



Board Report

File #: 2026-0198, **File Type:** Informational Report

Agenda Number: 39.

AD HOC BOARD COMPOSITION COMMITTEE MARCH 23, 2026

SUBJECT: BENCHMARKING ANALYSIS OF TRANSIT AND INFRASTRUCTURE AGENCIES

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE the Report on Benchmarking Analysis of Transit Agencies.

ISSUE

In November 2024, Los Angeles County voters approved Measure G, a charter amendment that expands the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors from five to nine members and implements related county governance reforms, including the election of a countywide Chief Executive Officer. Measure G does not amend Metro's statutory governance structure, though its passage has prompted discussion of whether Metro's Board composition should be changed to accommodate the impending change in county governance.

BACKGROUND

An Ad Hoc Committee of the Board was established by Chair Dutra in January 2026 to focus on potential governance considerations arising from Measure G. Motion 33.1 by Directors Dutra, Barger, Horvath, Padilla, Najarian, and Dupont-Walker (Attachment A) directs that the Ad Hoc Committee's deliberations and recommendations be informed by relevant demographic, historical, and comparative context which was presented at last month's Ad-Hoc meeting. The motion also requested that staff provide benchmarking of peer agencies, which is the purpose of this report.

DISCUSSION

Motion 33.1 specifically directed staff to prepare a benchmarking analysis of peer transit agencies of comparable size, scope, and governance complexity, including a summary of each agency's governing board composition, appointment or selection structure, voting authority, and any relevant statutory or local governance provisions.

To benchmark governance practices among large U.S. transit systems, staff reviewed peer agencies with comparable scale, multimodal operations, and regional service areas.

PEER AGENCIES

	Metropolitan Transportation Authority (NYMTA) New York City, NY
	New Jersey Transit (NJT) Newark, NJ
	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Boston, MA
	Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA) Philadelphia, PA
	Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Washington, D.C.
	Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) Chicago, IL
	Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) San Francisco, CA

While not direct peers in scale, the following agencies were also selected as examples of different transit governance structures to further inform the benchmarking analysis.

REFERENCE AGENCIES

	Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority (Sound Transit) Seattle, WA
	Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) Atlanta, GA
	Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) Toronto, ON
	Pittsburgh Regional Transit (PRT) Pittsburgh, PA
	Community Transit Snohomish County, WA

Attachment B (Summary of Findings Peer Agencies) focuses on the agencies’ Board composition and governance, including member selection process, statutory authority, voting authority, and member compensation. In addition, it includes a detailed overview of the agencies’ area of jurisdiction, organization and structure, service characteristics, budget and funding sources.

Attachment C (Summary of Findings Reference Agencies) summarizes the findings for other reference agencies. Attachment D provides a summary of the appointment process for county representatives. Attachment E provides an analysis of the board structure of other government agencies in Southern California.

Transit Agency Key Themes

Board Composition

Board composition and appointment structures vary across transit agencies. On average, peer agency Boards have 10 voting members. Large transit agencies in this study (operating budgets greater than \$2 billion) have an average of 10 voting members, whereas smaller transit agencies (operating budgets less than \$2 billion) have 12 members on average.

County Representation and Appointment Processes

The agencies reviewed demonstrate that no two transit systems use the same governance structure or appointment process. While counties often play an important role in board composition, the method of appointment, eligibility requirements, and level of county representation vary significantly across agencies.

At Metro, five members of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors serve, representing 38% of the Board. Metro is the only agency reviewed in which all County-elected officials serve on the board by virtue of their positions as County Supervisors.

Among the agencies reviewed, CTA is the only other system whose jurisdiction is entirely within a single county, similar to Metro. Most other agencies serve multi-county regions, which results in governance structures designed to balance representation across multiple jurisdictions.

Across these multi-county systems, counties typically participate through direct appointments or nominations by county executives or county governing bodies. For example, SEPTA, Sound Transit, MARTA, and Pittsburgh Regional Transit include members appointed by county officials or county governing bodies, sometimes with confirmation by local legislative bodies. These agencies may also require appointees to be local elected officials or residents with relevant expertise, and in some cases ensure geographic representation across the service area.

The New York MTA uses a hybrid structure in which county executives recommend candidates to the governor, who then appoints members subject to state senate confirmation. In contrast, Community Transit includes two county representatives selected by the Snohomish County Council, reflecting a more limited county role.

Overall, these examples illustrate that county involvement in transit governance is common but structured differently across agencies, reflecting differences in service areas, regional governance arrangements, and statutory frameworks.

Attachment D provides additional details on the appointment process for each agency reviewed for which the board includes County representation.

Local and Regional Infrastructure Agencies Key Themes

To provide further context for different approaches to regional governance, staff also reviewed several countywide and regional public authorities operating in Los Angeles County (Attachment E). The examples include entities responsible for infrastructure investment, environmental regulation,

regional planning, and public service delivery.

While each agency operates under a different statutory framework, Attachment E summarizes key governance features for each agency, including governing body composition, the process for selecting county representatives, voting structures, statutory authority, and the scale of fiscal oversight.

While LA County Board members commonly play a role in board composition, the method of representation and appointment varies significantly across entities, reflecting differences in statutory design, service responsibilities, and institutional purpose.

In several agencies, including the Metropolitan Water District, South Coast Air Quality Management District, the LA County Local Agency Formation Commission, and the Southern California Association of Governments, county representatives are appointed directly by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors through formal Board action. Some governance structures rely on ex officio representation, such as the LA County Sanitation Districts, where the Chair of the Board of Supervisors represents unincorporated county areas and other Board members service on the Districts that encompass their jurisdiction. In contrast, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District is governed directly by the Board of Supervisors acting as the district board, with all supervisors serving as members.

These examples demonstrate that no single model governs Los Angeles County's participation in regional authorities, and that governance structures are often shaped by the statutory authority, service area, and policy objectives of the agency.

EQUITY PLATFORM

This item is informational and does not propose changes to Metro governance, policies, or programs. Providing contextual information regarding County governance reforms supports informed and transparent decision-making, which aligns with Metro's equity principles.

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED OUTCOME

VMT and VMT per capita in Los Angeles County are lower than national averages, the lowest in the SCAG region, and on the lower end of VMT per capita statewide, with these declining VMT trends due in part to Metro's significant investment in rail and bus transit.* Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets align with California's statewide climate goals, including achieving carbon neutrality by 2045. To ensure continued progress, all Board items are assessed for their potential impact on VMT.

