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Summary of Transit Corridor Projects Strengths and Weaknesses

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Nine of the 26 (27 total projects - HART’s 200X was continued under a separate contract) transit corridor projects funded from July 1, 1993 through December 31, 1999 have been categorized as “Very Successful.” They include the following projects:

1. Lee Tran - US 41
2. Gainesville RTS - SW Gainesville Enhanced Bus Service
3. Gainesville RTS - Later Gator
4. Gainesville RTS - Tower Road
5. Escambia County Area Transit - Davis Highway (Route 19)
6. Miami-Dade Transit Agency - South Dade Busway
7. City of Miami Beach - The “Electrowave”
8. Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority - Route 59/Route 73 Service
9. Pasco County Transportation - US 19

Thirteen of the 26 projects funded have been categorized as “Successful.”

Two factors that lend to increasing a project’s chances of being “successful” include:

1. Marketing, both at the beginning and throughout the project. It is critical to ensuring the success of a project.
2. Public participation in the design and establishment of the project is extremely important and should not be overlooked.

The effectiveness and success of express routes, coupled with frequently running shuttles or feeder services, have been demonstrated by the projects summarized in this technical memorandum.

- Flexibility in route design, operating hours, etc. is critical in the initial stages of the project. You need to take the time to experiment and “tweak” the route to ensure the greatest ridership capture.
Both FDOT district offices and agencies who responded to the survey, along with subsequent verbal responses, stated that transit corridor projects should have multi-year joint participation agreements with dedicated, continued funding.

FDOT district respondents suggested that the Transit Corridor Program funds be programmed beyond the first year of the FDOT Work Program.

Through the review process, it became clear that carefully established goals and objectives are essential to the effective evaluation of a project. In addition, transit agencies should recognize the flexibility available to adjust originally established goals and objectives when warranted.

Through the review of project reports, it was very apparent that consistent reporting requirements are needed. CUTR staff recommends that all agencies report the same information, both quarterly performance (if reports required on a quarterly basis) and annual performance. Each report should contain the WPI or FPN number; name of the project as it appears on the joint participation agreement; brief project summary; goals for the project; performance measures, including, but not limited to: ridership, revenue, and expenses; any changes to the route or schedule during the period; and any significant successes or activities that occurred during the reporting period. (This suggestion will also appear in Technical Memorandum Three).

The Transit Corridor Program is an important program that allows public agencies to establish needed services that may not otherwise be financially feasible for them. Many of the projects identified in this technical memorandum have contributed to reduced congestion within significant regional transportation corridors, including US 1 (in Dade County), US 41 (in Lee and Hillsborough Counties) and US 19 (in Pinellas and Pasco Counties).

The Transit Corridor Program should continue as a separate program within the FDOT Transit Office and should not be combined with any other program (as suggested by some respondents).
Purpose

The purpose of this project is to review and summarize the performance of transit corridor projects funded by the FDOT during the time period from July 1, 1993 through December 1, 1999. Through surveys and interviews, CUTR will summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the individual projects. The lessons learned from the implementation of these projects will be shared with other transit systems within the State of Florida.

Task 1 of this project, CUTR analyzed and summarized all Joint Participation Agreements (JPAs) for the Transit Corridor Program from July 1, 1993 through December 1, 1999. Transit corridor projects which are currently underway were summarized in detail using the available progress report data. Those projects which started in FY 1999, that did not have progress reports available at the time the data collection activities were conducted, were summarized as to project scope, goals and budget. Where critical reporting and/or data were lacking, CUTR interviewed FDOT and transit agency personnel to gather the required information. Technical Memorandum Number 1 presented this information.

Task 2 builds on Task 1 with an emphasis on identifying the level of success of the Transit Corridor projects. This information is summarized in Technical Memorandum Number 2 below in a "lessons learned" manner to share with the State of Florida transit industry. It is intended that the results of this analysis may also be presented at FTA annual and midyear conferences.

Finally, in Task 3 CUTR will interview involved FDOT personnel at both the Central Office and District Offices and agency personnel to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the overall Transit Corridor Program, including the results of specific projects, as well as the FDOT procedures for project development, monitoring, project prioritization and funding. From these efforts recommendations may be made to aid in improving the Transit Corridor Program procedures and monitoring processes. Technical Memorandum Number Three will document these findings and recommendations.
SURVEY OF LESSONS LEARNED

In order to collect information regarding an individual project's success/failure, as well as to gain input into suggested changes to the Transit Corridor program, CUTR surveyed the transit agencies, and district FDOT personnel who were managing individual projects or FDOT district transit corridor programs during the timeframe of July 1, 1993 through December 31, 1999. The survey was sent to 13 systems who are or have been Transit Corridor Program fund recipients covering the active or completed transit corridor projects. The following five questions were asked of the project agencies (copy of cover letter and survey instrument provided in Appendix A of this document):

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active? (A) If yes, do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire? (B) If no, upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Did you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "Lessons Learned" from the project can you share with other agencies who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

The surveys were sent out in November and December 2000, with follow-up phone contacts to ensure receipt of the survey by the most knowledgeable person. Of the 13 agencies sent the surveys, nine were completed and returned and two were completed via telephone, representing 25 of the 26 transit corridor projects referenced in this report.

The surveys were also sent to FDOT district representatives in December 2000 with follow-up phone calls placed in December 2000 and early January 2001. Of the seven district offices who received the surveys, four completed and returned the surveys, one district
representative responded via voicemail, indicating they had no comments to make, two districts e-mailed their responses with subsequent follow-up phone calls. All responses are provided in Appendix B.

The following sections summarize the results of the survey. These results are addressed in two sections. The first section summarizes the responses to questions 1, 2, and 4 by project. The second section numerically summarizes the results of questions 3 and 5, related to the level of FDOT funding assistance, and suggestions for changes to the Transit Corridor Program. Note that some systems may not have answered all of the questions.

Project Success/Failure, Continuation of Project, and Lesson Learned

The following section summarizes by District, agency, and specific project, the stated success/failure of the funded project, the current status of the project, and the lessons learned, as derived from a survey and interviews of recipient agencies. "No Response" is shown for questions where no response to the survey was given, and follow up contact with the participating agency or FDOT district office was not successful. In some cases the reason for lack of data was the change over of staff with no remaining documentation of a project's success/failure.

District 1

LeeTran

JS 41 Transit Corridor Project

30th LeeTran staff and district FDOT staff noted the continued success of this project. While the service has been and continues to be "very successful," the project has served as a catalyst for systemwide ridership increases. Ridership goals are consistently exceeded (unlinked passenger trips), as are route efficiency (riders per hour/mile) and farebox recovery. One aspect that is noted as critical to the success of this project is public involvement and marketing. In addition, because actual operating expenses were less than originally anticipated, LeeTran was able to extend the service to an 18 mile route along US 41 with extended service hours (from 5:25 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday).
Lessons Learned

"DOT district staff suggested that grant recipients and FDOT district project managers watch" the way in which the relative success of a project is measured. For example, with his project, it initially appeared that LeeTran’s unlinked passenger trips decreased. However, the actual decrease was the result of the elimination of many transfers. After the first seven to eight months of the project, the sheer growth in ridership overcame this issue.

