within budget. Project Managers maintain monthly project management forms linked to our financial recordkeeping systems and work closely with our clients at all steps in the process in order to ensure quality, timeliness, and cost efficiency.

After the kickoff meeting, the AECOM Team will develop a Project Management Plan (PMP) for the TJPDC Team's review. AECOM will update the Plan as needed throughout the study process.

> ➲ Deliverables:
> - Project Plan with updated schedule
> - Kickoff meeting and meeting materials
> - Regularly scheduled coordination meetings

Phase 1: Existing Conditions

Task 1.1 Assessment of Current Transit Services, Administration, and Investments

AECOM has thorough knowledge of existing transit services and studies for transit within the study area. To begin, the team will assess the existing conditions of the study area under three categories (i) transit service, (ii) governance and administrative structures, and (iii) funding mechanisms. In particular, the team will review the governance and decision-making process including governance boards, its members, qualifications of members, terms of office, roles and responsibilities, committee structures among others.

Furthermore, the funding structure will be reviewed summarizing the principal uses of funding for operating and capital expenditures at a high level, and the sources and uses of federal, state, and local funding will be summarized.

The assessment will cover the key stakeholder agencies in the study area: Regional Transit Partnership (RTP), University Transit Service (UTS), University of Virginia (UVA), Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT), School transportation for Albemarle and Charlottesville, and Jaunt. Other stakeholders to be included are elected officials, representatives from rural governments, and the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) policy board.

➲ Because of AECOM and JWA's background leading recent transit plans, our team can hit the ground running on the assessments of existing conditions; the process will be quicker and more efficient.

Data for this effort will be primarily gathered from published material such as plans and reports, as well as virtual stakeholder interviews.

Task 1.2 Stakeholder Engagement

The first round of stakeholder engagement meetings will be conducted separately with the key stakeholders covered in the existing conditions assessment. It will include the following:

- Regional Transit Partnership
- University Transit Service
- Charlottesville Area Transit
- School Transportation for Albemarle and Charlottesville
- Jaunt

This set of initial meetings will serve two purposes: (i) to introduce the study objectives and approach, and (ii) to gather information for the initial research. Information to the gathered will include data on legal, technical, and political obstacles to forming an authority. The AECOM Team will also use this time to request the needed data required for assessing existing conditions in terms of service, governance, administration, and funding.

Task 1.3 Assessment of Current Legislative Authority

The TJPDC is fortunate in having legislation developed specifically for the region to establish a transit authority. This provides a basic structure that takes the City of Charlottesville, the counties and multiplicity

of operating agencies into account. While it would facilitate a consolidation of operating agencies, it does not require consolidated operations and could function with a continuation of the same operating structure that is in place today.

However, there are multiple critical issues addressed in the enabling legislation and the AECOM team can work with the RTP to identify and assess these issues. For example, the RTA legislation provides that voting board members will be elected officials from the governing bodies whom they represent and who appointed them to the board. (Provision is made for additional non-voting members who are not necessarily elected officials.) This is not the most common formulation of transit governing board membership. The practice across the United States ranges across three principal categories: (1) directly elected board members (candidates who are elected by the public directly to their seats on the transit governing board); (2) elected officials selected and appointed to serve on the transit governing board (as is the case with the RTA legislation); (3) citizen board members (persons appointed to serve on the board who are not serving out of any elected office), which is the most common form of governance. However, there are arguments for the other two forms of governance and the RTP may wish to address this critical issue in governance.

There is also no dedicated funding provided for in the RTA legislation. Rather the most likely source of funding would be an allocation of deficits to the member jurisdictions to fund from any sources of funding available to them. Hampton Roads Transit (HRT) has been a primary example of this funding arrangement until new dedicated funding was created to relieve the strains that had accumulated as a result of the deficit allocation agreement. The residual deficit allocation structure, as the HRT arrangement is sometimes called, generally results in a shift of service policy, service authority, and funding decisions to the funding jurisdictions. This renders unified transit policymaking and uniform, equitable, and uniformly productive service planning extremely difficult. Thus, the funding arrangements may be another aspect of the RTA legislation to be addressed.

Beyond these provisions, more specific provisions such as the power of eminent domain, the right to use public roadways and rights of way, the ability to carry out transit-oriented development policies and a range of issues may be analyzed as directed by the RTP. These issues could be identified by the AECOM Team in coordination with the peer review analysis of Task 2.1. The AECOM team would recommend the salient alternatives to the existing provisions, the advantages, and disadvantages if each, and would prioritize any recommended changes to be forwarded to a legislative process.

