

**SURVEY OF UNITED STATES TRANSIT SYSTEM
SECURITY NEEDS AND FUNDING PRIORITIES**

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

April 2004



**AMERICAN
PUBLIC
TRANSPORTATION
ASSOCIATION**

American Public Transportation Association
1666 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-4800
www.apta.com

**Survey of United States Transit System
Security Needs and Funding Priorities**

Summary of Findings

April 2004

published by the

American Public Transportation Association

George F. Dixon III, Chair
Richard A. White, First Vice Chair
Paul P. Skoutelas, Secretary-Treasurer
Celia G. Kupersmith, Immediate Past Chair

Vice Chairs

Karen Antion
Richard J. Bacigalupo
Ronald L. Barnes
Gordon Diamond
Nathaniel P. Ford, Sr.

William D. Lochte
Jeffrey A. Nelson
Lawrence G. Reuter
Joshua W. Shaw
Howard Silver

David L. Turney
Kathryn D. Waters
Linda S. Watson
Alan C. Wulkan

APTA Executive Committee Security Task Force

Richard A. White, Chair

Ronald L. Barnes
Peter A. Cannito
Peter M. Cipolla
George F. Dixon III

Celia G. Kupersmith
Paul J. Lennon
Dennis D. Louwerse
Lawrence G. Reuter

Ronald J. Tober
Alan C. Wulkan
Mychal H. Walker

President

William W. Millar

CONTENTS

Summary and Principal Findings	Page 4
APTA Survey of United States Transit System Security Needs and Funding Priorities	Page 6
Description of Survey Sample Categories of Transit Agency Security Personnel	
Transit Agency Security Actions and Expenditures Since September 11, 2001	Page 8
New and Augmented Transit Agency Security Measures Taken Since September 11, 2001 Transit Agency Expenditures on Security	
Transit Agency Security Needs	Page 11
Security Funding Shortfalls Since September 11, 2001 Security Funding Needs	
Transit Agency Security Priorities for Federal Funding	Page 12
Conclusion	Page 20

SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

The American Public Transportation Association conducted a survey of its transit agency members during the first quarter of 2004 to determine (a) the amount of funds they spend on and need for their security function; (b) the extent to which they had increased and improved their security measures since September 11, 2001; and (c) the priorities they place on security measures that should be supported by federal funding. A sample of 120 transit agencies participated in the survey representing a cross section of transit agencies operating all modes of transit service, in communities of all sizes, and in all areas of the U.S. The principal findings of that survey are:

- ***Total security needs***
Transit agency security-related investment needs are \$6 billion. This amount includes \$5.2 billion for transit agency security-related capital investment plus \$800 million annually for security-related personnel and other security-related expenses.
- ***Local security expenditures since September 11, 2001***
From September 11, 2001 through the end of 2003, U.S. transit agencies spent \$1.7 billion for their security functions: \$1.3 billion for security-related operating expenditures and \$400 million for investment in security capital equipment.
- ***Shortfall in security funding***
U.S. transit agencies experienced a total shortfall in security funding for the period September 11, 2001 through Calendar Year 2003 of about \$1.3 billion. Overall an additional \$350 million was needed for security-related operating expenditures and \$950 million for security-related capital investments.
- ***Adoption of new and improvement of current security measures***
New security measures have been adopted since September 11, 2001 by 88.3 percent of transit agencies responding to the survey, and 74.2 percent have increased security measures that were already in place.
- ***Priority of security operating needs***
Five security-related operating measures most often selected as those for which federal funding is "Very Important" are:
 - Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel
 - Training for Security Personnel Including Preparatory Drills
 - Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel
 - Security Training for Other Personnel
 - Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training Including Preparatory Drills

- ***Priority of security capital needs***

Five security-related capital investments most often selected as those for which federal funding is “Very Important” are:

- Radio Communications Systems Including Operational Control Redundancy
- Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles
- Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas
- Security Cameras in Stations
- Automated Vehicle Locator Systems

The very largest systems with extensive separated right-of-way rail lines and tunnel networks also rated federal funding for chemical, biological, and radiation detection devices as very important.

For further information contact Robert Healy, Director-Government Relations at (202) 496-4811, or by E-mail at rhealy@apta.com.

