

BCT CONNECTED

Transit Development Plan Major Update FY 2014-FY2023





August 2013



DRAFT

BCT Connected

BROWARD COUNTY TRANSIT Transit Development Plan, Major Update FY 2014 – FY 2023

Prepared for **Broward County Transit** 1 N. University Drive, Suite 3100A Plantation, FL 33324 Telephone: (954) 357-8300 Website: www.Broward.org/BCT

Prepared by **Tindale-Oliver & Associates, Inc.** 1000 N. Ashley Drive, Suite 400 Tampa, FL 33602 Telephone: (813) 224-8862 Website: www.TindaleOliver.com Project Number 670001-01.12

August 2013

Table of Contents

| Section 1: | INTRODUCTION | 1-1 |
|------------|---|------|
| | Organization of Report | 1-1 |
| | TDP Requirements | 1-1 |
| Section 2: | BASELINE CONDITIONS | 2-1 |
| | Service Area Description | 2-1 |
| | Population Profile | 2-1 |
| | Transportation Disadvantaged Population Estimates | 2-12 |
| | Demographic and Journey-to-Work Characteristics | 2-13 |
| | Major Employers | 2-26 |
| | Tourism | 2-28 |
| | Land Use Characteristics | 2-28 |
| | Discretionary Market Assessment | 2-28 |
| Section 3: | EVALUATION OF EXISTING TRANSIT SYSTEM | 3-1 |
| | Existing Services | 3-1 |
| | Trend Analysis | 3-20 |
| | Peer Review | 3-48 |
| | Organization and Governance Assessment | 3-71 |
| Section 4: | PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT | 4-1 |
| | Public Involvement Activities | 4-1 |
| Section 5: | SITUATION APPRAISAL | 5-1 |
| | Plan Review | 5-1 |
| | Situation Appraisal | 5-12 |
| Section 6: | GOALS AND OBJECTIVES | 6-1 |
| | BCT Mission Statement | 6-1 |
| | Goals | 6-2 |
| Section 7: | ALTERNATIVES | 7-1 |
| | Status Quo Plan | 7-1 |
| | Vision Plan | 7-11 |
| | Ridership Projections | 7-19 |



| Section 8: | FINANCIAL PLAN | 8-1 |
|-------------|---|-----|
| | Status Quo Plan | 8-1 |
| | Vision Plan | 8-9 |
| Appendix A | : FAREBOX RECOVERY REPORT | A-1 |
| Appendix B | : PRIVATE TRANSPORTATION PROVIDERS SURVEY | B-1 |
| Appendix C | : PEER SELECTION PROCESS | C-1 |
| Appendix D | BROWARD COUNTY ORGANIZATIONAL CHART | D-1 |
| Appendix E | : PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN | E-1 |
| Appendix F | : PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARIES | F-1 |
| Appendix G | : ON-BOARD SURVEY REPORT | G-1 |
| Appendix H | : TELEPHONE SURVEY REPORT | H-1 |
| Appendix I: | PLAN REVIEW | I-1 |
| Appendix J: | GOALS AND OBJECTIVES | J-1 |
| Appendix K | : INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PLAN | K-1 |
| Appendix L | BUDGET SUPPORT MATERIALS | L-1 |
| Appendix N | 1: TBEST RESULTS | M-1 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 1-1: | TDP Checklist | 1-3 |
|-------------|--|------|
| Table 2-1: | Population Characteristics | 2-3 |
| Table 2-2: | Broward County Population Trends | 2-3 |
| Table 2-3: | Regional Population and Density | 2-3 |
| Table 2-4: | Broward County Population Trends for Cities, Towns, Villages | |
| | and Unincorporated Areas | 2-4 |
| Table 2-5: | Broward County Potential Transportation Disadvantaged Population | 2-12 |
| Table 2-6: | Minority and Non-Minority Population within Broward County | 2-13 |
| Table 2-7: | Population and Age Distribution | 2-15 |
| Table 2-8: | Broward County Age Trends | 2-15 |
| Table 2-9: | Household Income Distribution | 2-18 |
| Table 2-10: | Distribution of Vehicle Availability by Household | 2-20 |
| Table 2-11: | Average Labor Force Participation | 2-20 |
| Table 2-12: | County of Work for Workers Residing in Broward County | 2-22 |
| Table 2-13: | Commuting from Neighboring Counties to Broward County | 2-22 |
| Table 2-14: | Travel Time to Work | 2-23 |
| Table 2-15: | Journey-to-Work Mode Split | 2-23 |
| Table 2-16: | Employment by Industry | 2-26 |

| Table 2-17: Broward County Top 30 Employers | 2-2 |
|---|-----|
| Table 2-18: Transit Service Density Threshold | 2-3 |
| Table 3-1: BCT Fixed-Route Bus Operating Characteristics | 3 |
| Table 3-2: BCCB Operating Characteristics | 3 |
| Table 3-3: Broward County Tri-Rail Stations | 3-1 |
| Table 3-4: Broward County Private Transportation Service Providers: Survey Responses | 3-1 |
| Table 3-5: Additional Broward County Private Transportation Service Providers | 3-1 |
| Table 3-6: Fixed-Route Performance Review Measures for Trend Analysis | 3-2 |
| Table 3-7: 2008–2012 Performance Indicators, BCT Fixed-Route Trend Analysis | 3-2 |
| Table 3-8: 2008–2012 Performance Indicators, BCCB Trend Analysis Analysis | 3-2 |
| Table 3-9 2008–2012 Effectiveness Measures, BCT Fixed-Route Trend Analysis | 3-2 |
| Table 3-10: 2008–2012 Effectiveness Measure, BCCB Trend Analysis | 3-3 |
| Table 3-11: 2008–2012 Efficiency Measures, BCT Fixed-Route Trend Analysis | 3-3 |
| Table 3-12: 2008–2012 Efficiency Measures, BCCB Trend Analysis | 3-3 |
| Table 3-13: Summary of BCT Fixed-Route Trend Analysis | 3-4 |
| Table 3-14: Summary of BCCB Trend Analysis | 3-4 |
| Table 3-15: TOPS Performance Review Measures for Trend Analysis | 3-4 |
| Table 3-16: TOPS Service Performance Indicators | 3-4 |
| Table 3-17: BCT TDP Final Peers | 3- |
| Table 3-18: Fixed-Route Peer Group Performance Statistics | 3- |
| Table 3-19: Performance Indicators, BCT Peer Review Analysis | 3-! |
| Table 3-20: Fixed-Route Peer Group Effectiveness Statistics | 3-! |
| Table 3-21: Effectiveness Measures, BCT Peer Review Analysis | 3-! |
| Table 3-22: Fixed-Route Peer Group Efficiency Statistics | 3- |
| Table 3-23: Efficiency Measures, BCT Peer Review Analysis | 3- |
| Table 3-24: BCT Fixed-Route Peer Review Analysis Summary | 3- |
| Table 3-25: Paratransit Peer Group Performance Statistics | 3- |
| Table 3-26: Paratransit Peer Review – Performance Indicators | 3- |
| Table 3-27: Paratransit Peer Group Financial & Operational Measures | 3- |
| Table 3-28: Paratransit Peer Review – Financial & Operational Indicators | 3- |
| Table 3-29: TOPS Paratransit Peer Review Analysis Summary | 3- |
| Table 3-30: BCT Staffing Level Peer Review | 3- |
| Table 3-31: BCT Staffing versus System Staffing | 3-1 |
| Table 3-32: BCT Staff Shortfall and Surplus | 3-7 |
| Table 4-1: Advisory Review Committee | 4 |
| Table 4-2: Stakeholders | 4 |
| Table 4-3: Discussion Groups | 4 |
| Table 4-4: On-board Survey Completion by Language | 4 |
| Table 4-5: Community Drop-ins | 4-1 |
| Table 4-6: Presentations | 4-: |
| Table 4-7: Public Involvement Summary | 4-1 |
| | |



| Table 4-8: | Public Involvement Goal Accomplishment | 4-17 |
|------------|---|------|
| Table 5-1: | Plan Review | 5-2 |
| Table 6-1: | Goal 1 with Objectives and Actions | 6-3 |
| Table 6-2: | Goal 2 with Objectives and Actions | 6-4 |
| Table 6-3: | Goal 3 with Objectives and Actions | 6-5 |
| Table 6-4: | Goal 4 with Objectives and Actions | 6-5 |
| Table 6-5: | Goal 5 with Objectives and Actions | 6-6 |
| Table 7-1: | Enhanced Bus Routes | 7-15 |
| Table 7-2: | Passenger per Hour Analysis | 7-20 |
| Table 7-3: | TBEST Average Weekday Ridership Projections | 7-24 |
| Table 8-1: | Status Quo Plan Infrastructure Improvements | 8-2 |
| Table 8-2: | Status Quo Plan: Operating and Capital Budgets (FY 2014-2023) | 8-8 |
| Table 8-3: | Vision Plan Infrastructure Improvements | 8-10 |
| Table 8-4: | Vision Plan: Operating and Capital Budgets (FY 2014-2023) | 8-14 |

LIST OF MAPS

| Map 2-1: | Study Area | 2-2 |
|-----------|--|------|
| Map 2-2: | Broward County 2013 Population Density | 2-6 |
| Map 2-3: | Broward County 2035 Population Density | 2-7 |
| Map 2-4: | Broward County 2013 Employment Density | 2-8 |
| Map 2-5: | Broward County 2035 Employment Density | 2-9 |
| Map 2-6: | Broward County 2013 Dwelling Unit Density | 2-10 |
| Map 2-7: | Broward County 2035 Dwelling Unit Density | 2-11 |
| Map 2-8: | Percent Minority Population by Census Tract | 2-14 |
| Map 2-9: | Percent of Population under Age 16 | 2-16 |
| Map 2-10: | Percent of Population over Age 60 | 2-17 |
| Map 2-11: | Percent of Population below Poverty Level | 2-19 |
| Map 2-12: | Percent of Households with Zero Vehicle Availability | 2-21 |
| Map 2-13: | Broward County 2009 Peak-Hour Roadway Level of Service | 2-24 |
| Map 2-14: | Broward County 2035 Peak-Hour Roadway Level of Service | 2-28 |
| Map 2-15: | Existing Land Use in Broward County | 2-29 |
| Map 2-16: | Future Land Use in Broward County | 2-30 |
| Map 2-17: | Future Land Use Local Activity Centers, Regional Activity Centers, | |
| | and Transit-Oriented Areas | 2-31 |
| Map 2-18: | Broward County 2013 Population Density Threshold Assessment | 2-33 |
| Map 2-19: | Broward County 2013 Employment Density Threshold Assessment | 2-34 |
| Map 3-1: | BCT Existing Transit Service | 3-3 |
| Map 3-2: | SFRTA Tri-Rail and Miami-Dade Transit Service | 3-13 |

| Map 4-1: | Short Survey Respondent ZIP Codes | 4-9 |
|----------|-----------------------------------|------|
| Map 4-2: | Public Involvement ZIP Codes | 4-16 |
| Map 7-1: | Reliability/Capacity Adjustments | 7-2 |
| Map 7-2: | Frequency Improvements | 7-12 |
| Map 7-3: | Service Span Improvements | 7-13 |
| Map 7-4: | Route Realignments | 7-14 |
| Map 7-5: | New Service Alignments | 7-16 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 3-1: | BCT Fixed-Route Bus Historical Ridership Data | 3-2 |
|--------------|---|------|
| Figure 3-2: | BCT Ridership and Broward County Population Growth | 3-2 |
| Figure 3-3: | BCCB Historical Ridership Data | 3-8 |
| Figure 3-4: | SFRTA Tri-Rail Historical Ridership Data | 3-11 |
| Figure 3-5: | SFRTA Shuttle Bus Historical Ridership Data | 3-12 |
| Figure 3-6: | MDT Metrobus Historical Ridership Data | 3-14 |
| Figure 3-7: | MDT Metrorail Historical Ridership Data | 3-15 |
| Figure 3-8: | MDT Metromover Historical Ridership Data | 3-15 |
| Figure 3-9: | Palm Tran Fixed-Route Bus Historical Ridership Data | 3-16 |
| Figure 3-10: | Fixed-Route Passenger Trips | 3-22 |
| Figure 3-11: | Fixed-Route Passenger Miles | 3-22 |
| Figure 3-12: | Fixed-Route Vehicle Miles | 3-23 |
| Figure 3-13: | Fixed-Route Revenue Miles | 3-23 |
| Figure 3-14: | Fixed-Route Total Operating Expense | 3-23 |
| Figure 3-15: | Fixed-Route Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service | 3-23 |
| Figure 3-16: | BCCB Passenger Trips | 3-24 |
| Figure 3-17: | BCCB Passenger Miles | 3-24 |
| Figure 3-18: | BCCB Vehicle Miles | 3-25 |
| Figure 3-19: | BCCB Revenue Miles | 3-25 |
| Figure 3-20: | BCCB Total Operating Expense | 3-25 |
| Figure 3-21: | BCCB Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service | 3-25 |
| Figure 3-22: | Fixed-Route Vehicle Miles Per Capita | 3-27 |
| Figure 3-23: | Fixed-Route Passenger Trips per Capita | 3-27 |
| Figure 3-24: | Fixed-Route Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 3-27 |
| Figure 3-25: | Fixed-Route Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 3-27 |
| Figure 3-26: | Fixed-Route Average Age of Fleet | 3-28 |
| Figure 3-27: | Fixed-Route Average Headway | 3-28 |
| Figure 3-28: | Fixed-Route Number of Vehicle System Failures | 3-28 |
| Figure 3-29: | Fixed-Route Revenue Miles between Failures | 3-28 |
| Figure 3-30: | Fixed-Route Weekday Span of Service | 3-29 |