As part of these ongoing efforts, this item is not expected to contribute to further reductions in VMT. Because the Metro Board has adopted an agency-wide VMT Reduction Target, and this item supports the overall function of the agency, this item is consistent with the goals of reducing VMT.

*Based on population estimates from the United States Census and VMT estimates from Caltrans' Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data between 2001-2019.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

Approval of this recommendation supports Metro Strategic Plan goal #5 to provide responsive, accountable, and trustworthy governance within the Metro organization by establishing organizational excellence, transparency, and accountable governance.

NEXT STEPS

Upon receipt and filing of this report, staff will incorporate Committee feedback and continue to provide informational materials as requested to support future deliberations of the Ad Hoc Board Composition Committee.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A - Motion 33.1
- Attachment B - Summary of Findings (Peer Agencies)
- Attachment C - Summary of Findings (Reference Agencies)
- Attachment D - Appointment of County Representatives
- Attachment E - Local Infrastructure Agency Peer Review

Prepared by: Madeleine Moore, Deputy Executive Officer, Government Relations, 213 922-4604
Marisa Perez, Deputy Chief, Community Relations, 213-922-3808

Reviewed by: Nicole Englund, Chief of Staff, 213-922-7950



Stephanie Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer



Board Report

File #: 2026-0035, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

Agenda Number: 33.1.

**EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
JANUARY 15, 2026**

Motion by:

DIRECTORS DUTRA, BARGER, HORVATH, PADILLA, NAJARIAN, AND DUPONT-WALKER

Metro Governance Review Motion

In November 2024, voters in Los Angeles County (County) approved Measure G, a voter-initiated charter amendment that significantly restructured County governance by providing for the creation of an elected County Executive, the expansion of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and related reforms. Under existing law, if the number of members of the County Board of Supervisors is increased, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is required to submit a plan to the legislature for revising the composition of the Metro Board within 60 days of the increase.

The passage of Measure G has prompted renewed discussion regarding the structure, composition, and representational frameworks of major regional governing bodies operating within the County.

Metro serves a geographically expansive and demographically diverse constituency encompassing 88 incorporated cities and extensive unincorporated areas, and its Board of Directors exercises critical oversight of regionwide transportation planning, investment, and policy decisions that affect residents across the County.

Accordingly, it is essential that Metro’s Board composition continue to reflect the diversity and geographic breadth of the County it serves, and that any consideration of potential changes be guided by principles of geographic equity, balanced representation, cost neutrality and jurisdictional inclusion.

Any review of Metro’s Board structure should be conducted in a transparent manner and led by Metro itself, consistent with its statutory authority and regional role. In this context, an Ad Hoc Committee has been established to review the current Board composition in a transparent and locally-driven manner. The Committee’s deliberations and recommendations should be informed by relevant comparative, historical, and demographic context.

SUBJECT: METRO GOVERNANCE REVIEW MOTION

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Motion by Dutra, Barger, Horvath, Padilla, Najarian, and Dupont-Walker that the Board direct the Chief Executive Officer to:

- A. A benchmarking analysis of peer transit agencies of comparable size, scope, and governance complexity, including a summary of each agency's governing board composition, appointment or selection structure, voting authority, and any relevant statutory or local governance provisions;









- B. An overview of the governing body composition of other major public agencies operating within the Los Angeles Metropolitan region, particularly those with regionwide responsibilities or significant public investment oversight, to provide local context on common approaches to representation and jurisdictional participation;

- C. An explanation of the historical context for Metro's current Board composition, including agency consolidation and the evolution of the agency's governance structure and key considerations that shaped representation;

- D. A compilation of basic demographic and jurisdictional context for Los Angeles County, including a snapshot of incorporated cities and unincorporated areas, population distribution, and governance geography, presented for informational purposes to support the Committee's understanding of regional representation; and









- E. A plan for community and stakeholder engagement, including but not limited to Los Angeles County Councils of Government, to ensure any recommendation reflects the diverse viewpoints of local residents, organizations, and municipalities.

Attachment B: Summary of Findings (Peer Agencies)

								
Service Region	LA Metro serves one county, 88 cities, and unincorporated county areas, organized into nine subregional planning areas.	MTA serves 12 Counties in NY and 2 Counties in CT (partial), with 250+ cities, towns and municipalities including New York City	NJ TRANSIT operates across the entire state of New Jersey, serving 21 counties, 564 municipalities	MBTA serves the Greater Boston area with 176 cities and towns across 8 counties in Massachusetts	SEPTA serves 5 primary Pennsylvania counties, with cross-state connections into New Jersey and Delaware, covering over 300 district municipalities	WMATA serves 1 federal district (District of Columbia), 2 states (Maryland, Virginia), 5 counties and 4 cities	CTA operates in Chicago and 35 surrounding municipalities, primarily within Cook County, Illinois.	Service across San Francisco Bay Area, serving 5 counties, (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara) and 22 cities
Service Area Population	10.4 million	15 million	8.46 million	4 million	4 million	4 million	3.4 million	3 million
Operating Budget (FY2024)	\$9 billion (July 1,2023 – June 30, 2024)	\$19.29 billion (January 1, 2024 – December 31,2024)	\$2.86 billion (July 1,2023 – June 30, 2024)	\$2.21 billion (July 1,2023 – June 30, 2024)	\$1.69 billion (July 1. 2023 – June 30, 2024)	\$2.4 billion (July 1,2023 – June 30, 2024)	\$1.99 billion (January 1, 2024 – December 31, 2024)	\$1.08 billion
Service Area	1,433 sqm	5,000 sqm	5,325 sqm	3,244 sqm	2,200 sqm	1,500 sqm	283 sqm	2,073 sqm
Annual Ridership (2024)	311 million	1.75 billion	222.5 million	235.7 million	198 million	242.1 million	309.1 million	50.66 million
Modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy Rail • Light Rail • Bus • Paratransit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy Rail • Commuter Rail • Bus • Paratransit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commuter Rail • Light Rail • Bus • Paratransit • Vanpool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy Rail • Commuter Rail • Light Rail • Bus • Paratransit • Ferry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy Rail • Commuter Rail • Light Rail • Bus • Paratransit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy Rail • Bus • Paratransit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy Rail • Bus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy Rail
Board Composition	13 voting 1 non-voting	14 total votes (1 collective vote between 4 county-appointed members) 17 voting members 6 rotating non-voting members (including 4 alternate non-voting members)	11 voting members Members primarily appointed by Governor or State representatives	9 voting members Members appointed by Governor based on areas of expertise plus agency and mayor appointees	15 voting members Members based on geographic representation plus legislature appointees	8 voting members Members based on signatories (Maryland, the District of Columbia and Virginia) plus federal appointees	7 voting members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 appointed by the Mayor of Chicago • 3 appointed by the Governor of Illinois 	9 members Members elected from geographic districts
Selection Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 38% (5 of 13 members) represent the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors • 31% (4 of 13 members) being mayors or council members appointed by the LA County City Selection Committee • 31% (4 of 13 members), including Mayor of City of LA and 3 Mayoral appointees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29% (4 of 14 votes) recommended by County executives, including one collective Hudson Valley vote • 43% (6 of 14 votes) recommended by the Governor • 29% (4 of 14 votes) recommended by New York City’s mayor <p>All members confirmed by the NY State Senate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% (11 of 11 votes) are State appointments including NJ Commissioner of Transportation, State Treasurer and 9 members appointed by the Governor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67% (6 of 9 members) appointed by the Governor based on specified areas of expertise • 11% (1 of 9 members) appointed by the Mayor of Boston • 22% (2 of 9 members) being: the State Secretary of Transportation and 1 MBTA advisory board appointee with municipal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 53% (8 of 15 members) appointed by County commissioners of each of the four counties, 2 per county • 13% (2 of 15 members) appointed by the City/County of Philadelphia • 7% (1 of 15 members) appointed by the Governor, they may be an ex-officio • 27% (4 of 15 members), appointed by State 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% (6 of 8 members) appointed by jurisdictions of Maryland, Virginia and District of Columbia, 2 each • 25% (2 of 8 members) appointed by the Federal Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 43% (3 of 7 members) appointed by the Governor of Illinois • 57% (4 of 7 members) appointed by the Mayor of Chicago 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% (9 elected officials) from the nine BART districts, each representing a geographical district within the BART system <p>Directors are directly elected by voters in their respective districts to four-year terms and must be registered voters and reside in the area they seek to represent.</p>



