

MAG Regional Transit Framework

Fact Sheet #4
June 2009

INTRODUCTION

A Regional Transit Framework is a guide established for developing a coordinated regional transit system. A framework is derived from analyzing where people in the region want to and will want to travel in the future, and addresses transit service investments through the identification of existing and future transportation needs and deficiencies (see Fact Sheet #3).

Three regional transit scenarios for year 2030 were developed to provide alternative options for improving transit service in the MAG region. Each scenario is based on a defined level of financial investment and a combination of improvements to existing transit service, transit service to new areas, and new transit service options (i.e. express bus, arterial Bus Rapid Transit, High Capacity Transit, etc.). Six different types of regional transit services (modes) were considered for each scenario. **Table 1** provides a description of the six transit modes considered.

Table 1: Regional Transit Framework Transit Service Models

SERVICE MODE	Purpose/Market Type	Typical Vehicle
Regional Connector	Rural to urban connections	Bus
Supergrid	Regional and local connections	Bus
Arterial BRT	Enhanced-speed, high-demand local or regional connections	Bus
Express Bus	Enhanced-speed, medium-volume commuter or regional connections	Bus
HCT Peak Period	Higher-speed, high demand regional connections	Bus or Rail
HCT All day	Higher-speed, high demand regional connections	Bus or Rail

YEAR 2030 TRANSIT SCENARIOS

Scenario I: Basic Mobility - The Basic Mobility Scenario is a low-cost expansion plan that includes a limited number of new routes and capital investments in high demand corridors. This scenario also includes a limited number of extensions to existing regional routes to serve growing areas within the region and provides enhanced service levels on existing regional routes within high demand corridors. Scenario I keeps additional operating and capital costs to a minimum, expands service to new areas, and improves service levels within a limited number of high demand transit corridors. Revenue assumptions are based on the continuation of all existing regional and local transit funding sources through year 2030.

Scenario II: Enhanced Mobility - The Enhanced Mobility Scenario is an intermediate plan that includes transit investments in the corridors from Scenario I, but focuses on providing options for faster regional transit services in the highest-demand corridors. Regional transit investments focus on addressing regional transit service levels, passenger capacity issues, and travel speeds in a limited number of high-priority corridors. This scenario emphasizes developing transfer hubs at key locations in the region to provide passenger access points for higher-speed travel alternatives. This scenario has moderate additional costs and provides premium transit services in a limited number of corridors that connect local areas with the region's activity centers. Scenario II assumes a continuation of all regional and local transit funding sources through year 2030, plus an additional funding source beginning in 2015 equal to 1.75 times the amount of revenue allocated to transit from Proposition 400. Total funding under this scenario would increase the MAG region's transit funding to a level consistent with the average annual per capita investment in transit made by MAG's peer regions in 2006 (see Fact Sheet #2).

Table 2: Transit Service Investment Modes by Scenario

TRANSIT SERVICE	Scenario I Basic Mobility	Scenario II Enhanced Mobility	Scenario III Transit Choice
Expanded Supergrid	X	X	X
Expanded Arterial Bus Rapid Transit	X	X	X
Expanded Regional Connector		X	X
Expanded Express Bus	X	X	X
New High Capacity Transit Peak Period		X	X
New High Capacity Transit All Day		X	X

Scenario III: Transit Choice - The Transit Choice Scenario includes transit investments in the corridors from Scenarios I and II. In addition, more areas with high transit demand are served with new or expanded regional transit service options providing a more comprehensive regional transit system. Because there are more options in more areas, travel on transit throughout the region will be easier, but this scenario also has a higher cost than the others to build and operate. Scenario III assumes a continuation of all regional and local transit funding sources through year 2030, plus an additional funding source beginning in 2015 equal to 3.75 times the amount of revenue allocated to transit from Proposition 400. The total investment is comparable to the 2006 average annual rail and bus transit expenditures per capita in the Seattle Region (adjusted based on the Cost of Living Index).

Tables 2 and 3 identify the types of transit service investments and the major transit investment corridors recommended for each scenario. The corridors represent a general area, not a specific street, roadway or railway. For example, the Thomas Road service may be operated on Thomas Road or another nearby roadway. In addition, the lengths of the corridors do vary by scenario. **Table 4** provides a comparison of each scenario’s ability to address regional transit deficiencies.

BEYOND YEAR 2030

Population and employment growth projections indicate that more than 1.2 million people may reside in western Maricopa County and northwestern Pinal County by 2050. Based on these projections, the Transit Framework outlines near-term actions to be considered for accommodating future transit services in the region’s projected high growth areas. The near-term actions include:

- Preserving right-of-way corridors such as a special lane for transit use only.
- Incorporating transit operations and passenger amenities such as bus stops when constructing new roadways.
- Providing dedicated parking for transit users. For example include park-and-ride space requirements for new developments.

Table 3: Major Investment Corridors by Scenario*

CORRIDOR	Scenario I Basic Mobility	Scenario II Enhanced Mobility	Scenario III Transit Choice
Thomas Rd	X	X	X
Glendale Ave	X	X	X
51 st Ave/59 th Ave	X	X	X
Central Ave	X	X	X
Scottsdale Rd\Rural Rd	X	X	X
Arizona Ave\Country Club Dr	X	X	X
Chandler Blvd\Williams Field Rd	X	X	X
Baseline Rd	X	X	X
Grand Ave		X	X
Bell Rd		X	X
44 th St		X	X
Loop 101 (Agua Fria)		X	X
UP Yuma Corridor		X	X
UP Mainline\Southeast Corridor		X	X
I-10 West		X	X
Main St		X	X
I-17 North			X
Power Rd			X
Litchfield Rd			X
Camelback Rd			X
Dunlap Ave\Peoria Ave\Shea Blvd			X

*Major investment includes arterial BRT or high capacity transit

Table 4: Comparison of Transit Scenarios and Transit Deficiencies

TRANSIT DEFICIENCY	Scenario I Basic Mobility	Scenario II Enhanced Mobility	Scenario III Transit Choice
Overcrowded Bus Routes	○	◐	●
Improve Service Frequency	○	●	●
New Park-n-Rides and Transit Centers	○	◐	●
More Convenient or Faster Services	○	◐	●
Service in Developed Areas with No Service Today	○	●	●
Service to New Growth Areas		◐	◐
New or Improved Service in Areas with Traffic Congestion	○	◐	◐

○ = Includes a limited number of routes/corridors but does not fully address deficiency
 ◐ = Includes a moderate number of routes/corridors but does not fully address deficiency
 ● = Includes most or all routes/corridors to address deficiency

FOR MORE INFORMATION

about the study or how to get involved, visit bqaz.org and select “MAG Regional Transit Framework Study”

or Contact Kevin Wallace of Maricopa Association of Governments
 phone: 602-254-6300
 e-mail: kwallace@mag.maricopa.gov