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Foreword: The Panel’s Assignment

PITTSBURGH AND ITS SURROUNDING communities are at an historical moment. The region is experiencing growth in population and jobs in an increasingly diverse economy. Tagged as one of the nation’s most livable cities, Pittsburgh is becoming a new destination for a younger generation. Technology companies drawn in part or in large measure by university research and skills are recruiting technology companies like Google and Intel. The retention of the millennial generation is changing the face of Pittsburgh and creating opportunities to think differently about the region, about economic development, and about smart growth.

With the successful passage of a robust transportation bill for Pennsylvania, transit across the state has a predictable funding stream. For the Port Authority of Allegheny County, this legislation means fiscal stability for the first time in a decade and the wherewithal to partner across the county on community and economic development plans that promote comprehensive and sustainable growth. Transit spurs development, and, if done right, it can help to revitalize and reshape Pittsburgh and the region.

Pennsylvania’s new transportation funding law presents a real opportunity to think about growth. The Port Authority of Allegheny County tasked the ULI Advisory Services panel team to address key questions as a piece of its overall strategy to draft a sound framework for transit planning in the region. The key questions asked of the panel are as follows:

- What is the strategic blueprint for a modern transit system in Allegheny County that best serves the region’s growth patterns?
- How best do we integrate existing service with new strategic initiatives such as bus rapid transit (BRT) from downtown to Oakland, extended busways, and high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) use?
- What is the role of transit-oriented development (TOD) in Allegheny County and where?
- What creative financing methods are used by others to leverage existing revenue?

Several panel members with extensive experience on other ULI Advisory Services panel assignments noted that these questions addressed a significantly large scope and that the answers could offer the opportunity for subsequent panels to look extensively at different elements and to expand the depth and detail of the recommendations.

However, as the panel conducted its research and deliberations, it addressed the major themes around which to formulate its recommendations. So, although the panel did not have an opportunity to address each question extensively, it hopes that its recommendations offer a relevant framework within which the Port Authority can effectively continue to transform its development and redevelopment patterns to respond both to its vision and to the new market realities of the new funding law along with the economic opportunities and demographics of the region.
Summary of Analysis and Recommendations

The panel’s recommendations flow directly from its analysis of the challenges summarized above and described in more detail in the sections that follow. A summary of the areas analyzed and recommendations follows.

In its approach, the panel went from macro analysis to more detailed work focusing on some specific areas. Thus, the work departs from setting the context in an economic base and trends. Instead, this detailed approach helps frame the existing transit infrastructure, an approach that is significant and offers immediate value. The next step is to consider enhancing the customer—or the rider—experience, which is a critical topic to improve service and to facilitate new components to the infrastructure.

Transit-oriented development is then analyzed by the real estate capability inside the transit agency itself. The panel uses the downtown Oakland corridor as a case study that illustrates a path to the transit solutions and the transportation mobility options under discussion in Pittsburgh.

Finally, the panel focuses on funding the Port Authority, on coming challenges, and on how much more self-reliant transit agencies around the United States will have to be.

The panel recommends a change in the culture of the agency—a change that emphasizes (a) approaching issues from the positive side but with a critical spirit, (b) recognizing the transit bargain, and (c) understanding why transit is so important to our urban future.

The Port Authority faces a unique opportunity to reestablish how it is perceived by its users, an opportunity that will hinge severely on the success of improving service.

The remainder of this report documents the panel’s analysis and recommendations.
**Economic Trends**

**UNDERSTANDING SOCIOECONOMIC FORCES** at work in a community helps plan for the future. Before addressing the specifics of Pittsburgh, it is critical to understand the regional context: the Pittsburgh metropolitan statistical area (MSA), Allegheny County, and the city of Pittsburgh itself.

Allegheny County includes one-half of the overall population in the region. Pittsburgh makes up about 30 percent of the Allegheny County population. The region is recovering from a loss of 100,000 steel industry jobs in the 1980s and a loss of nearly one-half of the population of Pittsburgh as a result of migration away from the city and region. However, the region has seen relatively little decline in jobs in the past five years. A strong economy helped to set employment at an all-time high in 2011. But additional job growth is expected to remain flat for 2014. Unemployment for the region has dropped from a high of 8.8 percent in 2010 to 5.8 percent in 2014, lower than the

Regional Demographic Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pittsburgh MSA</th>
<th>Allegheny County</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,468,289</td>
<td>1,336,449</td>
<td>369,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,431,052</td>
<td>1,282,568</td>
<td>334,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,356,285</td>
<td>1,223,325</td>
<td>305,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,361,874</td>
<td>1,229,577</td>
<td>307,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population age 20–34 (millennials)</td>
<td>433,735</td>
<td>251,134</td>
<td>93,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials as percentage of population</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with a college degree</td>
<td>475,740</td>
<td>295,997</td>
<td>71,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with degree as percentage of adult population</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force</td>
<td>1,954,139</td>
<td>1,019,547</td>
<td>263,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income, 2000</td>
<td>$37,453</td>
<td>$41,814</td>
<td>$31,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income, 2010</td>
<td>$46,820</td>
<td>$52,037</td>
<td>$39,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income, 2013</td>
<td>$48,346</td>
<td>$55,031</td>
<td>$41,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average travel time to work, 2010</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage who take transit to work, 2010</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data are for 2013 unless otherwise specified.
national average. Of the 126,000 employees working in downtown Pittsburgh, 54 percent commute on public transit. The average travel time to work in the region is about 20 minutes—not far off the national mean. And the city offers an attractive economic context, where six Fortune 500 companies are headquartered, for example.

Millennials are gaining prominence across current trends, and the future ramifications of this generation are a critical element to consider. As the figure “Regional Demographic Trends” shows, millennials represent approximately 30 percent of the resident base in central Pittsburgh. Their transit requirements are different from other demographic groups. And their presence offers the possibility of supporting a downtown environment open 24—7. Of course, serving millennials is not without its own set of challenges, including their interest in other modes of urban transportation such as the ridesharing companies Uber and Lyft and biking, all of which can potentially compete with conventional mass transit. If these alternatives are seen as the solution to the “last mile,” then there is much room for collaboration.

Office Market

The regional standard metropolitan statistical area presents 72 million square feet of office space, with 7.1 million square feet vacant, that is, a 10 percent vacancy rate. This vacancy rate is the third lowest in the United States.

An additional 2.3 million square feet is under construction. And just the Pittsburgh central business district (CBD) area presents 37.1 million square feet that includes 17 million square feet of Class A office space (45 percent). The CBD also has only a 10 percent vacancy rate.

Housing Market

Overall, the housing stock has a 10 percent vacancy rate across all types. However, in Pittsburgh the apartment market has a historical vacancy rate of 4.85 percent. Pittsburgh rental vacancy rate is 3.1 percent, among the lowest in the nation, and some areas such as Shadyside and Oakland have a vacancy rate as low as 1.8 percent with a current rental rate of $1,224 per month.

Economic growth and employment drives this rental demand. A supply of 961 units per year is expected to 2019; the projected vacancies of up to 3.9 percent will still be below the historical rate. The city’s current objective is to attract 20,000 new residents over the next decade, which would be attractive to continue the growth in retail and other service sectors.