APTA SURVEY OF UNITED STATES TRANSIT SYSTEM SECURITY NEEDS AND FUNDING PRIORITIES

The American Public Transportation Association conducted a survey of its transit agency members during the first quarter of 2004 to determine (a) the amount of funds they spend on and need for their security function; (b) the extent to which they had increased and improved their security measures since September 11, 2001; and (c) the priorities they place on security measures that should be supported by federal funding. Participating transit agencies completed a four page survey.

Description of Survey Sample

A sample of 120 transit agencies participated in the survey representing a cross section of transit agencies operating all modes of transit service, in communities of all sizes, and in all areas of the U.S. The sample is described on Table 1. In aggregate, the responding transit agencies carried 73.2 percent of all transit passenger trips in 2001, provided 71.7 percent of all transit passenger miles of service, and operated 46.8 percent of all transit vehicles.

Table 1: Description of Sample Group

Transit Agency Sample Group	Number of Transit Systems in Sample Group	2001 Unlinked Passenger Trips (000s)	2001 Passenger Miles (000s)	2001 Vehicles Available for Maximum Service
Multi-Mode with Rail or Ferry Total	32	6,144,461.7	31,265,740.9	43,281
Percent of All Multi-Mode	57.1%	92.7%	90.3%	82.8%
Large Bus Total	29	680,094.0	2,834,084.6	13,940
Percent of All Large Bus	40.8%	42.5%	42.0%	40.9%
Medium Bus Total	29	183,990.3	795,732.7	4,122
Percent of All Medium Bus	31.9%	47.2%	35.5%	31.7%
Small Bus Total	30	59,571.0	302,689.5	1,462
Percent of All Small Bus	0.5%	5.8%	5.6%	4.2%

To differentiate the effect of size on transit agency responses and to better estimate total expenditures on and funding needs for transit security, the sample is divided into four groups of similar systems by vehicle modes operated and system size based on vehicles available for operation as shown on Table 1. These groupings are selected solely to describe the survey sample and do not correspond to any APTA, Federal Transit Administration, or National Transit Database categories. Reported values are then expanded using standard statistical methods. The total sample of transit agencies operates 97.5 percent of all heavy rail cars, 84.5 percent of all commuter rail cars, 82.8 percent of all light rail cars, 47.0 percent of all motor buses, 25.9 percent of all demand response vehicles, and 34.6 percent of all other transit vehicles operated in the country.

Categories of Transit Agency Security Personnel

Responding agencies use a variety of sources to obtain their security personnel. As shown on Table 2, 16.7 percent of responding transit agencies have their own dedicated transit police. As would be expected, most transit agencies with their own law enforcement organization are larger systems, primarily rail or multimodal systems and a few very large bus systems. Dedicated security personnel in addition to transit police are employed by 25.8 percent of respondents.

Table 2: Types of Security Personnel at Transit Agencies

Sample Group	Systems in Survey Sample with Type of Security Personnel					
	Dedicated Transit Police Force	Dedicated Security Personnel Employed by System	Law Enforcement Contracted from Local/State Government	Law Enforcement Provided by State/Local Government	Contracted Security Personnel	Other Security Personnel Provision
Multi-Mode with Rail or Ferry Number Respondents	17	12	11	6	18	6
Multi-Mode with Rail or Ferry Percent Respondents	53.1%	37.5%	34.4%	18.8%	56.3%	18.8%
Large Bus Number Respondents	3	11	14	8	21	3
Large Bus Percent Respondents	10.3%	37.9%	48.3%	27.6%	72.4%	10.3%
Medium Bus Number Respondents	0	5	12	11	20	2
Medium Bus Percent Respondents	0.0%	17.2%	41.4%	37.9%	69.0%	6.9%
Small Bus Number Respondents	0	3	6	16	9	1
Small Bus Percent Respondents	0.0%	10.0%	20.0%	53.3%	30.0%	3.3%
Total Sample Number Respondents	20	31	43	41	68	12
Total Sample Percent Respondents	16.7%	25.8%	35.8%	34.2%	56.7%	10.0%

Law enforcement service is provided by state and local governments under paid contracts for 35.8 percent of responding transit systems and provided without payment for an additional 34.2 percent of respondents. The remaining responding systems did not specify the arrangement through which the local law enforcement function is provided to their agency. Dedicated security personnel are contracted for by 56.7 percent of responding agencies and 10 percent make other arrangements for security personnel. In all cases municipal, county, and state law enforcement officers would also provide a security function consistent with local law whether or not a formal contractual arrangement exists.