Board Representation	<p>Voting (13) includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 members represent 1 from each of the 5 supervisorial districts. One Mayor of the City of LA 3 appointed by the Mayor of the City of LA. At least one must be a member of the LA City Council. 4 appointed by the LA County City Selection Committee to represent the other incorporated and unincorporated areas in LA County. <p>1 non-voting, appointed by the Governor of California. Traditionally, represented by the Caltrans District 7 Director</p>	<p>Voting (17) includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 recommended by the Governor 4 recommended by NYC mayor 7 recommended by county executives (4 votes) <p>6 non-voting members from organized labor and citizen committee.</p>	<p>Voting (11) includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NJ Commissioner of Transportation (ex officio) State Treasurer (ex officio) 1 Executive Branch member chosen by the Governor (ex officio) <p>8 public members appointed by the Governor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointments with advice and consent of the Senate Appointments based on recommendations from the President of the Senate and Speaker of the General Assembly Appointments recommended by regional planning organizations (NJTPA and DVRPC). <p>2 non-voting labor representatives appointed by Governor upon recommendation of labor unions representing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rail Bus 	<p>Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secretary of Transportation 1 appointed by Mayor of City of Boston 1 appointed by MBTA Advisory Board <p>6 members appointed by the Governor include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 with safety experience 1 with experience in transportation operations 1 with experience in public or private finance 1 rider of MBTA and a resident of an environmental justice population 1 municipal official representing a city/town in the service area 1 from a list of 3 recommended by the president of Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO 	<p>Legislature Majority and Minority Leaders</p> <p>Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Bucks County Members 2 Chester County Members 2 Delaware County Members 2 Montgomery County Members 2 Philadelphia County Members 1 Governor's Appointee 1 Senate Majority Leader Appointee 1 Esquire Senate Minority Leader Appointee 1 Esquire House Majority Leader Appointee 1 House Minority Leader Appointee 	<p>Voting (8) includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 from District of Columbia 2 from State of Maryland 2 from Commonwealth of Virginia 2 from Federal Government <p>Alternate (8) includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 from District of Columbia 2 from State of Maryland 2 from Commonwealth of Virginia 2 from Federal Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 appointed by the Mayor of Chicago. Each appointment must be approved by both the Chicago City Council and the Governor of Illinois. 3 appointed by the Governor of Illinois. Appointments require confirmation by the Illinois State Senate and approval by the Mayor of Chicago. <p>The Governor of Illinois must appoint at least one metropolitan area resident living outside Chicago's city limits; all appointments need Senate confirmation and approval from Chicago's Mayor.</p>	<p>9 members, each representing a geographical district within the BART system,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District 1–3: largely Contra Costa County District 4–6: mainly Alameda County District 7–9: primarily in San Francisco
Statutory Authority	<p>Established by the California Legislature under the California Public Utilities Code (Division 12, § 130051 et seq.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established as a public benefit corporation New York Public Authorities (PBA) Law, Article 5, Title 11 (§1263) 	<p>Established under the New Jersey Public Transportation Act of 1979 (N.J.S.A. 27:25-1 et seq.), which created the New Jersey Transit Corporation as a public transportation authority.</p>	<p>Established under Chapter 161A of the Massachusetts General Laws as a body politic, corporate and a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formed by the Pennsylvania General Assembly as a state-created authority 74Pa. Consolidated Statutes (§1713) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governed under an interstate compact approved by Congress WMATA Compact (Article III, Paragraph 5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created by the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act (70 ILCS 3605), which provides the legal framework for its governance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established in accordance with California Public Utilities Code, as a special purpose transit district California Public Utilities Code Section 28500, Division 10, Part 2
Voting Authority	<p>Quorum: Majority of voting members</p>	<p>Quorum: Majority of voting members</p> <p>Majority voting with the four Hudson Valley members' vote counting as one vote</p>	<p>Quorum: Majority of voting members</p> <p>Majority of members present</p>	<p>Quorum: Presence of 4 members</p> <p>Majority of members present</p> <p>Statutory quorum requirement did not change in 2013 when Board size increased from 7 to 9 members</p>	<p>Quorum: Majority of Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority voting of all members Enhanced voting protection for highly populated counties' appointees having veto power unless overridden by 75% of the full board 	<p>Quorum: Presence of 4 members, at least one from each signatory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority voting including at least one affirmative from each signatory Except for actions of a plan of finance or the adoption, revision or amendment of mass transit plan, unanimous vote of 	<p>Quorum: Majority of Board (4 out of 7 members)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board actions need at least four affirmative votes Chair must sign for effectiveness. <p>If vetoed by the Chair, the Board can override with five affirmative votes</p>	<p>Quorum: Presence of 5 members</p> <p>Majority voting of all the board members (5 of 9 members)</p>