In addition, it was also noted that success on a major corridor, such as US 41, should invariably lead to improved performance on all interconnecting routes and eventually systemwide (when looking at performance measures).

Other comments established the importance of public involvement, "if done right, it's worth it." Also, FDOT suggested that multi-year JPAs are the best, eliminating the need for the annual budgeting process.

LeeTran also included the importance of continued public participation and marketing of the service in their comments. In addition, it was noted that using the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (MPO’s) Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was helpful in ensuring continued public involvement.

Sarasota County Area Transit (SCAT)

US 41 (South Tamiami Trail)

This project began in FY 2000. Performance cannot be determined at this time.

Lessons Learned

There were no reported "lessons learned."
Vanatee County Area Transit (MCAT) 

**Vanatee Avenue/SR 64 Corridor Project**

This project began on March 3, 2000 (execution date of JPA). MCAT and FDOT agree that the project has been successful, exceeding the established “Phase I” ridership goals. The Phase I ridership goal for the first year of the project (through March 31, 2001) was a 15 percent increase over the benchmark established for a total of 196,394 passengers. During this period, ridership actually increased 22 percent. In addition, noted successes included better on-time performance. MCAT also stated that due to changes on the route (adding an additional bus), which allowed changes on other connecting routes, other MCAT routes are experiencing increased ridership with better connections.

**Lessons Learned**

MCAT staff noted the importance of providing sufficient lead time for staff, particularly drivers, to familiarize themselves with the project; the need for sufficient marketing/public awareness activities; and the importance of having schedules and other information readily available and easily accessible.

**District 2**

Jacksonville Transportation Authority (JTA)

**Park-N-Ride Commuter Express Route**

The primary expenses that were paid by FDOT were for marketing and promotional activities for the route and the purchase and installation of 13 automated passenger counters (APCs). In the survey response, JTA stated that preliminary goals and objectives were established for the project that have been met. Those established included increasing service express services and ridership by 1.5 percent per quarter.

**Lessons Learned**

Reducing headways definitely increases ridership.
Gainesville Regional Transit System (RTS)

W Gainesville Enhanced Bus Service

TS staff indicated that the project has done very well. Ridership on the routes included within the project area all experienced significant ridership increases. FDOT staff categorized this project as very successful.

Lessons Learned

TS staff noted that this project did so well because it provides service to areas densely populated with University of Florida students. It provides direct routes to campus with reduced headways which served to increase ridership. Lessons learned: serving densely populated areas with reduced headways and direct routes will increase your ridership.

Light Bus Service (Later Gator)

TS indicated that the project is doing well, noting continuing increases in both ridership and passengers/hour. Some fluctuation in ridership and in passengers/hour is experienced during periods of low student population (i.e., spring break, summer schedule, winter break, etc.). FDOT district staff stated that this project has been very successful.

One lesson learned by RTS staff was that it is important to have those you are serving (in this case University of Florida students) involved in route creation and planning.

Lessons Learned

As stated in the summary of this project, involve the people you are serving (in this case University of Florida students) in the design of the route. RTS added that including the students from the University in the creation of these late night routes added to the success of this project.
Tower Road Corridor Service

The Tower Road project provided funding assistance for four separate RTS routes, Routes and 75 running between the University of Florida and the Oaks Mall; Route 4 running from downtown to Shands; and portions of Route 5 running from the Cedar Ridge area to the Oaks Mall.

Overall the project was successful in increasing ridership within and along the corridors established. Actual riders per hour on Route 1 increased from 24.1 to 28.4 riders. Service availability was also increased from 3,414.3 hours in the spring of 1998 to 5,728 hours in the spring of 1999.

Additional statistical data supporting the overall success of this project was unavailable. Quarterly reports did not contain consistent measures from one to the next. In addition, his project only supported a particular segment of Route 5, while data was gathered on the productivity, ridership, and operating costs on the entire route rather than the specific segment covered by the enhanced service. However, the district FDOT staff categorized his project as very successful.

Lessons Learned

Again, it was noted that reducing headways on routes helps to increase ridership not only on the enhanced route(s) but on other routes within the system.

District 3

Escambia County Area Transit (ECAT)

Davis Highway Transit Corridor Project (Route 19)

This project has been very successful in meeting and exceed the annual goals established for passengers per mile and revenue per mile. Ridership and route revenue continue to increase at a healthy rate. From the FY 1997 base year to FY 2000, ridership increased 35 percent, from 109,099 passengers to 180,352 passengers, and revenue increased 71.9 percent, from $66,044 to $113,536 per year. ECAT attributed the success of the project
the environment of the area within which it operates. The Davis Highway Corridor is extremely congested. In addition, over the past two years, the highway has been under construction for widening, with lane closures adding to the congestion in the area.

Lessons Learned

Advertising and marketing is critical - and marketing to the right group. ECAT staff stated that you need to make sure schedules are maintained and you keep the project running long enough to build confidence in the service provided.

Blue Angel Highway Corridor Project (Route 18)

This project has not been as successful as the Davis Highway project; however, it has been meeting the annual ridership and revenue goals established. From FY 1998 to FY 2000, ridership increased 56.9 percent from 35,985 passengers to 56,474 passengers, and revenue increased 38.1 percent from $29,637 to $40,932. ECAT staff attributes the moderate increases in ridership and revenue to the closure of the airbase. However, they did indicate that through an increased marketing effort, they are rebuilding their ridership base.

Lessons Learned

Again, ECAT staff noted that advertising and marketing is critical - and marketing to the right group. ECAT staff stated that you need to make sure schedules are maintained and you keep the project running long enough to build confidence in the service provided.

District 4

Broward County Transit (BCT)

The Broward Urban Shuttle (BUS) and Western Express

FDOT District 4 staff stated that this project is a success. The main four goals of the project are to: 1) increase mass transit accessibility; 2) increase ridership/productivity in designated residential communities contiguous to the corridor; 3) divert paratransit trips
onto the fixed route or alternative neighborhood circulator service; and 4) encourage the use of all mass transit's family of services through effective media advertising. Ridership has been "good and steady." Broward County Transit staff indicated that the project has been successful in meeting the goals established.

Lessons Learned

To ensure the success of the project and the "buy in" of local patrons, a series of meetings were held with local homeowner groups to identify routes and accommodate local needs. In addition, the service was designed to connect to regular BCT routes, a major transit terminal at a mall, a major flea market, and to Tri-Rail. BCT has conducted on-board surveys and special promotions to afford maximum opportunity for input by patrons and attract new riders to the service.

BCT staff stated that you should never underestimate the importance of effective marketing. In addition, traffic congestion motivates people to seek alternative means of transportation.

District 5

Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority (d.b.a. LYNX)

I-4 Express Survey

This project was awarded to develop and conduct origin and destination studies at three Interstate 4 interchanges in Volusia County. Survey results were to be used to determine the relative feasibility of establishing express bus service along Interstate 4 between Volusia, Seminole and Orange Counties. The surveys were completed in May 1995. LYNX and VOTRAN has since implemented express bus service between Volusia and Orange/Seminole Counties.