**TRANSIT AGENCY SECURITY ACTIONS AND EXPENDITURES
SINCE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001**

**New and Augmented Transit Agency Security Measures
Taken Since September 11, 2001**

Survey participants were asked whether or not they had implemented new security measures since September 11, 2001, or enhanced security measures that were already in place before then. The question was open ended and suggested responses were not provided. New security measures have been adopted by 88.3 percent of respondents and 74.2 percent have increased security measures that were already in place at that time. Several respondents pointed out that they had already implemented new security measures prior to September 11, 2001 and hence could only report a more limited set of initiatives since that date. As reported on Table 3, nearly all larger transit agencies implemented new security measures and most increased existing measures.

Table 3: Transit Systems Reporting New or Increased Security Measures Since September 11, 2001

Sample Group	Systems Adopting New Security Measures or Additional Security Measures Since September 11, 2001		Systems Increasing Security Measures That Were in Place Prior to September 11, 2001	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Multi-Mode with Rail or Ferry Number	31	1	27	5
Multi-Mode with Rail or Ferry Percent	96.9 %	3.1 %	84.4 %	15.6 %
Large Bus Number	28	1	26	3
Large Bus Percent	96.6 %	3.4 %	89.7 %	10.3 %
Medium Bus Number	25	4	19	10
Medium Bus Percent	86.2 %	13.8 %	65.5 %	34.5 %
Small Bus Number	22	8	17	13
Small Bus Percent	73.3 %	26.7 %	56.7 %	43.3 %
Total Sample Number	106	14	89	31
Total Sample Percent	88.3 %	11.7 %	74.2 %	25.8 %

Because the questions were open ended and requested only examples of new or increased security measures, not a check-off of all categories of security measures, the percent of transit agencies implementing or increasing specific security measures is not calculated. The types of security measures implemented or improved fell into eight general categories.

Please note that the absence of a system reporting new or increased efforts for a particular security measure does not imply that a system does not use that security measure. Many of the following security measures are part of the normal activity of most transit agencies and have been standard activities for many years. The described activities are a sample

of those that the transit agencies report doing in a new way or a significantly increased way relative to the size and needs of their agency.

Employee and Customer Training and Information. Fifty-one transit agencies reported new or increased security training and information measures. These activities include training for transit personnel, both security personnel and other personnel, and improving distribution of security-related information to employees and customers. Because many transit system employees, especially bus and rail vehicle operators, conductors, and station attendants, are continually in contact with transit customers, they are able to be a "first-line" in ensuring continuous security for transit patrons.

Security and Emergency Plans, Procedures, Assessments, and Drills. Sixty-three transit agencies reported new or increased security measures of this type. Transit agencies have developed new or revised existing security plans to account for the changing threats to their systems. Drills, including joint drills with other local security agencies and responders such as fire and medical personnel, improve an agency's ability to avoid security incidents and to respond to an incident should one occur.

Security Personnel Presence and Visibility. The presence of security personnel is an important part of reducing threats to transit agencies. Fifty-three agencies reported significant increases in the number of security personnel, the amount of time they were on patrol, or the areas they patrolled. Some agencies also have begun using specialized security personnel such as K-9 patrols.

Radio Communications Infrastructure. Thirteen transit agencies reported new, improved, or planned radio communications systems including operational control expansion and redundancy. In a later section of this report, radio communications systems will be among the highest priorities for federal funding needs of responding systems. The high priority placed on these systems compared to the limited number of respondents which have improved their radio communications systems is an indication of the investment required to introduce new systems and the shortfall in available security funding for capital investments.

Access Control and Intrusion Detection. Fifty-three transit agencies reported new or enhanced access control functions. Access control encompasses a variety of measures. New ID and visitor identification procedures have been implemented to control access to transit facilities. New procedures have been put in place to screen mail and other deliveries to transit facilities and offices. Larger systems with stations and tunnels are installing chemical, biological, and radiological detection devices to enhance the security of their patrons. Many systems are installing physical detection devices at their facilities as well as improved lighting, fencing, locks and doors that require swipe-card or similar electronic devices for employee access.