								
						Directors representing any two Signatories is required <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jurisdictional veto (e.g. one signatory does not affirm) requires advance notice of intent 		
Board Compensation	Per Diem allowance plus direct expenses	No member compensation except for direct expenses	No member compensation except for direct expenses	No member compensation except for direct expenses	No member compensation except for direct expenses	No member compensation except for direct expenses	Annual Salary plus direct expenses	Monthly stipend plus direct expenses.
Chair Appointment Process	The Metro Board Chair serves a one-year term rotating annually between the Los Angeles Mayor, a member of the LA County Board of Supervisors, and a City Selection Committee member.	Per legislative amendments enacted in 2009, NYMTA Board Chair is also the Chief Executive Officer of the NYMTA and is appointed by the Governor, subject to State Senate confirmation.	The New Jersey Commissioner of Transportation serves as Board Chair (ex officio). The Board designates a Vice Chair and Secretary annually.	The MBTA Board of Directors chair is appointed by the Governor of Massachusetts.	The Board elects a Chair and Vice Chair from among its members for one-year terms, and their authority and duties are defined by board resolution rather than statute.	The WMATA Board of Directors annually elects a Chair, a First Vice-Chair, and a Second Vice-Chair, typically during their January meeting, according to WMATA Board Bylaws. These officers are elected from the existing board membership without regard to their jurisdiction of residence or representation.	The Chair may be a member of the Board of the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) and is selected by the Board from among its members.	The Chair of the BART Board of Directors is elected by the 9-member Board from among its members during the Board's annual reorganization meeting. The Chair presides over meetings and represents the Board but holds the same voting authority as other members.
Areas of Authority	Key regional transit, highway, and funding decisions, directing sales tax revenue, and overseeing infrastructure projects	Long-term strategic planning, budget approvals (operating and capital), issuance of bonds and notes, major service contract procurements, labor relations, and agency performance	Responsible for overseeing and approving Agency policies, strategic direction, operating and capital budgets, major contracts and procurement decisions, transit service levels, fare structures, and infrastructure investments. Hiring and oversight of the President & CEO of NJ Transit	Strategic oversight, safety, financial stability (operating budget and Capital Investment Plans), major contracts and procurements, service improvements, appointment of the General Manager	Operating and capital budgets, fare policies, service standards, hiring or evaluating the agency's General Manager/CEO and conducting comprehensive reviews of SEPTA's services, technological applications, and overall organizational structure	Policy making, financial oversight, governance, and managing WMATA's relationships with its customers, jurisdictional partners, and signatories	Approving annual budgets, capital improvement programs, service standards, and key contracts, while overseeing management's performance in safety, hiring, and service delivery	District policies, strategic goals, annual budget, major contracts, setting fares, safety initiatives, and long-term system planning
State Oversight	State authority If Board of Supervisors expands, the authority must submit a plan to the Legislature within 60 days, detailing necessary changes to reflect the new board structure.	State authority Its board size, membership, appointment rules and core governance are set in the Public Authorities Law, so changes to the board structure require state legislative action.	State authority Board structure is established in state statute (N.J.S.A. 27:25-4), so changes require legislative amendment. The Governor can appoint or remove members within the existing statutory structure but cannot change the board structure itself without legislative action.	State authority Any change to the Board structure requires State Legislative Approval.	State created regional authority Any changes to SEPTA's Board of Directors, size, composition, or appointment methods must be made through amendments to Pennsylvania's enabling legislation, specifically Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes	District and State oversight Amendments to the Board Structure become effective after approval by the Mayor (or Council override of a veto), a 30-day congressional review per D.C. Code § 1-206.02(c)(1), and publication in the District of Columbia Register.	State oversight Changes to the CTA board require approval from the Illinois legislature. Governed by state law under the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act, the CTA is now overseen by the newly created Northern Illinois Transit Authority (NITA), established in 2025 through SB 2111 to replace the RTA.	State and Federal oversight State law defines district boundaries, powers, and legal framework
Funding	State dedicated funding plus local voter-enacted countywide sales taxes	State dedicated funding plus local taxes/subsidies	State dedicated funding plus statutory state contributions, passenger fares, and federal transit funding	State dedicated funding plus local assessments	State dedicated funding plus small local contributions from Philadelphia and the four suburban counties	Subsidies from the jurisdictional partners in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, and the District of Columbia	State dedicated funding plus statutory local required contributions	State provides dedicated transportation funding and allows local revenue options

Attachment C: Summary of Findings (Reference Agencies)



Service Region	Sound Transit serves three counties, 53 cities, and unincorporated areas within its voter-approved regional transit district in Washington State.	MARTA serves four counties in Georgia and the 12 cities, including City of Atlanta	TTC primarily serves the City of Toronto (single-tier municipality), with limited extensions into 3 neighboring municipalities.	PRT serves four counties (Allegheny, and small portions of Beaver, Butler, and Westmoreland), 2 cities, 130+ municipalities (boroughs, townships)	Serves Snohomish County with connections to King County and 19 cities
Operating Budget (FY2024)	\$875.1 million (January 1, 2024 – December 31, 2024)	\$631.4 million (July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024)	\$1.88 billion (CA\$2.57 billion) (January 1, 2024 – December 31, 2024)	\$535.36 million (July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024)	\$231.6 million (January 1, 2024 – December 31, 2024)
Service Area Population	3 million	2 million	1.7 million	1.23 million	663 thousand
Service Area	1,087 sqm	947 sqm	243 sqm (630 km ²)	745 sqm	1,300 sqm
Annual Ridership (FY 2024)	42 million	69.3 million	800.2 million	33.27 million	8.4 million
Modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commuter Rail Light Rail Bus Paratransit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heavy Rail Bus Paratransit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heavy Rail Light Rail Bus Paratransit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus Light Rail Paratransit Inclines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus Paratransit
Board Composition	18 voting members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17 officials from counties 1 ex-officio member, the Washington State Secretary of Transportation 	13 voting members Members primarily based on geographic representation plus governor appointee, 2 non-voting ex-officio members	10 voting members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 City Councilors 4 Citizen Commissioners 	11 voting members 6 appointed by the Allegheny County Executive.	9 voting members
Selection Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 94% (17 of 18 members) appointed from county officials based on population and confirmed by councils 6% (1 of 18 members) being the State Secretary of Transportation or their designee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 69% (9 of 13 members) represent counties and are appointed by the County Board of Commissioners 8% (1 of 13 members) appointed by the Governor 23% (3 of 13 members) nominated by the Mayor of Atlanta and elected by the City Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% (6 of 10 members) appointed by Toronto City Council 40% (4 of 10 members) appointed through City of Toronto's public appointment process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 55% (6 of 11 members) appointed by the Allegheny County Executive. 9% (1 of 11 members) appointed by Governor 36% (4 of 11 members) appointed by leaders from parties in the PA House of Representatives and Senate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 22% (2 of 9 members) selected from the governing body of Snohomish County 78% (7 of 9 members) elected officials from cities subject to population criteria



