AGENDA
Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) Monthly Meeting
Thursday, January 26, 2023 @ 4:00 p.m.
In Person at the: Water Street Center, 407 E. Water Street, Charlottesville, VA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | 4:00-4:10 | **General Administration**  
- Introductions  
- Approval of Agenda*  
- Approval of draft meeting minutes December 8, 2022*  
- Approval of 2023 meeting dates*  
  - Memo |
| 2    | 4:10-4:15 | **Matters from the Public: limit of 3 minutes per speaker**  
*Members of the Public are welcome to provide comment on any public-interest, transit-related topic, including the items listed on this agenda – limit three minutes per speaker* |
| 3    | 4:15-5:00 | **Jaunt 2022 review and Looking Ahead to 2023** (Ted Rieck)  
*Presentation and Discussion  
- New Jaunt Commercial  
- 2023 Jaunt Transit Development Plan - Final Report - January 2023  
- Jaunt Alternative Fuel Feasibility Study - Technical Report - December 2022* |
| 4    | 5:00-5:15 | **Mobility Management Letter of Support** (Lucinda Shannon)  
*Presentation  
- Draft Letter of Support* |
| 5    | 5:15-5:45 | **Transit Provider Updates**  
- Jaunt (Ted Rieck)  
- Albemarle County Schools (Charmane White)  
- UTS (Rebecca White)  
- CAT and City of Charlottesville Schools (Garland Williams)  
- DRPT (Neil Sherman) |
| 6    | 5:45-5:55 | **Staff Updates**  
- Afton Express (Sara Pennington)  
- MPO Updates (Sandy Shackelford)  
- Governance Study (Lucinda Shannon)  
  - Phase I—Existing Conditions Memo |
| 7    | 5:55-6:00 | **Other Business (Updates and Reminders)—Supervisor McKeel (Chair)** |
| 8    | 6:00 | **Adjourn** |

* A vote is expected for this item

Next Meeting February 23, 2023 (At the Water Street Center)

Guests can join in person or by using the link below:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81088437906?pwd=N2tOK3lVTnJEZkFIdCtWYXA2VzRwdz09
Meeting ID: 810 8843 7906  
Passcode: 148365  
Phone: 301-715-8592

TJPDC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in all programs and activities. TJPDC provides reasonable accommodations for persons who require special assistance to participate in public involvement opportunities. For more information, to request language translation or other accommodations, or to obtain a Discrimination Complaint Form, contact Lucinda Shannon at (434) 979-7310, lshannon@tjpdc.org or visit the website www.tjpdc.org.
The Regional Transportation Partnership Meeting  
DRAFT Minutes, December 8, 2022

The recording for this meeting can be found at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V9w4IpR4ADg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING MEMBERS &amp; ALTERNATES</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Pinkston, Charlottesville</td>
<td>Christine Jacobs, TJPDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Snook, Charlottesville</td>
<td>Lucinda Shannon, TJPDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diantha McKeel, Albemarle</td>
<td>Gretchen Thomas, TJPDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bea LaPisto-Kirtley, Albemarle</td>
<td>Ruth Emerick, TJPDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Hudson alternate for Neil Sherman, DRPT*</td>
<td>Ryan Mickles, TJPDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Morgan, Jaunt Rural</td>
<td>Michael Barnes, VDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Ames, Jaunt Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becca White, UTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-VOTING MEMBERS</th>
<th>GUESTS/PUBLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garland Williams, CAT</td>
<td>Jessica Hersh-Baller, Albemarle County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmane White, Alb County PS*</td>
<td>Stephanie Amoaning-Yankson, AECOM*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally LeBeau, UVA Hospital</td>
<td>Kristin Lam Peraza, FAMS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Thompson, CAA</td>
<td>Ben Chambers, City of Charlottesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Shackelford, CAMPO</td>
<td>Peter Voorhees, AECOM*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Pennington, Rideshare</td>
<td>Ethan Tate, CCF*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Rieck, Jaunt</td>
<td>Ryan Davidson, Albemarle County*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juwhan Lee, CAT</td>
<td>Sean Tubbs, Cville Community Engagement*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Howell, UTS (alternate)</td>
<td>Wyatt Burttscnell*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alberic Karina-Plun, Albemarle County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Remote attendance

1. CALL TO ORDER:

   The Regional Transportation Partnership Chair, Diantha McKeel, presided and called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

   The members of the meeting introduced themselves at the request of Ms. McKeel.

2. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (MINUTE 6:07)

   Approval of Agenda

   Motion/Action: Brian Pinkston moved to approve the agenda. Becca White seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.
Approval of Minutes

Motion/Action: Hal Morgan made a motion to approve the October 27, 2022 minutes. Bea LaPisto-Kirtley seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

3. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC (MINUTE 7:09):
   None.

4. FOOTHILLS AREA MOBILITY SYSTEM (FAMS) (MINUTE 7:35):
   Lucinda Shannon gave an overview of the Foothills Area Mobility System and then introduced Kristin Lam Peraza with the Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission and turned over the presentation to her.

   Ms. Lam Peraza presented the committee with how the Mobility Management System got started and how it grew and continues today.

   Christine Jacobs noted that the system that FAMS has will not necessarily be what the MPO area would start with. Lucinda Shannon also reminded the committee that TJPDC will not be providing vehicles for the mobility, but would partner with the transit agencies for transportation.

   Committee members asked numerous follow up and clarifying questions.

5. GOVERNANCE STUDY INTRODUCTION (MINUTE 1:02:40):
   Ms. Shannon gave a background on the Governance Study. She introduced Stephanie Amoaning-Yankson, PhD, AECOM to the committee. Dr. Amoaning-Yankson presented the committee with an introduction to the governance study.