Lessons Learned

None to report.
his project was considered a success by MDTA. Ridership along this corridor increased since its inception in December 1991. The objective of the project, to connect passengers who used to ride a local route or drove their own vehicle to the fixed route rail system with much quicker express route, was met.

The FDOT district office does not consider the project to have been a success. In addition, district staff stated that they could not support any additional operating assistance or capital improvements in the corridor, with the exception of local circulators.

The Transit Corridor funds for the project have been exhausted and the contract expired in 1997. Local funds are now being used to fund the project.

**Lessons Learned**

MDTA reported that this route is run on a mixed road corridor mainly as a quicker connection to the fixed route rail system or to major transfer points along this alignment. Nearly 50 percent of the northbound trips go to a major college along the route alignment according to MDTA's most recent market research project. Trips to the MetroRail station accounted for nearly 50 percent of the southbound trips.

DOT stated that local circulators within this corridor may provide the residents with transit services more suited to their transportation needs.

**Flagler MAX**

This project is the oldest Transit Corridor project in the district that is still receiving funding. The Flagler MAX continues to exceed the target goals established for ridership. For a period of time, ridership was nearly double the goals established. The Flagler MAX also continues to increase the carrying capacity along the second busiest transit corridor within
Miami-Dade County. Another measurable success for this project is that the net cost per passenger is very near the established levels of the comparable routes identified for the project.

Lessons Learned

DOT district staff stated that the requirement for an annual report for this project, rather than quarterly, came as a result of the longevity of this project.

South Dade Busway

The South Dade Busway is one of the most successful Transit Corridor projects discussed within this report. The average busway corridor ridership continues on an upward trend for both weekdays and weekends. Average weekday ridership for the first quarter of the 2000 calendar year was 12,765, an eight percent increase from the average for the first quarter of 1999, and a 76 percent increase in ridership within the corridor from the first quarter of 1996 (prior to the opening of the busway). Average weekend ridership for the same period was 14,193 (combined ridership for Saturday and Sunday) compared with 2,982 for the first quarter of the 1999 calendar year, with a 138 percent increase between the first quarter of 2000 and the first quarter of 1996.

Lessons Learned

Working closely with the community prior to the introduction of new service lays the groundwork for a successful venture. In the case of the Busway, extensive pre-opening promotional work took place, including group presentations and direct mail. In addition, the opening day event became a mile-long block party with all the local media and a large number of area residents in attendance. Within days of the Busway's implementation, it had a loyal following among Dade County residents.

In addition, a dedicated right-of-way for the busway, allowing for reduced headways and travel times, was critical to its success. Also, the establishment of two local and three express bus routes have created a unified, coordinated network of service within the corridor feeding into and complimenting the busway.
City of Miami Beach

Miami Beach Electric Shuttle "Electrowave" Project

The Electric Shuttle, "Electrowave," has been a very successful project and public/private partnership for the City of Miami Beach. Since the service was implemented on January 28, 1998, the "Electrowave" has transported over 3.2 million passengers (one-way trips) along the seven mile, two way circular route. As a result of the project, the Miami Beach Transportation Management Association (TMA) reports that there have been reductions in traffic congestion and air pollution within the corridor. They add that the project has served to support the goals established of the park and ride system within the corridor.

While the project continues with assistance from the Transit Corridor Program, the local government has committed to continued funding. The City of Miami Beach has committed to $1.3 million in operating funds for the shuttle for their 2000/2001 budget year, utilizing parking revenue generated from the project. In addition, the City recently completed an evaluation of parking meter rates in the South Beach area which resulted in a parking rate increase. Revenues generated through this additional rate will be used to continue operational support and the enhancement of the system. In addition, the funds will be available as a match for future grant activities.

Lessons Learned

Infrastructure, including a well located maintenance facility, trained mechanics, fleet storage, etc., needs to be in place prior to implementing an alternative fuel service such as the Electrowave. In addition, ongoing "nurturing" of the community and establishing firm political support was, and continues to be, critical for the life of the project.

The utilization of large full size buses in an already heavily congested area, such as in South Beach, was found to not be the key to traffic reduction in the area. Instead, this project afforded an opportunity to demonstrate that small shuttle buses, providing friendly, frequent service with an ability to coordinate stops and local parking facilities was much more effective. In addition, the psychological element of a small bus packed with passengers sent a message to tourists, visitors, and area residents that "if
veryone else was riding, I should give it a try." The shuttle has become an attraction for the area as well as a transportation alternative.

\textbf{District 7}

\textbf{lillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)}

\textbf{00X/Continuation of the 200X}

HART staff reported that the Route 200X is succeeding in the customers like it and use it. While the 200X has not met the annual performance goal established of a 10 percent increase in ridership for FY 1998 and FY 1999, FDOT district staff provided that it does have stable ridership and will be continued.

\textbf{Lessons Learned}

HART stated that more and continuous marketing and public outreach is needed for this project. They stated that their marketing budget has been too low.

\textbf{JS 41 Corridor Improvement Project}

HART and FDOT staff agree that while this project has not consistently met the ridership goals established, it has been and continues to be very successful with farebox recovery averaging 27 percent. Because the services offered within the corridor maintain consistently high ridership, this may suggest that the ridership goals that were established were too aggressive. In a District 7 budget request (10/99) for addition project funding, FDOT staff stated that "...This project has contributed to increasing and stabilizing transit ridership on all routes participating in this project."

\textbf{Lessons Learned}

Again, HART stated that more and continuous marketing and public outreach is needed for this project. They stated that their marketing budget has been too low. FDOT staff attributes some of the success of this project to major, ongoing road construction within the I-75/US 41 corridor.
IART staff indicated that this project has been somewhat successful. In part, this is due to the relative age of the project (JPA signed on November 22, 1999). Ridership is still building and route adjustments are being made to ensure the success of the project.

Lessons Learned

Coordination with local agencies and employers is "hugely" important and should be budgeted throughout the project.

Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA)

Route 59/Route 73 Service

PSTA staff stated that was probably one of the most successful transit corridor projects statewide in terms of consistently productive transit service that continues to grow in terms of ridership and productivity.

This project is no longer supported by Transit Corridor funds. However, it has been continued with local funding. The transit agency suggested that the continuation of the project with local funds but not corridor funds allowed state funds to be available for new projects.

Lessons Learned

The lesson learned for this Transit Corridor project is to realize the lag time required for a new service corridor to reach minimum performance standards. The provision of transit service along this major corridor has played an integral role in the growth of the overall PSTA system.
oute 100X

STA staff indicated that this project has also been successful in terms of ridership and rebox recovery, as well as providing an transportation alternative for residents of anellas and Hillsborough County residents who make intercounty commutes. This is a continuing FDOT Corridor project.

Lessons Learned

STA noted the importance of local feeder service for cross-county commuter bus service. In addition, the availability of premium employers along the route add to successes in transit ridership.

Alternate US 19 and SR 686 Corridors - Route 98

his project was successful in terms of ridership productivity, and service to the merging Carillon Business Center in mid-county.

his project is no longer supported by Transit Corridor funds. However, it has been ontinued with local funding. Again, this is a case where utilizing locally funds in lieu of tate funds enabled the transit agency to use state funds for new projects.