Several other factors also drive demand for rental housing:

■ Young professionals and seniors or empty nesters are opting for living in cities rather than suburban, exurban, and rural locations.

■ People are reluctant or unable to buy new homes in the wake of the recent housing and foreclosure crisis.

■ People are concerned about rising energy costs and have an increasing interest in lifestyles that are not dependent on automobiles. For Pittsburgh, in general, and the East End, in particular, little new housing is being built, and many young people prefer to live in the city near the universities and hospitals.

Additional Economic Drivers

Pittsburgh offers additional significant elements that need to be addressed to generate the region’s growth. Those elements include an emphasis on the urban core and imply additional ridership opportunities on public transportation.

In the hospitality sector, the city contemplates 4,570 rooms operating at 67.3 percent occupancy. The industrial inventory totals 116 million square feet, with a vacancy of 7.8 percent, and 700,000 square feet are currently under construction. However, retail has migrated from downtown, implying the need for grocery market operations. But the city sustains a very relevant downtown sports venue with around 4 million attendees a year, a convention center with 700,000 attendees, and a downtown performing arts scene with 1.2 million attendees.
This downtown economy will be supported over the next decade by many drivers: the Marcellus Shale tract development and related spin-offs; numerous buildings under construction or planned in downtown and Oakland; and emerging job growth in medical, financial, energy, and technology sectors with 88,900 new jobs projected by 2019 for the metropolitan region. Pittsburgh also currently offers a low cost of living relative to other big cities; some interviewed for this report called Pittsburgh “the mini New York with a maxi lifestyle.” Local university graduates increasingly want to stay in the area—millennials are seeking urban lifestyles, transit options, and walkable neighborhoods. Several other demographic trends point in this direction—baby boomers are looking to downsize from suburban homes to more urban settings and are seeking metro areas with colleges, universities, culture, and arts.

This background perspective informs the narrative of transit as a vital part to consider for the future of the development of the Pittsburgh market. High-capacity highway routes into downtown are severely congested, and the geography often limits the feasibility of expanding the system’s congested points. Federal and state fiscal constraints currently limit new transportation construction options. Employment centers in downtown and Oakland are relatively concentrated, thus highlighting the importance of making transit service more efficient. For instance, downtown parking availability and expenses ($8 to $11 a day and more at many parking places in downtown Pittsburgh) make commuting by car not feasible for many. The Pittsburgh Parking Authority recently raised rates in its garages throughout downtown Pittsburgh and other areas of the city. Three transit busways allow for users to bypass congested highways, yet crowding—or lack of transit capacity—is a problem on many local lines. In essence, travel time, congestion, parking and travel costs, and, increasingly, transit access are major determinants of where new businesses will locate and residents will live.
**Leveraging the Transit Backbone**

**THE EXTENT OF THE PITTSBURGH** transportation system has changed critically in the past eight years and significantly so because of financial constraints. However, these circumstances redefine an opportunity to embrace a blueprint for new service in the region.

Certain demand is generated by clusters with nodes such as employment concentration that drive transit demand in the region. The region also has areas where most households don’t use cars or their use is minimal. And then there are disbursed demands, such as those of populations age 65 and older who may rely heavily on the transportation network and those of labor-force populations that are relatively evenly distributed around the area.

These considerations are critical to create a more comprehensive, long-term transportation network. The system will be successful to the extent that it creates additional connections that give people more choices about how they move about the region and more choices about where to locate, both as residents and as employers.

Ridership, despite the loss in service and routes, remains strong. It is important to note that the busways are the most heavily used component of the system. The light-rail system, or $T$, is the next most used. The BRT in the Oakland corridor, depending on how the corridor is defined, has higher ridership than the $T$ and a higher ridership than all three busways combined. The BRT is followed by the Oakland corridor, which is not a facility by itself, but a remarkably highly used corridor. As is true with any urban transit system, the basic bus system does the lion’s share of the work. But all those common connections really affect the vitality of the region.

The area experiences 65 million rides a year, in broad numbers, and more than 215,000 rides a day. And of these figures, transit plays a key part: one of five city residents uses transit. In the county, nearly 10 percent of the residents are taking transit just to go to work, which highlights a large untapped market. Ninety percent of residents outside the city could potentially use transit, and more than 80 percent of city residents could do so.

---

*Evolution (reduction) of main transit lines and service corridors in Pittsburgh.*

---

2006

2014
Commuting is the primary purpose for the travel; but because that public transportation network connects to recreation sites, cultural sites, parks, and more, people could take advantage of it for many other trips—trips that will likely increase in the future.

Park-and-Ride Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port Authority</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7,742</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,164</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13,906</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of park-and-ride lots is significant with 54 such sites around the urban area. The average number of cars that use the lots actually masks what happens, because more than one-half of those locations are full or overflowing. Only a few very large park-and-ride lots happen to be underused, and those numbers skew the average. The strong demand for parking spaces shows a need to expand park and ride.

Indeed, one way to leverage the transit system is simply to make it more accessible and thereby boost ridership. When service can be restored strategically, there are some critical connections to those high-capacity lines that could be prioritized and that would help more people to move around the region. The panel wants to reinforce the importance of upgrading pedestrian and bicycle facilities and the need for the participating city and county parties to help provide better access to bus stops, shelters, and stations. Adding sidewalks for pedestrians is not quick and easy to accomplish nor is it within the Port Authority’s control. The authority is challenged throughout the system, especially in the suburbs, by the lack of adequate sidewalks.

Pittsburgh Public Transit Annual Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Annual ridership</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Busways</td>
<td>10,400,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail (T)</td>
<td>9,100,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland corridor</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bus</td>
<td>31,850,000</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incline railroad</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Daily ridership averages 215,000 people. Whereas approximately 20 percent of Pittsburghers take public transit, 86 percent of all transit users are daily commuters.

The importance of providing people with more choices and better connections cannot be overstated. The panel understands that there is much discussion about what sort of public transit should serve the airport. Understanding the airport transit needs of employees and travelers is very important, as is making those transit solutions easy to understand, simple to use, and efficiently marketed and advertised.

Opportunities may arise to coordinate with the other regional services that come into the county, and that might include joint operating agreements. Transit can be leveraged to support development, and that presents opportunities to coordinate with major institutions to sustain their growth and to boost transit ridership. As many institutions elsewhere have demonstrated, opportunities might arise to contract for late-night service, weekend service, or peak-period service to meet needs. Any joint operating agreement in Allegheny County with regional transit carriers must consider the Port Authority’s collective bargaining agreement with its primary labor union (Local 85 of the Amalgamated Transit Union) that represents the bus and light-rail operators. Cooperative agreements with regional transit agencies that connect to and transfer passengers to the Port Authority’s system at the Allegheny County line would be mutually beneficial. The Port Authority would increase its ridership and demand, and the regional transit agencies would reduce costs to travel in and out of Allegheny County as well as be able to focus more service in their primary counties and service areas. (Now the regional carriers essentially provide door-to-door service for their passengers.)
Enhancing the Customer Experience

THE CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE must be enhanced to improve the value for the customer and the overall system. The panel recommends addressing the following points:

■ Understand what’s needed, what’s necessary, and what must take place.

■ Define the audiences that will respond.

■ Develop a strategy to effectively illustrate a proactive desire for change.