   Dr. Amoaning-Yankson reviewed the study’s goals and approach. She reviewed the background of the transit providers who would be affected by the governance, CAT, Jaunt, and UTS.

   She continued with the next steps including the peer study. The criterion included service area demographics, number of transit providers in the region and agency size, and operating characteristics, governance structure and funding.

   Becca White noted that UTS is supportive of the Jaunt connect services and they invoice UTS for that support. She noted that they haven’t been invoiced since prior to the pandemic.

   Dr. Amoaning-Yankson noted that Phase I of the study includes a legislative review.

   Committee members provided feedback, made suggestions, and asked clarifying questions. It was noted by Ms. McKeel that additional thoughts and feedback should be sent to Lucinda Shannon via email.
6. TRANSIT PROVIDER UPDATES (MINUTE 1:40:14)

Jaunt: Ted Rieck said Jaunt has received a draft of their Transit Development Plan. They would like to get public input. It will be on their website next week. They are also wrapping up their Alternative Fuel study to be presented next week. He also noted that they are reviewing how to be a more efficient operation.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Rieck to present the Alternative Fuel study to the RTP. She also said she would like to add the TDP to a future agenda for the RTP as well.

Albemarle County Public Schools: Charmane White reported that the schools are trying to recruit new drivers and retain current employees. She noted that she will be presenting a transportation plan for Albemarle transportation to the superintendent and his cabinet. She also reported that she will be submitting an RFP for a portion of their transportation needs.

Ms. Jacobs asked for a link to the RFP so the TJPDC can distribute it widely.

UTS: Becca White said she is interested in the RFP from Albemarle County. She noted that the exam period is over and the holiday break has begun, so the student routes are altered, but employee services are still ongoing.

CAT and City of Charlottesville Schools: Garland Williams reported that CAT is finalizing their IFP to get their transit strategic plan which will go out in the next few weeks. He noted that CAT is looking to put some alternative fuel busses in the fleet. He is not sure how many because of their limitations. He went on to say there are going to be additions to routes, including The Center, in the near future. He said the issue continues to be a lack of drivers.

Re: the City Schools, Mr. Williams said they will be doing a revised commercial to recruit more drivers.

Mr. Williams reported that they have funding to create shelters and other amenities, but the person on CAT’s staff who was in charge of that left the organization. Once they have that position filled, they can move forward with getting those projects completed.

DRPT: Wood Hudson reminded that DRPT’s grant season opened on December 1 and ends on Feb 1. He noted that guidelines and applications are available on their website. He also reported that there is a 5310 project management position open at DRPT.

Mr. Williams said he will be working with the County on the micro-transit project. He reported that they are aiming to start services July 1.

7. OTHER BUSINESS (UPDATES AND REMINDERS) (MINUTE 1:54:17)

None.
8. **Staff Updates (Minute 1:56:29)**
   Tabled due to time constraints.

**Adjournment:** Ms. McKeel adjourned the meeting at 5:56 p.m.
MEMO

To: Regional Transit Partnership
From: Lucinda Shannon, Senior Regional Planner
Date: January 26, 2023
Subject: Committee meeting dates for 2023

The Regional Transit Partnership usually meets on the 4th Thursday of the month at 4:00 p.m. at the Water Street Center, 407 E. Water Street. Due to holiday scheduling conflicts, the RTP usually cancels the July meeting and combines the November and December meetings. The following meeting schedule is proposed for 2023.

- January 26, 2023
- February 23, 2023
- March 23, 2023
- April 27, 2023
- May 25, 2023
- June 22, 2023
- July 27, 2023 (Canceled)
- August 24, 2023
- September 28, 2023
- October 26, 2023
- November 23, 2023 (Canceled)
- December 14, 2023
Jaunt is a public service corporation owned by 5 governmental entities, serving 7 jurisdictions plus nonprofit agencies.

Stockholders:
- Albemarle County
- City of Charlottesville
- Louisa
- Nelson
- Fluvanna

Others—not stockholders:
- Greene County
- Buckingham County
Jaunt: supports independent living / aging in place
Jaunt: contributes to healthy outcomes
Jaunt: is an investment with great returns
Jaunt: is an investment in equity
Challenges and Initiatives

- Addressing Cure Findings
  - Need to address community funding (precursor to RTA issues)
- Alternative fueled vehicles implementation planning
- Microtransit
- Transit Development Plan (TDP)
  - Needs study
  - Tech Development Plan
- Pandemic Ridership Recovery
Addressing Cure Findings

- Performance Data and Contracted Services
- Use of rural funding
- Other
• Overstated performance data  
  • Tie reporting to actual operational results  
  • Paid excess funds back to DRPT  
• Under payment of services by social service agencies  
  • New cost allocation model; still need to work out compensation.  
  • Boilerplate contract  
• Need to work with agencies; may lose business as pricing will go higher.
Jaunt operates in rural and urban; multiple jurisdictions
Receives rural funding
Receives urban funding as reimbursement through from City.
Can’t mix; creating local funding problems
Use of rural funds: Creates a funding “desert”
Under Funded Services
### Use of rural funds: Capital Funding Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Proportional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target Contribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Proportional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local</strong></td>
<td>$104,383</td>
<td>$926,535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | $2,609,576  | $2,609,576   |
• 108 revenue vehicle fleet; reducing to about 80
• Standard vehicle replacement eligibility: 5 years, or 150,000 miles whichever comes first
• Normal price: $96,000, 6-month delivery; $160,000, 12 to 24-month delivery
FY2023/FY2024 Challenges & Initiatives

- Increased local share contribution
  - Funding deserts
  - Increased operating costs (driver wages)
  - Informal allocation of costs (cross subsidy)
  - COVID funding