<p>Board Representation</p>	<p>Based on population representation from the 3 member counties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 members elected from Snohomish County • 10 from King County • 4 from Pierce County <p>Total board members can be up to 25 members with composition revised to reflect county population.</p>	<p>Voting (13) includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 from the City of Atlanta • 3 from Fulton County • 2 from Clayton County • 4 from DeKalb County • 1 appointee by the Governor of Georgia <p>Non-voting (2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 from Georgia DOT • 1 from Georgia Regional Transportation Authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 City Councilors appointed by the Toronto City Council • 4 public members appointed through the City of Toronto's public appointment process. Once nominated, these individuals must be confirmed by City Council. <p>Public members should meet a set of criteria (residency, age, employment restrictions, etc.) to be eligible and demonstrate directorship and executive-level experience</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 members representing Allegheny County • 2 members representing City of Pittsburgh • 2 members representing other municipalities in Allegheny County outside the City of Pittsburgh. (Selected by the Allegheny County Mayors' Association) • 2 members representing the State (Appointed by the Pennsylvania Senate and the Pennsylvania House of Representatives leadership) 	<p>Voting (9) members</p> <p>Representation is allocated by city population tiers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 members, selected from the governing body of Snohomish County • 3 members from cities with populations over 35,000 • 2 members from cities with populations between 15,000–35,000 • 2 members from cities with populations under 15,000 <p>These representatives are chosen by officials from jurisdictions within each population category, meaning cities in the same tier select one of their elected officials to represent them on the board.</p> <p>Non-voting (1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labor Representative <p>Alternates (5)</p>
<p>Statutory Authority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorized by state law to propose ballot measures for voter approval of regional transit projects • Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Chapter 81.112.040 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established under Georgia state law as a joint public instrumentality of City of Atlanta and five counties • Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority Act of 1965, Section 9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act and continued under the City of Toronto Act, 2006 • Additional governance provisions outlined in Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 279 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established pursuant to Pennsylvania state law, specifically the Second-Class County Port Authority Act (55 Pa.C.S. Chapter 55). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a Public Transportation Benefit Area (PTBA), Community Transit is authorized under Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Chapter 36.57A



Voting Authority	<p>Quorum: Majority of Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority voting For major decisions, affirmative vote of two thirds of the full board State Secretary of Transportation or designee may vote with approval of majority of other members of the Board 	<p>Quorum: Majority of Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority voting of members present Exception: majority of members present plus one vote for certain actions in legislation including: issuance and sale of revenue bonds, purchase/lease of privately owned system of transportation of passengers, contracts over \$200k, granting concessions or contract award for management of Authority-owned property or facility. 	<p>Quorum: Majority of Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority voting of members present 	<p>Quorum: Majority of Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 of 11 members' affirmative vote 	<p>Quorum: Majority of Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority voting of members present
Board Compensation	Per Diem allowance plus direct expenses	Per Diem allowance plus direct expenses	Annual retainer plus per Diem allowance	Do not receive financial compensation	Per Diem allowance plus direct expenses
Chair Appointment Process	The board elects a board chair and two vice chairs and must all be from different counties serving two-year terms that coincide with calendar years. The Executive Committee develops recommendations to the Board for the selection of Board chair and vice chairs, and the selection is made when a nominee receives a majority vote of all board members in attendance	The MARTA Board of Directors elects a new chair and leadership annually, typically at the beginning of the year, from its 13 voting members. The board, which includes a Governor's appointee and two ex-officio members, votes on a new chair, vice-chair, and other officers.	The Board Chair is appointed by City Council and is chosen from among the council members serving on the TTC Board while the Vice-Chair is elected by the Board from among its public members	The Board members annually elect a Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Secretary, and Treasurer from among its member individuals.	The leadership roles within the Board, Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary are filled by elections from among the voting Board members.
Areas of Authority	Budgets, financial plans, major contracts, and project milestones	System expansion and innovation, Operating and Capital budgets, major contracts and procurement, policies and collective bargaining agreements	Policy decisions, annual budgets, fare structures, service levels, and significant operational plans	Providing strategic oversight, hiring the CEO, approving capital and operating budgets, and setting policy for the region's bus, light-rail, and incline services	Review and approval of the annual budget, oversee development of 6-year Transit Development Plan. Articulate Transit's positions to public, legislative bodies, and the broader community. Hire, supervise, and evaluate the CEO
State Oversight Role	Regional oversight ST's board composition and appointment process are governed by RCW 81.112.040; any changes to the board structure must be approved by the Washington State Legislature.	Regional oversight According to the By-Laws of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, the Board shall consist of members whose number, qualifications, appointments, and terms of office are determined in accordance with the provisions set forth in the MARTA Act.	City Oversight Changes to the board structure does not require direct approval from the provincial (Ontario) state legislature, remaining directly accountable to the Toronto City Council	Regional Oversight Since the board size, structure, and appointment authority are explicitly defined within state statutes (Second-Class County Port Authority Act - 55 Pa.C.S. Chapter 55), the board does not possess independent authority to alter its composition	Regional Oversight Under RCW 36.57A.055, the representatives of county and cities are empowered to review and change the governing body composition. When annexations exceed the 15% or 25% population thresholds, the representatives must meet within 90 days to reassess representation. If it is determined that change is appropriate, they can modify the board composition directly during that meeting; the statute does not require separate legislative approval.
Funding	State dedicated funding plus local taxes	Local sales taxes; no dedicated state funding	City's property tax revenues plus Provincial funding	State provides over 50% of PRT's total operating revenue along with federal grants	Primarily funded by a 1.2% local sales tax plus state and federal grants