The panel recognizes the challenges and severe difficulties faced in recent years, in particular from 2006 to 2013. The need to cut service while increasing fares was daunting. In those years, approximately 33 percent of the service was cut, and the bus system went from more than 200 routes to 98. In a relatively short period, this drop in service and rise in fares affected riders enormously, with an emphatic impact in some demographic sectors and locations, such as seniors, citizens with special needs, or those relying exclusively on a single mode of transportation.

Those are the challenges that a public agency such as the Port Authority needs to constantly address along with competing requirements and seemingly impossible obligations. But the essence of the public agency and its staff members lies in serving the transit requirements and in never forgetting the important public service they provide. This permanent challenge needs to be faced and embraced by all similar agencies. Securing funding commitments to support the future of the Port Authority and the service it provides is a critical achievement that needs to be recognized.

This milestone presents a fresh opportunity to consider new elements and to enhance other aspects that the agency and the regional transportation structure have been dealing with in a subdued manner.

Riders can feel ignored, according to interviews conducted for this report. The panel heard riders say the following:

■ “The system is currently not based on the needs of the user. If it were, there would be a better set of services responding to those who know how to use what is out there.”

■ “The current focus is on funding, not riders.”

■ “Please recognize how important the rider’s voice is to the services issue overall.”

■ “The people in this county are committed to finding a solution to the problems plaguing this transit system, but you must first find someone who is really willing to listen and use what they will hear.”

Some of these observations are real challenges the system is facing, and some observations are the result of public misperception or lack of information. The voices of the riders need more recognition from the agency. The agency and the riders are both interested in having riders get a voice at the table in a different, more effective way.
Customers and riders and the products that are offered to them need to be contemplated with care by public agencies in the various user-case scenarios that follow.

Commuters make 86 percent of trips in the Pittsburgh region. But that is just one user-case scenario; other scenarios that need to be contemplated include those with event-based riders coming downtown for sporting events or cultural events. For example, in the Dallas region the biggest single day of ridership for the system is St. Patrick’s Day, which competes with game days between the University of Texas and the University of Oklahoma. The ridership on St. Patrick’s Day is four times the average. It requires the system to completely reconfigure itself, routes are realigned, and bus bridges are used. More than 300 events a year occur in Dallas that demand different transit service responses. This event-based and occasion-based analysis is critical, and the panel recommends enhanced planning and consideration around such events. The Port Authority currently ramps up capacity for events such as high-attendance football games (running two-car trains during home Steelers games, for example), but the authority is limited by both staffing and equipment. Further, transit agencies are limited by Federal Transportation Agency (FTA) regulations in what kind of event-based service they can provide. For instance, special shuttle service is prohibited. However, the Port Authority can make the customer experience better during these peak ridership situations in many ways. Event planning is as much about event identification and preparation of overall agency resources as it is about changing schedules and adding equipment. Improving the customer experience starts with knowing that a new experience is about to occur. The introduction of mobile ticketing can reduce queuing around ticket vending machines with tickets instead purchased and downloaded to the user’s phone. Enhanced website support can address inquiries by event attendees about trip planning, train and bus schedules, stations and stop locations, fare information, and so forth. Many of the event riders are occasional riders, often referred to as “choice riders,” and are the source of new ridership demand over time.

Another important group is out-of-town visitors who are trying to use the services. These are occasional riders, not regular riders. Ticket vending machines and wayfinding tools need to operate smoothly to help this group’s casual use of the system. In discussing how to make transit usable for out-of-town visitors, the transit agency must consider the roles of other organizations and develop a proactive way to work with these organizations. For example, the Port Authority team should develop a process to work with conference organizers who would then provide information about the 28X route for attendees flying to Pittsburgh. Similarly, the Port Authority should work with hotel managers to provide correct transit information to guests. Proposals to restructure downtown bus routings need to consider how out-of-town visitors would access bus services.

Business conferences and university events bring another special type of rider. Having public transit available is key to making these events successful and attractive, thereby avoiding car rentals by attendees and reducing extensive use of downtown parking lots.

Another important group is the transit-dependent population, including people over age 65 and, particularly, people with disabilities.

Historically, transit agencies generated a ridership report once a month, which was commonly three weeks after the end of the month. Such a report could be made up to seven weeks after an event took place. Although use-
ful, such reports lose immediate validity and impact. To efficiently address similar user-case scenarios, transit agencies need immediate reporting by, for example, daily pulling all information from buses, trains, HOV lanes, and monitors. Ridership reports by shift, by type of route, and by time of day help agencies to learn and to understand in detail the system riders. In Dallas, this analysis helped the transit agency identify the most heavily used time slot by separating the day into four sections: (a) 3:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.—the commuting time, (b) 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m., (c) 2:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., and (d) 7:00 p.m. to midnight. Surprisingly, the most heavily used period was midday, not peak. Midday—or 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.—is when Dallas’s public transport is used by seniors, students, and people who are not working but who are going to appointments. Although the system was most used during morning peak or afternoon peak, the largest single use was midday. Using this data helped reform the way the system was priced and the way routes were developed.

Another important shift is the change in independent ridership, in particular through the rise of the millennials. This demographic group is not dependent on cars and considers public transit one of the most logical ways to move around.

The panel strongly believes that as those elements just discussed are considered, in particular how to think about addressing commuters, then the way products are delivered will change. In every one of these cases, the key is that there are early adopters. The goal is to make early adopters also enthusiastic adopters.

A number of ridership drivers affect this process. These include the following:

- Employment
- Commuting cost (gasoline, parking, ownership)
- Freeway congestion and effect on commute times
- Service availability (frequency of headways, number of transfers)

- Transit dependency
- Events and entertainment demand

There are also ridership deterrents. When these aspects are poorly executed, they contribute to people choosing not to ride the system. These deterrents can include the following:

- Travel (speed and rider experience)
- Reliability
- Boarding, alighting, and the associated speed
- Safety and security
- Affordability and pricing perceptions
- Fare payment options
- Service integration
- Comfort, ease of use
- Poor accessibility
- Poor information (including updates) and system information design for the user
- Courtesy and responsiveness of personnel
- Attractiveness of key system impact elements, such as vehicles and shelters
- Amenities, including stations

Successful transit infrastructure will have to continuously meet user expectations through a variety of measures. Marketing the system services must be continuous and integrate with the overall vision. The panel recommends identifying the best opportunities to exceed expectations. Also, the system must provide accurate information about locations of trip disruptions, and that information must be available on mobile devices, on vehicles, and on platforms. Use a “publisher/communications” function by moving an agency social media expert into the dispatch office. Hence, the social media expert, not the dispatcher, is responsible to relay information to all who need to know by getting the
news to social media, to customer service, and to the rest of management. The goal is to address the various groups that really need the information; to inform those groups well; to not bother the dispatcher who might be rescheduling a train, rerouting a bus line, or untangling a variety of other issues; to provide specific information about the routes affected rather than an all-points announcement; and to simplify the interface with the user, which is challenging to accomplish but essential to succeed.

Presenting transit in different ways is also a key component to refresh and enhance the system. And some essential steps are already on their way, such as the implementation of the ConnectCard. Improvements can be made to maps at platforms and bus shelters and to schedule information so it is easy to find and read. In addition, improvements to maps and schedule information can be made by adding interactive and tactile technology where possible and by incorporating geo-fencing information for nearby services and establishments.