| Figure 3-31: BCCB Vehicle Miles Per Capita | 3-31 |
|---|------|
| Figure 3-32: BCCB Passenger Trips per Capita | 3-31 |
| Figure 3-33: BCCB Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 3-31 |
| Figure 3-34: BCCB Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 3-31 |
| Figure 3-35: BCCB Average Age of Fleet | 3-32 |
| Figure 3-36: BCCB Average Age of Fleet | 3-32 |
| Figure 3-37: BCCB Average Headway | 3-32 |
| Figure 3-38: BCCB Average Headway | 3-32 |
| Figure 3-39: BCCB Number of Vehicle System Failures | 3-33 |
| Figure 3-40: BCCB Revenue Miles between Failures | 3-33 |
| Figure 3-41: BCCB Weekday Span of Service | 3-33 |
| Figure 3-42: BCCB Weekday Span of Service | 3-33 |
| Figure 3-43: Fixed-Route Operating Expense per Capita | 3-35 |
| Figure 3-44: Fixed-Route Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | 3-35 |
| Figure 3-45: Fixed-Route Operating Expense per Passenger Mile | 3-35 |
| Figure 3-46: Fixed-Route Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | 3-35 |
| Figure 3-47: Fixed-Route Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | 3-36 |
| Figure 3-48: Fixed-Route Farebox Recovery | 3-36 |
| Figure 3-49: Fixed-Route Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile | 3-36 |
| Figure 3-50: Fixed-Route Revenue Hours per Employee | 3-36 |
| Figure 3-51: Fixed-Route Vehicle Miles per Gallon | 3-37 |
| Figure 3-52: Fixed-Route Average Fare | 3-37 |
| Figure 3-53: BCCB Operating Expense per Capita | 3-38 |
| Figure 3-54: BCCB Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | 3-38 |
| Figure 3-55: BCCB Operating Expense per Passenger Mile | 3-39 |
| Figure 3-56: BCCB Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | 3-39 |
| Figure 3-57: BCCB Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | 3-39 |
| Figure 3-58: BCCB Farebox Recovery | 3-39 |
| Figure 3-59: BCCB Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile | 3-40 |
| Figure 3-60: BCCB Revenue Hours per Employee FTE | 3-40 |
| Figure 3-61: BCCB Vehicle Miles per Gallon VMG | 3-40 |
| Figure 3-62: BCCB Average Fare | 3-40 |
| Figure 3-63: TOPS Passenger Trips | 3-45 |
| Figure 3-64: TOPS Revenue Miles | 3-45 |
| Figure 3-65: TOPS Vehicle Miles | 3-45 |
| Figure 3-66: TOPS Revenue Hours | 3-45 |
| Figure 3-67: TOPS Operating Expense | 3-46 |
| Figure 3-68: TOPS Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 3-46 |
| Figure 3-69: TOPS Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 3-46 |
| Figure 3-70: TOPS Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | 3-46 |
| Figure 3-71: TOPS Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | 3-47 |

| Figure 3-72: TO | OPS Operating Expense per Passenger Mile | 3-47 |
|-------------------|---|------|
| Figure 3-73: TO | OPS Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | 3-47 |
| Figure 3-74: Fix | ed-Route Service Area Population | 3-50 |
| Figure 3-75: Fix | ed-Route Population per Square Mile of Service Area | 3-50 |
| Figure 3-76: Fix | ed-Route Annual Passenger Trips | 3-51 |
| Figure 3-77: Fix | ed-Route Annual Revenue Miles | 3-51 |
| Figure 3-78: Fix | ed-Route Annual Operating Expense | 3-52 |
| Figure 3-79: Fix | ed-Route Annual Passenger Fare Revenue | 3-52 |
| Figure 3-80: Fix | ed-Route Vehicles Operating in Maximum Service | 3-53 |
| Figure 3-81: Fix | ed-Route Vehicle Miles per Capita | 3-54 |
| Figure 3-82: Fix | ed-Route Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 3-55 |
| Figure 3-83: Fixe | ed-Route Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 3-55 |
| Figure 3-84: Fix | ed-Route Revenue Miles between Failures | 3-56 |
| Figure 3-85: Fix | ed-Route Operating Expense per Capita | 3-58 |
| Figure 3-86: Fix | ed-Route Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | 3-58 |
| Figure 3-87: Fix | ed-Route Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | 3-59 |
| Figure 3-88: Fix | ed-Route Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | 3-59 |
| Figure 3-89: Fix | ed-Route Farebox Recovery Ratio | 3-60 |
| Figure 3-90: Fix | ed-Route Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile | 3-60 |
| Figure 3-91: Fix | ed-Route Revenue Hours per Employee FTE | 3-61 |
| Figure 3-92: Fix | ed-Route Average Fare | 3-61 |
| Figure 3-93: Pa | ratransit Annual Passenger Trips | 3-65 |
| Figure 3-94: Pa | ratransit Annual Revenue Miles | 3-65 |
| Figure 3-95: Pa | ratransit Annual Revenue Hours | 3-66 |
| Figure 3-96: Pa | ratransit Annual Operating Expense | 3-66 |
| Figure 3-97: Pa | ratransit Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | 3-67 |
| Figure 3-98: Pa | ratransit Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | 3-68 |
| Figure 3-99: Pa | ratransit Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | 3-68 |
| Figure 3-100:Pa | ratransit Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 3-69 |
| Figure 3-101:Pa | ratransit Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 3-69 |
| Figure 3-102:Bro | oward County Organizational Structure | 3-71 |
| Figure 4-1: BC | T Connected Logo | 4-1 |
| Figure 4-2: AC | R Meeting Participants | 4-1 |
| Figure 4-3: AR | C Meeting Participants | 4-2 |
| Figure 4-4: BC | T TDP Website Screenshot | 4-3 |
| Figure 4-5: Co | mmunity Bus Service Discussion Group | 4-4 |
| Figure 4-6: She | ort Survey Instrument | 4-4 |
| Figure 4-7: Ho | w often do you use BCT transit services? | 4-5 |
| Figure 4-8: Im | portance of the following features to BCT services? | 4-6 |
| Figure 4-9: If y | /ou do not use BCT services, why not? | 4-6 |
| Figure 4-10: In | nprovements that would encourage the use of BCT services? | 4-7 |



| Figure 4-11: | Support long-term sustainable funding for public transportation? | 4-7 |
|--------------|--|------|
| Figure 4-12: | : On-board Survey Instrument | |
| Figure 4-13: | Use of Bus and Public Transit Services | 4-11 |
| Figure 4-14: | Priority for Additional Funding for Public Transit | 4-11 |
| Figure 4-15: | Priority Service Hour Expansion | 4-12 |
| Figure 4-16: | Support for Sales Tax Increase to Improve Bus Service | 4-12 |
| Figure 4-17: | Believe in the Benefits of Public Transit | 4-13 |
| Figure 4-18: | Community Drop-in Events | 4-13 |
| Figure 5-1: | Housing and Transportation Costs | 5-16 |
| Figure 8-1: | Status Quo Plan Operating Budget | 8-9 |
| Figure 8-2: | Status Quo Plan Capital Budget | 8-9 |
| Figure 8-3: | Vision Plan Operating Budget | 8-15 |
| Figure 8-4: | Vision Plan Capital Budget | 8-15 |

LIST OF ACRONYMS

| AAA | American Automobile Association |
|------------|---|
| AC Transit | Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District |
| ACS | American Community Survey |
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act |
| APC | Automatic Passenger Counter |
| APTS | Advanced Public Transportation System |
| ARC | Advisory Review Committee |
| ATMS | Advanced Traffic Management System |
| AVL | Automatic Vehicle Locators |
| BAT | Business Access and Transit |
| BCC | Board of County Commissioners |
| BCCB | Broward County Community Bus |
| ВСТ | Broward County Transit |
| BCTED | Broward County Traffic Engineering Department |
| BLS | Bureau of Labor Statistics |
| BPAC | Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee |
| BT | Broward Central Terminal |
| CAD | Computer-Aided Dispatch |
| CATS | Charlotte Area Transit System |
| СВТ | Computer-based Training |
| CCTV | Closed Circuit Television |
| CDC | Center for Disease Control and Prevention |
| CEDS | Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies |
| | |

| CIR | Community Involvement Roundtable |
|--------|---|
| CNG | Compressed Natural Gas |
| COA | Comprehensive Operations Analysis |
| CPI | Consumer Price Index |
| СТС | Community Transportation Coordinator |
| CRA | Community Redevelopment Agency |
| CUTR | Center for Urban Transportation Research |
| DDA | Downtown Development Authority |
| DO | Directly Operated |
| DOR | Department of Revenue |
| DTA | Density Threshold Assessment |
| FDOT | Florida Department of Transportation |
| FTE | Full-Time Equivalent |
| FTP | Florida Transportation Plan |
| EBS | Enhanced Bus Service |
| EJ | Environmental Justice |
| EPA | Environmental Protection Agency |
| FA | Fleet Anywhere |
| FAC | Florida Administrative Code |
| FEC | Florida East Coast |
| FS | Florida Statutes |
| FTA | Federal Transit Administration |
| FTIS | Florida Transit Information System |
| FSUTMS | Florida Standard Urban Transportation Model Structure |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| HOV | High-Occupancy Vehicle |
| HRT | Hampton Roads Transit |
| HUD | Department of Housing and Urban Development |
| JARC | Job Access and Reverse Commute |
| INTDAS | Integrated National Transit Database Analysis System |
| IP | Internet Protocol |
| IT | Information Technology |
| LOS | Level of Service |
| LPA | Locally Preferred Alternative |
| LRTP | Long Range Transportation Plan |
| LYNX | Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority |
| MAP-21 | Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act |
| MIC | Miami Intermodal Center |
| MDT | Miami-Dade Transit |
| MPO | Metropolitan Planning Organization |



| MSA | Metropolitan Statistical Area |
|-------|--|
| NAAQS | National Ambient Air Quality Standards |
| NTD | National Transit Database |
| OD | Origin-Destination |
| PAC | Project Advisory Committee |
| PD&E | Project Development and Environment |
| PPH | Passengers per Hour |
| PT | Purchased Transportation |
| PTAC | Planning Technical Advisory Committee |
| PTBG | Public Transit Block Grant |
| RTSMP | Regional Transit System Master Plan |
| SFECC | South Florida East Coast Corridor |
| SFRTA | South Florida Regional Transportation Authority |
| SFTC | South Florida Transportation Council |
| SFRP | Southeast Florida Regional Partnership |
| TAC | Technical Advisory Committee |
| STS | Special Transportation Service |
| TAZ | Traffic Analysis Zone |
| TBEST | Transit Boardings Estimation and Simulation Tool |
| тсс | Technical Coordinating Committee |
| TCRP | Transportation Cooperative Research Program |
| TD | Transportation Disadvantaged |
| TIGER | Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery |
| TDP | Transit Development Plan |
| ТОА | Tindale-Oliver & Associates, Inc. |
| TOD | Transit Oriented Development |
| TOPS | Transportation Options |
| TSM&O | Transportation System Management and Operation |
| TSP | Transit Signal Priority |
| VAS | Voice Annunciation System |
| V/C | Volume-Demand-to-Capacity Ratios |
| VTA | Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority |





Introduction



| | And Delik methy | the second second second | | | ARRINGLES. | Needed Improvement | Total Cost | Sec |
|------------|-----------------|--|--------------|-----|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--|
| inal Diam. | A B | c | DE | | а н | ExpandMaintain Existing Service | \$ 96,043,487 | - I Share I |
| inal Plan: | | | | | Table 1 | New MetroRapid Service | \$ 17,453,804- | |
| | | Fixed-Route/ADA/Other Service Florida Translt TDP U | | | | \$ 3,209,833 | man, shed | |
| Phasing & | 1 | | | | | New Local Service | \$ 9,738,320 | The sale of the sa |
| mashing or | terms (united | Income | In interiore | 1.1 | a section of a | New Files Service | \$ 0,380,882 | The set set of |
| inances | | | | | | New Paralramat Service | \$ 3521.540 | |
| inditces | Note /1 | Parage Street State Service | | | NE 10. | Total Operating Cost | \$ 108,423,876 | 1 |
| | Rank () | Planta last lans | | | | Total Operating Revenues* | \$ 13,173,855 | - |
| | last par | the first | 1 2 2 | | | Shortfall | 5 (63,250,017) | - 15 |

Introduction

Section 1

The 2014–2023 Transit Development Plan (TDP), known as BCT *Connected*, for Broward County Transit (BCT) serves as the strategic guide for public transportation in Broward County over the next 10 years. Development of the TDP includes a number of activities: documentation of study area conditions and demographic characteristics, evaluation of existing transit services in Broward County, market research and public involvement efforts, development of a situation appraisal and needs assessment, and preparation of a 10-year TDP document that provides guidance during the 10-year planning horizon.

ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

The report is broken into eight sections, including this one. Detailed supporting documentation is provided in appendices.

Section 2, Baseline Conditions, analyzes demographic data for BCT's service area. Section 3, Evaluation of Existing Transit System, examines changes to BCT's operating statistics over time and compares those statistics to other transit systems. Section 4, Public Involvement, presents the results of public outreach for this project. Section 5, Situation Appraisal, examines the environment in which BCT operates. Section 6, Goals and Objectives, presents the goals, objectives, and measures for BCT. Section 7, Alternatives, presents the improvements to be implemented over the 10-year timeframe. Section 8, Financial Plan, analyzes the financial impacts of implementing these improvements and resources available to pay for the improvements.

TDP REQUIREMENTS

BCT *Connected* is consistent with the requirements for the State of Florida Public Transit Block Grant (PTBG) program, a program enacted by the Florida Legislature to provide a stable source of funding for public transit. The Block Grant program requires public transit service providers to develop and adopt a 10-Year TDP using the requirements formally adopted by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) on February 20, 2007 (Rule 14-73.001 – Public Transit). Chief requirements of the rule include the following:

- Major updates must be completed every five years, covering a 10-year planning horizon.
- A public involvement plan must be developed and approved by FDOT or be consistent with the approved Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) public involvement plan.
- FDOT, the Regional Workforce Development Board, and the MPO must be advised of all public meetings where the TDP is presented and discussed, and these entities must be given the



opportunity to review and comment on the TDP during the development of the mission, goals, objectives, alternatives, and 10-year implementation program.

- Estimation of the community's demand for transit service (10-year annual projections) must be made using the planning tools provided by FDOT or a demand estimation technique approved by FDOT.
- Consistency with the approved local government comprehensive plans and the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTP) is required.

An additional requirement for the TDP was added by the Florida Legislature in 2007 when it adopted House Bill 985. This legislation amended Section 341.071 of the Florida Statutes (FS), requiring transit agencies to "... specifically address potential enhancements to productivity and performance which would have the effect of increasing farebox recovery ratio." FDOT subsequently issued guidance requiring the TDP and each annual update to include a one- to two-page summary report on the farebox recovery ratio, and strategies implemented and planned to improve it (provided in Appendix A of this plan).

TDP CHECKLIST

This 10-year plan meets the requirement for a major TDP update in accordance with Rule 14-73.001 – Public Transit, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). Table 1-1 is a list of TDP requirements from Rule 14-73.001. The table serves as a checklist that all requirements are addressed in the BCT *Connected* plan documentation.

Table 1-1

TDP Checklist

| Public Inv | olvement Process | TDP Section |
|------------|---|-------------|
| V | Public Involvement Plan (PIP) | Appendix D |
| V | PIP approved by FDOT | Section 4 |
| V | TDP includes description of Public Involvement Process | Section 4 |
| V | Provide notification to FDOT | Section 4 |
| V | Provide notification to Regional Workforce Board | Section 4 |
| Situation | Appraisal | |
| V | Land use | Section 5 |
| V | State and local transportation plans | Section 5 |
| V | Other governmental actions and policies | Section 5 |
| V | Socioeconomic trends | Section 5 |
| V | Organizational issues | Section 5 |
| V | Technology | Section 5 |
| V | 10-year annual projections of transit ridership using approved methodology | Section 7 |
| V | Assessment of whether land uses and urban design patterns support transit service provision | Section 5 |
| V | Calculate farebox recovery | Appendix A |
| Mission a | nd Goals | |
| V | Provider's vision | Section 6 |
| V | Provider's mission | Section 6 |
| V | Provider's goals | Section 6 |
| V | Provider's objectives | Section 6 |
| Alternati | ve Courses of Action | |
| V | Develop and evaluate alternative strategies and actions | Section 7 |
| V | Benefits and costs of each alternative | Section 7 |
| V | Financial alternatives examined | Section 8 |
| Impleme | ntation Program | |
| V | 10-year implementation program | Section 8 |
| V | Maps indicating areas to be served | Section 8 |
| V | Maps indicating types and levels of service | Section 8 |
| V | Monitoring program to track performance measures | Section 6 |
| V | 10-year financial plan listing operating and capital expenses | Section 8 |
| V | Capital acquisition or construction schedule | Section 8 |
| v | Anticipated revenues by source | Section 8 |
| Relations | hip to Other Plans | |
| V | Consistent with Florida Transportation Plan | Section 5 |
| V | Consistent with local government comprehensive plans | Section 5 |
| V | Consistent with MPO long-range transportation plans | Section 5 |
| V | Consistent with regional transportation goals and objectives | Section 5 |
| Submissi | | |
| Pending | Adopted by BCT Governing Board | N/A |
| | Submitted to FDOT by September 1, 2013 | N/A |





Baseline Conditions



Baseline Conditions

Section 2

This section of BCT *Connected* summarizes existing conditions and demographic characteristics within the transit service area. Baseline conditions establish the context for the delivery of transit services in Broward County and provide background information needed to understand BCT's service operating environment. A service area description, demographic characteristics, land use information, commuting patterns data, and roadway conditions are presented. Information and data reflect the most recent information available at the time of preparation of this Plan.

SERVICE AREA DESCRIPTION

Broward County is located in southeast Florida and is bordered to the north by Palm Beach County, to the south by Miami-Dade County, and to the west by Collier and Hendry counties. About two-thirds of Broward County comprises conservation area, including the Everglades. BCT service operates in the remaining one-third of the county that consists of urbanized area. Ninety-nine percent of the population in Broward County resides in 31 incorporated municipalities. Among incorporated municipalities, the largest city, Fort Lauderdale, has more than 165,000 residents as of 2010.

Other municipalities with a population greater than 100,000 in 2010 include Coral Springs, Miramar, Hollywood, and Pembroke Pines. Map 2-1 presents a physical representation of the county and its municipal areas. To better understand the study area conditions and demographic characteristics of Broward County, a review of pertinent information was conducted as part of the TDP update process. The sources for this information include the U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), the Broward County MPO, and BCT.

POPULATION PROFILE

As of the 2010 U.S. Census, the total population of Broward County was 1,748,066. Table 2-1 shows the population levels for Broward County and Florida. The county population increased from 1,623,018 in 2000 to 1,748,066 in 2010, a growth of 7.7 percent over the 10-year period. This growth was not as strong as the population growth of Florida as a whole. A similar trend is true for growth in the number of households and the number of workers. Although Broward County greatly surpasses Florida in terms of population density, Florida's population density increased much more than Broward County's did over the time period between 2000 and 2010. Table 2-2 shows growth in population, households, and employment in Broward County from 1990 to 2010. Table 2-3 shows population and population density in Broward County, Miami-Dade County, and Palm Beach County.



| Population Data | 2000 | | 2010 | | % Change (2000–2010) | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------|
| | Broward County | Florida | Broward County | Florida | Broward County | Florida |
| Persons | 1,623,018 | 15,982,824 | 1,748,066 | 18,801,310 | 7.7% | 17.6% |
| Households | 654,445 | 6,337,929 | 686,047 | 7,420,802 | 4.8% | 17.1% |
| Number of Workers (employed) | 758,939 | 7,221,000 | 850,849 | 8,159,000 | 12.1% | 13.0% |
| Urbanized Area (sq. mi.) | 1,205.4 | 53,926.8 | 1,209.8 | 53,926.8 | 0.8% | 0.0% |
| Conservation Area (sq. mi.) | 114.2 | 11,827.8 | 113.1 | 12,132.9 | 1.0% | 2.6% |
| Persons per Household | 2.48 | 2.52 | 2.55 | 2.53 | 2.7% | 0.4% |
| Workers per Household | 1.16 | 1.14 | 1.24 | 1.10 | 6.9% | -3.5% |
| Persons per Square Mile | 1,346.5 | 296.4 | 1,444.9 | 350.6 | 7.7% | 18.3% |
| Workers per Square Mile | 629.6 | 133.9 | 703.3 | 152.1 | 12.1% | 13.6% |

Table 2-1Population Characteristics

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census, 2010 Census, and 2007–2011 American Community Survey

Table 2-2Broward County Population Trends

| Population Data | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | % Change (1990– 2000) | % Change (2000– 2010) | % Change (1990– 2010) |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Persons | 1,255,488 | 1,623,018 | 1,748,066 | 29.3% | 7.7% | 39.2% |
| Households | 528,442 | 654,445 | 686,047 | 23.8% | 4.8% | 29.8% |
| Number of Workers (employed) | 616,278 | 758,939 | 850,849 | 23.1% | 12.1% | 38.1% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census, 2000 Census, and 2010 Census

| Regional Population and Density (2010) | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Location | Population | Density (Persons per Square Mile) | | | | | |
| Broward County | 1,748,066 | 1,444.9 | | | | | |
| Miami-Dade County | 2,496,435 | 1,315.5 | | | | | |
| Palm Beach County | 1,320,134 | 670.2 | | | | | |

Table 2-3

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census

Table 2-4 presents the population and population change between 2000 and 2010 for incorporated and unincorporated areas in Broward County. Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, Parkland, and Miramar experienced the top three population changes between 2000 and 2010, with 136.3 percent, 73.2 percent, and 67.8 percent growth, respectively.



Table 2-4

Broward County Population Trends for Cities, Towns, Villages, and Unincorporated Areas

| Municipality | 2000 | 2010 | % Change (2000–2010) |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|
| Coconut Creek | 43,566 | 52,909 | 21.4% |
| Cooper City | 27,939 | 28,547 | 2.2% |
| Coral Springs | 117,549 | 121,096 | 3.0% |
| Dania Beach | 20,061 | 29,639 | 47.7% |
| Davie | 75,720 | 91,992 | 21.5% |
| Deerfield Beach | 64,583 | 75,018 | 16.2% |
| Fort Lauderdale | 152,397 | 165,521 | 8.6% |
| Hallandale Beach | 34,282 | 37,113 | 8.3% |
| Hillsboro Beach | 2,163 | 1,875 | -13.3% |
| Hollywood | 139,357 | 140,768 | 1.0% |
| Lauderdale Lakes | 31,705 | 32,593 | 2.8% |
| Lauderdale-by-the-Sea | 2,563 | 6,056 | 136.3% |
| Lauderhill | 57,585 | 66,887 | 16.2% |
| Lazy Lake | 38 | 24 | -36.8% |
| Lighthouse Point | 10,767 | 10,344 | -3.9% |
| Margate | 53,909 | 53,284 | -1.2% |
| Miramar | 72,739 | 122,041 | 67.8% |
| North Lauderdale | 32,264 | 41,023 | 27.1% |
| Oakland Park | 30,966 | 41,363 | 33.6% |
| Parkland | 13,835 | 23,962 | 73.2% |
| Pembroke Park | 6,299 | 6,102 | -3.1% |
| Pembroke Pines | 137,427 | 154,750 | 12.6% |
| Plantation | 82,934 | 84,955 | 2.4% |
| Pompano Beach | 78,191 | 99,845 | 27.7% |
| Sea Ranch Lakes | 1,392 | 670 | -51.9% |
| Southwest Ranches* | - | 7,345 | - |
| Sunrise | 85,779 | 84,439 | -1.6% |
| Tamarac | 55,588 | 60,427 | 8.7% |
| West Park* | - | 14,156 | - |
| Weston | 49,286 | 65,333 | 32.6% |
| Wilton Manors | 12,697 | 11,632 | -8.4% |
| Incorporated | 1,493,581 | 1,731,709 | 15.9% |
| Unincorporated | 129,437 | 16,357 | -87.4% |
| Total | 1,623,018 | 1,748,066 | 7.7% |

*Southwest Ranches and West Park were not incorporated in 2000.

Note: Some increases in population from 2000 to 2010 are due to annexation. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Census Maps 2-2 and 2-3 illustrate 2013 and 2035 population density by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) for Broward County. TAZs are geographic units used in the transportation planning process to assist in forecasting travel demand. Broward County has an extremely high population density compared with Florida as a whole – 1,445 versus 351 people per square mile of land area, respectively. The highest population growth areas are located near Hollywood Boulevard & US 1, between Oakland Park Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard near the Florida Medical Center, and in Deerfield Beach.