Lessons Learned

STA provided that commuter bus service is important to augment local bus service in metropolitan areas. In addition, it is important to note the influence that industrial land ses and employment have on transit ridership.

llmerton Road (SR 688) Corridor - Route 99X

STA staff stated that this project has been successful in terms of providing additional commuter bus service for the mid-county industrial areas. Ridership growth is evident, but additional time will be needed for full development. This is a continuing FDOT Corridor project.
Lessons Learned

It is important to provide transit service along major urban corridors, linking residential and industrial areas.

JS 19 Corridor Service Marketing

This project has been successful in marketing new bus service along US 19 connecting Pinellas and Pasco counties. A multi-media marketing plan was developed and then fully implemented within the prescribed budget and timeframe established for the project. This project has been completed.

Lessons Learned

A detailed multi-media marketing plan is critical when introducing new bus service along major urban corridors.

Route 58

This is a new route and ridership is still under development. PSTA noted that a very minimal amount of Transit Corridor funds are being used for this project.

Lessons Learned

This project exemplifies the importance of serving urban corridors where industrial land uses are prevalent.

Tarpon Mall to Oldsmar (SR 584)

PSTA notes that this is a new route with ridership still building. PSTA also noted that a very minimal amount of Transit Corridor funds are being used for this project.
Lessons Learned

As noted with Route 58 above, serving urban corridors with industrial land uses is important.

Pasco County Public Transportation

19 Corridor Project

Pasco County reported that this project has been very successful. In the first three quarters of this year, the service exceeded the annualized ridership goal by 126 percent. The annual ridership goal of 47,384 was met as of the September 30, 2000 (third quarter) progress report.

Lessons Learned

Pasco County stated that continual advertising is needed to sustain continued growth of ridership within the corridor.

Summary of Project Success

Of the 27 (HART's 200X was continued under a separate JPA, therefore, only 26 projects appear in the summary section above) projects surveyed, 27 projects were represented in the responses (either from the agency, district staff, or both) to questions 1, 2, and 4, allowing for a summary of the projects' activity status, success, and "lessons learned." The projects' (26 projects due to continuation of HART's 200 X) activity status and successes have been categorized into six results. Eight of the projects have been deemed very successful and are still active, receiving FDOT funding. One of the projects has been deemed very successful and is being continued with local funding (allowing the use of transit corridor funds for new projects for the agency). Nine of the projects have been deemed successful and are still active, receiving FDOT funding. Three of the projects have been deemed successful and have been completed, JTA marketing for the Park and Ride Express; the LYNX I-4 Express Survey; and PSTA's U.S. 19 marketing. One project, PSTA's Route 98 was considered successful and is being continued with local funds.
In response to the surveys regarding the 26 (see notes regarding HART's 200X above) transit Corridor projects funded during the period established for this analysis, eleven agencies, representing 23 projects, stated that they received adequate funding from FDOT in order to make their projects successful. One agency, representing two projects, noted that funding was not sufficient for those projects. One agency, representing one project, did not respond.

**Agency Suggested Changes to FDOT Transit Corridor Program**

Of the agencies responding to the survey, representing 25 of the 26 projects studied, all responded to the “Suggested changes to the FDOT Transit Corridor Program” question. The following are the categorized responses to the survey question. Note that the number attributed to a categorized response is based on each individual project, and could for example be the same response from one transit system for its four projects.

- No changes. (1 response)
- Longer-term funding and more availability. (2 responses)
- Need quicker turnaround of funds from time of application to award of JPA. This will help in local budgeting. (1 response)
- More funding. (3 responses)
- Expand the funding program to include demand responsive bus service within the corridor, targeting the transit dependent population. (1 response)

**FDOT District Suggested Changes to FDOT Transit Corridor Program**

Of the FDOT district staff who responded to the survey, the following responses were received related to suggested changes to the program.
• A minimum of three (3) years of funding in the tentative work program each year.
  (2 responses)

• The possibility of some minimum success standards to be used as a starting point for establishing project goals.

• A requirement to include public involvement in any/all project proposals.

• Make all new projects, and those that are successful and being continued with state funding, multi-year!

• Although there is no time limit on this program, maybe we should have a maximum of ten (10) years even if the project is meeting its goals. Particularly with a decrease in funds the last few years of the program.

• I would like to see the Transit Corridor Program be less labor intensive and more user friendly. Eliminate all the “transit corridor constraint”/TAG requirements, etc. It could be used for a sub-area or county. I feel several programs could be mixed with this one so you could blend funding to a better use. Commuter Assistance, carpool/vanpool assistance, park & ride facilities, and Service Development activities are all included in the eligible costs and could eliminate the need for separate funding sources and procedural requirements.

• State funding only pays for a small portion of the actual cost of providing the service. Suggest more funding.

• Only annual reports should be required for Transit Corridor projects that are long-term, ongoing projects.

• Dedicated district allocations.

• Combine this program with the Service Development Program.

• We don’t have enough funds to provide the additional services that are needed. We need additional capital and operating funds.
- "I am always interested in reducing reporting requirements.

technical Memorandum Number Three will summarize interviews with FDOT District
taff regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor program, as well
suggested changes to procedure for project development, monitoring, prioritization
and funding.
APPENDIX A

FDOT and Agency Survey Cover Letter
and Survey Instrument
29 November 2000

Dear «Contact»:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. Your agency is identified as having received funding to support a project or projects under this program.

«Projects»

For each project listed above, we would appreciate your taking the time to answer the five questions on the enclosed questionnaire to the best of your ability and returning your answers to us via mail, email, or FAX. Please return your answers no later than Friday, 24 December.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT
Lisa Staes, CUTR

The University of South Florida is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution.
EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b) Yes _____ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
   
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?
      If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
05 December 2000

Dear «Contact»:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. As a FDOT District staff person overseeing local Transit Corridor projects, your insight into the program’s strengths and weaknesses is invaluable.

«Projects»

We would appreciate your insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor Program as it relates to each of the projects listed above. Either Lisa Staes or myself will contact you via phone to solicit your answers to the four questions on the enclosed questionnaire. If you prefer, you may return your written answers via mail, email, or FAX.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,  
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT  
Lisa Staes, CUTR
EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
FDOT District Staff

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? (What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?)