The panel members understand that the bus shelters are not managed and maintained by the transit system, but by the city in most cases. Instead, the shelters are owned and managed by private companies contracted by municipalities, which presents a challenge and some opportunities for public agencies. For example, differing views between the city and the transit agency often arise about what a shelter should be, where it should be, how it should look, and what kinds of technology should be in it.

Shelters can transform your customer’s experience, and the panel recommends that the Port Authority explores enhancing the system of stops, shelters, and platforms to make them more easy to locate and able to provide better information such as real-time schedule information and service status. When possible, the Port Authority should partner with allied interests to share the burden of costs of ongoing programming and maintenance. Those allies include advertisers, adjacent property owners, community organizations, and so forth.

**ConnectCard**

ConnectCard is the Port Authority of Allegheny County’s new fare collection system. The Port Authority aims to provide a more convenient and secure way to pay fares with a smart card. The system uses a plastic smart card with a computer chip inside that can store a variety of fare options, including passes and fare value. The Port Authority has rolled out ConnectCard service locations throughout its coverage area, including retail outlets where the card can be bought and machines where it can be recharged. Although the Port Authority is the lead agency on this project, ConnectCard was envisioned as a regional smart card system that would make it easier for riders to transfer between the transit services of Southwestern Pennsylvania. Panelists were provided with individual ConnectCards during their time in Pittsburgh to directly explore the operations of the system and experience its usability.
Shelters and Platforms

Shelters and platforms offer an opportunity to engage customers not only through efficient improvements in their trip, but also through added cultural enjoyment during their time in transit. This opportunity, when customers are waiting for their service, offers a great occasion to interact with the customer and can be used to deliver information. Private advertising initiatives have offered interactive screens with augmented reality such as the one pictured above in London, where elements of the real-world are augmented by computer-generated sensory input. In this case, the intervention took several playful forms such as a robot invasion, a roaming wild lion in the city, and a giant tentacle pulling pedestrians into the city sewers. In an integrated public art program in Madrid, 20 bus stops featured 20 international artists who composed art works made exclusively of sounds. People could listen to the work by connecting their earphones to devices set up at bus stops. The temporary program was exhibited for three months in 2005. Recently, the small Austrian town of Krumbach, with 1,000 residents, invited seven architects to design bus shelters across the system; the result attracted much international attention and enhanced the town’s pride reflected on its bus routes.
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Enhancements to the transit system’s work culture—targeted to the workforce—are also basic to improving the system. The transit’s workforce is the sales force of the system: bus operators, customer service representatives, maintenance personnel, and so forth. Any transit system needs to develop a customer-service culture focused on achieving five-star service for the customer. The culture must emphasize customer service and provide hospitality training for all employees who work with customers.

The Port Authority has an opportunity to be perceived as a local solution, with self-reliance and a back-to-basics approach with three major focuses:

- Improve the quality of the service.
- Increase the efficiency of the system.
- Stabilize future funding to enable capital investment and service expansion.

The successful outcomes are self-evident: (a) greater penetration of the available market, (b) higher ridership, (c) increased operating revenues, and (d) opportunities to collaborate with the community and local government entities to enable local funding options and added stability.

Mobile Technology

Mobile technology is a reliable and meaningful resource where a large portion of riders have access to it, and riders’ preference for it as a means of interaction is on the rise. Mobile technology provides the ability to plan trips, to observe service disruptions, and to buy different types of tickets. Riders want to be able to plan trips. They want to be able to know where their bus is and when the next train will arrive. They want to know about service disruptions. And they want access to all these services by using their mobile technology. This technology does not require extensive time to implement and offers immediate returns by improving customer experience. The Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) GoPass app, pictured, was downloaded 145,000 times in the nine months that followed implementation.

Like transit systems in other regions, Dallas Rapid Area Transit offers an all-in-one transit tool to help riders use the system, get information, and so forth. GoPass and similar applications are free for people to download and use with a variety of mobile devices. Riders need to update the applications regularly to ensure an optimal experience.

Enhancements to the transit system’s work culture—targeted to the workforce—are also basic to improving the system. The transit’s workforce is the sales force of the system: bus operators, customer service representatives, maintenance personnel, and so forth. Any transit system needs to develop a customer-service culture focused on achieving five-star service for the customer. The culture must emphasize customer service and provide hospitality training for all employees who work with customers.

The Port Authority has an opportunity to be perceived as a local solution, with self-reliance and a back-to-basics approach with three major focuses:

- Improve the quality of the service.
- Increase the efficiency of the system.
- Stabilize future funding to enable capital investment and service expansion.

The successful outcomes are self-evident: (a) greater penetration of the available market, (b) higher ridership, (c) increased operating revenues, and (d) opportunities to collaborate with the community and local government entities to enable local funding options and added stability.
TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD) has become a common term for agencies dealing with transit. Another common term is transit adjacent development. But a lot of ground separates the two approaches in the United States. Both TOD and transit adjacent development can have the same amount of land uses, the same transit use, and the same building cost. However, one approach—transit adjacent development—separates the station from the community; TOD weaves the station into the community.

Transit adjacent development offers limited development on publicly owned land and is focused on segmented private development. Although that approach is often acceptable, it has a more limited impact in supporting communities.

TOD typically defines an area within a five-minute walk of a station. It enables the developers of public and private land to build value together. The transit facility is embraced by development, while it synergizes transportation with land uses to create compact, dense development. TOD supports a mix of uses around the transit—housing, retail, and commercial. This mix creates walkable, sustainable communities that enhance transit ridership and provide affordable transportation choices.

Most important, TOD tries to ease the disparity between jobs and housing, moving them closer together so people have less distance to go. TOD also enables using the transportation infrastructure more efficiently and decreases the need for additional public funds to be used for transportation facilities.

Encouraging a mix of uses is fundamental for a successful TOD development, and it is often one of the most difficult parts of creating a TOD. Building a mix of uses requires a
savy developer, experienced in TOD or capable of working with others to bring that demand together. Mixed-uses can be developed vertically or horizontally. Either approach provides multiple benefits that include more walking, additional ridership, and reduced car dependency.

The challenges metro areas face to seamlessly generate TOD are abundant. However, national demand for this type of development is high. By the year 2025, more than 14.6 million households want to live in a TOD. Most of those households are single person or couples without children. Yet 20 percent of the demand is from households with children. We need to commit development efforts to meet future demands for the millennials as well as the baby boomers who want to live in the city.

However, to make TOD happen, we must plan for it. “Build it and they will come” does not always happen. TOD requires strong effort with many building blocks. There needs to be a regional vision. There needs to be development with growth near transit. There needs to be local leadership that takes up the steps and moves the project forward. Collaboration cannot just be handed off between various agencies. The collaboration has to be a fruitful and committed process that includes the developer and the community.

Stationary plans made before securing the development provide certainty for the developer, which is very important to move a project forward. Zoning approvals already in place help with speedy development.

Leadership is vital, and it often comes in the form of a political champion. This person defends what is needed and stands up to marshal the resources and build those coalitions. Most important, this person will be there to resolve the disputes between various agencies, developers, and the public.