- Shift in capital funding not able to use rural funds
  - Strain on capital funding
Louisa Sources of Operating Funding: Shifts in Funding
• Achieve 45% GHG reduction by 2030; net zero by 2050

Source: Kimley Horn
Vehicle Fuel Technologies

Source: Kimley Horn
Vehicle Fuel Technologies

Source: Kimley Horn
Vehicle Fuel Technologies: Implementation
Vehicle Fuel Technologies: Implementation
Vehicle Fuel Technologies: Implementation

Source: Kimley Horn
Microtransit
• Short-term plan to guide transit growth – updated every six years
• The TDP planning process identifies an area’s:
  • Transit goals and objectives
  • Unmet transit needs
  • Alternatives for unmet needs or performance
  • Phased plan for improvements
  • Capital and operating budget projections
• A TDP is not an operations plan
Population Below Poverty

Source: American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates, 2016-2020
Percent Population Needing Transit

Source: American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates, 2016-2020
Stakeholder Satisfaction

- Jault service overall: 72% Strongly Satisfied, 25% Satisfied, 2% Neutral, 10% Dissatisfied, 2% Strongly Dissatisfied
- Cost of services: 80% Strongly Satisfied, 16% Satisfied, 10% Neutral, 9% Dissatisfied, 3% Strongly Dissatisfied
- Availability of information on services: 58% Strongly Satisfied, 31% Satisfied, 10% Neutral, 9% Dissatisfied, 2% Strongly Dissatisfied
- Timeliness of your trip: 62% Strongly Satisfied, 27% Satisfied, 9% Neutral, 8% Dissatisfied, 2% Strongly Dissatisfied
- Sense of safety and security on the bus: 81% Strongly Satisfied, 16% Satisfied, 10% Neutral, 9% Dissatisfied, 2% Strongly Dissatisfied
- Cleanliness of the bus: 80% Strongly Satisfied, 18% Satisfied, 10% Neutral, 9% Dissatisfied, 2% Strongly Dissatisfied
- Courtesy of bus drivers: 84% Strongly Satisfied, 14% Satisfied, 10% Neutral, 9% Dissatisfied, 2% Strongly Dissatisfied
- Courtesy of reservation staff: 65% Strongly Satisfied, 23% Satisfied, 10% Neutral, 8% Dissatisfied, 2% Strongly Dissatisfied
- Reservation experience: 59% Strongly Satisfied, 30% Satisfied, 8% Neutral, 3% Dissatisfied, 2% Strongly Dissatisfied

The diagram shows a bar chart with different categories of stakeholder satisfaction and the percentage of respondents falling into each satisfaction level.
Service Improvements

1. App-based demand response – focus on Albemarle County
2. Monticello microtransit
3. Greene/Albemarle/Charlottesville Link
4. Stoney Creek / Nelson County additional service
5. Streamline Crozet CONNECT
6. Streamline Buckingham CONNECT
7. New Louisa Circulator Flex Route
• Rural Transit Needs Study
• Technology Development Plan

Source: American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates, 2016-2020
Pandemic Ridership Recovery: Advertising

- Play Commercial here
QUESTIONS?
Mobility Management

SECTION 5310: ENHANCED MOBILITY FOR SENIORS AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) manages the FTA Section 5310 program

SUPPORTS CAPITAL.

OPERATING COSTS of transportation services and transportation alternatives beyond those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

MOBILITY MANAGEMENT
What is Mobility Management?

The purpose of the FTA Section 5310 program is to improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities by removing barriers to transportation services and expanding the transportation mobility options available. The program requires coordination with other transportation programs and services in order to make the most efficient use of federal resources.
There are three goal areas of the FTA Section 5310 program, and each applicant must demonstrate how their project attains at least one of these three:

- **INCREASE PUBLIC TRANSIT PROJECTS THAT EXCEED ADA REQUIREMENTS (42 U.S.C. 12101 ET SEQ.)**
- **IMPROVE ACCESS TO FIXED-ROUTE SERVICES AND DECREASE RELIANCE ON PARATRANSIT**
- **BUILD ALTERNATIVES TO PUBLIC TRANSIT THAT ASSIST SENIORS AND INDIVIDUAL WITH DISABILITIES WITH TRANSPORTATION**
Foothills Area Mobility System

The FAMS Call Center provides free, person-centered information and referral on all available public, private and volunteer transportation, in addition to free travel training, trip planning, gas card vouchers and taxi vouchers. FAMS has also coordinated with various local volunteer transportation programs within the Rappahannock-Rapidan region to streamline the volunteer driver application process, enhancing efficiency and collaboration of locally-run programs.

Initiated in 2009 by the Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission and Rappahannock-Rapidan Community Services
Regional Mobility Management for our Area

Introduce the concept
Start a call center/website
Gather Data on Needs
Build partnerships
Start Up Details

- First-year budget of $125,000
- 4% local match
- Halftime manager 12 months
- Fulltime staff 6 months
Continue to grow...

- meet unmet needs
- Support transit
- taxi & gas voucher
- volunteer driver
- Expand rural counties
- Coordinated scheduling
- Unified transit interface
- travel training
- Efficiency & collaboration
Questions?
And comments
January 30, 2023

Jennifer DeBruhl, Director
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
600 East Main Street, Suite 2102
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Director DeBruhl,

Please accept this letter of support for the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission’s (TJPDC) application to the FTA 5310 Program to implement a mobility management program. The addition of an informational and referral program will enhance our current transit services and help meet the requirements of growing senior and disabled populations.

The Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) serves as an official advisory board to the TJPDC, created by the City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, UVA, and JAUNT, in Partnership with the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation to provide recommendations to decision-makers on transit-related matters. Because of the goodwill built among the members of the RTP, and recent successful transit planning projects, to include the Regional Transit Vision Plan, the TJPDC is uniquely qualified to continue efforts to enhance transit and coordination among services.

Working with jurisdictions and service providers, the TJPDC has fostered multiple partnerships and coordination efforts, including the Regional Transit Partnership and the Charlottesville Community Alliance who will both be active partners in the proposed mobility management program.

The Regional Transit Partnership enthusiastically supports TJPDC’s application and the addition of much needed mobility management services.

Sincerely,

Diantha McKeel, Regional Transit Partnership Chair
Memo

Subject: Phase I – Existing Conditions

1 Introduction

Over the past several years, Region 10 has worked collaboratively with its member jurisdictions to improve transit service in the region. In the past year, the region undertook a collaborative effort to develop a Transit Vision Plan to establish a clear, long-term vision for efficient, equitable and effective transit service for the region. Led by the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and supported by the City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, and DRPT, the Transit Vision Plan established a unified vision for transit service in Region 10, which is made up of the counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, Nelson, and the City of Charlottesville.

The objective of this Regional Transit Governance Study is to identify governance options for regional transit and increase transportation investments to achieve regional transit priorities.

This study is divided into five phases:

- Phase 1 – Existing Conditions
- Phase 2 – Peer Regional Transit Governance Structures
- Phase 3 – Potential Revenue Generation
- Phase 4 – Develop Governance Scenarios and Funding Allocations
- Phase 5 – Evaluate and Recommend Governance Structures

This memo covers Phase 1 – Existing Conditions and is the first in a series of technical memoranda for the Regional Transit Governance Study. It provides an overview of the existing transit operators in the region, as well as a comparative legislative analysis of existing state provisions for establishing a Charlottesville-Albemarle regional transit authority. It explores comparisons with other regional authorities in the Commonwealth including the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA), Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission (HRTAC), and the Central Virginian Transportation Authority (CVTA). The memo concludes by offering direction for the legislative process and a set of objectives for consideration by TJPDC for further discussion.
2 Overview of Regional Transit Operators and the Regional Transit Partnership (RTP)

Region 10 is served by three transit operators: Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT), Jaunt, and the University of Virginia’s University Transit Service (UTS). CAT provides fixed-route service in the City of Charlottesville and some urbanized parts of Albemarle County; Jaunt provides ADA paratransit for CAT service as well as commuter route and demand response service to the rural portions of the region; UTS serves the University of Virginia Grounds and neighboring commercial and residential areas.

2.1 Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT)

2.1.1 Operator Overview

CAT was founded in 1975 as Charlottesville Transit Service (CTS) by the City of Charlottesville after acquiring a then privately-owned transit company. The CTS served the city exclusively until 1978, when Albemarle County entered into its first agreement with the city to provide contracted fixed-route service in parts of the county. In 1985, the city began operation of the school bus transportation system in addition to running CTS. Two decades later, the service expanded by entering into a reciprocal ridership agreement with the University of Virginia’s (UVA) UTS in 2008 (Figure 1).

![Figure 1 CAT Historical Timeline (1975-2010)](image)

CTS now operates as Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) following a rebranding effort in 2010. The agency currently serves an area of about 38 square miles and a service area population of approximately 85,755\(^1\), which includes the City of Charlottesville, parts of Albemarle County, and the UVA Grounds. CAT service is Monday through Saturday on varying routes from 6:00am to 10:30pm using 11 fixed routes and a free trolley service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (2021)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>~38 square miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area Population</td>
<td>~85,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Passenger Miles Estimate</td>
<td>~2.1 million(^2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) National Transit Database 2021 Annual Agency Profile. City of Charlottesville dba Charlottesville Area Transit

\(^2\) CAT is not a full reporter to FTA, so self-reported annual passenger miles in 2021 was not available. The estimate shown was calculated using the average CAT trip length in 2018 of 3.44 miles (VTA data) multiplied by the number of unlinked passenger trips in 2021.
### Measure (2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Unlinked Trips</td>
<td>617,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Vehicle Revenue Miles</td>
<td>730,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Vehicle Revenue Hours</td>
<td>74,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Operated in Max Service</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Funds Expended</td>
<td>$9,211,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Funds Expended</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.2 **Organizational Structure**

As a division of the City of Charlottesville, all CAT employees are city employees. CAT is headed by a Transit Director who manages approximately 142 employees to provide service (Figure 2). Three Assistant Directors (operations, maintenance and facilities, and finance and grant management) and seven other administrative positions support CAT operations. CAT has 59 full-time and 11 part-time bus operators in addition to 26 relief bus operators with many vacancies yet to be filled. These operators serve both the CAT transit and Charlottesville school bus services.

![Image of Charlottesville Area Transit Organizational Structure](image)

Figure 2 Charlottesville Area Transit Organizational Structure

2.1.3 **Governance Structure**

The city operates under a Council-Manager form of government with a City Council serving as the ultimate decision-making body. Residents elect a five-member City Council who serve four-year staggered terms. The City Council, in turn, selects the Mayor and Vice Mayor who serve two-year terms each. The City Council also appoints the City Manager who serves as the chief executive officer of the city and manages all departments including transit. Transit-related decisions are ultimately determined by the City Council; however, daily transit operations are run by the Transit Director who reports to the City Manager.
The CAT Advisory Board was a citizen advisory board set up by the City Council to provide input to CAT service improvements. This includes service changes such as routing, schedules, budget changes, or personnel needs. The CAT Advisory board has been inactive since the 2020 pandemic, but discussions are ongoing about re-establishing the board.