Attachment D: Appointment of County Representatives

Agency	County Official / County Appointee	Appointment Process
Metro	38% (5 of 13 members) are members of the LA County Board of Supervisors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LA County Board supervisors from each of the five districts are appointed to the Board.
NYMTA	29% (4 of 14 votes) recommended by County executives, including one collective Hudson Valley vote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The elected County Executive from each of the 7 suburban counties recommends up to 3 potential candidates to the Governor by gathering suggestions from local officials, community leaders, business groups, or transportation experts, with no specific selection qualifications described in statute. Governor makes a selection subject to confirmation by the NY State Senate.
SEPTA	53% (8 of 15 members) appointed by County commissioners/council of each of the four suburban counties, two members each	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The elected County Council or Board of County Commissioners in each suburban county appoints two residents from the county through a majority vote of the counties' governing bodies. County commissioners may sometimes choose to serve on the Board themselves.
Sound Transit	94% (17 of 18 members) appointed from county officials based on population and confirmed by councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board members are appointed by the elected County Executive and confirmed by the elected council or legislative authority of each member county. Appointees must be local elected officials, either a city mayor, city councilmember, county councilmember, or county executive within the authority area. County executives must ensure representation from the largest city in each county and proportional representation from other cities and unincorporated areas within the service area. At least half of the appointees from each county are to serve on the governing authority of a public transportation system.
MARTA	69% (9 of 13 members) represent counties and appointed by local legislative delegations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The elected County Board of Commissioners and/or a caucus of mayors of the municipalities in each county appoint members by a majority vote. Members may or may not be elected officials and are subject to specific residency requirements within each county.
PRT	55% (6 of 11 members) represent the County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four members are appointed directly by the elected County Executive. Two members are appointed by the elected County Executive with elected County Council approval. All appointees may or may not be elected officials, must reside in Allegheny County with expertise in budgeting, finance, economic development, transportation or mass transit.
CT	22% (2 of 9 members) represent the County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two Board members are elected officials selected from the Snohomish County Council approved by the council at large.

Attachment E: Local Infrastructure Agency Peer Review

Agency / model	Governing body	Selection / appointment process	County representative selection process	Voting authority / structure	Statutory / legal authority	State role in oversight	Role / purpose	Budget / fiscal oversight magnitude
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD)	38-member Board representing 26 member agencies	Each member public agency appoints one or more directors to represent that agency; number of directors scales with assessed valuation within the district.	The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors appoints the County's MWD directors through a formal Board motion. A supervisor (often the Chair or a sponsoring supervisor) nominates the candidate(s), and the Board confirms the appointment by majority vote in a public meeting.	Weighted voting tied to assessed valuation; votes may be shared across multiple directors	Metropolitan Water District Act (Uncodified Act of the State of California, 1927; amended)	State enabling statute governs governance structure and weighted voting provisions	Wholesale water supply, regional reliability, and long-term water infrastructure investment	Multi-billion-dollar enterprise including water purchases and major capital program
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	86-member Regional Council	Representatives are designated by member jurisdictions from population-based districts; cities appoint mayors or councilmembers.	The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors designates specific supervisors to serve as the County's SCAG representatives through Board action. Supervisors typically self-select or are nominated by the Chair, and the full Board ratifies the designation.	One-member / one-vote in council proceedings, subject to SCAG bylaws	23 U.S.C. §134; 49 U.S.C. §5303; California Government Code §65080 et seq.	State and federal transportation planning requirements govern MPO authority	Regional transportation planning and federal/state funding programming	Planning and programming oversight rather than enterprise operating budget
South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD)	13-member Governing Board	Ten local elected officials representing counties and cities plus three state appointees	The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors appoints one of its members to the AQMD Governing Board. A supervisor is nominated (often aligned with regional representation practices), and the Board approves the appointment by majority vote.	Board adopts regulations, establishes policy, and appoints Executive Officer	California Health & Safety Code §§40400–40474	State appointees and California Air Resources Board oversight; federal Clean Air Act requirements	Air quality regulation and permitting across four counties	Major regulatory agency with permit fee revenues and significant policy authority
LA County Sanitation Districts	Boards of Directors for each district composed of member city representatives and county representation	Member cities are represented by mayors or councilmembers serving ex officio	The Chair of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors serves automatically (ex officio) as the county representative for unincorporated territory within each district; no separate appointment action is required.	District boards vote on service, capital, and rate decisions	California Health & Safety Code §§4700–4858 (County Sanitation District Act)	State environmental permitting and special district law oversight	Wastewater treatment, solid waste management, recycled water	Combined enterprise and capital programs frequently in the hundreds of millions
Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LAFCD)	Governing Board composed of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors	Supervisors serve as the governing board of the district	All five supervisors serve ex officio as the Flood Control District Board; the Board of Supervisors itself functions as the district governing body, so no separate appointment process occurs.	One-member / one-vote among supervisors acting as district board	California Water Code §§56–73 (Los Angeles County Flood Control District Act)	State law defines powers; subject to water regulation and infrastructure oversight	Flood protection and stormwater infrastructure across the county	Major watershed infrastructure and flood control capital program
LA County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	Commission with county, city, special district, and public members	Members appointed by their respective constituencies	The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors appoints two supervisors to serve as county commissioners on LAFCO through Board motion. Appointments are typically nominated by the Chair or through supervisor agreement and confirmed by majority vote.	One commissioner / one vote	California Government Code §§56000–57550 (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act)	State law establishes LAFCO structure and oversight framework	Oversees formation, consolidation, and boundary changes for cities and special districts	Small administrative oversight budget rather than service delivery