Automated Vehicle Locator Systems. Automated vehicle locator systems (AVL), also referred to as global positioning systems (GPS) for the technology that some of them use, allow transit agencies to know in real-time the exact location of their buses and vans. Coupled with communication systems they allow immediate response to any security threat to those vehicles. Only 17 responding systems have been able to implement new or improve existing AVL systems. As with radio communication systems, this is due in part to the expense of these systems and the limited funds that transit agencies have to make security investments. AVL systems are a high priority for investment for bus and van transit operators.

Surveillance Systems. Surveillance systems provide for real time observation of transit facilities and vehicles as well as visual and audio recording. Eighty-one responding agencies report new or enhanced surveillance systems. Real time surveillance is primarily provided by closed circuit television (CCTV) and is used in transit stations and facilities and in some cases on vehicles. Cameras record activity on transit vehicles and in stations and facilities. Transit agencies invest in the technology that is appropriate to their system and needs.

Other Investments. Other investments cover a wide variety of security measures designed to meet very specific needs. Although mentioned by only a few respondents, cyber security at agencies that use computer controls for their operations will become increasing more important. Many transit systems are establishing new committees or task forces to bring a greater range of expertise to the security function. Coordination with other government and law enforcement agencies is also being improved and continued investment in and improvement of emergency equipment is necessary to adequately respond to incidents.

Transit Agency Expenditures on Security

In their recent year reported transit agencies spent \$740 million for transit security and a total of approximately \$1.7 billion from September 11, 2001 through the end of Calendar Year 2003. Over that time period about \$1.3 billion was spent for security-related operations and \$400 million for security-related capital investments.

Table 4: Transit System Expenditures for Security During Most Recent Year Reported

Sample Group	Security Expenditures During Most Recent Year Reported		
	Operating (Millions of Dollars)	Capital (Millions of Dollars)	Total (Millions of Dollars)
All Transit Systems	\$565	\$175	\$740

Expenditures are estimated for the entire U.S. transit industry by expanding reported amounts by vehicles available for service within each of four groups where transit agencies are stratified by mode and size. Respondents were requested to report only security-related expenditures and to avoid reporting safety related expenditures that do not have a security function.

TRANSIT AGENCY SECURITY NEEDS

Security Funding Shortfalls Since September 11, 2001

To fully fund their security needs, all U.S. transit agencies should have spent an additional \$160 million for operating related security expenses and \$440 million for security-related capital investments during their most recently reported year. The total shortfall for the September 11, 2001 through Calendar Year 2003 period was about \$1.3 billion. Overall an additional \$350 million was needed for security-related operating expenditures and \$950 million for security-related capital investments during that period. The amounts were calculated by expanding reported amounts based on vehicles available for service.

Table 5: Transit System Expenditure Shortfall for Security
During Most Recent Year Reported

Sample Group	Additional Security Funding That Was Needed During Most Recent Year Reported		
	Operating (Millions of Dollars)	Capital (Millions of Dollars)	Total (Millions of Dollars)
All Transit Systems	\$160	\$440	\$600

Security Funding Needs

A total of \$6 billion in security-related funding needs were estimated from survey responses, \$5.2 billion in capital needs and \$800 million in annual operating needs.

Survey respondents were asked to project “How much additional funding do you need in the long-term to complete your capital program to maintain, modernize, and expand your security function?” Responses were expanded within categories of systems with similar fleet sizes and modal composition and then summed to arrive at national projections. The total projected transit agency security oriented capital needs are \$5.2 billion. Types of investments that would be made with these funds are described in detail in the next section, where priorities for security-oriented capital investments reported by survey participants are summarized.

Annual personnel and other operating costs are projected to be \$800 million annually. Over the past year transit agencies spent \$565 million for security-related activities and found a funding shortfall of \$160 million for security activities. The need for further increases in security measures and normal cost growth result in a projected annual need for \$800 million in operations related security expenditures. Total needs are shown on Table 6.