2.1.4 Funding Sources

Transit funding can generally be divided into operating sources of assistance and capital sources of assistance. These sources include federal, state, local, and internal agency-generated funds.

**Federal Sources**

Federal grant programs require a minimum local match of four percent for all eligible projects. The primary source of federal operating assistance for urbanized areas such as Charlottesville comes from the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grants program, a formula-based program that offers transit capital and operations assistance to service providers in urbanized areas. For urbanized areas greater than 200,000 people, funds are apportioned directly to the service providers; for urbanized areas under 200,000 people, funds are apportioned to the state for distribution. According to the 2021 National Transit Database statistics, the Charlottesville urbanized area has a population of approximately 92,359. In addition to capital costs, eligible uses of the proceeds from the grants include preventative maintenance activities and rebuilding of vehicles, track, signals, and communications equipment.

Another primary source of federal funding made available beginning in 2020 was the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act which provided $25 billion to transit agencies nationwide.

**State Sources**

State funding consists of operating and capital assistance provided by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT). Operating assistance follows a performance-based methodology to determine funds allocation for each agency. Operating assistance funds a maximum of 30 percent of agency operating expenses. For capital assistance, DRPT employs a prioritization process to allocate capital funds. Projects are scored under the following three categories:

- State of good repair: Up to 68 percent matching funds for projects focused on replacements or rehabilitation of existing transit assets.
- Minor enhancements: Up to 68 percent matching funds for projects to add capacity, new technology, and customer facilities with costs under $2 million. This may also include some vehicle expansion projects.
- Major expansion: Up to 50 percent matching funds for expansion or improvements that exceed $2 million or for purchases of more than five vehicles or five percent of fleet size.

Other state funding for CAT in fiscal year 2023 includes the Transit Ridership Incentive Program (TRIP). This grant program is available for urban areas that exceed a population of 100,000 to improve regional connectivity by supporting low-income and zero-fare programming. Following receipt of these TRIP funds, CAT has stopped collecting fares and does not anticipate using fares as a revenue source for the foreseeable future. In addition to these sources, other competitive grants are available to agencies including Technical Assistance grants, Public Transportation Workforce Development Program, and Demonstration Project Assistance grants.

**Local Sources and Directly Generated Funds**

Funding from local and directly-generated sources include City of Charlottesville general revenues, contract funds from Albemarle County and UVA, advertising, and other sources.

Figure 3 shows sources of operating funds for CAT as reported to the National Transit Database (NTD) for 2021.

---

3 2021 Annual Agency Profile. City of Charlottesville dba Charlottesville Area Transit.
Figures 4 and 5 show the historical trends for CAT’s operating and capital funds from 2016 to 2021. Figure 6 shows the trend of CAT’s operating funds per vehicle revenue hour from 2016 to 2021.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
7.00 & 7.42 & 8.44 & 8.26 & 7.92 & 9.21 \\
\end{array} \]

**Figure 4 CAT Operating Funds in Millions of Dollars (NTD 2016 to 2021)**

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
1.36 & 0.79 & 0.99 & 0.01 & 0.26 & 0.00 \\
\end{array} \]

**Figure 5 CAT Capital Funds in Millions of Dollars (NTD 2016 to 2021)**

---

4 2021 NTD reports $0 in capital funding for CAT.
2.2 Jaunt Inc.

2.2.1 Agency Overview

Originally known as Jefferson Area United Transportation (JAUNT), Jaunt was formed in 1975 to provide transit for human service agencies (senior agencies, family assistance agencies, etc). In 1983, the agency became incorporated as Jaunt, Inc. with ownership transferred to local governments.

Today, Jaunt provides regional transit service to customers in the counties of Albemarle, Buckingham, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, and Nelson, and the City of Charlottesville. It was formed to provide for the maintenance, development, improvement and use of public transit in the rural and urbanized areas of the localities served. Service is provided through Jaunt, CONNECT, and Greene County Transit.

- Jaunt – This provides demand response service to Buckingham, Fluvanna, Louisa, Nelson, and rural parts of Albemarle county. Jaunt also provides complementary paratransit service for CAT to fulfil American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Under this arrangement, eligible riders can travel within a three-quarter mile radius of CAT’s fixed route service.

- CONNECT is a fixed route commuter service that operates from park-and-ride lots in parts of Albemarle, Buckingham, and Nelson counties to destinations at UVA and downtown Charlottesville.

- Greene County Transit is a demand response service for residents of Greene County. Residents of the county can travel anywhere within the county and to Charlottesville with advanced reservations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (2021)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service area</td>
<td>~2,719 square miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service area population</td>
<td>~273, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Pax miles</td>
<td>1,463,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Unlinked Trips</td>
<td>147,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Vehicle Revenue Miles</td>
<td>1,101,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Vehicle Revenue Hours</td>
<td>66,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Operated in Max Service</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td>$9,410,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Budget</td>
<td>$955,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*2021 NTD reports $0 in capital funding for CAT.
2.2.2 Organizational Structure
Jaunt is headed by a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and reports to a Board of Directors. The CEO is supported by a Chief Operations Officer (COO) and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and together manage about 125 employees to provide its service. Key staff roles include Road Supervisors, Director of Procurement, Chief Mechanic, Safety Manager, Call Center Supervisor, Marketing and Communications Coordinator, and about 86 operators. The full organizational structure is shown in Figure 7.