Maps 2-4 and 2-5 illustrate the 2013 and 2035 employment density by TAZ for Broward County. The highest growth areas for employment density between 2013 and 2035 are anticipated to occur in Deerfield Beach, Pompano Beach, and Hollywood. Maps 2-6 and 2-7 display total existing (2013) and future (2035) dwelling unit densities in the county. The highest dwelling unit densities are found in downtown Fort Lauderdale and along the Atlantic coast. The highest growth in dwelling unit density between 2013 and 2035 is expected to occur between Oakland Park Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard near the Florida Medical Center and in downtown Fort Lauderdale.















TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED POPULATION ESTIMATES

As shown in Table 2-5, Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) population estimates are split into two categories. Category I refers to the entire TD population and includes persons with disabilities (Disabled), older adults (Elderly), low-income persons, and "high-risk" or "at-risk" children. Category II is a subset of Category I and includes only those who are not able to transport themselves or cannot afford transportation. TD populations in both categories increased by more than 10 percent from 2008 to 2013, indicating the potential for an increase in demand for paratransit services in the future.

| Bioward County Potential ITa | • | | <u> </u> | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| TD Segments | Population Estimates (2008) | Percent of Total | Population Estimates (2013) | Percent of Total | % Change (2008– 2013) |
| | Category I | | | | |
| Disabled, Non-Elderly, Low Income | 9,251 | 1.5% | 9,536 | 1.4% | 3.1% |
| Disabled, Non-Elderly, Non-Low Income | 78,025 | 12.3% | 80,424 | 11.5% | 3.1% |
| Disabled, Elderly, Low Income | 13,979 | 2.2% | 16,053 | 2.3% | 14.8% |
| Disabled, Elderly, Non-Low Income | 139,641 | 22.1% | 160,357 | 22.8% | 14.8% |
| Non-Disabled, Elderly, Low Income | 25,070 | 4.0% | 28,789 | 4.1% | 14.8% |
| Non-Disabled, Elderly, Non-Low Income | 250,415 | 39.6% | 287,565 | 41.0% | 14.8% |
| Non-Disabled, Non-Elderly, Low Income | 115,766 | 18.3% | 119,326 | 17.0% | 3.1% |
| Total (Category I) | 632,147 | 100.0% | 702,050 | 100.0% | 11.1% |
| C | ategory II | | | | |
| Transportation Disabled, Non-Elderly, Low | 3,125 | 2.7% | 3,222 | 2.5% | 3.1% |
| Income, No Transport | | | | | |
| Transportation Disabled, Non-Elderly, Non-Low | 26,360 | 22.8% | 27,170 | 21.3% | 3.1% |
| Income, No Transport | | | | | |
| Transportation Disabled, Elderly, Low Income, No | 6,248 | 5.4% | 7,175 | 5.6% | 14.8% |
| Transport | | | | | |
| Transportation Disabled, Elderly, Non-Low | 62,409 | 54.0% | 71,667 | 56.2% | 14.8% |
| Income, No Transport | | | | | |
| Non-Transportation Disabled, Low Income, No | 17,444 | 15.1% | 18,341 | 14.4% | 5.1% |
| Auto, No Fixed-Route Transit | | | | | |
| Total (Category II) | 115,586 | 100.0% | 127,575 | 100.0% | 10.4% |

 Table 2-5

 Broward County Potential Transportation Disadvantaged Population

Source: BCT 2009-2018 Transit Development Plan, Broward County 2012 Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan

DEMOGRAPHIC AND JOURNEY-TO-WORK CHARACTERISTICS

Demographic information including data regarding minority populations, age, and income along with journey-to-work characteristics such as household vehicle availability, labor force rates, commuting patterns, travel time to work, means of travel to work, and roadway conditions are provided in this section.

MINORITY POPULATION

Table 2-6 displays the percent distribution of minority populations within Broward County compared to Florida. Broward County is a majority-minority county, with a minority population of 55.4 percent, about 14 percentage points more than Florida as a whole. As illustrated in Map 2-8, the highest concentrations of minority populations in Broward County are located in located in the northeast, north central, and southern portions of Broward County.

| Minority and Non-Minority Population within Broward County | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Location Minority % of Total Non-Hispanic % of Total | | | | | | | |
| | Population | Population | White Population | Population | | | |
| Broward County | 965,236 | 55.4% | 776,876 | 44.6% | | | |
| Florida | 7,771,368 | 41.6% | 10,917,419 | 58.4% | | | |

 Table 2-6

 Minority and Non-Minority Population within Broward County

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007–2011 American Community Survey

AGE DISTRIBUTION

The age distribution of Broward County is similar to the age distribution of Florida as a whole, as shown in Table 2-7. The population cohorts that are most closely associated with transit-dependency—persons under age 18 and persons age 65 and over—represent 36.7 percent of the total population in Broward County. Table 2-8 shows age trends in Broward County from 1980 to 2010. In 2010, a smaller proportion of the population is aged 65 and over than in any of the previous years.


| Population and Age Distribution (2011) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | Age | | | | | | | |
| Location | Under 18 | 18–24 | 25–44 | 45–64 | 65 Years and Over | | | | |
| Broward County | 392,112 | 146,454 | 481,438 | 474,720 | 247,288 | | | | |
| % of total population | 22.5% | 8.4% | 27.6% | 27.3% | 14.2% | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Florida | 4,005,833 | 1,733,738 | 4,749,797 | 4,992,966 | 3,206,453 | | | | |
| % of total population | 21.4% | 9.3% | 25.4% | 26.7% | 17.2% | | | | |

Table 2-7Population and Age Distribution (2011)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

| | Broward county Age mentas | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Year | Age | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Under 15 | 15–44 | | 65 Years and Over | | | | | | | |
| 1980 | 16.7% | 39.4% | 21.9% | 22.0% | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 17.4% | 43.4% | 18.6% | 20.7% | | | | | | | |
| 2000 | 19.9% | 42.4% | 21.7% | 16.1% | | | | | | | |
| 2010 | 18.3% | 39.8% | 27.7% | 14.3% | | | | | | | |

Table 2-8Broward County Age Trends

Source: Bureau of Economic and Business Research

As indicated, young people and older adults are more likely than the rest of the population to use public transportation. These populations include youth under age 16 who cannot legally operate a motor vehicle and, therefore, typically have a higher propensity for using transit, as well as older adults, who often are no longer able to drive due to impairments from aging. Maps 2-9 and 2-10 illustrate the concentrations of residents under age 16 and those who are over age 60 within the county.

INCOME

As shown in Table 2-9, the distribution of household incomes for Broward County is similar to that of Florida. The biggest difference between Broward County and the state are in the "\$50,000 and Over" household income category, with Florida at 48.1 percent and Broward County at 51.8 percent.

Map 2-11 shows the geographic distribution of families living below the poverty level in Broward County. The U.S. Census Bureau uses a set of dollar value thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is living in poverty. To determine poverty status, the Census Bureau compares the household's total family income in the last 12 months with the poverty threshold appropriate for that household's family size and composition.







| Household income Distribution (2011) | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Household Income | | | | | | | | | |
| Location | \$0- \$9,999 | \$10,000- \$14,999 | \$15,000- \$24,999 | \$25,000– \$34,999 | \$35,000 \$49,999 | \$50,000 and Over | | | | |
| Broward County | 45,430 | 35,854 | 72,992 | 73,602 | 92,987 | 344,172 | | | | |
| % of total households | 6.8% | 5.4% | 11.0% | 11.1% | 14.0% | 51.8% | | | | |
| | | | | | · | • | | | | |
| Florida | 522,572 | 405,372 | 840,479 | 839,473 | 1,094,185 | 3,437,915 | | | | |
| % of total households | 7.3% | 5.7% | 11.8% | 11.8% | 15.3% | 48.1% | | | | |

Table 2-9Household Income Distribution (2011)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

For example, consider a family of three with one child under 18 years of age, interviewed in July 2011 and reporting a total family income of \$14,000 for the last 12 months (July 2010 to June 2011). The appropriate poverty threshold for this family type based on Census thresholds is \$17,788. Comparing the family's income of \$14,000 with the poverty threshold shows that the family and all people in the family are considered to have been living in poverty at the time of the data collection. In Broward County, Pompano Beach and Fort Lauderdale have the highest proportion of those living below the poverty level.

HOUSEHOLD VEHICLE AVAILABILITY

Table 2-10 shows the number of vehicles available by household within Broward County and Florida. As shown, the County's distribution of household vehicle availability is similar to that for Florida. Almost three-quarters of the households in the county have at least two vehicles available to them. Household vehicle availability plays an important role in determining public transit needs. Persons living in zero-vehicle households are traditionally considered transit-dependent as they rely heavily upon transit to fulfill their transportation needs. Map 2-12 illustrates the geographic distribution of those zero-vehicle households within the county by census tract.





Table 2-10

Distribution of Vehicle Availability by Household (2011)

| Location | Number of Vehicles Available | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|--|--|--|
| | Zero | One | Two | Three or More | | | |
| Broward County | 24,278 | 209,133 | 374,574 | 216,653 | | | |
| % of total households | 2.9% | 25.4% | 45.4% | 26.3% | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Florida | 234,449 | 1,958,332 | 3,731,877 | 2,148,015 | | | |
| % of total households | 2.9% | 24.3% | 46.2% | 26.6% | | | |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

LABOR FORCE

Table 2-11 displays the total labor force and the average percentage of those laborers who were unemployed in the time period from March 2012 to February 2013. At 7.2 percent, Broward County has a lower unemployment rate than the State as a whole.

| Average Labor Force Participation (March 2012 to February 2013) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|---------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Location | Total Labor Force | Labor Force Employed | | Unemployment | | | | | | |
| | | | | Rate | | | | | | |
| Broward County | 1,018,350 | 945,272 | 73,078 | 7.2% | | | | | | |
| Florida | 9,385,748 | 8,598,647 | 787,101 | 8.4% | | | | | | |

Table 2-11

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics

COMMUTING PATTERNS

Table 2-12 summarizes commuter flows for workers living in Broward County. The analysis of 2010 data indicates that more than 60 percent of the workers residing in Broward County also work in Broward County. Nearly 40 percent of Broward County workers commute to neighboring counties. Miami-Dade County is the most common destination for workers commuting to destinations outside Broward County (19.4%). Compared with 2009, the total number of workers who both resided and worked in Broward County in 2010 experienced a 1.1 percentage point increase.





| Table 2-12 |
|------------|
|------------|

County of Work for Workers Residing in Broward County (2009 and 2010)

| County of Residence | | County of Work | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|---------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--|--|
| | | Broward | Miami- | Palm | St. Lucie | Martin | Monroe | Other | Total | | |
| Broward | # of Workers | 418,761 | 130,108 | 56,946 | 1,539 | 1,502 | 828 | 62,158 | 671,842 | | |
| (2010) | % Distribution | 62.3% | 19.4% | 8.5% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 9.3% | 100.0% | | |
| Broward | # of Workers | 414,217 | 129,534 | 57,346 | 1,580 | 1,469 | 1,004 | 69,219 | 674,369 | | |
| (2009) | % Distribution | 61.4% | 19.2% | 8.5% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 10.3% | 100.0% | | |
| % Chang | ge (2009–2010) | 1.1% | 0.4% | -0.7% | -2.6% | 2.2% | -17.5% | -10.2% | -0.4% | | |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics

Table 2-13 reflects commuting flows for persons living outside the county and commuting into Broward County for work. More than 60 percent of the work trips terminating in Broward County originate inside the county. Miami-Dade County makes up the largest (14.8%) trip origin for workers commuting to Broward County from other counties.

| | communing norm reignborning counties to broward county (2005 and 2010) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|---------|---------------------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--|--|--|
| | | | County of Residence | | | | | | | | | |
| County of Work | | Broward | Miami- | Palm | St. Lucie | Monroe | Martin | Other | Total | | | |
| | | | Dade | Beach | | | | | | | | |
| Broward | # of Workers | 418,761 | 96,150 | 61,299 | 3,925 | 2,814 | 2,395 | 65,776 | 651,120 | | | |
| (2010) | % Distribution | 64.3% | 14.8% | 9.4% | 0.6% | 0.4% | 0.4% | 10.1% | 100.0% | | | |
| Broward | # of Workers | 414,217 | 94,576 | 61,419 | 3,802 | 2,790 | 2,422 | 68,651 | 647,877 | | | |
| (2009) | % Distribution | 63.9% | 14.6% | 9.5% | 0.6% | 0.4% | 0.4% | 10.6% | 100.0% | | | |
| % Chang | e (2009–2010) | 1.1% | 1.7% | -0.2% | 3.2% | 0.9% | -1.1% | -4.2% | 0.5% | | | |

 Table 2-13

 Commuting from Neighboring Counties to Broward County (2009 and 2010)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics

TRAVEL TIME TO WORK

Table 2-14 conveys the distribution of travel time to work in Broward County and Florida. More than 60 percent of workers in Broward County and the State as a whole travel less than 30 minutes to reach their place of employment.

| | | Travel Time to Work (Minutes) | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|--|--|
| Location | Fewer than 10 | 10–19 | 20–29 | 30–44 | 45–59 | 60–89 | 90 or More | | |
| Broward County | 8.7% | 25.6% | 22.6% | 27.4% | 8.7% | 5.2% | 1.8% | | |
| Florida | 10.5% | 28.7% | 22.8% | 23.2% | 8.1% | 4.8% | 1.9% | | |

Table 2-14 Travel Time to Work (2011)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

MEANS OF TRAVEL TO WORK

Table 2-15 provides the distribution of the primary commute modes of transportation used in Broward County and Florida. Approximately 80 percent of workers in Broward County and the State as a whole drive alone to work. Compared to the overall state distribution, a larger proportion of people in Broward County use public transit to access work (2.8%), but a lower percentage (9.6%) carpool to work.