Table 6: Transit Security Funding Needs

Category of Funding Need	Long-Term Funding Requirement (Millions of Dollars)
Transit Agency Capital Needs to Maintain, Modernize, and Expand Security Function	\$5,200
Annual Security-related Personnel and Other Operating Needs	\$800
Total Transit Agency Security Needs	\$6,000

Additional security-related funding is needed for federal support of national research and training programs that assist transit agencies in planning and carrying out their security programs. Experience will allow a more detailed assessment of funds needed to carry out these programs. National security activities include:

Technical support for security and emergency preparedness plan development and refinement; technical support for preparedness drills; comprehensive security needs assessments, and infrastructure security plan development.

Research and development for security systems that will enhance detection of chemical, biological, radiological, and physical intrusion threats in public transit environments.

Training for national and regional security workshops and symposiums through government, industry, and partnered initiatives; development and delivery of internal security programs; participation in established security programs external to transit agencies; and inter-agency emergency preparedness drills.

Support for national defense to develop and refine evacuation plans and mobilization of public transit systems for evacuation needs.

TRANSIT AGENCY SECURITY PRIORITIES FOR FEDERAL FUNDING

Survey participants were asked to rate the importance of federal funding for eleven types of operating funding security measure expenditures and eleven types of security-related capital investments. The ratings are “Very Important,” “Important,” “Somewhat Important,” “Not Important,” and “Not Applicable.” A summary of the ratings for each security measure for all respondents is on Table 7, Part A, and summaries for the four categories of transit agency by size and mode are shown on Tables 7, Parts B through E.

The five operating measures and five capital investments receiving the largest number of “Very Important” responses are listed by transit agency size and mode group as well as for all respondents on Table 8. Where two measures received the same number of “Very Important” responses, the ranking was determined by the number of “Important” responses. The five most frequently selected as “Very Important” security-related operating measures by all respondents are:

- Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel
- Training for Security Personnel Including Preparatory Drills
- Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel
- Security Training for Other Personnel
- Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training including Preparatory Drills

The five most frequently selected as “Very Important” security-related capital investments by all respondents are:

- Radio Communications Systems Including Operational Control Redundancy
- Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles
- Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas
- Security Cameras in Stations
- Automated Vehicle Locator Systems

The investments rated most highly were appropriate to the size and type of transit agency. Large multi-modal systems differed from all bus systems by rating Intrusion Detection Devices highly. The very largest systems with rail rights-of-way and tunnel networks, which are not reported as a separate group, also rated federal funding for chemical, biological, and radiation detection devices as very important.

Table 7, Part A: Importance of Federal Funding for Selected Security Measures

All Responding Transit Systems									
Operations Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	59	60.8%	17	17.5%	14	14.4%	7	7.2%	21
Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	54	52.9%	28	27.5%	14	13.7%	6	5.9%	15
Funding for Over-Time/Extra Personnel During Heightened Alert Levels	51	50.5%	30	29.7%	13	12.9%	7	6.9%	16
Creation of New Security Units, e.g., K-9 Teams	13	14.4%	22	24.4%	38	42.2%	17	18.9%	25
Training for Security Personnel	55	48.7%	43	38.1%	11	9.7%	4	3.5%	6
Security Training for Other Personnel	53	45.7%	46	39.7%	15	12.9%	2	1.7%	3
Security Planning Activities	49	42.6%	51	44.3%	12	10.4%	3	2.6%	3
Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training	53	45.7%	42	36.2%	19	16.4%	2	1.7%	2
Customer Outreach	36	31.0%	47	40.5%	25	21.6%	8	6.9%	3
Access to Security Intelligence Information	39	34.5%	41	36.3%	25	22.1%	8	7.1%	6
Ongoing Technical Support for Security Plan Development	51	45.1%	46	40.7%	11	9.7%	5	4.4%	4
Capital Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Automated Vehicle Locator Systems	76	67.9%	21	18.8%	13	11.6%	2	1.8%	5
Radio Communications Systems	96	85.7%	12	10.7%	2	1.8%	2	1.8%	5
Passenger-Operator Intercoms	22	21.6%	44	43.1%	24	23.5%	12	11.8%	14
Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles	82	72.6%	23	20.4%	5	4.4%	3	2.7%	4
Security Cameras in Stations	78	75.0%	17	16.3%	7	6.7%	2	1.9%	12
Public Address Systems On-Board Vehicles	46	42.2%	40	36.7%	19	17.4%	4	3.7%	7
Public Address Systems in Stations	42	42.4%	38	38.4%	14	14.1%	5	5.1%	18
Security Fencing Around Facilities	62	54.4%	37	32.5%	12	10.5%	3	2.6%	3
Chemical/Biological/Radiological Detection Devices	21	19.8%	36	34.0%	35	33.0%	14	13.2%	11
Intrusion Detection Devices	48	42.1%	38	33.3%	22	19.3%	6	5.3%	3
Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas	81	71.1%	27	23.7%	5	4.4%	1	0.9%	3