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (If no, skip to Question 3) Yes _____
   Do you foresee the project continuing with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

3. What “lessons learned” from the project could you share with other transit agencies and/or FDOT staff who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

4. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?
APPENDIX B

FDOT and Agency Written Responses To Survey
FDOT DISTRICT #1

FDOT District #1
Richard Dreyer
PO Box 1249
Bartow, FL 33831

FDOT District #1
Fran Theberge
PO Box 1030
Fort Myers, FL 33902-1030

Lee Tran
Chris Leffert
Lee County
Transit Division
PO Box 398
Fort Myers, FL 33902-0398
(941) 277-5012 x2232
* US 41 Corridor Project

Sarasota County Area Transit
Phil Lieberman
Transit Planner
5303 Pinkney Ave
Sarasota, FL 34233-2421
(941) 316-1738
plieberman@co.sarasota.fl.us
* US 41 (S Tamiami Tr) Corridor Project

Manatee County Area Transit
Peter Gadjis
1108 26th Ave
Bradenton, FL 34208
(941) 747-8621
* Manatee Ave/SR 64 Corridor Project

FDOT DISTRICT #2

FDOT District #2
James Driggers
PO Box 1089
Lake City, FL 32056-1089
Jacksonville Transportation Authority
Dawn Charpel
PO Drawer “O”
100 N Myrtle Ave
Jacksonville, FL 32203
(904) 630-3106
* Park & Ride Commuter Express Routes

Gainesville Regional Transit System
Maria Sovoia
Chief Transit Planner
PO Box 490 Sta 5
Gainesville, FL 32601-0490
(352) 334-3682
* SW Gainesville Enhanced Bus Service
* Night Bus Service
* Tower Road Corridor Service

FDOT DISTRICT #3

FDOT District #3
Kathy Rudd
Public Transit Specialist
1074 Hwy 90
Chipley, FL 32428
(850) 638-0250
Kathy.rudd@dot.state.fl.us

Escambia County Area Transit
Bob Blandine
Financial Director
1515 W Fairfield Dr
Pensacola, FL 32501
(850) 595-3228
* Davis Highway Corridor Project
* Blue Angel Highway Corridor

FDOT DISTRICT #4

FDOT District #4
Toby Wright
3400 W Commercial Blvd
Ft Lauderdale, FL 33309
(954) 777-4490
Broward County Transit
Sylvia Smith
Transit Manager, Service Development
3201 W Copans Rd
Pompano Beach, FL 33069
(954) 357-8375
* Southwest Broward Express

FDOT DISTRICT #5

FDOT District #5
Karen Adamson
5151 Adanson St
Orlando, FL 32804

Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority
Belinda Balleras
Grants Manager
Ste 800
445 W Amelia St
Orlando, FL 32801-1128
(407) 841-2279
bballeras@golynx.com
* I-4 Express Survey

FDOT DISTRICT #6

FDOT District #6
Ed Carson
602 S Miami Ave
Miami, FL 33130
(305) 377-5906

Metro-Dade Transit Agency
John Garcia
Transit Planner II
MDTA - Service Planning
3300 NW 32nd Ave
Miami, FL 33142-5795
(305) 637-3749
jogarcia@co.miami-dade.fl.us
* Northwest 27th Ave MAX
* Flagler MAX
* South Dade Busway

WPI/FPN #4811331
WPI/FPN #5815144
WPI/FPN #6819003
WPI/FPN #6810184 & #6810237
WPI/FPN #6810309
City of Miami Beach  
Judy I Evans  
Project Administrator, Electrowave  
Miami Beach TMA  
301 41st St  
Miami Beach, FL 33140  
(305) 535-9160  
* Miami Beach Electric Shuttle  

FDOT DISTRICT #7

FDOT District #7  
Ray Clark  
11201 N McKinley Dr  
Tampa, FL 33612  
(813) 975-6000  

Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority  
L Walker  
Ste 1600  
201 E Kennedy Blvd  
Tampa, FL 33602  
(813) 223-6831  
* Express Bus Service, Downtown Tampa to Clearwater, Route 200X  
* US 41 Corridor Improvement Program  
* Express Bus Service, Net Park Transit Center to Oldsmar  

Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority  
Bill Steele  
14840 49th St N  
Clearwater, FL 34622-2893  
(727) 330-9911  
* Ulmerton Rd Corridor, Routes 59 & 73  
* Route 100X  
* Alt US 19 & SR 686, Route #98 Express  
* Ulmerton Rd (SR 688) Corridor Route 99 Express Service  
* US 19 Corridor Service Marketing  
* Cross County Service CR 296 Corridor Route 58  
* Fixed Route Service, Tarpon Mall to Oldsmar (SR 584 Corridor)  

WPI/FPN #6810341  
WPI/FPN #7813923 & #7814028  
WPI/FPN #7810010 & #7814115  
WPI/FPN #4064791  
WPI/FPN #7816678  
WPI/FPN #7816679  
WPI/FPN #4039011  
WPI/FPN #4039031  
WPI/FPN #4064761  
WPI/FPN #4064771  
WPI/FPN #4064781
Pasco County Public Transportation
Thelma Williams
8620 Galen Wilson Blvd
Port Richey, FL 34668
(727) 834-3344
* US 41 Corridor Project

WPI/FPN #4064811
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b)   Yes _____ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?
      If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients:

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b)  Yes _____ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance, from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.org.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

The project has not been completed. We have implemented some of the goals and objectives and the ones implemented were met.

2. Is the project still active?

No _____ (skip to Part b) Yes ___ (continue to Part a)

   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire? That has not been determined at this time.

   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success? That determination has not been made at this time.

4. What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made? Less time from when projects are submitted for funding and when project implementation takes place.

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5376; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT’s
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No ____ (skip to Part b)  Yes ____ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CTR 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@ctr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b)  Yes _____ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit/Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-537S; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVÁLUAÇÃO DE
PROJETOS NA PROGRAMA TRANSIT CORRIDOR
Grants Recipientes.

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No ______ (skip to Part b)   Yes ______ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave., Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutl.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b)       Yes _____ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?
      If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
December 8, 2000

arin Allan, Research Associate
enter for Urban Transportation Research
iversity of South Florida
202 East Fowler Avenue, CUT 100
ampa, Florida 33620-5375

t Mr. Allan:
ntached please find the questionnaire regarding the Southwest Broward Express (WPI/FPN 4811331).

you need further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

incerely,

ylvia M. Smith, Transit Manager
ervice Development

MS:ecs
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?
   
   Primary goal was to reduce some traffic congestion by moving downtown workers from cars to mass transit. This goal was accomplished.

2. Is the project still active?
   
   No ____ (skip to Part b)   Yes ___ (continue to Part a)
   
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
      Yes. The funding of this project was continued with revenue derived from the implementation of a once-cent local option gas tax.

   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?
   
   YES

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?
   
   Never underestimate the importance of effective marketing
   Traffic congestion motivates seeking alternatives

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?
   
   Expand the funding program to include Demand Response Bus service within the corridor, targeting the transit dependent population.

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
To:  Darin Allan  
From:  Belinda Balleras  
Subject:  CUTR Survey - Transit Corridor Program  
Date:  December 27, 2000  

Attached are the responses to the questionnaire. If you have questions, please let me know.

TRANSMITTAL by fax 813-974-5168
EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IN THE FDOT'S TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
LYNX 1-4 EXPRESS

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives for the project were met?

Service on Link 120 was started on November 10, 1997 and discontinued on August 14, 1998. Link 120 was in service for slightly less than one year due to low ridership and slow growth. Service objectives based on systemwide averages were established as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Passengers per revenue hour</td>
<td>75% of system wide average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Passengers per revenue trip</td>
<td>75% of system wide average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) % farebox return</td>
<td>75% of system wide average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Passengers per revenue mile</td>
<td>50% of system wide average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the Link 120 service did not perform well based on established criteria, a lack of park & ride lots presented a problem in developing stops for the service. Based on a survey conducted an accumulation of several other factors contributed such as no express lanes on I-4, lack of knowledge about the benefit of the service and unwillingness to give up convenience of a car due to lack of park and ride lots. It is the lack of infrastructure which is an integral component of packaging a new express service that contributed primarily to the project not meeting the established goals.