➲ Phase 1 Deliverables:
- Initial meetings with the Regional Transit Partnership, University Transit Service, University of Virginia, Charlottesville Area Transit, school transportation for Albemarle and Charlottesville, and Jaunt and related meeting presentation and materials
- Memo #1 outlining the following:
  - Review of the legislative authority for the Charlottesville-Albemarle Regional Transit Authority assessing the effectiveness of the existing legislation and identifying areas where further clarification or revisions would be needed
  - Outline of current transit governance in the Thomas Jefferson Planning District related to decision making and oversight with evaluation of effectiveness regarding accountability, services, planning, and maximizing financial investment

Phase 2: Peer Regional Transit Governance Structures

Task 2.1 Assessment of Peer Transit Agencies

Our team will interview regional transit authorities in peer regions to understand information and experiences that will be most valuable to the TJPDC. At least one of these authorities will serve a large university that is a peer to the University of Virginia with a similar institution to host community population ratio. This task will summarize ideas from peer transit authorities to inform the governance evaluation and selection efforts in Task 4 and Task 5. Strengths, weaknesses, and potential suitability of various governance structures will be summarized for applicability to the study area. This effort will also provide contacts for follow-up as potential recommendations are identified.

A key consideration in thinking about peer governance review, governance scenarios, and the eventual governance recommendations is the difference between the governance and oversight of a funding body and the governance and management of an operating agency or authority. If the region implements a regional funding system similar to CVTA or NVTC, that does not require that transit operations are also consolidated regionally, but it certainly raises key questions about the governance and oversight of the body that decides how to spend the regional funding source.

In the urbanized area of the region within Charlottesville and Albemarle County, transit services are operated by the city government, but the urban area (and transit service) extends into surrounding Albemarle County. This kind of geography always raises questions about whether a larger regional agency should control transit in both the city and the county, as HRT does in Hampton Roads, or as GRTC does in Richmond. Another model is to retain municipal control of transit but for a regional body like the PDC or MPO to provide oversight and coordination. There is no right answer. Consolidating transit into a regional organization can ensure that the city limits do not become a barrier to transit trips and can make it easier to combine city and county resources. On the other hand, control by the city government can make it easier to integrate transit with other local functions, including street design, law enforcement, and land use planning. The interaction between these functions is routine and having them inside one government can reduce friction among them. Many regions work successfully either way, though there can often be challenges to service planning and provision within any governance structure.

For example, within HRT there are numerous challenges in designing, scheduling, budgeting, and allocating costs of services across multiple jurisdictions within the constraints of the Transportation District Commission by-laws. These constraints mean that any decision within one locality that might cause costs to increase in another locality must be reviewed and approved by both localities, since each locality individually funds the services in their own jurisdiction. Due to this arrangement, the city boundaries are quite clear in the layout and structure of the region's network. On the other hand, the process requirements imposed by these by-laws means that HRT has very clear and transparent costs by route and by jurisdiction and can easily show each jurisdiction what is being funded and supported by local investments. This transparency, though, does come at the cost of a highly regimented planning process

Building off the AECOM Team's experience in Virginia and the rest of the country, peer authorities, will be selected to best match the TJPD jurisdiction. To select the authorities, a variety of demographic,

geographic, service, and governance characteristics will be assessed. Selection criteria for determining peer authorities would include the following:

- **Service area demographics**: service area population, service area square miles, and population density, at least one of the peer authorities studied will have a large university in the region;
- **Number of transit providers in the region and the agencies' sizes**: vehicles operated in maximum service, number of modes, number of employees, and total operating budgets;
- **Operating Characteristics:** total annual vehicle revenue miles, total annual vehicle revenue miles per capita, total annual vehicle revenue hours per capita; and
- **Governance structure and funding:** governance type, board size and composition, qualifications for members, selection of officers, committees, roles, voting and veto authority.

> ⮕ Phase 2 Deliverables:
> - Memo #2, outlining the following:
>   - Peer agency/region list
>   - Peer agency/region interview materials
>   - Summaries of governance structures from peer analysis

Phase 3: Potential Revenue Generation

Task 3.1 Assemble Prioritized List of Revenue Sources and Stakeholder Engagement

Sources of funding should include internally generated revenue such as innovative fare structures, dedicated or reliable sources of public assistance, and residual deficit assignment or allocation to the member jurisdictions.