Table 7, Part B: Importance of Federal Funding for Selected Security Measures

Multimodal Systems with Rail or Ferry Boat, Rail Only, and Ferry Boat Only Transit Systems									
Operations Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	19	63.3%	7	23.3%	3	10.0%	1	3.3%	2
Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	22	68.8%	7	21.9%	3	9.4%	0	0.0%	0
Funding for Over-Time/Extra Personnel During Heightened Alert Levels	20	66.7%	9	30.0%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1
Creation of New Security Units, e.g., K-9 Teams	8	26.7%	7	23.3%	14	46.7%	1	3.3%	2
Training for Security Personnel	18	56.3%	14	43.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Security Training for Other Personnel	13	40.6%	16	50.0%	3	9.4%	0	0.0%	0
Security Planning Activities	15	46.9%	13	40.6%	3	9.4%	1	3.1%	0
Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training	16	50.0%	13	40.6%	3	9.4%	0	0.0%	0
Customer Outreach	12	37.5%	12	37.5%	7	21.9%	1	3.1%	0
Access to Security Intelligence Information	16	50.0%	10	31.3%	5	15.6%	1	3.1%	0
Ongoing Technical Support for Security Plan Development	17	54.8%	10	32.3%	2	6.5%	2	6.5%	0
Capital Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Automated Vehicle Locator Systems	12	40.0%	12	40.0%	5	16.7%	1	3.3%	2
Radio Communications Systems	24	77.4%	5	16.1%	1	3.2%	1	3.2%	0
Passenger-Operator Intercoms	10	32.3%	15	48.4%	4	12.9%	2	6.5%	0
Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles	16	51.6%	10	32.3%	2	6.5%	3	9.7%	1
Security Cameras in Stations	22	71.0%	6	19.4%	3	9.7%	0	0.0%	0
Public Address Systems On-Board Vehicles	13	41.9%	13	41.9%	3	9.7%	2	6.5%	0
Public Address Systems in Stations	16	51.6%	12	38.7%	2	6.5%	1	3.2%	0
Security Fencing Around Facilities	17	54.8%	7	22.6%	6	19.4%	1	3.2%	0
Chemical/Biological/Radiological Detection Devices	10	32.3%	9	29.0%	9	29.0%	3	9.7%	0
Intrusion Detection Devices	19	59.4%	13	40.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas	25	78.1%	5	15.6%	2	6.3%	0	0.0%	0

Table 7, Part C: Importance of Federal Funding for Selected Security Measures

Bus and Van Only Transit Systems with 230 or More Vehicles Available for Service									
Operations Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	17	68.0%	2	8.0%	4	16.0%	2	8.0%	2
Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	17	70.8%	5	20.8%	2	8.3%	0	0.0%	3
Funding for Over-Time/Extra Personnel During Heightened Alert Levels	14	56.0%	7	28.0%	3	12.0%	1	4.0%	2
Creation of New Security Units, e.g., K-9 Teams	2	9.5%	7	33.3%	11	52.4%	1	4.8%	6
Training for Security Personnel	17	60.7%	7	25.0%	4	14.3%	0	0.0%	0
Security Training for Other Personnel	12	42.9%	13	46.4%	2	7.1%	1	3.6%	0
Security Planning Activities	14	51.9%	10	37.0%	3	11.1%	0	0.0%	0
Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training	14	53.8%	8	30.8%	4	15.4%	0	0.0%	1
Customer Outreach	8	28.6%	12	42.9%	6	21.4%	2	7.1%	0
Access to Security Intelligence Information	13	46.4%	8	28.6%	6	21.4%	1	3.6%	0
Ongoing Technical Support for Security Plan Development	12	44.4%	11	40.7%	4	14.8%	0	0.0%	0
Capital Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Automated Vehicle Locator Systems	22	84.6%	4	15.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
Radio Communications Systems	25	96.2%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
Passenger-Operator Intercoms	3	13.6%	10	45.5%	7	31.8%	2	9.1%	4
Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles	21	77.8%	5	18.5%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	0
Security Cameras in Stations	18	81.8%	1	4.5%	2	9.1%	1	4.5%	5
Public Address Systems On-Board Vehicles	10	40.0%	10	40.0%	4	16.0%	1	4.0%	2
Public Address Systems in Stations	8	38.1%	5	23.8%	8	38.1%	0	0.0%	6
Security Fencing Around Facilities	15	55.6%	9	33.3%	2	7.4%	1	3.7%	0
Chemical/Biological/Radiological Detection Devices	4	15.4%	8	30.8%	11	42.3%	3	11.5%	1
Intrusion Detection Devices	11	42.3%	7	26.9%	6	23.1%	2	7.7%	0
Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas	19	73.1%	6	23.1%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	0