When the goals were established there was no prior history to base a more reasonable performance criteria as LYNX has not operated other comparable limited stop express services. What is valuable from this project standpoint are the lessons learned which can be applied to future services.

2. Is the project still active?

NO

b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project. If no, why?

Without the necessary park and ride, it was not cost effective to continue the service. Service development funds were reprogrammed to another express service, the Volusia Express which captured a significant number of riders on the 120 who originated from Volusia county.

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success? Yes.

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

The necessary infrastructure must be secured and packaged together with the services to be implemented. A system of continuing public information and coordination with area employers, TMA and public agencies is also necessary.

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by FDOT would you like to see made?

Multi-year funds programming and availability. As it stands there is very limited funding under this program.
December 8, 2000

Mr. Darin Allan, Research Associate  
Center for Urban Transportation Research  
University of South Florida  
4202 East Fowler Avenue, CUT 100  
Tampa, FL 33620-5375

Re: Questionnaire  
Miami Beach Electric Shuttle  
(WPI/FPN #6810341

Dear Mr. Allan:

Please find enclosed the evaluation questionnaire related to FDOT's Transit Corridor Program and the City of Miami Beach ELECTROWAVE shuttle project.

Should you require any additional information please don't hesitate to call me at (305)535-9160.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Judy I. Evarns, Project Administrator  
City of Miami Beach - ELECTROWAVE Shuttle Project

JIE:Ih  
Enclosure
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients
(WPI/FPN#6810341)

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

The electric shuttle (ELECTROWAVE) has been an extremely successful project and public/private partnership for the City of Miami Beach. The service implemented on January 28, 1998 has transported over 3.2 million passengers (one-way trips) along a seven (7) mile, two-way circulator route. As a result of the project there have been reductions in traffic congestion and air pollution while also supporting the goals of a park & ride system.

2. Is the project still active?

No ____ (Skip to Part b) Yes ____ (Continue to Part a)

a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

The City of Miami Beach has committed $1.3 million dollars toward the operations of the shuttle for Budget Year 2000/2001, utilizing parking revenue funds. In addition, the City recently completed an evaluation of parking meter rates in the South Beach area (shuttle service area) resulting in a rate increase. Revenues generated through this additional rate will be used to continue support of operations and enhancement of the shuttle system. In addition, the funds will provide "hard match" funds for any future grant opportunities.

b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

Yes. Without the initial funding commitment by FDOT the project would not have become a reality and the project would not have been able to generate the additional funding support from the City of Miami Beach, Florida Power & Light and other grantees.
4. **What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?**

An infrastructure (well located maintenance facility, trained mechanics, fleet storage, etc.) needs to be in place prior to implementing an alternative fuel service such as the electric shuttles. Ongoing nurturing of community and political support will continue to be a crucial element for the future of the project.

The utilization of large full size buses in an already heavily congested area of a community such as South Beach was found to not be the key to traffic reduction. Instead, the project afforded an opportunity to demonstrate that small shuttle buses, providing friendly, frequent service with the ability to coordinate stops in conjunction with transit stops and local parking facilities was more effective. In addition, the psychological element of seeing a small shuttle bus packed with passengers sent a message to tourists, visitors and area residents that “if everyone else was riding it they should give it a try.” The shuttle has become an attraction as well as a transportation provider.

5. **What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by FDOT would you like to see made?**

None. Other than continuing to be receptive to the development of new shuttle systems in heavily congested areas of a city such as South Beach, that support the goals of FDOT and the Transit corridor Program. In addition, the advocacy of shuttle projects that directly support the use of parking facilities and existing transit services and have the potential of reducing traffic congestion has an added benefit of supporting community growth, development and the quality of life for its residents and visitors/tourists.
ow would you rate the project’s success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met? We rate this project as a success. Ridership along this corridor has increased since its inception. We achieved the objectives of this project to connect passengers who used to ride a local route or drove their personal automobile to the fixed route rail system with a much quicker express bus route.

the project still active?

X   (skip to Part B)  Yes (skip to Part A)

Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?

Yes, local monies have taken over as the funding source for this project.

Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

Yes

What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project? This project route is run on a mixed road corridor mainly as a speedier connection to the fixed route rail system or to major transfer points along this alignment. Nearly 50% of the northbound trips are headed to the major college along this route alignment according to the most recent market research project, while the trips connecting to the MetroRail station also accounted for nearly 50% of the reported southbound trips.

What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made? Additional funding to facilitate greater participation in capital acquisition and increase operational outlays in the areas of planning, park-n-ride facilities, marketing, etc.
Evaluation of Projects in the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program
Grant Recipients
MDTA – Flagler MAX
(WPI/FPN # 6810184)

Would you rate the project’s success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met? *This project has exceeded the target goals for ridership. For a period of time, this project’s ridership was nearly double the goals established. The Flagler MAX also increases the capacity of the second busiest transit corridor within Miami-Dade County. Another measurable goal on this project is that the net cost per passenger is very near to the established levels of the comparable routes.*

Do the project still active?

______ (skip to Part B)  

Yes  XX  (skip to Part A)

Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

Yes

Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?

Yes

Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

Yes

What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested implementing a similar project? *This project route is another program run on a mixed road corridor; wherever, this route nearly runs identical to a local bus route. This project connects the urban area in the south part of the county with the Central Business District and then into the South Beach area across a major causeway.*

What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made? Additional funding to facilitate greater participation in capital acquisition and increase operational layoffs in the areas of planning, park-n-ride facilities, marketing, etc.
would you rate the project’s success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met? This project is seen as a major success. Weekday and weekend ridership has shown a steady increase every reporting period since its inception. Ridership growth on the combined routes along the busway has experienced nearly double-digit growth since the same reporting period of previous year. This project also incorporates different transit strategies that merge together to serve the corridor and then the nearby areas.

Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?

Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

At "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project? This project is unique due to its operation alone a single use (located) road. Also unique to this project is the implementation of two local and three express routes, a unified coordination of service that doesn’t supplant resources already existing but runs in unison to provide a network of service along this corridor.

At changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made? Additional funding to facilitate greater participation in capital acquisition and increase operational days in the areas of planning, park-n-ride facilities, marketing, etc.
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

Route 200X is succeeding in that customers like it and use it. However, HART did not meet the performance goal of a 10 percent increase in ridership for 1998 and 1999 fiscal years.

2. Is the project still active?

No ____ (skip to Part b) Yes X (continue to Part a)

a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

The service will be deleted when funding ends.

b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

Yes.

4. What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

More and continuous marketing and public outreach is needed. Our marketing budget has been too low.

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Continued funding.
Cross-county and cross-FDOT District programs are a state responsibility. They should be encouraged and funded.

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375, or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT’s
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?
   Ridership goals are not being met.

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b) Yes X_____ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
      The service will be deleted when funding ends.
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?
      If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?
   Yes.

4. What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?
   More, and continuous marketing and public outreach is needed. Our marketing budget has been too low.