![Jaunt Organizational Chart](image)

Figure 7 Jaunt Organizational Structure

2.2.3 Governance Structure
Jaunt was incorporated in 1983 as a public service corporation by the City of Charlottesville and the Counties of Albemarle and Nelson. However, ownership of Jaunt also includes Fluvanna and Louisa Counties, making a total of five stock owners. Stockholder shares are divided as follows:

- City of Charlottesville 5 shares
- Albemarle County 5 shares
- Nelson County 2 shares
- Fluvanna County 2 shares
- Louisa County 2 shares

2.2.3.1 Board Characteristics
Jaunt is governed by a Board of Directors elected by the five Stockholders. Directors elected by Stockholders can in turn appoint Directors at large to serve on the Board in a non-voting capacity (ex-officio). Stockholders are entitled to nominate two (2) Directors for every two shares held. In cases where an odd number of shares are held, the number of Directors nominated will be rounded down. The breakdown of Director nominations is as follows:

- City of Charlottesville 4 Directors
The Board is currently composed of 14 voting members who serve three-year terms. The City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County have four members each, while Louisa, Fluvanna, and Nelson Counties have two members each. Non-voting members appointed by the Board are Buckingham County, TJPDC, and DRPT. According to the agency bylaws, the Board may have no more than 20 and no less than 12 voting members at any time. Directors serve a three-year term each which may be extended, decreased, or modified by the Stockholders.

Each Board member is entitled to one vote with no allowance for proxy votes.

2.2.3.2 Officers and Committees

The Board elects Officers to serve as President, Vice President, Treasurer, and Secretary at their annual meeting. Select Board members also serve on three committees (Executive, Finance, and Jaunt Friends) and represent Jaunt at the Regional Transit Partnership.

- Executive Committee: This committee includes the President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, Immediate Past President, and Executive Director (CEO). According to the Bylaws, the committee may also include chairs of various subcommittees, other Board directors, or Jaunt employees appointed by the President. The Immediate Past President, Executive Director and employees appointed to the committee serve as non-voting members.

  The committee may exercise all the routine and ordinary powers of the Board to discuss issues related to urgent business matters, organizational and operating procedures of the Board, legal issues, compliance with requirements, and supporting the Executive Director. Business transacted by the committee must be reported to the Board for ratification.

- Finance Committee: This committee includes the Treasurer and at least two other Directors chosen by the Board for the purpose of providing financial oversight and management of Jaunt.

- Jaunt Friends, a 501(c)3 organization, awards scholarships to the financially disadvantaged, so they remain active in society and as independent as possible. Its mission is supporting Jaunt transportation services and providing fare scholarships to the passengers who need them.

2.2.4 Funding Sources

Similar to CAT, Jaunt’s funding comes from a combination of federal, state, local, and directly-generated funds (farebox).

Federal Sources

As CAT’s provider of ADA paratransit services, Jaunt receives a portion of CAT’s annual Section 5307 operating funds allocation. Jaunt has been eligible for other federal grants in the past, including the Rural Area Formula Program Grant (Section 5311), Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Formula Program (Section 5310), Bus and Bus Facilities (Section 5337), and New Freedom Program 6 (Section 5317).

Oftentimes, federal sources of assistance also have minimum requirements for matching funds, which varies for capital grants and operating grants. Generally, the Section 5311 program may provide up to 50% of the net deficit for rural needs, with the remaining balance split evenly between state and local assistance (25% each). Capital costs on the other hand, are typically funded at an 80%, federal; 16% state, and 4% local match.

---

6 Grants for both capital and operating aimed reducing transportation barriers faced by individuals with disabilities to expand mobility through transportation, beyond the requirements of the ADA Act of 1990.
**State Sources**

As an agency operating in the commonwealth, Jaunt receives state assistance through the general transportation fund. The agency is also eligible to apply for applicable state grants previously described in *Section 2.1.4*.

**Local Sources and Directly-Generated Funds**

Local funding for Jaunt comes from the jurisdictions within its service area based on an agreed-upon formula. Directly-generated funds include revenue from contracted service, advertising, and other sources.

Figures 8 and 9 show the sources of operating and capital funds for Jaunt in 2021 as reported to the NTD.

![Figure 8 2021 Jaunt Operating Funding Sources (NTD)](image)

![Figure 9 2021 Jaunt Capital Funding Sources (NTD)](image)

Figures 10 and 11 show the historical trend of operating and capital funding for Jaunt from 2016 to 2021. Figure 12 shows the trend of Jaunt’s operating funds per vehicle revenue hour from 2016 to 2021.
2.3 University of Virginia University Transit Service (UTS)

2.3.1 Operator Overview

The University Transit Service, UTS, provides transportation services to UVA students, faculty, and staff on and around UVA Grounds and UVA’s hospital. The service started in the 1970s as a way to influence parking demand on UVA Grounds. As a major employer and trip generator in the region, the service started by providing circulator and parking lot shuttle services. As demand grew, UTS added more services and currently serves about 1.5 square miles.
Service levels vary throughout the year, depending on the university's academic calendar, holidays, and events. Service is divided between the parking lot shuttles and transit routes on the Grounds. The service area is bounded by Arlington Boulevard, Alderman Road, Jefferson Park Avenue, 14th Street, Grady Avenue, and Rugby Road. It also goes off-Grounds along the JPA Corridor.

### 2.3.2 Organizational and Governance Structure

UTS is an operational unit at UVA housed under the Department of Parking and Transportation. Other units in the department include parking and administration; however, UTS relies on other University resources for various services, including professional planners, architects, facilities management, human resource management, and procurement. UTS has an alternative transportation team, a safety training team, and operations teams.

UTS is headed by the Director of Parking and Transportation who reports to the Associate Vice-President for Operations who is ultimately accountable to the University Board of Regents. The service is very staff-driven and approvals to the Board of Regents is only needed for the comprehensive student fee.