Planning is also fundamental, whether it is local land use planning, community planning, or stationary planning. But it builds the vision and the support in a process that is driven by the market.

TOD in Pittsburgh, as this report outlines, offers many opportunities and challenges. Some projects are moving forward: for example, East Liberty, a neighborhood in Pittsburgh’s East End, is a remarkable example of TOD. And other examples include Port Authority properties and other publicly owned parcels around the city that may be able to be used as incentives development. Financial and demographic limitations are challenging. And a common effort needs to coalesce to create places that people want to come back to. The emphasis has to be on building communities, not projects.

The area has several strengths that need to be explicitly considered:

- The Port Authority is using a cross-functional team (legal, engineering, operations) to bring these projects to fruition. Also the authority is working cooperatively with Allegheny County Economic Development in valuing the deals and providing general development advice.

- Current negotiations on developing the four most promising stations (East Liberty, Castle Shannon, Dormont, and South Hills Village) require real estate expertise beyond legal expertise. The Port Authority needs to strategically pursue joint development opportunities at the 21 park-and-ride lots to minimize the adverse impact on riders using them. For example, if multiple projects are advanced on all those park-and-ride lots at once, too many lots may be closed for construction at one time with little options for alternative parking during construction.

- More than 21 park-and-ride lots are owned in fee by the Port Authority. Note that although the Port Authority owns more than 1,000 unique parcels in the region, the majority of those parcels are essential to transit operations and are of great value to the authority. For example, the East Busway alone is made up of hundreds of parcels. However, to clarify and address what property the Port Authority owns, where it is located, and what parcels may be viable for development, the Port Authority is now mapping this information to be used by developers and local leaders as they create TOD.
More than 1,000 parcels may offer little value to the Port Authority but perhaps can present great value to others.

Underused land close to transit is held by other public agencies, but has potential for greater scale.

Rights of way have potential for revenue generation through advertising, utility, fiber optics, and other creative uses; they are a great source of continuous revenue.

Fees are collected for busway access by more than six surrounding county transit systems under a maintenance fee agreement.

The growing population base is younger (45 percent under age 40, 27 percent under age 30), has more than $100,000 in median income, and wants to live near transit.

Numerous activities and studies espouse the value of TOD and transit investment. (See, for example, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, Southwest Pennsylvania Commission, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership, 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania, Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh [URA], Riverlife, Oakland, Pittsburgh Comprehensive Plan process, and so forth.)

Special programs to attain some funding include the following: Transit Revitalization Investment District grants, Tax Increment Financings, the City Revitalization and Improvement Zone, and Value Capture at state and local level; Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER), HUD Sustainable Communities funding, FTA TOD, and Joint Development Guidance at the federal level. Most programs require collaboration. For instance, as a resource, the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) offers several publications that address funding alternatives for transit and its international counterpart UITP—the International Association for Public Transportation—has been publishing ideas about funding options used by transit agencies around the world. See www.apta.com and www.uitp.org.

Several potential weaknesses need to be addressed to reach a successful process:

- Shrinking staff risks being greatly overloaded with responsibilities.
- Administrative budgets have been significantly reduced.
- Shortage of expertise exists in land planning, real estate, and in financial valuation.
- Limited accounting and geographic information system (GIS) mapping of total real estate assets and rights of way need to be increased.
- Lack of consistent and professional valuation of assets and process to monetize the assets exists. The Port Authority has a consistent and federally compliant process for valuing its real estate assets through an appraisal and review that determines fair market value for each site under consideration for TOD sale or lease. However, the authority agrees that a more efficient way may exist to get more value from TOD deals beyond just the rent from fair market value.

And the process also faces a number of threats:

- The Port Authority, like many urban transit agencies, recognizes the critical role its real property assets and the location of stations and rail alignments play in the region’s land use decisions. Yet it is somewhat hesitant to move forward on TOD efforts. This hesitation is due not only to the effect mass development of its assets has on its riders or patrons, but also because land use regulation and economic development are traditionally the province of city and county governments. An incremental approach to developing Port Authority real property assets is preferred. This approach would recognize (versus discounting) the need to minimize the adverse impact on the Port Authority’s operations and riders while development is underway. Ultimately, the Port Authority’s primary mission is transit service, but it recognizes the need to involve its real estate assets in regional land use decisions and initiatives, subject to limitations by federal regulations on use of federally
funded transit assets. The potential for the process slowing down because of current staff levels could result in lost opportunities and revenues.

A meaningful TOD process can be sustained from the following assumptions:

- Statutory authority is needed to evaluate and manage the sale or lease of properties.
- Some properties may lend themselves to TOD, including the 21 park-and-ride lots owned in fee.
- Good stewardship leverages the value of those assets.
- Options are available to leverage financial resources to create capacity to realize TOD.
- More opportunities might exist beyond the four active Port Authority TOD projects to create a more robust program.
- Access to professional real estate capabilities is required to make this stewardship effective.

All aspects of the agency’s assets need to be fulfilled, including the following:

- GIS database on all real estate holdings, including rights of way and all related private easements
- General real estate competency including land use planning, design, and real estate finance
- Valuation of parcels owned
- Preparation of requests for proposals (RFPs)
- Draft contracts and negotiating deal structure
- Management of rights of way and encroachment
- Accounting functions
- Involvement in community planning processes

The panel applauds the ongoing efforts to map the Port Authority’s real estate assets and cross-functional team used in TOD negotiations. Furthermore, the Port Authority is to be commended for the RFP form it developed along with Allegheny County Economic Development and for a standard lease form it uses for all of its current TOD lease negotiations. Similar to many other transit agencies, much of this process is dictated by federal requirements because the majority of Port Authority assets were acquired with federal funds. Although this factor creates impediments to the timely and orderly pursuit of joint development opportunities, it should not become an excuse for inaction.

How are transit agencies and other public agencies across the country handling real estate functions? Generally speaking, there are three options to contemplate:

**Option 1: Manage outsourced real estate functions in house**

- One person in house would coordinate real estate.
- Real estate program costs would be covered by real estate program income.
- Support services for real estate program would be procured by RFPs.
- Compensation for staff person would include a base fee for GIS database creation and maintenance; commission would be paid on project revenues.

**Pros**

- Program generates new revenues to the authority to cover costs.
- Agency exercises management responsibility to optimize real estate holdings.
- Program provides access to professional real estate expertise.
- With the right management contract, the authority and its outsourced agent have incentives to make deals and get projects built.

**Cons**

- Because it costs money to make money, the program’s financial needs may create a public perception problem.
Option 2: Add more in-house capabilities to manage limited outsourced functions

- In-house staff would do as follows:
  - Develop and manage a GIS database of real estate holdings.
  - Develop RFP and prepare contracts.
  - Negotiate structure deals with support of expert and determine Port Authority lead by complexity of deal.
- Staff would handle accounting and debt collection.
- Additional program costs would be covered by new revenue sources and deal revenues.
- All disciplines that do not require full-time staff would be outsourced.

**Pros**

- Program generates new revenues to the authority to cover costs.
- Agency exercises management responsibility to optimize real estate holdings.
- Program provides access to professional real estate expertise.
- With the right management contract, the authority and its outsourced agent have incentives to make deals and get projects built.
- Total out-of-pocket expenses might be less than the other options.