It is AECOM's experience that the study area can most productively consider the funding sources in two stages. A broad range of funding mechanisms will be collected from peers across the Commonwealth and the nation, summarized, and presented to the TJPDC for review. The TJPDC will select up to six funding sources that are apparently feasible, productive enough to fund the needs, and potentially acceptable to the study area. The criteria for assessment include the following:

- the total yield for representative rates of fund generation,
- the economic consequences of the source in regional productivity and growth,
- the nexus with transit benefits, particularly external benefits,
- the competitive effects of taxation vis a vis neighboring jurisdictions with differing tax structures, and
- the administrative feasibility of collecting the revenue.

The Virginia requirements for delegating taxation authority from the legislature would be incorporated into each alternative. Further policies that the legislature has observed across multiple administrations (such

as reservation of certain bases of taxation to Commonwealth-wide rather than local taxes, or to specific categories of public functions and benefit) will also be incorporated.

The final sources of revenue will be arrayed with the strengths and weaknesses of each and a short list of prioritized sources adequate to fund the study area's transit needs will be developed for the TJPDC and provided to the project steering committee for advisory review. Although internally generated revenue (e.g., innovative fares, advertising, or other joint use revenue) may be included, the primary revenue sources are expected to be in public assistance. Based on the data gathered, the team will develop at least three revenue models for review.

Results from the analysis will be packaged and presented to the steering committee, RTP, TJPDC Commission and MPO Policy Board for consideration and review. During the meeting, comments from key stakeholders will be gathered and incorporated into a finalized strategy for transit revenue generation.

➲ Phase 3 Deliverables:
- Memo #3 outlining the following:
  - Prioritized list of revenue sources
  - Three revenue models for transit funding with estimated revenue streams, their worth, and with five-year projections
- Presentation to steering committee, RTP, TJPDC Commission, and MPO Policy Board

Phase 4: Develop Governance Scenarios & Funding Allocations

AECOM's experience is that governance and funding proposals are best developed in conjunction with each other. Although in a legislative or procedural sense the two issues can be addressed independently, separating the two carries greater risks of failure. Requesting policymaker or public approval of one (either governance or funding, but particularly funding) without a clear proposal for the other increases the objections and concerns; it is easier to approve a funding proposal if it is clear who will be responsible stewards for the proceeds as well as how it will be used.

We will select the final recommendations through a consensus building process with the steering committee and community stakeholders. While we can objectively prioritize the options based on the analysis and our experience, the final question is "What is feasible in the study area and what will its policy makers advocate?" We believe we will reach consensus in series of individual stakeholder meetings and three group meetings.

Task 4.1 Individual Stakeholder Engagement

The first step will involve separate meetings with each of the TJPDC members and Jaunt service jurisdictions if appropriate to measure their interest in participating alternative governance structures based on the peer analysis, legislative research, and funding analysis. The purpose of these individual meetings

would be to determine each jurisdiction's core interests and to identify areas of possible compromise in developing final governance scenarios. Specifically, we will identify each jurisdiction's perspective on the following evaluation criteria:

- Political feasibility
- Administrative feasibility
- Equity impacts
- Establishment of accountability for transit funding
- Maximizing financial investments
- Service outcomes
- Long-range outcomes (sustainability)
- Possible options for rural jurisdictions to be a part of the governance structure OR purchase services from the providers

Meetings will be conducted with elected officials and staff from the following:

- City of Charlottesville
- Albemarle County
- Green County
- Fluvanna County
- Louisa County
- Nelson County
- Buckingham County
- University of Virginia

Task 4.2 Group and Individual Stakeholder Meetings

Task 4.2 will involve three group stakeholder meetings with the steering committee and individual meetings with each jurisdiction and UVA and other stakeholders. The potential make-up of the steering committee may include representatives from the following entities:

- City of Charlottesville
- Albemarle County
- Greene County
- Fluvanna County
- Louisa County
- Nelson County
- Buckingham County
- University of Virginia
- University Transit Services
- Charlottesville/Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO)
- Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB)
- Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)

Final selection of steering committee members will be determined by the TJPDC Project Manager.

Details of the three group meetings and second round of individual meetings are described below.

Meeting #1 Identify Governance and Funding Issues

The first group session will be for consensus building and to achieve common understanding of terminology and issues. We will review the options under current legislation, the legislative options for changes, and the extent to which each meets the study area's needs. We will attempt to identify any going-in perspectives that differ, such as the uniformity of service benefits across the study area, and the reliability of the proposed balance of control in the governance options.