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?
   Continued funding.
   Cross-county and cross-FDOT District programs are a state responsibility. They should be encouraged and funded.

Please return mail to: Darin Altran, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email altran@cut.eng.usf.edu
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EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IN THE FDOT'S TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?
Ridership goals are not being met.

2. Is the project still active?
No ____ (skip to Part b)    Yes X (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
      The service will be deleted when funding ends.
   
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?
      If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?
   Yes.

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?
   Coordination with local agencies and employers is hugely important and should be budgeted throughout the project.

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?
   Continued funding.
   Cross-county and cross-FDOT District programs are a state responsibility. They should be encouraged and funded.

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
29 November 2000

Bill Steele  
PSTA  
14840 49th St N  
Clearwater, FL 34622-2893

Dear Bill Steele:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. Your agency is identified as having received funding to support a project or projects under this program.

Ulmerton Rd (WPI/FPN #7816678), Route 100X (WPI/FPN #7816679), Alt US 19 & SR 636 (WPI/FPN #4039011), Route 99X (WPI/FPN #4039031), US 19 Marketing (WPI/FPN #4064761), CR 296 Route 58 (WPI/FPN #4064771), SR 584 Tarpon Mall to Oldsmar (WPI/FPN #4064781)

For each project listed above, we would appreciate your taking the time to answer the five questions on the enclosed questionnaire to the best of your ability and returning your answers to us via mail, email, or FAX. Please return your answers no later than Friday, 24 December.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,  
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT  
    Lisa Staes, CUTR
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No ✓ (skip to Part b)  Yes ___ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IN THE FDOT’s TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b) Yes ✓ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?
      If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b)   Yes ☑ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients.

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No ___ (skip to Part b)    Yes ____ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IN THE FDOT’s TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No $\checkmark$ (skip to Part b)     Yes _____ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What “lessons learned” from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   - No ____ (skip to Part b) Yes ___ (continue to Part a)
     a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

     b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b) Yes ___ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project? If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
29 November 2000

Thelma Williams  
Pasco County Public Transportation  
8620 Galen Wilson Blvd  
Port Richey, FL 34668

Dear Thelma Williams:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT's Transit Corridor Program. Your agency is identified as having received funding to support a project or projects under this program.

US 41 (WPI/FPN #4064811)

For each project listed above, we would appreciate your taking the time to answer the five questions on the enclosed questionnaire to the best of your ability and returning your answers to us via mail, email, or FAX. Please return your answers no later than Friday, 24 December.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,  
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT  
Lisa Stues, CUTR
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
Grant Recipients

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (skip to Part b)   Yes ✓ (continue to Part a)
   a. Do you foresee continuing to fund the project with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?
   b. Upon completion of the project did you continue to locally fund the project?
      If no, why not?

3. Do you feel that you received adequate funding assistance from the FDOT to make the project a success?

4. What "lessons learned" from the project can you share with other transit agencies that may be interested in implementing a similar project?

5. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5376; or FAX (813) 974-6168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
05 December 2000

Richard Dreyer
FDOT, District 1
PO Box 1249
Bartow, FL 33831

Dear Richard Dreyer:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. As a FDOT District staff person overseeing local Transit Corridor projects, your insight into the program’s strengths and weaknesses is invaluable.

US 41 (WPI/FPN #1814972), US 41 (WPI/FPN #4071071), Manatee Ave/SR 64 (WPI/FPN #4071171)

We would appreciate your insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor Program as it relates to each of the projects listed above. Either Lisa Staes or myself will contact you via phone to solicit your answers to the four questions on the enclosed questionnaire. If you prefer, you may return your written answers via mail, email, or FAX.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Rajan Allian,
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT
Lisa Staes, CUTR
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT’s
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
FDOT District Staff

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? (What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?)

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (If no, skip to Question 3)   Yes _____
   Do you foresee the project continuing with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

3. What “lessons learned” from the project could you share with other transit agencies and/or FDOT staff who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

4. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5376; or FAX (813) 974-5158; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
this page is blank
05 December 2000

Fran Theberge  
FDOT, District 1  
PO Box 1030  
Fort Myers, FL 33902-1030

Dear Fran Theberge:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. As a FDOT District staff person overseeing local Transit Corridor projects, your insight into the program’s strengths and weaknesses is invaluable.

US 41 (WPI/FPN #1814972)

We would appreciate your insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor Program as it relates to each of the projects listed above. Either Lisa Staes or myself will contact you via phone to solicit your answers to the four questions on the enclosed questionnaire. If you prefer, you may return your written answers via mail, email, or FAX.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,  
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT  
Lisa Staes, CUTR
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
FDOT District Staff

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? (What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?)

2. Is the project still active?
   No ____ (If no, skip to Question 3)    Yes ____
   Do you foresee the project continuing with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

3. What “lessons learned” from the project could you share with other transit agencies and/or FDOT staff who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

4. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?
05 December 2000

Jan Parham
FDOT, District 1
PO Box 1249
Bartow, FL 33831

Dear Jan Parham:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. As a FDOT District staff person overseeing local Transit Corridor projects, your insight into the program’s strengths and weaknesses is invaluable.

US 41 (WPI/FPN #4071071), Manatee Ave/SR 64 (WPI/FPN #4071171)

We would appreciate your insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor Program as it relates to each of the projects listed above. Either Lisa Staes or myself will contact you via phone to solicit your answers to the four questions on the enclosed questionnaire. If you prefer, you may return your written answers via mail, email, or FAX.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT
Lisa Staes, CUTR
05 December 2000

James Driggers
FDOT, District 2
PO Box 1089
Lake City, FL 32056-1089

Dear James Driggers:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT's Transit Corridor Program. As a FDOT District staff person overseeing local Transit Corridor projects, your insight into the program's strengths and weaknesses is invaluable.

Park & Ride Commuter Express Routes (WPI/FPN #2814311), SW Gainesville Enhanced Bus Service (WPI/FPN #2810791), Night Bus Service (WPI/FPN #2810829), Tower Rd Corridor Service (WPI/FPN #2810830)

We would appreciate your insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor Program as it relates to each of the projects listed above. Either Lisa Staes or myself will contact you via phone to solicit your answers to the four questions on the enclosed questionnaire. If you prefer, you may return your written answers via mail, email, or FAX.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT
Lisa Staes, CUTR
guess I am OK.

In response to your questions concerning the four (4) projects listed:

JTA Commuter Express (Downtown Trolley Shuttle) is very useful. The line has been extended a few blocks.

Gainesville's SW Enhanced Bus Service: Very successful, buses over at Still in service.

Gainesville's Night Service (Later Gator): Very successful. Great to use as well as employees.

Gainesville's Tower Road: Very successful.

sale of 1 to 10:
1 provided = 10
3 - Gainesville all 3 = 10
Jacksonville = 9 only because I don't think the trip is what I expected.

- Don't have enough funds to provide additional services that is needed.

Need additional capital and operating funds.

- learned - Plan for the worst case scenario and hope for the best. Gainesville had more riders than anticipated thus causing a need for capital in the SW areas. You may need to alter your plans in the middle of things.

ly thing/s I would say about the program is: combine it with the element Program. One Procedure. Get more funds into the program.