Table 7, Part D: Importance of Federal Funding for Selected Security Measures

Bus and Van Only Transit Systems with 85 to 229 Vehicles Available for Service									
Operations Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	19	76.0%	3	12.0%	2	8.0%	1	4.0%	4
Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	11	42.3%	8	30.8%	4	15.4%	3	11.5%	3
Funding for Over-Time/Extra Personnel During Heightened Alert Levels	10	40.0%	9	36.0%	4	16.0%	2	8.0%	4
Creation of New Security Units, e.g., K-9 Teams	1	4.5%	7	31.8%	7	31.8%	7	31.8%	6
Training for Security Personnel	15	53.6%	11	39.3%	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	1
Security Training for Other Personnel	17	58.6%	7	24.1%	4	13.8%	1	3.4%	0
Security Planning Activities	13	44.8%	12	41.4%	3	10.3%	1	3.4%	0
Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training	12	41.4%	11	37.9%	5	17.2%	1	3.4%	0
Customer Outreach	10	34.5%	14	48.3%	3	10.3%	2	6.9%	0
Access to Security Intelligence Information	5	17.9%	16	57.1%	6	21.4%	1	3.6%	1
Ongoing Technical Support for Security Plan Development	13	44.8%	14	48.3%	1	3.4%	1	3.4%	0
Capital Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Automated Vehicle Locator Systems	24	85.7%	4	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
Radio Communications Systems	27	93.1%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Passenger-Operator Intercoms	5	19.2%	12	46.2%	6	23.1%	3	11.5%	3
Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles	23	82.1%	4	14.3%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	1
Security Cameras in Stations	20	83.3%	4	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4
Public Address Systems On-Board Vehicles	12	42.9%	10	35.7%	6	21.4%	0	0.0%	2
Public Address Systems in Stations	9	36.0%	11	44.0%	3	12.0%	2	8.0%	4
Security Fencing Around Facilities	15	51.7%	12	41.4%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	0
Chemical/Biological/Radiological Detection Devices	2	8.3%	11	45.8%	10	41.7%	1	4.2%	5
Intrusion Detection Devices	7	24.1%	13	44.8%	9	31.0%	0	0.0%	0
Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas	19	67.9%	8	28.6%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	1