Table 2-15Journey-to-Work Mode Split (2011)

| Area | Travel Mode | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|---------|--------|------|---------|-------|--|--|
| | Drive Alone | Carpool | Public | Walk | Work at | Other | | |
| Broward County | 80.1% | 9.6% | 2.8% | 1.3% | 4.3% | 1.8% | | |
| Florida | 79.9% | 10.2% | 1.9% | 1.4% | 4.4% | 2.2% | | |

* Includes motorcycle, bicycle, taxicab, and other means of transportation.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

ROADWAY CONDITIONS

Maps 2-13 and 2-14 illustrate peak-hour level-of-service information for major roadways within Broward County for 2009 and 2035, respectively. The maps display Volume-Demand-to-Capacity Ratios (V/C), a measure that reflects mobility and quality of travel of a facility or a section of a facility. It compares roadway demand (vehicle volumes) with roadway supply (carrying capacity). A significant number of roadways, including Hallandale Beach Boulevard, Hollywood Boulevard, Sunrise Boulevard, Oakland Park Boulevard, Atlantic Boulevard, I-75, and I-95 have notable level-of-service deterioration by 2035.







MAJOR EMPLOYERS

As part of the baseline conditions analysis, data on major employers in Broward County were reviewed and summarized. The major industries in Broward County include trade, transportation, and utilities; professional and business services; education and health services, and leisure and hospitality. Table 2-16 shows employment by industry for Broward County and Florida.

With nearly 27,000 employees, the largest employer in Broward County is the Broward County School Board, followed by the Memorial Healthcare System and Broward Health. Nova Southeastern University and American Express remain two of the largest private-sector employers. The top 30 public and private employers, listed in Table 2-17, employ nearly 90,000 people. Both geographies have a similar distribution of workers in each industry. Approximately one-fifth of workers have jobs in educational services, health care, and social assistance, followed by professional services, retail, and service sector professions.

| Industry | Broward | Florida |
|--|---------|---------|
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining | 0.3% | 1.1% |
| Construction | 6.7% | 7.7% |
| Manufacturing | 5.2% | 5.6% |
| Wholesale trade | 4.0% | 3.0% |
| Retail trade | 13.1% | 13.1% |
| Transportation and warehousing, and utilities | 5.3% | 5.1% |
| Information | 2.7% | 2.2% |
| Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing | 8.9% | 7.9% |
| Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste | 13.4% | 12.0% |
| Educational services, and health care and social assistance | 19.9% | 20.2% |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services | 10.2% | 11.2% |
| Other services (except public administration) | 5.7% | 5.3% |
| Public administration | 4.4% | 4.9% |
| Armed forces | 0.2% | 0.7% |

Table 2-16 Employment by Industry (2011)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

| Rank | Company | Sector | South Florida Employment |
|---------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Broward County School Board | Public Schools and Adult Education | 26,933 |
| 2 | Memorial Healthcare System | Hospital District | 10,700 |
| 3 | Broward Health | Hospital District | 8,207 |
| 4 | Broward County Commission | County Government | 5,493 |
| 5 | Broward County Sheriff | County Law Enforcement | 5,315 |
| 6 | Nova Southeastern University | University – Bachelors, Masters, Doctoral Degrees | 3,971 |
| 7 | American Express | Commercial/Consumer Financial Services and Traveling Consulting | 3,000 |
| 8 | Kaplan Higher Education | Online Educational Provider | 2,800 |
| 9 | The Answer Group | Custom Computer Programming, Business Consulting | 2,800 |
| 10 | Interbond Corporation of America dba BrandsMart USA | Consumer Electronics Retailer | 2,600 |
| 11 | City of Fort Lauderdale | City Government | 2,487 |
| 12 | Alorica | Business Services Provider Delivering Customer Management and Sales/Marketing Solutions | 2,000 |
| 13 | Spirit Airlines | Air Carrier | 1,450 |
| 14 | Citrix Systems | Computer Network Software | 1,428 |
| 15 | JM Family Enterprises, Inc. | Diversified Automotive Corporation | 1,400 |
| 16 | Motorola | Connected Home Solutions, Government and Enterprise Mobility Solutions, Mobile Devices and Networks | 1,400 |
| 17 | City of Hollywood | City Government | 1,239 |
| 18 | SFN Group | Employment Services | 1,208 |
| 19 | Sun Sentinel Co./WSFL-TV | Publishes and Prints Daily and Weekly Newspapers, Niche Publications, Commercial Printing, Television | 1,133 |
| 20 | DHL Express | Air Courier Services | 1,075 |
| 21 | City of Miramar | City Government | 938 |
| 22 | Saveology.com | Comparison Shopping Website | 900 |
| 23 | City Furniture | Home Furniture Retailer | 883 |
| 24 | City of Pembroke Pines | City Government | 859 Full Time; 218 Part Time |
| 25 | Aviall | New Aviation Parts and Related Aftermarket Operations | 842 |
| 26 | First Data | Electronic Commerce and Payment Processing | 800 |
| 27 | Zimmerman Advertising | Advertising Agency | 800 |
| 28 | Rick Case Automotive Group | Automotive Sales and Services | 796 |
| 29 | American Changer Corporation | Developer and Manufacturer of Innovative Bill Changers and Token Dispensers | 590 |
| 30 | Ed Morse Automotive Group | Automotive Sales and Services | 558 |
| Source: | | Largest Employers - Ranked by Employees and Largest Publi | c Sector |

Table 2-17Broward County Top 30 Employers, 2012

Source: Greater Fort Lauderdale Alliance, Largest Employers - Ranked by Employees and Largest Public Sector Employers (Government and Tax assisted), 2012



TOURISM

Tourism is one of the largest employment sectors in the county. In 2012, Broward County had a total of 12 million visitors, including 2.8 million international visitors, according to the Greater Fort Lauderdale Convention & Visitors Bureau. Broward County offers 550+ lodging establishments with 33,000+ hotel rooms, 5,000+ restaurants, and 132 nightclubs. Visitors spent \$9.81 billion in Broward County in 2012. Florida's Office of Economic and Demographic Research estimates that Broward County's Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 realized tax revenues from tourist development taxes will be \$43,532,515, compared with a projected statewide county average of \$905,058.

LAND USE CHARACTERISTICS

FDOT's updated TDP guidelines promote the review of ongoing and anticipated residential and commercial development activities. Broward County and its municipalities have established land use and zoning maps to guide future developments in the county. Map 2-15 shows the existing land uses in Broward County and Map 2-16 presents future land use designations for Broward County. Map 2-17 illustrates the local and regional activity centers identified in future land use data. This map also contains areas designated for transit-oriented development or as a transit-oriented corridor to demonstrate emphasis areas in Broward County.

DISCRETIONARY MARKET ASSESSMENT

A Density Threshold Assessment (DTA) is an analysis tool for conducting a market analysis. The DTA tool can be used to determine whether existing transit routes are serving areas of the county considered to be transit-supportive for the corresponding transit market. The discretionary market refers to potential riders living in higher density areas of the county who may choose to use transit as a commuting or transportation alternative. A DTA was conducted based on industry standard relationships to identify those areas of Broward County that experience transit-supportive residential and commercial density levels in 2013. TAZ data from the Broward MPO were obtained to conduct the DTA.

Three levels of density thresholds were developed to indicate whether or not an area contains sufficient densities to sustain efficient fixed-route transit operations:

• *Minimum* – Reflects minimum population or employment densities to consider basic fixed-route transit services (i.e., fixed-route bus service).



Map 2-16: Future Land Use



Map 2-17: Future Land Use Local Activity Centers, Regional Activity Centers, and Transit-Oriented Areas





- *High* Reflects high population or employment densities that may be able to support higher levels of transit investment than areas that meet only the minimum density threshold (i.e., increased frequencies).
- *Very High* Reflects very high population or employment densities that may be able to support higher levels of transit investment than areas that meet the minimum or high density thresholds (i.e., premium transit services, etc.).

Table 2-18 presents the density thresholds for each of the noted categories.

| Transit Mode | Population Density Threshold ¹ | Employment Density Threshold ² |
|--------------|--|--|
| Minimum | 4.5–5 dwelling units/acre | 4 employees/acre |
| High | 6–7 dwelling units/acre | 5–6 employees/acre |
| Very High | >=8 dwelling units/acre | >=7 employees/acre |

Table 2-18Transit Service Density Threshold

¹ TRB, National Research Council, Transportation Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) Report 16, Volume 1 (1996), *Transit and Land Use Form*, November 2002, MTC Resolution 3434 TOD Policy for Regional Transit Expansion Projects.

² Based on a review of research on the relationship between transit technology and employment densities.

Map 2-18 and 2-19 illustrates high and very high threshold areas identified in the 2013 DTA analysis. As shown on the map, there are many areas in Broward County that qualify as transit-supportive in terms of density, including areas of Deerfield Beach, Pompano Beach, Fort Lauderdale, Sunrise, Coral Springs, Plantation, and Hollywood. Each of these areas is currently served by transit and should continue to be transit emphasis areas in the future. Weston and Davie appear to be less transit supportive than these other locations in Broward County.









Evaluation of Existing Transit System



3 1995 1997 1999 2001 2003 2005

(This page intentionally left blank.)

Evaluation of Existing Transit System

Section 3

Section 3 includes an overview of the existing transit system and is divided into four main components:

- Existing service A description of those services offered by BCT as well as those transit services that interact with and impact BCT's transit services.
- Trend analysis Comparison of BCT's performance over time.
- Peer analysis Comparison of BCT's performance to other similar transit agencies' performance.
- Organization and governmental assessment Examination of BCT's staffing structure and levels as compared to other transit agencies' staffing levels.

EXISTING SERVICE

Included under existing service are those services offered by BCT: fixed-route services, Community Bus service, and paratransit service. It also includes a description of services offered by other providers that impact and interact with BCT.

FIXED-ROUTE SERVICE

BCT provides public transportation services in Broward County. Fixed-route bus services include 42 weekday routes, 30 Saturday routes, and 28 Sunday routes providing 13.7 million miles of service annually. Fixed routes provide connections to the community's multimodal transportation network as well as to system-wide connections at four transfer terminals: Broward Central Terminal (downtown Fort Lauderdale), West Regional Terminal (Plantation), Lauderhill Mall Transfer Facility (Lauderhill), and Northeast Transit Center (Pompano Beach). Major transfer locations can be found at Miramar Town Center, Golden glades, Aventura Mall, Young Circle, Fort Lauderdale – Hollywood International Airport Tri-Rail, Sawgrass Mills Mall, Galt Ocean Mile, and Pompano Citi Center.

The standard one-way fare on BCT is \$1.75. An unlimited daily pass is \$4, an unlimited 7-Day pass is \$16, a 10-Ride pass is \$16, and a 31-Day unlimited pass is \$58. BCT provided 37,917,737 passenger trips in FY 2012. Historical ridership data from the National Transit Database (NTD) are shown in Figure 3-1. Ridership has grown steadily since 1987, with significant growth occurring since 2000. Figure 3-2 depicts a comparison of the percent change in ridership and population since 1987. As shown in the figure, BCT ridership has grown as a rate that significantly outpaces population growth during the same time period.

In addition to regular fixed-route bus services, BCT also operates Breeze and express service, coordinates Community Bus service, and provides paratransit service. Map 3-1 displays BCT's Breeze, fixed-route local, express, and Community Bus network. Breeze serves limited stops along the route at major intersections only, with headways of 30 minutes during morning and afternoon peak travel hours.



Express bus service travels along the major interstate highways to downtown Fort Lauderdale and Miami on weekdays during morning and afternoon peak travel hours. Free commuter park-and-ride locations are available for express bus riders.