Transit Agency Governance Models – Benchmarking Analysis




Item 39: Ad Hoc Board Composition Committee, March 23, 2026

Benchmarked Transit Agencies

Peer Agencies



NYMTA




NJ Transit



MBTA




SEPTA



WMATA




CTA



BART

Reference Agencies



Sound Transit




MARTA




Toronto Transit Commission









Pittsburgh Regional Transit








































Community Transit



Peer Agencies – Characteristics









KEY	 HEAVY RAIL/SUBWAY	 BUS
	 COMMUTER RAIL	 PARATRANSIT
	 LIGHT RAIL	 FERRY

Agency	Service Region	Service Area Population	Operating Budget*	Service Area	Transit Modes
 Metro Los Angeles, CA	1 County 88 Cities	10.4 million	\$9.0 billion	1,433 sqm	   
 NYMTA New York City, NY	12 Counties 2 Counties in CT (partial) 250+ Cities & Municipalities	15 million	\$19.3 billion	5,000 sqm	   
 NJ Transit Newark, NJ	21 Counties 2 Counties in NY (partial) 564 Municipalities	8.46 million	\$2.86 billion	5,325 sqm	   
 MBTA Boston, MA	8 Counties 176 Cities and Towns	4 million	\$2.2 billion	3,244 sqm	     
 SEPTA Philadelphia, PA	5 Counties 1 City	4 million	\$1.7 billion	2,200 sqm	    
 WMATA Washington, D.C.	1 Federal District (DC), 2 States (MD, VA) 5 Counties 4 Cities	4 million	\$2.4 billion	1,500 sqm	  
 CTA Chicago, IL	1 County 1 City	3.4 million	\$2.0 billion	283 sqm	 
 BART San Francisco, CA	5 Counties 22 Cities	3 million	\$1.1 billion	2,073 sqm	

- Based on FY24. FY24 dates vary by agency. Some agencies include COVID relief funding. Metro's total includes asset acquisitions for Transit & Highway projects.
- No County Executive Representation on any of the Boards



Peer Agencies – Voting Member Appointments

Agency	Chart	Voting Members	County Appointee(s)	State Appointee(s)	Major City Appointee(s)	Other Appointee(s)
Metro		13	38% (5 of 13) are members of the LA County Board of Supervisors	None	31% (4 of 13) – Mayor of City of LA + 3 Mayoral appointees	31% (4 of 13) appointed by LA County City Selection Committee representing other LA County incorporated and unincorporated areas
NYMTA*		14	29% (4 of 14) recommended by County executives	43% (6 of 14) recommended by the Governor	29% (4 of 14) recommended by New York City's mayor	None
NJ Transit		11	None	100% (11 of 11) – Commissioner of Transportation + State Treasurer + 9 appointed by the Governor	None	None
MBTA		9	None	78% (7 of 9) – State Secretary of Transportation + 6 appointed by Governor based on specific expertise	11% (1 of 9) appointed by the Mayor of Boston	11% (1 of 9) MBTA advisory board appointee with municipal government experience
SEPTA		15	53% (8 of 15) appointed by County commissioners	33% (5 of 15) – 1 Governor appointee + 4 appointed by State Legislature Majority and Minority Leaders	13% (2 of 15) appointed by the City / County of Philadelphia	None
WMATA		8	None	75% (6 of 8) appointed by jurisdictions of MD, VA and DC	None	25% (2 of 8) appointed by the Federal Government
CTA		7	None	43% (3 of 7) appointed by the Governor	57% (4 of 7) appointed by the Mayor of Chicago	None
BART		9	None	None	None	100% (9 of 9) are elected by voters to represent the 9 BART districts

* NYMTA is considered to have 14 voting members (rather than 17 Board members), as 4 members cast one collective vote.

Key Themes

Board Composition

Board composition and appointment structures vary across transit agencies.

Changes to board composition generally **require formal legislative action** at the state level.

Voting Members

On average, Metro's **peer agency Boards have 10-11 voting members.**

- Large transit agencies in this study (operating budget >\$2B) have an average of 10 voting members, whereas smaller transit agencies (operating budget <\$2B) have 12 members on average.

County Representation

Compared to peers, Metro is unique in having all its Board of Supervisors serve on the Board. Of the peer agencies, no entity has a County Executive serve on the Board.

County representation is generally a **mixture of appointees selected by the county's elected legislative body** (i.e. county executives, board of commissioners, council or municipality mayors) **and elected officials.**

Other than Metro, CTA is the only other single-county peer agency and **does not have any direct County representation.** Nor do multi-county MBTA and BART, or the multi-state WMATA.

Example Approach: Collective One Vote



NYMTA's Board includes the concept of one collective vote, where **4 of the 7 County-appointed members cast 1 collective vote.**


- These 4 members represent the Hudson Valley counties, being Dutchess, Orange, Putnam and Rockland.
- Together, the **collective population of the Hudson Valley counties is comparable to the other full vote County members.**

The collective one vote approach ensures **balanced representation** where **highly populated areas hold more direct voting power** while still including **input from suburban and less populated areas.**

Voting rules:


- For each vote taken by the full board, the four members **must internally agree** on how to cast their one vote.
- The board then counts their position as one vote in total.
- For the purposes of quorum, the **group of four is treated as one member.** If any one of the four is present, the collective vote counts as present.

County	Population (2020 Census)
<i>Dutchess</i>	295,911
<i>Orange</i>	401,310
<i>Putnam</i>	97,668
<i>Rockland</i>	338,329
<i>Hudson Valley total</i>	1,133,288
Nassau	1,395,774
Suffolk	1,525,920
Westchester	1,004,457



New York State County Map with MTA Board Representation

Example Approach: Specific Expertise



MBTA requires each of its six **Governor-appointed members** have areas of expertise / background:



Safety



Transportation
operations



Public or
private finance



Rider and resident
of environmental
justice population



Municipal official
within service
area



Recommended
by MA State
Labor Council



































Multiple agencies have expertise requirements for some or all of their board members.

Generally, areas commonly required include:

- Executive experience
- Transportation experience
- Business management
- Financial management
- Engineering
- Capital project experience
- Labor relations

Reference Agencies – Characteristics

KEY	 HEAVY RAIL/SUBWAY	 BUS
	 COMMUTER RAIL	 PARATRANSIT
	 LIGHT RAIL	 FERRY

Agency	Service Region	Service Area Population	Operating Budget*	Service Area	Transit Modes
 Metro Los Angeles, CA	1 County 88 Cities	10.4 million	\$9.0 billion	1,433 sqm	   
 Sound Transit Seattle, WA	3 Counties 53 Cities	3 million	\$875 million	1,087 sqm	   
 MARTA Atlanta, GA	3 Counties 12 Cities	2 million	\$631 million	947 sqm	  
 Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) Toronto, ON	1 City 3 Municipalities	1.7 million	\$1.9 billion	243 sqm	   
 Pittsburgh Regional Transit (PRT) Pittsburgh, PA	4 Counties 2 Cities 130 Municipalities	1.2 million	\$535 million	745 sqm	  
 Community Transit Snohomish County, WA	1 County 19 Cities	0.7 million	\$231 million	1,300 sqm	 

* Based on FY24. FY24 dates vary by agency. Some agencies include COVID relief funding. Metro’s total includes asset acquisitions for Transit & Highway projects.




