

**ANALYSIS OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROGRAM/PROJECTS**

**Technical Memorandum Number Two**

***Summary of Transit Corridor Projects*  
Status/Strengths and Weaknesses/Lessons Learned**

**Prepared for  
Florida Department of Transportation**



**Prepared by**

**Center for Urban Transportation Research  
College of Engineering  
University of South Florida  
Tampa, Florida**



**March 2001**

**SUMMARY OF TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECTS  
STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	1
<b>PURPOSE</b> .....	3
<b>SURVEY OF LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....	4
<b>Project Success/Failure ,Continuation of Project, and Lesson Learned</b> .....	5
<b>District 1</b> .....	5
LeeTran .....	5
US 41 Corridor Project .....	5
Sarasota County Area Transit (SCAT) .....	6
US 41 (S. Tamiami Trail) Corridor Project .....	6
Manatee County Area Transit (MCAT) .....	7
Manatee Avenue/S.R. 64 Corridor Project .....	7
<b>District 2</b> .....	7
Jacksonville Transportation Authority (JTA) .....	7
Park N Ride Commuter Express .....	7
Gainesville Regional Transit System (RTS) .....	8
SW Gainesville Enhanced Bus Service .....	8
Later Gator - Night Bus Service .....	8
Tower Road Corridor Service .....	9
<b>District 3</b> .....	9
Escambia County Area Transit (ECAT) .....	9
Davis Highway Corridor Project .....	9
Blue Angel Highway Corridor Project .....	10
<b>District 4</b> .....	10
Broward County Transit (BCT) .....	10
Southwest Broward Express .....	10
<b>District 5</b> .....	11

Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority, d.b.a. LYNX . . . . .	11
Interstate 4 Express Survey . . . . .	11
<b>District 6 . . . . .</b>	<b>12</b>
Miami-Dade Transit Agency . . . . .	12
Northwest 27 <sup>th</sup> Avenue MAX . . . . .	12
Flagler MAX . . . . .	12
South Dade Busway . . . . .	13
City of Miami Beach . . . . .	14
Miami Beach Electric Shuttle . . . . .	14
<b>District 7 . . . . .</b>	<b>15</b>
Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART) . . . . .	15
Express Bus from Downtown Tampa to Clearwater (200X) . . . . .	15
Express Bus from Downtown Tampa to Clearwater Mall (continuation of the 200X) . . . . .	15
US 41 Corridor Improvement Program . . . . .	15
Express Bus from Net Park Transit Center to Oldsmar . . . . .	15
Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA) . . . . .	16
Ulmerton Road Corridor (Route 59/Later Route 73) . . . . .	16
Route 100X . . . . .	17
Alternate US 19 and SR 686 Corridors (Route 98 Express) . . . . .	17
Ulmerton Road (SR 688) Corridor (Route 99 Express) . . . . .	17
US 19 Corridor Service Marketing . . . . .	18
Cross-County Service CR 296 Corridor (Route 58) . . . . .	18
Fixed Route Service from Tarpon Mall to Oldsmar (SR 584) . . . . .	18
Pasco County Public Transportation . . . . .	19
US 19 Corridor Project . . . . .	19
 <b>Adequacy of FDOT Funding Assistance . . . . .</b>	 <b>20</b>
 <b>Agency Suggested Changes to FDOT Transit Corridor Program . . . . .</b>	 <b>20</b>
 <b>FDOT Suggested Changes to the Transit Corridor Program . . . . .</b>	 <b>20</b>

## Technical Memorandum Number Two

### 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 31, 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.

In Task 1 of this project, CUTR analyzed and summarized all Joint Participation Agreements (JPAA) for the Transit Corridor Program from July 1, 1993 through December 31, 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**

#### ***US 41 Transit Corridor Project***

Both 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***

FDOT 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 this 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.”

### **Manatee County Area Transit (MCAT)**

#### ***Manatee 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)**

#### ***SW Gainesville Enhanced Bus Service***

RTS 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***

RTS 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.

#### ***Night Bus Service (Later Gator)***

RTS 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 1 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, this 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 this 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 65 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 to 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.

## **District 6**

### **Miami-Dade Transit Agency (MDTA)**

#### ***N.W. 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue MAX***

This 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 a 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.

FDOT 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*

FDOT 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 12,982 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 ground work 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

everyone else was riding, I should give it a try.” The shuttle has become an attraction for the area as well as a transportation alternative.

## **District 7**

### **Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)**

#### **200X/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.

#### *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.

#### ***US 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.*”

#### *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.

#### ***Oldsmar/Tampa Express Service***

HART 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.

### ***Route 100X***

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

### *Lessons Learned*

PSTA 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***

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

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

### ***Lessons Learned***

PSTA 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 uses and employment have on transit ridership.

### ***Ulmerton Road (SR 688) Corridor - Route 99X***

PSTA 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.

### ***US 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**

#### ***US 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.

### **Adequacy of FDOT Funding Assistance**

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 the 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.

C No changes. (1 response)

- C Longer-term funding and more availability. (2 responses)
- C Need quicker turnaround of funds from time of application to award of JPA. This will help in local budgeting. (1 response)
- C More funding. (3 responses)
- C 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.

- C A minimum of three (3) years of funding in the tentative work program each year. (2 responses)
- C The possibility of some minimum success standards to be used as a starting point for establishing project goals.
- C A requirement to include public involvement in any/all project proposals.
- C Make all new projects, and those that are successful and being continued with state funding, multi-year!
- C 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.
- C 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.

- C State funding only pays for a small portion of the actual cost of providing the service. Suggest more funding.
- C Only annual reports should be required for Transit Corridor projects that are long-term, ongoing projects.
- C Dedicated district allocations.
- C Combine this program with the Service Development Program.
- C We don't have enough funds to provide the additional services that are needed. We need additional capital and operating funds.
- C "I am always interested in reducing reporting requirements."

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

## APPENDIX A

### FDOT and Agency Survey Cover Letter and Survey Instrument

## APPENDIX B

# FDOT and Agency Written Responses To Survey