**Cons**

- Software and technical maintenance requirements could be burdensome, mishandled, and more expensive in house.
- Staff might bear a higher overhead burden.
- Authority’s salary structure may not attract the expertise needed.

Option 3: Establish a real estate office in the agency

- All functions would be carried out by a newly established agency department.

**Pros**

- Program generates new revenues for the authority to cover costs.
- Agency exercises management responsibility to optimize real estate holdings.
- Program provides access to professional real estate expertise.
- Agency maintains complete control and knowledge of all activities.

**Cons**

- Software and technical maintenance requirements could be burdensome, mishandled, and more expensive in house.
- Staff bears the highest overhead burden.
- Authority’s salary structure may not attract the expertise needed.

The panel sees the third option as the least feasible because it involves a direct dedication to real estate, which does not seem necessary. Few agencies can accomplish all real estate functions on their own. Yet all agencies have in-house capabilities.

The Port Authority’s real estate function is now housed in its legal department, with an outside consultant helping with daily real estate management. This consultant provides assistance on TOD-related efforts, but not to the degree the panel recommends. The current level of support with the consultant could be augmented with an experienced real estate professional in a dedicated staff position. The two professionals would be able to work across departments with the Port Authority management team and professional staff, thus allowing the agency to leverage its limited resources to respond quickly to emerging economic development opportunities.
TRANSIT SOLUTIONS CAN BE ANALYZED by how they would improve circulation, reduce dependence on the automobile, improve the quality of life, and support development. This type of analysis should be the approach to the corridor from downtown Pittsburgh to Oakland, the two largest employment and activity centers in the region. The corridor links downtown with a remarkable collection of universities, medical centers, and major destinations. An analysis of several parcels in this large corridor show underused and publicly owned land, a finding that implies a large public interest in creating new uses for those properties.

As Pittsburgh considers implementing an enhanced level of transit—whether street cars, light rail, or BRT—it is important to note that an improved transit level can take many shapes, and, in fact, Pittsburgh has this enhanced transit with dedicated lanes and services. Many kinds of improved transit exist, ranging from a variety of dedicated lanes to a simple part-time use of a curb lane for a bus. But the purpose of an improved level of transit is to serve longer trips with relatively infrequent stops, with higher passenger loads, and with more frequent service. This structure results in faster service where people understand the different types of service and where a distinctive design of the vehicles and stations helps passengers differentiate the service, especially if it is BRT, from conventional express bus service.

In considering enhanced transit options, some fundamental questions need to be addressed:

- Where do riders want to go?
- How much time will it save for riders?
- How many new riders will it carry?
- What’s the incremental capital and operating cost per new rider, in both capital and operating expenditures?
- Will the proposed solution significantly increase ridership without creating traffic congestion for other modes of transportation in the corridor?
To provide the most effective service, we must understand both market needs and transportation infrastructure constraints and options. Assessments of transit and how it has helped spur economic development have shown that success relies on three factors that must be present: government interest in redevelopment, market potential for that development, and quality of the transit investment.

The panel members caution that it may be premature to determine if BRT is the best solution for Pittsburgh. The panel noted that current headways on the Oakland corridor are about as high as can be practically achieved. Inserting a slightly larger BRT vehicle into a dedicated lane may not increase service levels or improve capacity on the route. At the observed densities witnessed by the panel, an argument could be made that either light rail or street cars might be the better solution and should be evaluated before being dismissed as too costly. Considering the solution on the basis of life-cycle costs and with the possibility of future federal funding, the panel suggests that choosing infrastructure with higher capacity may be the better choice.

Based on the advisory process, the panel understands that the goals of the downtown Oakland corridor are as follows:

- Strengthen physical connection between two cores.
- Support economic and community development.
- Spur transformation for expansion of Oakland as an employment and residential center.
- Enhance place making and livability through sustainable infrastructure and an attractive and pedestrian-friendly public realm.
- Support streets with vibrant retail and exciting destinations.
- Reinforce the Oakland and Uptown “brand” around innovation.
- Create a stronger link between land use and transportation.
- Catalyze sites for development opportunities.
- Provide safe, reliable, and convenient multimodal transportation options.
- Capture revenue from new development for infrastructure and transit improvements.
- Develop Oakland as a sustainable live, work, and play community.
- Support economic development for the Uptown area and the adjacent Hill District.

These goals depart from a transit proposition, but are much broader than transit, and they highlight the importance of transit as an engine of change. The panel members see an unprecedented momentum and interest across stakeholders—from the county, to the city, to the community, and to the Port Authority—to set priorities in this corridor for transit enhancements as well as for economic development.

An existing asset is that the corridor is there. It has a great backbone and possesses the ingredients for corridor success. The panel members suggest some short-term initiatives or actions to showcase the corridor as an example of excellence and community investment in transportation,
technology, and community-based planning. Those initiatives are as follows:

■ Focus on immediate service enhancements.  
  Lead: the Port Authority

■ Pilot innovative interventions for transit technology,  
  state-of-the-art shelters, and complete streets.  
  Lead: the Port Authority, institutional partners, and  
  the city

■ Develop a corridor plan through community-based planning. The plan should include the following elements: (a) a vision statement; (b) the scope of plan both geographically and programmatically; (c) the parties responsible for implementing the plan; (d) the process through which goals, objectives, and outcomes are accomplished; and (e) the governance and funding mechanisms required to implement the plan.  
  Lead: the city

The panel received abundant feedback about a desire to frame innovation; Oakland, in particular, wants to be an innovation district and wants to develop the area and its reputation. This feedback offers a strong connection to the idea of transforming the streets and the corridor into a place for innovation—in innovation in place making and innovation in transit. The panel suggests that, given the institutional partners in the area, the Oakland corridor could be a testing ground for state-of-the-art transit shelters and other infrastructure that was pointed to earlier in the report. Furthermore, the corridor could become a beacon of best practices, which could include testing parklets—or miniparks—that extend from the sidewalk, testing bike-ways, and testing various place-making and mode-sharing strategies. These tactics can be adopted temporarily to test alternatives. The effort could create momentum and buy-in across the city for thinking in different ways about streets, and also it could help to continue to brand and enhance the area.

The Port Authority should be commended for the innovative, open approach it is taking with the new Fifth Avenue and Atwood Street station. This approach illustrates the opportunities available to the agency, community residents, and property owners when they seek common objectives.

The panel understands that there is a broad range of quality planning and thinking about the area. A number of plans that have been completed are underway or are on the horizon, such as the Oakland 2025 plan and the work on the BRT. Whereas a foundation of good planning is in place for transit in the Oakland corridor, the panel is concerned that a unified vision seems to be lacking for how to crystallize the transit solutions and the economic development along this corridor. The panel suggests an integrated plan to guide both the transit solutions and the economic development opportunity corridor.