Table 7, Part E: Importance of Federal Funding for Selected Security Measures

Bus and Van Only Transit Systems with Fewer Than 85 Vehicles									
Operations Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	4	23.5%	5	29.4%	5	29.4%	3	17.6%	13
Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	4	20.0%	8	40.0%	5	25.0%	3	15.0%	9
Funding for Over-Time/Extra Personnel During Heightened Alert Levels	7	33.3%	5	23.8%	5	23.8%	4	19.0%	9
Creation of New Security Units, e.g., K-9 Teams	2	11.8%	1	5.9%	6	35.3%	8	47.1%	11
Training for Security Personnel	5	20.0%	11	44.0%	6	24.0%	3	12.0%	5
Security Training for Other Personnel	11	40.7%	10	37.0%	6	22.2%	0	0.0%	3
Security Planning Activities	7	25.9%	16	59.3%	3	11.1%	1	3.7%	3
Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training	11	37.9%	10	34.5%	7	24.1%	1	3.4%	1
Customer Outreach	6	22.2%	9	33.3%	9	33.3%	3	11.1%	3
Access to Security Intelligence Information	5	20.0%	7	28.0%	8	32.0%	5	20.0%	5
Ongoing Technical Support for Security Plan Development	9	34.6%	11	42.3%	4	15.4%	2	7.7%	4
Capital Funding									
Security Measure or Investment	Very Important		Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Automated Vehicle Locator Systems	18	64.3%	1	3.6%	8	28.6%	1	3.6%	1
Radio Communications Systems	20	76.9%	4	15.4%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	4
Passenger-Operator Intercoms	4	17.4%	7	30.4%	7	30.4%	5	21.7%	7
Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles	22	81.5%	4	14.8%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	2
Security Cameras in Stations	18	66.7%	6	22.3%	2	7.4%	1	3.7%	3
Public Address Systems On-Board Vehicles	11	44.0%	7	28.0%	6	24.0%	1	4.0%	3
Public Address Systems in Stations	9	40.9%	10	45.5%	1	4.5%	2	9.1%	8
Security Fencing Around Facilities	15	55.6%	9	33.3%	2	7.4%	1	3.7%	3
Chemical/Biological/Radiological Detection Devices	5	20.0%	8	32.0%	5	20.0%	7	28.0%	5
Intrusion Detection Devices	11	40.7%	5	18.5%	7	25.9%	4	14.8%	3
Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas	18	64.3%	8	28.6%	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	2

**Table 8: Importance of Federal Funding for Selected Security Measures:
Funding Needs Receiving Largest Number of “Very Important” Responses in Rank Order (a)**

Operating Funding					
Ranking	Multimodal Systems with Rail or Ferry Boat, Rail Only, and Ferry Boat Only Transit Systems	Bus and Van Only Transit Systems with 230 or More Vehicles Available for Service	Bus and Van Only Transit Systems with 85 to 229 Vehicles Available for Service	Bus and Van Only Transit Systems with Fewer Than 85 Vehicles	All Responding Transit Systems
1st	Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	Training for Security Personnel	Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training	Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel
2nd	Funding for Over-Time/Extra Personnel During Heightened Alert Levels	Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	Security Training for Other Personnel	Security Training for Other Personnel	Training for Security Personnel
3rd	Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	Funding Current Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel	Training for Security Personnel	Ongoing Technical Support for Security Plan Development	Funding Additional Transit Agency/Local Law Enforcement Security Personnel
4th	Training for Security Personnel	Security Planning Activities	Ongoing Technical Support for Security Plan Development	Security Planning Activities	Security Training for Other Personnel
5th	Ongoing Technical Support for Security Plan Development	Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training	Security Planning Activities	Funding for Over-Time/Extra Personnel During Heightened Alert Levels	Joint Transit/Law Enforcement Training
Capital Funding					
1st	Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas	Radio Communications Systems	Radio Communications Systems	Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles	Radio Communications Systems
2nd	Radio Communications Systems	Automated Vehicle Locator Systems	Automated Vehicle Locator Systems	Radio Communications Systems	Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles
3rd	Security Cameras in Stations	Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles	Security Cameras On-Board Vehicles	Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas	Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas
4th	Intrusion Detection Devices	Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas	Security Cameras in Stations	Security Cameras in Stations	Security Cameras in Stations
5th	Security Fencing Around Facilities	Security Cameras in Stations	Controlled Access to Facilities and Secure Areas	Automated Vehicle Locator Systems	Automated Vehicle Locator Systems

(a) Measures receiving the same number of “Very Important” responses are ranked in order of the number of “Important” responses.

CONCLUSION

Since September 11, 2001, public transportation systems have spent \$1.7 billion from their own budgets to meet threats brought about by the terrorist attacks on our nation. The April 2004 APTA survey of transit industry security needs demonstrates that to improve security for the tens of millions of Americans who use public transportation, an additional security investment of \$6 billion is required: \$5.2 billion for capital and other one-time investments and \$800 million annually for security-related personnel and other costs.

APTA is communicating the results of this survey to Congress and the Administration and is advocating for significant federal investment in transit security through the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

For further information contact Robert Healy, Director-Government Relations at (202) 496-4811, or by E-mail at rhealy@apta.com.