Figure 3-1 BCT Fixed-Route Bus Historical Ridership Data (1987–2012)

Source: National Transit Database



Figure 3-2 BCT Ridership and Broward County Population Growth (1987–2012)

Source: Broward County Transit Division





CONNECTED

As of April 2013, BCT services cover an area of approximately 410 square miles with a total active fleet of 320 fixed-route buses, 76 community buses, and 238 paratransit vehicles in contracted service. Table 3-1 outlines service characteristics as of the first quarter of 2013 and FY 2012 ridership information for BCT's fixed-route local bus, Breeze, and express bus services by route.

BCT also provides links to the transit systems in Miami-Dade and Palm Beach counties and to Tri-Rail commuter rail service. BCT Routes 10 and 18 connect with Palm Tran in Palm Beach County. Routes 1, 2, 18, 28, US 1 Breeze, 441 Breeze, University Breeze, 95 Express—Hollywood, 95 Express—Pembroke Pines, 95 Express—Miramar, 595 Express—Sunrise to Miami/Brickell, and 595 Express—Westgate Square to Miami Civic Center connect to Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) in Miami-Dade County.

BCT does not have a robust and reliable means of tracking transfers among the Southeast Florida agencies. A system-wide Origin-Destination (OD) study conducted in 2010 considered inter-agency transfers as part of the BCT Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA). This analysis flagged origin or destination information that contained an address outside of Broward County. In an analysis of district-to-district flows, the OD study found that transfers between Broward County and Palm Beach County accounted for 0.9 percent of total trips. Transfers between Broward County and Miami-Dade County occurred at a slightly higher rate—4.5 percent of total trips. Additionally, the on-board survey conducted as part of the 2014–2023 TDP asks questions about inter-agency transfers.

| Route | Route Name | FY 2012 Passenger Trips | Days and Hours of Operation | | Frequency | |
|-------|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | Aventura Mall to Broward Central Terminal | | Weekday | 5:05 am - 12:00 am | 15 min | |
| 1 | | 2,445,919 | Saturday | 5:15 am - 12:00 am | 20 | |
| | via US 1 | | Sunday | 6:45 am - 10:00 pm | 20 min | |
| 2 | 207th Street to Westview Drive via | 2 042 512 | Weekday | 5:00 am - 12:25 am | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak | |
| 2 | 2 University Drive | 2,042,512 | Saturday | 5:20 am - 12:20 am | 30 min | |
| | | | Sunday | 7:55 am - 8:50 pm | 60 min | |
| | Hallandale Beach Boulevard to Fort | | Weekday | 5:15 am - 10:20 pm | | |
| 4 | Lauderdale/Hollywood Airport Tri-Rail | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Saturday | 6:00 am - 9:35 pm | 45 min | |
| | Station via A1A | | Sunday | 8:15 am - 8:50 pm | | |
| 5 | Pembroke Lakes Mall to Hallandale Beach | 102.020 | Weekday | 6:00 am - 10:15 pm | 30 min peak / 45 min off-peak | |
| 5 | City Hall via Pembroke Road | 492,626 | Saturday | 7:00 am - 9:50 pm | 60 min | |
| | | | Sunday | 8:00 am - 8:50 pm | 60 min | |
| | County Line Dood & Divis Llighter to | 637,018 | Weekday | 5:15 am - 10:55 pm | 30 min | |
| 6 | County Line Road & Dixie Highway to Broward Central Terminal | | Saturday | 5:20 am - 10:55 pm | 60 min | |
| | Browaru Central Terminal | | Sunday | 8:20 am - 9:05 pm | 60 min | |

Table 3-1 BCT Fixed-Route Bus Operating Characteristics (2013)

| Route | Route Name | FY 2012 Passenger Trips | Days and Hours of Operation | | Frequency |
|-------|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | US 27 & Pines Boulevard to Young Circle via | | Weekday | 5:00 am - 11:20 pm | 20 min |
| 7 | Hollywood/Pines Boulevard | 1,452,907 | Saturday | 5:00 am - 11:15 pm | 30 min |
| | Honywood/Thes Boulevard | | Sunday | 8:45 am - 9:28 pm | 30 1111 |
| | | | Weekday | 5:30 am - 10:15 pm | 45 min |
| 9 | Young Circle to Broward Central Terminal | 628,633 | Saturday | 5:50 am - 10:20 pm | 60 min |
| | | | Sunday | 8:30 am - 8:10 pm | 001111 |
| | Broward Central Terminal to Camino Real | | Weekday | 5:21 am - 11:37 pm | 30 min |
| 10 | and Dixie Highway via US 1 | 1,289,047 | Saturday | 5:10 am - 11:10 pm | 50 1111 |
| | | | Sunday | 8:20 am - 8:45 pm | 40 min |
| | Broward Central Terminal to Copans Road | | Weekday | 5:00 am - 11:15 pm | 30 min |
| 11 | & US 1; Broward Central Terminal to | 1,030,395 | Saturday | 5:00 am - 11:15 pm | 40 min |
| | Commercial Boulevard & Highway 441 | | Sunday | 7:00 am - 9:15 pm | 45 min |
| | | | Weekday | 5:20 am - 8:04 pm | 45 min |
| 12 | onal Terminal to North Beach Park via Sherio | 582,411 | Saturday | 6:00 am - 8:13 pm | 60 min |
| | | | Sunday | 10:00 am - 7:41 pm | 00 11111 |
| 14 | Broward Central Terminal - Oakland Park Boulevard - McNab Road - Copans Road - | 1 1 4 6 70 4 | Weekday | 5:00 am - 10:51 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| 14 | Hillsboro Boulevard | 1,146,794 | Saturday | 5:30 am - 10:50 pm | 40 min |
| | HIISDOLO BOULEVALO | | Sunday | 9:00 am - 7:55 pm | 60 min |
| 15 | Griffin Road to County Line Road—Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood Airport Tri-Rail Station | 43,278 | Weekday | 6:00 am - 10:00 am / 3:00 pm - 7:00 pm | 60 min |
| 16 | Pembroke Lakes Mall to Dania Beach City Hall | 299,156 | Monday - Saturday | 6:00 am - 8:50 pm | 30 min peak / 60 min off-peak |
| | | | Weekday | 4:40 am - 12:35 am | 15 min |
| 18 | Golden Glades Park-and-Ride to Sandalfoot | 4,779,008 | Saturday | 5:00 am - 12:30 am | 20 min |
| | Cove Boulevard & Highway 441 | | Sunday | 6:00 am - 11:01 pm | 30 min |
| | | | Weekday | 5:40 am - 9:50 pm | 45 min |
| 20 | Broward Central Terminal to North Broward | 364,831 | Saturday | 6:00 am - 8:50 pm | CO min |
| | Hospital | | Sunday | 10:00 am - 7:45 pm | 60 min |
| | Sources Mills to Drouged Control | | Weekday | 5:00 am - 11:55 pm | 15 min |
| 22 | Sawgrass Mills to Broward Central | 1,410,155 | Saturday | 5:25 am - 11:35 pm | 20 min |
| | Terminal via Broward Boulevard | | Sunday | 8:10 am - 9:50 pm | 30 min |
| 23 | Pembroke Lakes Mall to Sawgrass Mills | 77,151 | Weekday | 6:30 am - 10:20 am / 3:30 pm - 7:20 pm | 60 min |
| 20 | Memorial Hospital Miramar to Aventura | | Weekday | 5:10 am - 11:40 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| 28 | Mall | 1,478,451 | Saturday | 6:00 am - 11:40 pm | 30 min |
| | | | Sunday | 9:00 am - 8:30 pm | 45 min |
| | West Designal Terminal to Drows of Control | | Weekday | 5:30 am - 10:35 pm | 20 min |
| 30 | West Regional Terminal to Broward Central Terminal via Peters Road/Davie Boulevard | 773,914 | Saturday | 6:00 am - 10:35 pm | 30 min |
| | | | Sunday | 9:30 am - 7:05 pm | 45 min |
| 24 | Broward Central Terminal - BCC North | 1,121,488 | Weekday | 5:05 am - 10:55 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| 31 | Campus - Hillsboro Boulevard & Lyons | | Saturday | 5:35 am - 10:55 pm | |
| | Road | | Sunday | 9:00 am - 8:55 pm | 45 min |

Table 3-1 (Continued)BCT Fixed-Route Bus Operating Characteristics (2013)



Table 3-1 (Continued)BCT Fixed-Route Bus Operating Characteristics (2013)

| Route | Route Name | FY 2012 Passenger Trips | Days and Hours of Operation | | Frequency |
|-------|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| 34 | Sample Road & Coral Ridge Drive to Sample | 1,052,079 | Weekday | 5:00 am - 10:45 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| 54 | Road & US 1 | 1,032,079 | Saturday | 5:40 am - 9:45 pm | 40 min |
| | | | Sunday | 7:55 am - 7:45 pm | 60 min |
| | Sawgrass Mills - Galt Ocean Mile via | | Weekday | 5:10 am - 12:00 am | 20 min |
| 36 | Sawgrass Mins - Gart Ocean Mine Ma | 1,818,214 | Saturday | 5:40 am - 12:00 am | 30 min |
| | Sumise Boulevaru | | Sunday | 7:20 am - 9:00 pm | 30 11111 |
| 40 | Lauderhill Mall to Galleria Mall via | 1,284,104 | Weekday | 5:30 am - 11:25 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| | Sistrunk Boulevard/17 Street Causeway/A1A | 1,201,101 | Saturday | 5:30 am - 11:00 pm | 30 min |
| | | | Sunday | 7:40 am - 8:05 pm | 40 min |
| | Atlantic Boulovard & Caral Bidgo Drive to | | Weekday | 5:20 am - 11:00 pm | 30 min |
| 42 | Atlantic Boulevard & Coral Ridge Drive to Atlantic Boulevard & A1A | 719,800 | Saturday | 5:40 am - 10:15 pm | 60 min |
| | Attailtic Boulevalu & AIA | | Sunday | 8:45 am - 8:20 pm | 60 mm |
| 48 | US 441 to A1A via Hillshore Deulovard | 212 207 | Weekday | 5:40 am - 8:57 pm | 4E min |
| 40 | US 441 to A1A via Hillsboro Boulevard | 212,397 | Saturday | 6:15 am - 8:57 pm | 45 min |
| 50 | Broward Central Terminal - Sample Road & | 1 401 422 | Weekday | 5:20 am - 10:58 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| 50 | Dixie Highway - Deerfield Beach/A1A | 1,401,433 | Saturday | 5:30 am - 11:00 pm | 45 |
| | | | Sunday | 7:45 am - 8:55 pm | 45 min |
| | Hiatus Road to A1A via Commercial | 017 420 | Weekday | 5:05 am - 9:50 pm | 30 min |
| 55 | Boulevard | 817,438 | Saturday | 6:00 am - 9:30 pm | 45 min |
| 60 | Broward Central Terminal to Highway 441 | 1,325,645 - | Weekday | 5:26 am - 10:52 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| 60 | & NW 15th Street via Andrews Avenue and | | Saturday | 5:30 am - 11:11 pm | 30 min |
| | MLK Boulevard/Coconut Creek Pkwy | | Sunday | 9:05 am - 7:58 pm | 45 min |
| | Westign Drive & University Drive to NE C2 | | Weekday | 5:00 am - 9:41 pm | 40 min |
| 62 | Westview Drive & University Drive to NE 62 Street & US 1 | 692,797 | Saturday | 6:20 am - 8:11 pm | 60 · |
| | Street & US 1 | | Sunday | 8:20 am - 8:05 pm | 60 min |
| | Courses Mills to Calt Ocean Mile 9, 414 | | Weekday | 5:00 am - 12:35 am | 15 min |
| 72 | Sawgrass Mills to Galt Ocean Mile & A1A via Oakland Park Boulevard | 2,695,643 | Saturday | 5:35 am - 12:35 am | 20 min |
| | via Oakialiu Park Boulevalu | | Sunday | 8:10 am - 9:55 pm | 30 min |
| 81 | Broward Central Terminal - Lauderhill Mall - | 1 204 402 | Weekday | 5:10 am - 11:35 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| 01 | NW 36 Street & NW 43 Avenue | 1,394,493 | Saturday | 5:40 am - 11:35 pm | 30 min |
| | | | Sunday | 8:00 am - 8:55 pm | 45 min |
| | Coral Ridge Drive & Sample Road to | | Weekday | 5:40 am - 9:25 pm | 30 min peak / 40 min off-peak |
| 83 | Pompano City Centre via Royal Palm Boulevard/Copans Road | 381,313 | Saturday | 6:20 am - 9:05 pm | 60 min |
| | | | Sunday | 9:00 am - 7:45 pm | 50 min |
| | Broward Central Terminal to Highway 441 | 1,325,645 | Weekday | 5:26 am - 10:52 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| 60 | & NW 15th Street via Andrews Avenue and MLK Boulevard/Coconut Creek Pkwy | | Saturday | 5:30 am - 11:11 pm | 30 min |
| | | | Sunday | 9:05 am - 7:58 pm | 45 min |
| | | <u> </u> | Weekday | 5:00 am - 9:41 pm | 40 min |
| 62 | Westview Drive & University Drive to NE 62 | 692,797 | Saturday | 6:20 am - 8:11 pm | 60 min |
| 62 | Street & US 1 | | Sunday | 8:20 am - 8:05 pm | |