The panel commends the effort underway by the Port Authority to negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding with the city of Pittsburgh, the URA, and Allegheny County to advance BRT collaboratively. The Port Authority thinks the core governmental group most appropriate to advance BRT consists of those four entities. Yet the panel would argue that the government agencies and city departments

Structure for a Community-Based Planning Process

■ City as lead

■ Neighborhood advisory committee to include institutions, civic organizations, community and resident leaders, community development corporations, community-based organizations, and business improvement districts

■ Interagency working group to include the Port Authority; the Pittsburgh Parking Authority; Pennsylvania Department of Transportation; the Pittsburgh Mayor’s Office; URA; the Pittsburgh Department of City Planning, Department of Public Works, and Department of Parks and Recreation; and Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority

■ Direct public engagement
identified in the bulleted list in the box “Structure for a Community-Based Planning Process” would be relevant to the process to advance BRT and would need a way to communicate their issues, concerns, and priorities effectively. Moreover, the panel thinks the BRT project is an urban corridor initiative. As such, the project requires the city to exercise the key leadership because community development is a primary function of city government.

Successful planning must have a great deal of clarity. From the start, all involved must be clear about who is leading and about what the timeline is. Now there is stimulating momentum for the corridor, and it is critical that this momentum is not lost in the process of crystallizing a mission.

The typical structure of a plan is (a) vision, (b) goals, and (c) recommendations. But the panel wishes to highlight that for recommendations to be ready for action, the plan needs to ensure that the recommendations are premised on specialty studies and analysis. A land use analysis and market analysis, in particular, as well as a transportation analysis would lead to mobility solutions and improved levels of service and ridership capacity in the corridor.

Finally, what would the plan lead to? The panel understands that the ability to make zoning adjustments is required to fully realize the development opportunity and to be able to determine what the public investments will be and what special projects might be the next step.
FOR GENERAL FUNDING, passing Act 89, Pennsylvania’s transportation funding law, was fundamental. Funds are being raised all across the state, and they’re being channeled into a number of different places. The act increases funding by more than $500 million through 2019. This boost in financing from Act 89 has allowed the Port Authority to eliminate near-term operating deficits and to make substantial progress toward completing the necessary capital asset rehabilitation and replacements to maintain the transit system in good repair. However, the additional funding from the act is not sufficient to fund construction of any significant new capital additions nor to significantly increase service levels by restoring service previously eliminated. Unfortunately, additional state funding is not likely.

But the passage of the transportation law implies that the near-term operating deficits facing the Port Authority can be dealt with now. And it also means that some critical work can be done to bring the system up to a state of good repair. To accomplish those two pressing needs, the agency must spend some money.

The figure below, “Port Authority Projected Capital Program, 2015–2023,” illustrates the spending of $500 million over the next nine years. The capital program starts out by funding projects needed to keep the transit system in a state of good repair.

As stated previously, additional funding from Act 89 is not available.

The funding landscape presents an insufficient range of federal resources, and it is not likely to be resolved in the next five years. Whereas some small opportunities may arise, this stream cannot be a reliable asset in planning for the future of the region. So where can the Port Authority, Southwestern Pennsylvania, and Allegheny County get additional money?

The panel has observed that Pittsburgh is a place with the potential, resources, and initiative to seek regional solutions that apply to its system and needs. For instance, there are funding opportunities with parking fees, passenger fares, Port Authority real estate opportunities, and more.

If every Port Authority parking lot charged $2 a day for parking, annual revenues could be $3 million. Such a measure would face initial opposition, but once the advantages of such a proposition were understood, the parking revenue could become a bondable stream. Everyone benefits from transit, even those who do not directly use it. Public transit takes tens of thousands of cars off the roads every day. More cars on the roads cost everyone in wear and tear on roads, gridlock delays, and pollution. The panel suggests regional cooperation to discourage the use of private vehicles and increased incentives to ride public transit. In partnership with the Port Authority parking fee,
the panel suggests evaluating the feasibility of adding a city or county surcharge of $2 a day on all paid (public and private) commuter parking lots. The revenues from these fees would be remitted to the Port Authority for use in enhanced transit service. The panel recognizes that the Port Authority is already moving in the necessary direction of charging a fee for park-and-ride use with its ongoing TOD efforts. The projects at East Liberty, Shannon, and Dormont all contemplate structured parking for a fee, thus indicating that such fees could be implemented in all transit parking lots.

Passenger fares are another pivotal element. All riders need to pay the appropriate fare. The fare system could be reviewed to examine the equity of the free-fare zone and the overall fare structure while enhancing fare payment options.

A regional option for collecting revenues would be to expand the sales tax. Allegheny County collects a 1 percent sales tax, whereas surrounding counties do not collect sales taxes. The 2014 sales tax revenue budget for Allegheny County is $44.8 million. A regional 1 percent sales tax that would include Allegheny, Armstrong, Beaver, Butler, Washington, and Westmoreland counties would generate an estimated $69.3 million in 2014. Sales tax is an ideal transit funding source because it is indexed for inflation and population growth. Although potentially controversial in its implementation, a sales tax brings benefits and a visible improvement to the transit system that would facilitate improvements to the transit system.

Any such tax should be explicitly dedicated to improving mass transit services and operations in the region. The manner in which the tax is allocated among transit projects of regional significance will require extensive study and debate to achieve a broad-based public consensus that would translate into a successful voter referendum. If the tax is not dedicated and advanced in this manner, there is a very high likelihood that only a limited amount of the funds generated would ultimately be provided to the region’s public transit agencies as municipal governments struggle to plug budget holes year to year.

Understanding the Transit Bargain

Transit is a bargain. The median household income in Allegheny County is about $55,000 a year. The average parking charge downtown is approximately $12, and, as noted earlier, many downtown parking facility operators charge well above that amount. The federal mileage reimbursement rate, which accounts for depreciation on a vehicle, repairs, insurance, registration fees, fuel, and so forth, is $0.56 a mile. So if a worker has a ten-mile commute, it costs $22 a day, including parking, to drive a car.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Cost of Commute</th>
<th>One-way auto commute</th>
<th>Fed mileage rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Daily cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 miles</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$5.60</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$16.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 miles</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$11.20</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$22.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 miles</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$22.40</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$33.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public transit</th>
<th>Daily cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way base fare</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way zone 2 fare</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way average fare</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Cost of Commute</th>
<th>One-way auto commute</th>
<th>Fed mileage rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Annual total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 miles</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$1,344</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
<td>$3,984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 miles</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$2,688</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
<td>$5,328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 miles</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$5,376</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
<td>$8,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Public transit        | Annual pass, zone 1  | $1,072           |       |
|                       | Annual pass, zone 2  | $1,609           |       |

Note: Based on 240 days.

If a user pays a one-way base fare and takes a round trip on public transit, the fare is $5. Even in zone 2, the fare is $7.50. However, because of free fares and monthly and annual passes purchased at discount, when people ride a
Port Authority vehicle, they pay an average of $1.37 a trip. The average round trip cost is $2.74.

The annual cost of a commute is high. If a user buys an annual pass, the price is $1,072. If a user were to buy an annual zone 2 pass, the price would be $1,600.

For a one-way commute of ten miles, a user who bought an annual pass for zone 1 at a cost of $1,000 would save $4,256 a year over buying tickets and paying parking without the annual pass. This pass is the bargain that needs to be recognized and to be an important part of the message shared as the agency looks for implementation, funding, and a new blueprint for the region’s transit.