### 2.3.3 Funding Sources

The Department for Parking and Transportation has a budget of about $20 million per year, with between $8 million to $9 million allocated to transit. Service is funded through student fees and parking fees from the health system. The system also generates some funds through event contracts such as football games and graduations. Beginning in 2008, UTS entered into a reciprocal agreement with CAT to allow the public to ride fare-free for a modest fee. This and a similar arrangement with Jaunt changed with the onset of the pandemic. The three agencies are currently working to resume this collaborative arrangement.

Although the UTS service is open to the public, it differs from CAT and Jaunt by not being a publicly funded agency. It therefore does not receive any federal, state or local funds. It also does not report to the Federal Transit Administration.

### 2.4 Regional Transit Partnership

The Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) is an advisory board formed to provide recommendations to decision-makers on transit-related matters in the region. The RTP’s goal is to support improved communications, coordination, and collaboration. The Partnership provides a forum for local officials, transit providers, and other regional stakeholders to craft and work towards regional transit goals.

The RTP was formed in October 2017 by the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO), the City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, Jaunt, and the TJPDC entering into a Memorandum of Understanding. This was a result of consistent efforts in the region to enhance transit collaboration and coordination. The RTP meets once a month to discuss transit-related matters.

The RTP voting membership is as follows:

- Charlottesville City Council: Two representatives from and appointed by the Council
- Albemarle Board of Supervisors: Two representatives from and appointed by the Board of Supervisors
- Jaunt Board: One urban and one rural representative
- Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation: One representative of the Department
- University of Virginia: One representative of the university

The RTP non-voting membership is as follows:

- CAT staff
- Jaunt staff
- Albemarle County Student Transportation
- City of Charlottesville Student Transportation
- Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (CA-MPO)
The RTP elects a Chair and Vice-Chair as officers who serve one-year terms. Officers of the RTP are eligible for reelection after their term expires.

Currently, the RTP is actively following through its FY2023 Work Program which includes supporting regional transit planning activities, information sharing, and identifying and supporting regional transit opportunities.

UTS, CAT and Jaunt continue to collaborate by sharing bus transfer stops and hosting coordination meetings with directors to discuss challenges and possible solutions in addition to the ongoing coordination undertaken through the RTP.

2.5 Summary

The three operators in the region differ widely in their core services, governance, and accountability characteristics. Together, they each support a critical part of the transit landscape in the region; however, more transit investments and coordination are needed to support each jurisdiction’s needs.

Existing collaboration efforts through the RTP have been an essential first step in crafting a regional vision for transit and determine the steps required to reach it. As this study progresses, the operators, jurisdictions, and RTP members will be integral in discussing options for governance and funding to improve overall transit in the region.

3 Legislative Review

We understand Virginia law provides at least four examples of governance structures that support transit and that may be considered by regional stakeholders.

3.1 Charlottesville-Albemarle Regional Transit Authority

The legislature provided for the Charlottesville-Albemarle Regional Transit Authority (CARTA) as early as 2009 with subsequent amendments. The authority is initially established as a service delivery organization, with the contracting, financial (including bonding), and acquisition and operating powers necessary. Its authority is for transit.

Charlottesville and “all or portions of Albemarle County” are the essential boundaries, but additional portions of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, and Nelson counties as well as cities, towns, tourist-driven and public transit agencies, and higher education agencies may join as members.

The governing board is comprised of two Charlottesville Council members, two Albemarle County Commissioners, and one commissioner from each other county; other members are represented by non-voting members.

There is no provision in the current CARTA legislation for funding; public funding would need to come from federal, commonwealth, and local funds.

3.2 Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

The Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) is established as a multimodal planning and funding agency. It is funded with a variety of taxes including sales tax, grantors tax on real property, and other transfers provided for in-tax revenue laws.

It is comprised of Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties, as well as nearby independent cities.
The governing board is comprised of elected officials from counties and cities, as well as state legislators from relevant committees, a gubernatorial appointee, the DRPT director, the Commissioner of Highways, and the chief elected official of one town.

While the authority has some powers to contract for and deliver services, it operates primarily through grants to service delivery agencies for roads and transit.

### 3.3 Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission

The Hampton Roads Accountability Commission (HRTAC) is established primarily as a planning and funding authority like the NVTA. It funds both transit and road projects. The boundaries of the authority are those of Planning District 23, which includes four counties and ten cities.

The HRTAC was originally established to fund transportation (excluding transit) with specific taxes. In addition to the sales tax and fuel taxes provided for in the tax revenue statutes, the HRTAC has access to a portion of the tolls on the I-64 / I-264 / Jefferson Avenue interchange.

Amendments then added additional funding sources dedicated exclusively to transit, and specifically to a regional transit program. This service is distinguished from the existing service which continues to be funded from the historical federal, state, and municipal funds and requires the municipalities to maintain their prior transit funding level.

The composition of the governing board is similar to NVTA's: the chief elected official of the counties and cities, together with state legislators, a gubernatorial appointee, the Director of DRPT and the Commissioner of Highways. The Executive Director of the Virginia Port Authority is included as well.

### 3.4 Central Virginia Transportation Authority

The newest of these agencies is the Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA) in the greater Richmond region, whose boundaries are those of Planning District 15.

Like NVTA, CVTA has some service delivery authority, but it has established itself as a planning and funding authority. Furthermore, it is required to pass through substantial funding to the Greater Richmond Transit Company (GRTC) or its successor.

CVTA is funded primarily by a sales tax, but with some fuel tax and provision for future toll revenue. It also has a maintenance-of-effort requirement requiring continuation of 50% of the pre-existing local public transit funding, plus escalation. While most of CVTA's revenue is available for roads or other transportation, 15% is designated for use by GRTC or its successor.