| Route | Route Name | FY 2012 Passenger Trips | Days and Hours of Operation | | Frequency |
|-------|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | Sources Mills to Colt Occor Mile 9 414 | | Weekday | 5:00 am - 12:35 am | 15 min |
| 72 | Sawgrass Mills to Galt Ocean Mile & A1A | 2,695,643 | Saturday | 5:35 am - 12:35 am | 20 min |
| | via Oakland Park Boulevard | | Sunday | 8:10 am - 9:55 pm | 30 min |
| 81 | Broward Central Terminal - Lauderhill Mall - | | Weekday | 5:10 am - 11:35 pm | 20 min peak / 30 min off-peak |
| 01 | NW 36 Street & NW 43 Avenue | 1,394,493 | Saturday | 5:40 am - 11:35 pm | 30 min |
| | | | Sunday | 8:00 am - 8:55 pm | 45 min |
| 83 | Coral Ridge Drive & Sample Road to Pompano City Centre via Royal Palm | 381,313 | Weekday | 5:40 am - 9:25 pm | 30 min peak / 40 min off-peak |
| 05 | Boulevard/Copans Road | 501,515 | Saturday | 6:20 am - 9:05 pm | 60 min |
| | Boulevaru/Copalis Road | | Sunday | 9:00 am - 7:45 pm | 50 min |
| 88 | West Regional Terminal to Holmberg Road & Coral Ridge Drive via Pine Island Road/Coral Springs Drive | 247,506 | Weekday | 6:00 am - 8:45 pm | 30 min peak / 60 min off-peak |
| 101 | US 1 Breeze | 272,581 | Weekday | 6:00 am - 9:26 am / 3:50 pm - 7:23 pm | 30 min |
| 102 | University Breeze | 269,907 | Weekday | 5:30 am - 9:21 am / 3:30 pm - 7:25 pm | 30 min |
| 107 | 95 Express—Hollywood | 87,114 | Weekday | 5:30 am - 9:47 am / 3:42 pm - 7:44 pm | 30 min |
| 108 | 95 Express—Miramar | 239,225 | Weekday | 5:45 am - 9:09 am / 3:07 pm - 8:16 pm | 15 min |
| 109 | 95 Express—Pembroke Pines | N/A | Weekday | 5:40 am - 9:43 am / 3:38 pm - 7:27 pm | 15 min peak/ 30 min off-peak |
| 110 | 595 Express—Sunrise to Miami/Brickell | 9,918 | Weekday | 5:10 am - 9:23 am / 3:05 pm - 7:56 pm | 30 min |
| 112 | 595 Express—Sunrise to Fort Lauderdale | 3,771 | Weekday | 6:00 am - 9:28 am / 3:30 pm - 7:31 pm | 30 min |
| 114 | 595 Express—Westgate Square to Miami Civic Center | N/A | Weekday | 5:20 am - 9:17 am / 3:10 pm - 8:39 pm | 30 min |
| 441 | 441 Breeze | 562,045 | Weekday | 5:07 am - 11:03 am / 2:37 pm - 7:52 pm | 30 min |

Table 3-1 (Continued)BCT Fixed-Route Bus Operating Characteristics (2013)

Source: Broward County Transit Division

COMMUNITY BUS SERVICE

Broward County Community Bus (BCCB) service operates in partnership with 18 Broward County municipalities to provide 50 routes. Community buses serve residential areas, freeing larger fixed-route buses to travel along major thoroughfares as part of a regional bus network. BCCB routes provide local circulation to passengers traveling short distances, as well as "first-mile" and "last-mile" connections to BCT fixed routes. BCCB service is designed to increase the number of destinations within city limits that residents can access through public transit. All community buses connect to BCT fixed routes, are wheelchair accessible, and are equipped with bike racks. BCCB provided 2,370,715 passenger trips in FY



2012. Figure 3-3 shows historical ridership trends for BCCB since 1990. Rapid ridership growth has occurred since 2001. Table 3-2 outlines BCCB service characteristics.



Figure 3-3 BCCB Historical Ridership Data (1990-2012)

Source: National Transit Database

| Route | Days and Hours of Operation | | Frequency | Fare |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------|
| Coconut Creek North | Monday - Saturday | 7:00 am - 6:00 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Coconut Creek South | Monday - Saturday | 6:30 am - 6:02 pm | 60 min | Free |
| | Weekday | 8:00 am - 5:55 pm | 60 min | \$0.50 |
| Coral Springs Blue | Saturday | 8:00 am - 4:55 pm | 60 min | \$0.50 |
| | Sunday | 12:00 pm - 4:55 pm | 60 min | \$0.50 |
| | Weekday | 8:00 am - 5:54 pm | 60 min | \$0.50 |
| Coral Springs Green | Saturday | 8:00 am - 4:54 pm | 60 min | \$0.50 |
| | Sunday | 12:00 pm - 4:54 pm | 60 min | \$0.50 |
| Dania Beach East | Monday - Saturday | 9:00 am - 5:30 pm | 30 min | Free |
| Dania Beach West | Monday - Saturday | 9:00 am - 5:47 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Devie Dive | Weekday | 5:50 am - 7:40 pm | 45 min | Free |
| Davie Blue | Saturday | 8:00 am - 6:05 pm | 45 min | Free |
| Davia Crean | Weekday | 7:00 am - 7:54 pm | 90 min | Free |
| Davie Green | Saturday | 8:00 am - 4:45 pm | 95 min | Free |
| Davie SFEC—Tri-Rail Express | Weekday | 6:45 am - 8:30 pm | 30 min | Free |
| Deerfield Beach Express I | Weekday | 8:00 am - 4:00 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Deerfield Beach Express II | Weekday | 8:00 am - 4:00 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Fort Lauderdale Convention Connection | Friday - Monday | 9:30 am - 6:30 pm | 30 min | \$0.50 |

Table 3-2BCCB Operating Characteristics (2013)

| Route | Days and Hours of Operation | | Frequency | Fare |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Fort Lauderdale Courthouse Loop | Weekday | 7:30 am - 5:50 pm | 20 min | Free |
| Fort Lauderdale Galt Ocean Mile A | Monday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday, | 8:30 am - 4:30 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Fort Lauderdale Galt Ocean Mile B | Monday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday, | 8:30 am - 4:30 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Fort Lauderdale Las Olas/Beaches | Friday - Monday | 9:30 am - 6:30 pm | 30 min | \$0.50 |
| Fort Lauderdale Neighborhood Link | Weekday | 8:30 am - 2:45 pm | 95 min | Free |
| Hallandale Route 1 | Monday - Saturday | 7:00 am - 7:00 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Hallandale Route 2 | Monday - Saturday | 7:00 am - 7:00 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Hallandale Route 3 | Monday - Saturday | 7:00 am - 7:00 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Hillsboro Beach | Weekday | 9:00 am - 4:50 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Lauderdale Lakes East/West | Weekday | 9:00 am - 5:53 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Lauderdale Lakes North/South | Weekday | 9:00 am -5:55 pm | 60 min | Free |
| | Weekday | 9:00 am - 5:25 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Lauderdale-By-the-Sea Pelican | Saturday | 10:00 am - 7:55 pm | 45 min | Free |
| Hopper | Sunday | 8:00 am - 6:00 pm | 30 min | Free |
| Lauderhill Route 1 | Weekday | 6:30 am - 6:30 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Lauderhill Route 2 | Weekday | 6:30 am - 6:30 pm | 30 min | Free |
| Lauderhill Route 3 | Weekday | 6:30 am - 6:30 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Lauderhill Route 4 | Weekday | 6:30 am - 6:30 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Lauderhill Route 5 | Weekday | 8:30 am - 8:30 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Lighthouse Point | Weekday | 9:00 am - 3:25 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Margate Route A | Weekday | 7:30 am - 4:30 pm | 60 min | \$0.75 |
| Margate Route C | Weekday | 7:30 am - 4:30 pm | 60 min | \$0.75 \$0.75 |
| Margate Route D | Weekday | 7:20 am - 4:20 pm | 60 min | \$0.75 |
| Miramar Green | Weekday | 6:15 am - 6:15 pm | 80 min | Free |
| Miramar Orange | Weekday | 6:30 am - 6:26 pm | 90 min | Free |
| Miramar Red | Weekday | 6:30 am - 6:30 pm | 80 min | Free |
| Miramar Yellow | Weekday | 7:00 am - 7:00 pm | 72 min | Free |
| Pembroke Pines Blue West | Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday | 9:00 am - 3:15 pm | 75 min | Free |
| Pembroke Pines Blue East | Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday | 8:00 am - 3:25 pm | 90 min | Free |
| Pembroke Pines Gold | Monday - Saturday | 7:00 am - 7:28 pm | 30/60 min | Free |
| Pembroke Pines Green | Monday - Saturday | 7:38 am - 7:37 pm | 60 min | Free |
| | Weekday | 7:10 am - 7:45 pm | 45 min | Free |
| Plantation Routes A | Saturday | 8:10 am - 5:00 pm | 90 min | Free |
| | Weekday | 7:00 am - 7:35 pm | 45 min | Free |
| Plantation Route B | Saturday | 8:00 am - 4:50 pm | 90 min | Free |
| Pompano Beach Blue | Weekday | 8:45 am - 4:42 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Pompano Beach Green | Weekday | 9:00 am - 4:52 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Pompano Beach Red | Weekday | 9:05 am - 5:02 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Pompano Beach Orange | Weekday | 9:00 am - 4:57 pm | 60 min | Free |
| Sunrise Lakes | Weekday | 6:30 am - 7:10 pm | 45 min | Free |
| Tamarac Red | Weekday | 7:00 am - 6:55 pm | 60 min | \$0.50 |
| Tamarac Yellow | Tuesday & Thursday | 9:00 am - 4:56 pm | 60 min | \$0.50 \$0.50 |

Table 3-2 (Continued)BCT Community Bus Operating Characteristics (2013)

Source: Broward County Transit Division



TOPS

BCT also offers TOPS (Transportation Options) complementary paratransit service for qualified individuals with disabilities. The service is for persons with physical, cognitive, emotional, visual, or other disabilities that functionally prevent them from using the BCT fixed-route bus system. TOPS service is available during BCT's fixed-route hours of service, and reservations must be made in advance. The estimated travel time of a TOPS trip is similar to the same trip, including transfers, if made by a fixed-route bus. The one-way fare per trip is \$3.50. Additionally, any registered TOPS rider with current eligibility may use the fixed-route service free of charge. In 2011, 685,998 passenger trips were made on TOPS.

OTHER TRANSIT OPTIONS

This section includes information from several other transit options in the region. These options include the following:

- South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA),
- MDT,
- Metrobus,
- Metrorail,
- Metromover,
- Special Transportation Service (STS),
- Palm Tran, and
- Private Transportation Service Providers.

South Florida Regional Transportation Authority

SFRTA operates Tri-Rail commuter rail services in Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties. The rail line goes as far south as Miami International Airport and as far north as Mangonia Park in Palm Beach County. Service operates from 4:00 AM until 11:35 PM with a peak frequency of approximately 30 minutes. Service runs every 120 minutes on weekends and holidays. The Tri-Rail system comprises six zones. Weekday fare is determined by the number of zones through which a passenger travels. Fares range from \$2.50 to \$6.90 per one-way trip and \$4.40 to \$11.55 per round trip. SFRTA also operates shuttle bus services from many of its stations to areas surrounding the rail stations and the airport. These shuttle buses offer free and convenient service for Tri-Rail riders.