### Annual Savings of Public Transit Commute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-way auto commute</th>
<th>Fed mileage rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Annual total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 miles</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$2,688</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
<td>$5,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual pass, zone 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,256</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on 240 days.
WHILE CHALLENGES ABOUND, the stabilization of the region in recent years combined with a culture of collaboration and proactive change signal a stimulating outlook to the future. Much of what needs to come will take place through a shift in the culture of the agency as others change to meet the new requirements that the agency presents. The panel believes the Port Authority is committed in its efforts toward best practices.

Adjusting and reforming an agency requires work on specific components. The variety and volume of changes in recent years is such that certain aspects of the agency must be reset. The governance of the Port Authority has recently been reformed and restructured. The Port Authority’s finances have been stabilized for a multiyear period. And necessary adjustments to reductions in the system’s service along with staff reductions have largely been accomplished. Enhancing the customer experience will take on special importance as the agency seeks to restore confidence in its ability to provide services that are safe, reliable, efficient, and high quality.

A new strategic plan is needed. The Port Authority’s board of directors will need to develop a process to establish strategic priorities to guide the authority’s leadership team. The board is obligated to guide the management of staff and the leadership team in a structured fashion so that work can be done quickly and efficiently.

A new service plan is needed to reflect contemporary conditions and market demand—a plan that will be developed during open discussion and not be governed by historical schedules. The realignment of services must find a way to reintroduce some late evening transit services to support workforce needs. System additions and improvements, although lacking current funding, need to be identified, prioritized, and positioned for implementation as sustainable new funding is identified and secured. And the appropriate
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role for the authority in economic development and TOD needs to be defined.

A significant contributor to effectively managing this change will be a new process for business planning. Scarce resources require focus and discipline. The leadership team must perform at a high level. A “best practices” culture should be expected, maintaining an emphasis on the continuous improvement of the process. Agency staff members must shift from a model of delivering utility service to one of delivering hospitality. And midway through

Mission Statement—DART’s mission statement defines the purpose for which the agency was created:
The mission of Dallas Area Rapid Transit is to build, establish, and operate a safe, efficient, and effective transportation system that, within the DART Service Area, provides mobility, improves the quality of life, and stimulates economic development through the implementation of the DART Service Plan as adopted by the voters on August 13, 1983, and as amended from time to time.

Vision Statement—To help achieve the Board’s mission and strategic priorities, the Board has approved a vision statement to address DART’s customers and stakeholders.

DART: Your preferred choice of transportation for now and in the future.

Board Strategic Priorities—To achieve this mission and ensure agency alignment, in April 2009 the board adopted six strategic priorities:

Strategic Priority I: Strive to Exceed Customer Expectations

Strategic Priority II: Manage System Development and Maintain Infrastructure

Strategic Priority III: Build and Maintain DART’s Regional Transportation Leadership

Strategic Priority IV: Drive Change through Employee Engagement

Strategic Priority V: Maximize Funding Resources

Strategic Priority VI: Use Technology to Integrate and Advance Services and Systems

Source: Dallas Area Rapid Transit.
the strategic plan’s implementation, leadership will need to develop a long-term financially sustainable business model that the community will support.

A commitment to best practices offers a few classic tools to the Port Authority’s board to embrace a revamped business plan. That plan should include a mission, vision, or value statement; strategic priorities; and management goals.

Whereas it may seem initially complicated, this planning process for DART ensures that the organization can go from the board-level mission-vision-values assessment through the business planning process and all the way to employee performance and employee engagement. The majority of the transit industry now is using a similar method to inform and guide how they manage their properties and manage the communities they are in.

A mission statement is the board-level statement. The statement tends to get argued about in length because the mission of a public transit agency has to be considered carefully. What's the context? What region does it serve? What publics? What markets? All the answers to those

---

**DART’s Strategic Measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic priority</th>
<th>Examples of key leading indicators</th>
<th>Examples of key lagging indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Strive to exceed customer expectations. | ■ On-time performance  
■ Accidents per 100,000 miles  
■ Complaints per 100,000 passengers  
■ Call center service levels  
■ Mean distance between service calls | ■ Ridership  
■ Passengers per mile/hour  
■ Customer satisfaction surveys |
| II. Manage system development and maintain infrastructure. | ■ Revenue miles/hours  
■ Actual schedule vs. plan for system expansion  
■ Operator lost time claims  
■ Unscheduled absences  
■ Pay-to-platform ratio  
■ Average system speed  
■ Deadhead ratio  
■ Timely replacement of assets | ■ Ridership  
■ Passengers per mile/hour  
■ Customer satisfaction surveys  
■ Subsidy per passenger  
■ Administrative ratio  
■ Sales taxes for operations  
■ Unused financing capacity |
| III. Build and maintain DART’s regional transportation leadership. | ■ Complaints and commendations  
■ News clippings and other media mention | ■ Climate satisfaction survey  
■ Completion of transit system plan commitments  
■ Joint development created |
| IV. Drive change through employee engagement. | ■ Employee verbal feedback  
■ Number of grievances  
■ Corrective disciplinary actions  
■ Retention and absenteeism | ■ Employee satisfaction survey |
| V. Maximize funding resources. | ■ Passenger revenues  
■ Advertising and other revenues  
■ Federal funding | ■ Sales taxes for operations  
■ Administrative ratio  
■ Unused financing capacity |
| VI. Use technology to integrate advance services and systems. | ■ Cycle time and process measurements  
■ Project implementation vs. plan  
■ Benchmark comparisons | ■ Ridership |

*Source: Dallas Area Rapid Transit.*
questions have to be woven into the fabric of the mission statement.

Performance needs to be measured. Running an agency responsibly requires ownership of the process. Compensation has to be tailored according to performance, and personnel need to move out of the agency if the performance is not accomplished. Those elements are fundamental to an organization's excellence.

This report offers a range of recommendations and strategies to foster positive change in the region. It is a good time to live in Pittsburgh with its strong local economy; world-class universities and medical institutions; and its strong urban core with excellent cultural, sports, and entertainment facilities. Now is a good time to take on community infrastructure issues and opportunities. There is alignment between the county and city executives, and new leadership at the city and the Port Authority has demonstrated willingness to collaborate and to engage community groups. Now is an essential time for the Port Authority to reestablish itself in the eyes of its customers and stakeholders. And change starts with a message of being up to the challenge to improve service.

The agency will also have to earn the ability to request additional funds in the future and to talk about tax rates and special zones. The challenge is to work within the existing constraints, while showing customers and riders that service can be improved.

The panel recommends seeking ways to do so with visible evidence of progress so customers can see and experience the improvements. Visible differences establish credibility.

This challenge will require hard work. But success in accomplishing this vision depends on one factor: leadership. The Port Authority has demonstrated its desire to continue leading the way. And the panel believes in the authority's commitment. The panel hopes the recommendations it has offered for how to do this will help the agency fulfill its leadership vision and commitments.
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Lawrence brings more than 30 years of in-depth background and experience in real-world problem solving, strategy formation, feasibility assessment, and project management for complex real estate development projects. Founded in 1995, Cityscope Inc. is a real estate consulting, brokerage, property management, and development company. It specializes in evaluating the market and financial feasibility of larger-scale projects of all types.
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She graduated summa cum laude from George Washington University and received her MA in city planning from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Halina Steiner
Brooklyn, New York
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