### 3.5 Other Frameworks

Other noteworthy frameworks in Virginia are the public service corporation and the transportation district commission.

The Public Service Corporation (examples include GRTC and Jaunt) provides public ownership and control of the powers needed for transit service delivery and a governance mechanism. Like the CARTA, there is no provision for new funding. The governance is based on a joint stock corporation concept which reflects the initial ownership and agreed changes.

The Transportation District Commission framework is available to all groups of counties or cities in Virginia. The Transportation District Commission of Hampton Roads (or Hampton Roads Transit) and the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) are examples. The governance is by a board made up of elected officials, and there is no new funding authority in the legislation. While HRT is primarily a service delivery organization, NVTC (which has some unique legislative provisions) is primarily a service and funding coordinating agency, taking advantage of the multi-county, multi-city structure of the commissions.
4 Legislative Process and Objectives

When new legislation is enacted, the possible combinations and variations are infinite. However, the effort and time required to enact legislation with the required number of approvals and votes makes each additional change in any proposal progressively more difficult, with completely new institutions generally being the most difficult of all.

TJPDC can formulate its objectives for legislation and compare those to the legislative possibilities. These objectives may include:

- Level of new funding and potential in the future
- Side-effects of any funding generated (such as economic impact, equity, competitiveness of region’s economy, revenue administration efficiency)
- Boundaries of the district affecting taxes paid or tax revenue no longer available for other uses, and affecting people served; the ability to change those boundaries in the future
- Composition of the governing board
- Coordination and effectiveness of the institutions, including duplication of functions, operational planning effectiveness, efficiencies and economies of scale, ability to finance projects with debt, eminent domain power, intergovernmental coordination of regulatory, public works, and interfacing transportation functions

The possible ways to achieve these objectives through a new entity or the modification of one of the frameworks described above are numerous, but can be grouped, sorted, and assessed.

From the perspective of the frameworks and the objectives, it seems that the possibilities can be grouped into three courses to obtain properly governed transit resources: (1) establish a new authority similar to CVTA or HRTAC, (2) modify the CARTA legislation to provide the additional authority needed, or (3) modify another framework (such as the Transportation District Commission or Public Service Corporation) to provide the additional authority needed.

The first option will offer some of the advantages and disadvantages of the existing authorities, will allow material changes, but will require substantial new legislation. The second option offers a framework already tailored for the TJPDC, with flexibility as to boundaries, but requires integrating this with restrictive requirements for public funding in Virginia. The third option has the challenges of the second, along with curing other disadvantages of the Transportation District Commission or Public Service Corporation frameworks.

We look forward to clarifying these objectives and assessing the choices that hold the greatest promise of governance success.
## 4.1 Transit Governance Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charlotteville-Albemarle Regional Transit Authority (Existing Legislation)</th>
<th>Northern Virginia Transportation Authority</th>
<th>Hampton Roads Accountability Commission</th>
<th>Central Virginia Transportation Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundaries and membership</strong></td>
<td>Charlottesville and all or portions of Albemarle County; All or portions of counties of Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, and Nelson; private nonprofit tourist-driven agencies, higher education facilities of the Charlottesville-Albemarle area, and public transportation agencies serving such counties. Each other city, town or portion of county that opts in and is approved by existing members.</td>
<td>Counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William and the Cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park</td>
<td>Each county [four] and city [ten] located in Planning District 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Composition</strong></td>
<td>Two commissioners from Albemarle County; two council members from Charlottesville, one member of each other member county, up to four non-voting members representing the interests of other members</td>
<td>Chief elected officer of the governing body of each county and city embraced by the Authority or their designated elected officer; two from the membership of the House Committee on Appropriations; the House Committee on Finance, or the House Committee on Transportation; one from the membership of the Senate Committee on Finance and Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Transportation; one gubernatorial appointment shall be a member of the Commonwealth Transportation Board and one shall be a person who has significant experience in transportation planning, finance, engineering, construction, or management; ex officio: the Director of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation; or his designee; the Commissioner of Highways, or his designee; and the chief elected officer of one town in a county embraced by the Authority to be chosen by the Authority.</td>
<td>Chief elected officer of each of the 10 cities; a current elected official of each of the four counties; three members of the House of Delegates and two members of the Senate; a member of Commonwealth Transportation Board appointed by the Governor; the Director of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation, or designee; the Commissioner of Highways, or designee; and Executive Director of the Virginia Port Authority, or designee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate Revenue Sources</strong></td>
<td>No dedicated revenue authorized - but administrative expenses not otherwise funded will be allocated to the members by formula.</td>
<td>Sales Tax, Grantees Tax, Northern Virginia Transportation District Fund Transfer, Interstate Operations &amp; Enhancement Program Transfer - restructured as transfers from Commonwealth Transportation Fund</td>
<td>Regional 0.7 percent of sales and use tax, and wholesale gas tax of 7.6 cents per gallon for gasoline and 7.7 cents per gallon for diesel fuel; specific future tolls; No locality embraced by the Authority shall reduce its local funding for public transit by more than 50 percent of what it appropriated for public transit as of July 1, 2019 with escalation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorized Uses</strong></td>
<td>Transit planning and service delivery.</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>35 percent be used for transportation-related purposes benefiting the localities; 15 percent to the Greater Richmond Transit Company (GRTC), or its successor, to provide transit and mobility services; Fifty percent, proportionally, to each locality to improve local mobility,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition/Operating Authority</strong></td>
<td>May acquire assets and deliver services; may contract for service delivery.</td>
<td>Distributes funds to delivery agencies</td>
<td>Distributes funds to delivery agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonding</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2021 Capital and Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$351,175,864</td>
<td>$260,299,069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>