After the individual meetings and first group session, the AECOM Team will develop preliminary governance scenarios and associated funding allocations based on the identified revenue streams from Task 3. The scenarios would include the following:

- Make-up of the board/membership with consideration of changes that may need to be made to the existing legislation
- Role of the authority in decision making and transit planning
- Role of transit providers
- Performance indicators and accountability
- Participation opportunities for rural counties
- Participation opportunities for school transportation for Albemarle and Charlottesville
- Administrative cost burden

We understand that a gradual process is needed to fully develop final alternatives. Thus, the subsequent tasks will continue to inform and shape the governance and funding alternatives.

Meetings with Individual Jurisdictions

After the initial group meeting, the project team will meet with the jurisdictions and other stakeholders to discuss items specific to their area. The jurisdictions and other stakeholders have different built environments and priorities, it will be essential to provide individual attention to each one's individual circumstance.

Meeting #2 Debate Governance and Funding Alternatives

Governance and funding options developed with feedback from individual meetings and results from the first group meeting will be presented to the group. The second group meeting will be to clarify any differences that characterize the different perspectives on the funding and governance issues. If there is concern that one entity may have too little influence in the governance to protect its interest, then alternative compositions may be considered. As a last resort we can consider protective mechanisms such as a double-majority requirements so that a proposition could not pass without both a majority of votes as well as a majority of the peers (e.g., all smaller county representatives) of the concerned member.

Meeting #3 Facilitate Consensus on Preferred Governance and Funding Alternative

The final meeting will be to resolve any remaining details or clarification and reinforce the agreements reached. This meeting will also aim to resolve issues on moving forward with the recommended governance and funding proposal. This meeting will also ensure alignment with the Regional Transit Vision making sure to consider the service plan and financial assumptions established in the visioning process.

⮞ Phase 4 Deliverables:
- Two sets of 8 Individual stakeholder meetings with the study area jurisdictions and stakeholders
- Three group stakeholder meetings to the Steering Committee
- A total of 19 stakeholder meetings in Phase 4

Memo outlining governance and funding options developed through consensus that address preselected criteria and a set of final governance and funding options that align with the Regional Transit Vision

Phase 5 Evaluate and Recommend Governance Structures

Task 5.1 Evaluate and Document Alternative Governance Structures

Following the series of individual meetings, group stakeholder sessions, and the development of final governance and funding options, the next step would be accurately documenting the study area's preferences for moving forward.

Furthermore, the AECOM Team will assess any service outcomes as part of the final evaluation. These service outcomes could include reviews of service coverage or access outcomes, the range of service types that might be fundable under different governance scenarios, and considerations of the equity impacts of those outcomes.

Task 5.2 Recommendations and Next Steps

The AECOM Team will develop a final report outlining the previous steps in the study, recommending a governance structure, and suggesting implementation strategies or next steps for the partners (TJPDC members plus Buckingham County) to reach its transit expansion goals.

Task 5.3 Stakeholder Outreach and Final Presentation

The final task will involve final presentations to the steering committee, RTP, TJPDC Commission, and MPO Policy Board. The presentation will present the final report, recommendations and next steps for feedback or any final comments.

Throughout the study process, AECOM will engage with stakeholders either by coordinating meetings to overlap existing meeting calendars or schedule them separately. Specifically, we will aim to schedule informational presentations to the Albemarle Board of Supervisors and Charlottesville City Council.

AECOM will work with the TJPDC to keep stakeholders engaged in the process by providing project updates at selected RTP meetings where representatives from the rural communicates are invited to participate.

➲ Phase 5 Deliverables:
- Final presentations to the Steering Committee, Regional Transit Partnership, TJPDC Commission and the MPO Policy Board to present the final report, recommended resolutions, and next steps
- Final presentations to eight jurisdictions
- Final presentation to the TJPDC Commission to pass a resolution with commitment to take next steps
- Final report consolidating Tasks 1 to 5 with recommendations and next steps

4 Project Schedule

Phase	Description	Month	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
0	Kickoff Meeting and Project Management		★	★		★		★	★		★	★		★		★		★
1	Existing Conditions				★													
2	Peer Regional Transit Governance Structures						★ ★											
3	Potential Revenue Generation									★ ★								
4	Develop Governance Scenarios and Funding Allocation										★ ★		★ ★		★ ★			
5	Evaluate and Recommend Governance Structures														★			★

■ Progress of Task

★ Project Management Meeting

★ Principal Deliverable Submission

★ Steering Committee/Stakeholder Meeting(s)