!!! James M. Driggers, Sr.

------------------------- ATTACHED NOTE
-------------------------

te: 02/12/01 13:40
om: staes@cutr.eng.usf.edu
To: DRIGGERS,James
st: Stutts,Elizabeth
ct: FW: Transit Corridor Projects

u o.k.?? Sorry this is so impersonal. Please see my e-mail

you,
Dear Kathy Rudd:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. As a FDOT District staff person overseeing local Transit Corridor projects, your insight into the program’s strengths and weaknesses is invaluable.

Davis Hwy (WPI/FPN #2258251), Blue Angel Hwy (WPI/FPN #2258341)

We would appreciate your insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor Program as it relates to each of the projects listed above. Either Lisa Staes or myself will contact you via phone to solicit your answers to the four questions on the enclosed questionnaire. If you prefer, you may return your written answers via mail, email, or FAX.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT
    Lisa Staes, CUTR
Toby Wright
FDOT, District 4
3400 W Commercial Blvd
Ft Lauderdale, FL 33309

Dear Toby Wright:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. As a FDOT District staff person overseeing local Transit Corridor projects, your insight into the program’s strengths and weaknesses is invaluable.

Southwest Broward Express (WPI/FPN #4811331)

We would appreciate your insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor Program as it relates to each of the projects listed above. Either Lisa Staes or myself will contact you via phone to solicit your answers to the four questions on the enclosed questionnaire. If you prefer, you may return your written answers via mail, email, or FAX.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT
    Lisa Staes, CUTR
for Broward Blvd. Corridor Project

- Project was successful. The main objectives were:
  - Increase mass transit accessibility.
  - Increase productivity/ridership in designated residential communities contiguous to the corridor.
  - Divert paratransit trips onto fixed-route service or onto alternative neighborhood circulator service.
  - Encourage the use of all mass transit's family of services through effective media advertising.

- County selected a small minority business to provide the shuttle for this project and the CMAQ western express reverse commute. Meetings were held with local homeowners groups to select routes to try and accommodate local needs. The service connects to regular rail, a major transit terminal at a mall, a major flea market, and regular transit. Ridership has been good and steady. There have been onveys, special promotions, etc.

- The project is still active, although local participation has waned. We have advised BCT that we will not extend this project without renewed interest, new goals and objectives, and possible expansion of the service area.

- The project was established, it became hard to keep up the enthusiasm with ALL parties. Attendance at TAG meetings ended up being only FDOT and County staff reviewing ridership and status. The project concept was good and could easily be implemented in other areas. I think that now that we have an additional staff person who can spend more time on this project, that it could be worked up and continued.

- Though there is no time limit on this program, maybe we should set a maximum of 10 years even if they are meeting goals. With decrease in funds the last few years of the project. These are my thoughts on this and I support funding transit systems as much as we can, especially the smaller/newer systems that are struggling to survive.

- This is what you needed from me. If not, give me a call.

Toby
1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? (What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?)

2. Is the project still active?
   No ____ (If no, skip to Question 3) Yes ____
   Do you foresee the project continuing with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

3. What “lessons learned” from the project could you share with other transit agencies and/or FDOT staff who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

4. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
05 December 2000

Ed Carson
FDOT, District 6
620 S Miami Ave
Miami, FL 33130

Dear Ed Carson:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. As a FDOT District staff person overseeing local Transit Corridor projects, your insight into the program’s strengths and weaknesses is invaluable.

Northwest 27th Ave MAX (WPI/FPN #6819003), Flagler MAX (WPI/FPN #6810184 & #6810237), South Dade Busway (WPI/FPN #6810309), Miami Beach Electric Shuttle (WPI/FPN #6810341)

We would appreciate your insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor Program as it relates to each of the projects listed above. Either Lisa Staes or myself will contact you via phone to solicit your answers to the four questions on the enclosed questionnaire. If you prefer, you may return your written answers via mail, email, or FAX.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Darin Allan,
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT
    Lisa Staes, CUTR
EVALUATION OF
PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
FDOT District Staff

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? (What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?)

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (If no, skip to Question 3)      Yes _______
   Do you foresee the project continuing with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

3. What "lessons learned" from the project could you share with other transit agencies and/or FDOT staff who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

4. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allen, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUTC 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5100; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? (What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?)

2. Is the project still active?
   No ______ (If no, skip to Question 3)  Yes
   Do you foresee the project continuing with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

3. What "lessons learned" from the project could you share with other transit agencies and/or FDOT staff who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

4. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CUTC 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5168; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IN THE FDOT’s TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
FDOT District Staff

1. How would you rate the project’s success or failure? (What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?)

2. Is the project still active?
   No _____ (If no, skip to Question 3)        Yes _____
   Do you foresee the project continuing with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

3. What “lessons learned” from the project could you share with other transit agencies and/or FDOT staff who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

4. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CLOT 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-5188; or email allan@curt.eng.usf.edu
EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IN THE FDOT's TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM
FDOT District Staff

1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? (What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?)

2. Is the project still active?
   No ______ (If no, skip to Question 3)    Yes ______
   Do you foresee the project continuing with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

3. What "lessons learned" from the project could you share with other transit agencies and/or FDOT staff who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

4. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?

Please return mail to: Darin Allan, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, CTR 100, 4202 E Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620-5375; or FAX (813) 974-2180; or email allan@cutr.eng.usf.edu
George Boyle  
FDOT, District 7  
11201 N McKinley Dr  
Tampa, FL 33612

Dear George Boyle:

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is under contract with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate the FDOT’s Transit Corridor Program. As a FDOT District staff person overseeing local Transit Corridor projects, your insight into the program’s strengths and weaknesses is invaluable.

Route 200X (WPI/FPN #7813923 & #7814028), US 41 (WPI/FPN #7810010 & #7814115), Express Service Net Park to Oldsmar (WPI/FPN #4064791), Ulmeron Rd (WPI/FPN #7816678), Route 100X (WPI/FPN #7816679), Alt US 19 & SR 686 (WPI/FPN #4039011), Route 99X (WPI/FPN #4039031), US 19 Marketing (WPI/FPN #4064761), CR 296 Route 58 (WPI/FPN #4064771), SR 584 Tarpon Mall to Oldsmar (WPI/FPN #4064781), US 41 (WPI/FPN #4064811)

We would appreciate your insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the Transit Corridor Program as it relates to each of the projects listed above. Either Lisa Staes or myself will contact you via phone to solicit your answers to the four questions on the enclosed questionnaire. If you prefer, you may return your written answers via mail, email, or FAX.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (813) 974-2850 if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Warin Allan,  
Research Associate

Cc: Elizabeth Stutts, FDOT  
Lisa Staes, CUTR
1. How would you rate the project's success or failure? (What goals and/or objectives established for the project were met?)

2. Is the project still active?
   - No ☑ (If no, skip to Question 3)
   - Yes ______
   Do you foresee the project continuing with local funds after FDOT funds are exhausted or expire?

3. What "lessons learned" from the project could you share with other transit agencies and/or FDOT staff who may be interested in implementing a similar project?

4. What changes to the Transit Corridor Program funded by the FDOT would you like to see made?