Example Approach: Population-Driven Board Changes

ST's Board composition is defined in the State of Washington bylaws and based on population from that portion of each county which lies within the service area:

- **The elected County CEO from each of the three counties appoints the board member, and may sit on the board**
- **Sometimes the elected CEO sits on the board, and other times it doesn't**
- **The governing board shall be reconstituted on a population basis, using the official office of financial management population estimates, 5 years after its initial formation and, at minimum, in the year following each official federal census.**
- Board membership may be reduced, maintained, or expanded to reflect population changes but **may not exceed 25 members.**







Each county representative member of the board shall be:

- **An elected official** who serves on the legislative authority of a city or as mayor of a city within the boundaries of the authority
- **On the legislative authority of the county**, if 50% of the population of the legislative official's district is within the authority boundaries; or
- **A county executive** from a member county within the authority boundaries.



When making appointments, each county executive shall ensure that representation on the board includes an elected city official representing the largest city in each county and assures proportional representation from other cities, and representation from unincorporated areas of each county within the service area. At least one-half of all appointees from each county shall serve on the governing authority of a public transportation system.

Reference Agencies – Voting Member Appointments

Agency	Chart	Voting Members	County Appointee(s)	State Appointee(s)	Major City Appointee(s)	Other Appointee(s)
Metro		13	38% (5 of 13) are members of the LA County Board of Supervisors	None	31% (4 of 13) – Mayor of City of LA + 3 Mayoral appointees	31% (4 of 13) appointed by LA County City Selection Committee representing other LA County incorporated and unincorporated areas
Sound* Transit		18	94% (17 of 18) appointed from elected county officials	6% (1 of 18) – State Secretary of Transportation	None	None
MARTA		13	69% (9 of 13) appointed by County Board of Commissioners and/or mayors	8% (1 of 13) appointed by the Governor	23% (3 of 13) nominated by Mayor of Atlanta, elected by City Council	None
TTC		10	None	None	60% (6 of 10) – Toronto City Councilors	40% (4 of 10) citizens nominated through a public appointment process and confirmed by the City
PRT*		11	55% (6 of 11) appointed by Allegheny County Executive	45% (5 of 11) – 1 Governor appointee + 4 appointed by House and Senate	None	None
Community Transit*		9	22% (2 of 9) selected from the Snohomish County Council	None	78% (7 of 9) elected city officials, subject to population criteria	None

*As requested by the Ad Hoc Committee on February 23, 2026

Conclusions

Board Composition

Board composition and appointment structures vary across transit agencies. Metro's governance structure is consistent with peer agencies.

Voting Members

On average, Metro's **peer agency Boards have 10-11 voting members.**

County Representation

Compared to peers, Metro is unique in having all its Board of Supervisors serve on the Board. Of the peer agencies, no entity has a County Executive serve on the Board.

County representation is generally a **mixture of appointees selected by the county's elected legislative body** (i.e. county executives, board of commissioners, council or municipality mayors) **and elected officials.**

Representation is achieved through the structure and composition of board members.

Appendix



LA COUNTY – DEMOGRAPHIC SNAPSHOT

Year	City of Los Angeles	% of County	All Other LA County Cities (Combined)	% of County	Unincorporated Areas	% of County	Total LA County Population
1950	1,970,358	47.5%	1,863,000	44.9%	318,329	7.6%	4,151,687
1960	2,479,015	41.3%	3,050,000	50.8%	465,000	7.9%	5,994,000
1970	2,816,061	39.1%	3,650,000	50.7%	735,000	10.2%	7,201,000
1980	2,968,528	38.5%	3,900,000	50.6%	850,000	10.9%	7,718,000
1990	3,485,398	39.3%	4,407,046	49.7%	970,720	11.0%	8,863,164
2000	3,694,820	38.8%	4,836,981	50.8%	987,537	10.4%	9,519,338
2010	3,792,621	38.6%	4,968,558	50.6%	1,057,426	10.8%	9,818,605
2020	3,898,747	38.9%	5,093,095	50.9%	1,022,167	10.2%	10,014,009



Los Angeles County includes 88 incorporated cities as well as unincorporated areas governed directly by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.



Approximately 90 percent of County residents live in incorporated cities.



Approximately 10 percent reside in unincorporated communities.



The City of Los Angeles accounts for roughly 40 percent of the County's total population, making it larger than any other municipality in the region.

City of LA - If LA's population falls below 35% of all county cities, one mayoral appointee seat would be vacated and filled by a City Selection Committee appointee from a city not already represented.



Metro LA County – Demographic Snapshot - Revised

Year	City of Los Angeles	% of Total County	All Other LA County Cities (Combined)	% of County	LA City % Compared to all incorporated Cities	Unincorporated Areas	% of County	Total LA County Population
1950	1,970,358	47.5%	1,863,000	44.9%	51.4%	318,329	7.6%	4,151,687
1960	2,479,015	41.3%	3,050,000	50.8%	44.8%	465,000	7.9%	5,994,000
1970	2,816,061	39.1%	3,650,000	50.7%	43.6%	735,000	10.2%	7,201,000
1980	2,968,528	38.5%	3,900,000	50.6%	43.2%	850,000	10.9%	7,718,000
1990	3,485,398	39.3%	4,407,046	49.7%	44.2%	970,720	11.0%	8,863,164
2000	3,694,820	38.8%	4,836,981	50.8%	43.3%	987,537	10.4%	9,519,338
2010	3,792,621	38.6%	4,968,558	50.6%	43.3%	1,057,426	10.8%	9,818,605
2020	3,898,747	38.9%	5,093,095	50.9%	43.4%	1,022,167	10.2%	10,014,009

• • •

If the **City of LA** population falls below 35% of all incorporated cities in LA County, one City of Los Angeles Mayoral appointee seat would be vacated and filled by a City Selection Committee appointee from a city not already represented.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census (1950-2020); figures for “All Other Cities” and “Unincorporated Areas” are calculated based on published county and city-level data.