There are seven rail stations within Broward County, and BCT serves each station. Table 3-3 describes the location of Tri-Rail stations in Broward County and the routes serving them. Historical ridership data

for Tri-Rail and SFRTA shuttle bus services can be found in Figures 3-4 and 3-5. Map 3-2 shows Tri-Rail and MDT Metrorail service in Southeast Florida.

| | | | DOT | DCCD | MDT |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Tri-Rail Station | Street Address | SFRTA Shuttle Bus | BCT | BCCB | MDT |
| | 1300 W Hillsboro | | | Deerfield Beach | |
| Deerfield Beach Station | Boulevard | DB1, DB2 | 48 | Express II | - |
| Pompano Beach Station | 3491 NW 8th Avenue | PB1 | 34 | - | - |
| Cypress Creek Station | 6151 N Andrews Way | CC1, CC2, CC3 | 60, 62 | - | - |
| | | | 9, 22, 81, 595 | | |
| | | | Express-Sunrise to Fort | TMA-Fort Lauderdale | |
| Fort Lauderdale Station | 200 SW 21st Terrace | FL1, FL2, FL3 | Lauderdale | Neighborhood Link | 95 Express |
| Fort Lauderdale/ Hollywood | | | 4, 6, 15, 16, | | |
| Intl. Airport at Dania Beach | | | 595 Express–Sunrise to | Dania Beach East | |
| Station | 500 Gulf Stream Way | FLA1, SFEC | Miami/Brickell | West | - |
| Sheridan Street Station | 2900 Sheridan Street | SS1 | 12 | - | 95 Express |
| | 3001 Hollywood | | 7, 95 Express- | | |
| Hollywood Station | Boulevard | - | Hollywood | Hallandale Beach 3 | - |

Table 3-3Broward County Tri-Rail Stations

Source: Broward County Transit Division, SFRTA, and Miami-Dade Transit





Source: National Transit Database





Figure 3-5 SFRTA Shuttle Bus Historical Ridership Data (2004–2011)

Source: National Transit Database

Miami-Dade Transit

MDT, a department of Miami-Dade County government, is the largest transit agency in Florida. It operates fixed-route bus service known as Metrobus; a 24.4-mile elevated heavy rail system known as Metrorail; a 4.4-mile, elevated, electric people-mover system known as Metromover; and paratransit service called STS. MDT's regular fixed-route fare is \$2, and monthly passes are \$100. In 2011, MDT provided a system-wide total of 103,025,698 passenger trips.

Metrobus

Metrobus offers countywide service from Miami Beach to West Miami-Dade and from the Middle Keys to Broward Boulevard in Broward County. All buses are wheelchair accessible. In addition, Metrobus connects with Metrorail and Metromover. More than 90 Metrobus routes travel approximately 29 million miles per year using 800+ buses. Several bus routes operate 24 hours per day and 3 routes provide overnight service between 11:00 PM and 6:00 AM. MDT Route 105 E and Route 95 Dade-Broward Express travel into Broward County, as shown in Map 3-2. Figure 3-6 shows historical ridership data for MDT Metrobus services.

Draft Transit Development Plan







Figure 3-6 MDT Metrobus Historical Ridership Data (1984–2011)

Source: National Transit Database

Metrorail

Miami-Dade County's 24.4-mile elevated rail system runs from Kendall through South Miami, Coral Gables, and downtown Miami to the Civic Center/Jackson Memorial Hospital area, and to Brownsville, Liberty City, Hialeah, and Medley in northwest Miami-Dade, with connections to Broward and Palm Beach counties at the Tri-Rail/Metrorail transfer station. Metrorail trains run from Dadeland South Metrorail station to either the new MIA Metrorail station (Orange Line) or the Palmetto Metrorail station (Green Line). The 23 accessible Metrorail stations are about one mile apart, providing easy access for bus riders, pedestrians, and passengers dropped off and picked up. Metrorail operates from 5:00 AM to 12:00 midnight seven days per week. Trains arrive every 10 minutes during weekday peak hours, every 15 minutes at midday, every 30 minutes from about 7:30 PM until closing, and every 30 minutes on weekends. Figure 3-7 presents historical ridership data for Metrorail.

Metromover

Metromover is a 4.4-mile elevated electric people-mover system. The Metromover inner loop and outer loop to Omni and Brickell operate in the downtown Miami area. Trains run from 5:00 AM to 12:00 midnight seven days per week. Trains arrive frequently, and all fares are free on the Metromover. Figure 3-8 shows historical ridership data for Metromover.


Figure 3-7 MDT Metrorail Historical Ridership Data (1984–2011)



Figure 3-8 MDT Metromover Historical Ridership Data (1986–2011)



Special Transportation Service

STS is MDT's complementary paratransit service. Established in 1976 to meet the special transportation needs of Miami-Dade County's citizens with disabilities, STS is available to anyone deemed eligible. Privately-contracted sedans, vans, and vans equipped with lifts provide door-to-door service for eligible customers. Service is offered with no restrictions on trip purpose. Passengers made 1,593,806 trips on STS in 2011.

Palm Tran

Palm Tran, a department of Palm Beach County, currently operates 34 fixed routes. Palm Tran runs seven days per week and provides more than 10 million trips per year. Generally speaking, weekday peak service runs every 30 minutes, and off-peak and weekend service runs every 60 minutes. The majority of service is concentrated in the eastern portions of the county as far north as Jupiter and as far south as Boca Raton. Three routes (1, 91, and 92) provide connections with BCT Routes 10 and 18. Palm Tran Route 92 travels into Broward County. The standard one-way fare on Palm Tran buses is \$1.50, 1-Day passes are \$4, and 31-Day passes are \$60. Historical ridership data for Palm Tran are shown in Figure 3-9.



Figure 3-9 Palm Tran Fixed-Route Bus Historical Ridership Data (1984–2011)

Source: National Transit Database

In addition to its directly-operated service, Palm Tran also serves as the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) and provides demand response service known as Palm Tran Connection. Connection is a shared ride, door-to-door paratransit service that provides transportation for residents and visitors in Palm Beach County with disabilities. Connection travels in Palm Beach County from Jupiter to Boca Raton and from Palm Beach to South Bay. The fare is \$3 for each one-way trip. A total of 913,057 paratransit trips were made on Palm Tran Connection in 2011.

Private Transportation Service Providers

This section includes an inventory of existing private transportation service providers in Broward County. Each provider was contacted by email, mail, or telephone to obtain information about its transportation services. A short questionnaire was prepared for each provider to complete. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix B. Table 3-4 includes information for agencies that completed the questionnaire. Of the 65 service providers contacted, seven returned a completed form. Service providers that did not respond to the questionnaire are listed in Table 3-5.



CONNECTED

 Table 3-4

 Broward County Private Transportation Service Providers: Survey Responses

| Name | Address | Туре | Service Area | Service Period | Annual Ridership | Regular Fare | Vehicles in Maximum Service | Coordinate with Broward County |
|---|--|------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| City of Deerfield Beach Dept of Senior Services/ Northeast Focal Point Senior Center | 227 NW 2nd St, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441 | Fixed Route, Demand Response | Northeast Broward County | Weekdays, 8:30 am – 4:30 pm | 70,000 | Free (donation accepted) | 8 | Yes |
| City of Hallandale Beach Human Services Department | 750 NW 8th Ave, Hallandale Beach, FL 33009 | Fixed Route | Hallandale Beach | Weekdays, 8:00 am – 6:00 pm | 44,460 | Free | 5 | Yes |
| City of Lauderhill | 7500 W Oakland Park Blvd, Lauderhill, FL 33313 | Fixed Route, Demand Response | Lauderhill | Weekdays, 6:30 am – 8:30 pm | 334,100 | Free | 7 | Yes |
| City of Tamarac Senior Center | 6001 Nob Hill Rd, Tamarac, FL 33321 | Fixed Route, Demand | Tamarac | Weekdays, 7:00 am – 7:00 pm | 88,416 | \$0.50 | 9 | Yes |
| Joseph Meyerhoff Senior Center/ Southeast Focal | 3081 Taft St, Hollywood, FL 33021 | Fixed Route | Dade County Line–Griffin Road | Daily, 8:00 am – 4:00 pm | 29,469 | Free | 4 | Yes |
| Southwest Focal Point | 301 NW 103rd Ave, Pembroke Pines, FL | Fixed Route, Demand | Fixed Route: Pembroke Rd (South), US 27 (West), Taft St (North), University Dr (East); | Fixed Route: Monday - Saturday, 7:00 am – 7:30 pm | 255,000 | Free | 28 | Yes |
| Senior Center 33026 Response County Line Rd (South), US 27 (West), State Rd 84 (North); US 441 (East) | Demand Response: Weekdays, 8:00 am – 4:00 pm | 233,000 | FIEE | 28 | 163 | | | |
| Water Taxi | 413 SW 3rd Ave, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33315 | Water Taxi | Oakland Park Blvd - Hallandale Beach Blvd on Intracoastal, New River to Las Olas Riverfront | Daily, 10:00 am – 12:00 midnight | 500,000 | 20 (1-Day Pass) | 13 | No |

Source: Information collected through questionnaire distributed to each private transportation service provider in Broward County

Evaluation of Existing Transit System 3 – 18

| Business Norse | | City |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Business Name A&B Advance Transportation | Street Address 4060 Galt Ocean Mile | City Fort Lauderdale |
| | | |
| A1A Airport & Limousine | 1990 NW Boca Raton Blvd | Boca Raton |
| ABC Limousine | 300 S Pine Island Rd | Fort Lauderdale |
| ACTS – Agency for Community Treatment Services, Inc. Ambassador Taxi Services, Inc. | 4612 N 56th St 201 W Sunrise Blvd | Tampa Fort Lauderdale |
| Ambassador Taxi Services, Inc. | 3595 NW 110th St | Miami |
| American Taxi | 300 W Sunrise Blvd, #7 | Fort Lauderdale |
| | | |
| AMT – Allied Medical Transport | 5896 Rodman St | Hollywood Fort Lauderdale |
| Ann Storck Center | 1790 SW 43rd Way | |
| ARC Broward-Achievement and Rehabilitation Center | 10250 NW 53rd St | Sunrise |
| Archways, Inc. | 919 NE 13th St | Fort Lauderdale |
| Austin Hepburn Senior Mini Center | 750 NW 8th Ave | Hallandale Beach Fort Lauderdale |
| B & L Service, Inc. dba Yellow Cab of Fort Lauderdale | PO Box 950 | |
| BARC Housing, Inc. | 10250 NW 53rd St | Sunrise |
| Broward Airport Taxi dba Broward Taxi | 2106 N Dixie Hwy | Hollywood |
| Broward Children's Center, Inc. | 200 SE 19th Ave | Pompano Beach |
| Broward County Paratransit Services | 1 N University Dr | Plantation |
| Cerebral Palsy Adult Home, Inc. | 1405 NE 10th St | Dania Beach |
| City of Margate | 6009 NW 10th St | Margate |
| City of Miramar | 6700 Miramar Pkwy | Miramar |
| City of North Lauderdale | 701 SW 71st Ave | North Lauderdale |
| City of Pembroke Pines | 301 NW 103rd Ave | Pembroke Pines |
| Cordiality Transportation | 1500 Weston Rd | Weston |
| Daniel D Cantor Senior Center | 5000 Nob Hill Rd | Sunrise |
| Douglas Gardens North | 705 SW 88th Ave | Pembroke Pines |
| Fred Lippman Multi-Purpose Center | 2030 Polk St | Hollywood |
| Friendly Checker Cab Company | 2223 Pembroke Pines | Hollywood |
| Go Airport Shuttle (Yellow Airport Limousine Service) | 221 W Oakland Park Blvd | Fort Lauderdale |
| Greyhound | 515 NE 3rd St | Fort Lauderdale |
| Gulf Coast Jewish Family & Community Services | 14041 Icot Blvd | Clearwater |
| Henderson Mental Health /John Aquino | 4740 N State Rd | Lauderdale Lakes |
| Inktel Direct – Tops Reservation Center | 13975 NW 58th Ct | Miami Lakes |
| Intercity Taxi | 1255 S Flagler Ave | Pompano Beach |
| Lucanus Developmental Center | 6411 Taft St | Hollywood |
| Medex Transportation, Inc. | 2025 Harding St | Hollywood |
| Medicaid Subcontracted Transportation Provider – | | |
| TMS of Brevard, Inc. | 13825 Icot Blvd, #613 | Clearwater |
| Miramar Satellite Senior Center | 6700 Miramar Pkwy | Miramar |
| Northeast Focal Point Senior Center | 227 NW 2nd St | Deerfield Beach |
| Northwest Focal Point Senior Center | 6009 NW 10th St | Margate |
| NW Federated Woman's Club | 2185 NW 19th St | Fort Lauderdale |
| Quality Community Services, Inc. | 3700 Georgia Ave, #10-C | Palm Beach |

 Table 3-5

 Additional Broward County Private Transportation Service Providers



| , , | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Business Name | Street Address | City | | | |
| Rayfield Family Literacy | 427 S SR 7 | Hollywood | | | |
| Soref Jewish Community Center | 6501 W Sunrise Blvd | Plantation | | | |
| Southeast Focal Point Senior Center | 3081 Taft St | Hollywood | | | |
| St. Elizabeth Gardens | 801 NE 33rd St | Pompano Beach | | | |
| St. Joseph's Tower | 3475 NW 30th St | Lauderdale Lakes | | | |
| Sun Trolley | 305 S Andrews Ave, #710 | Fort Lauderdale | | | |
| Sunrise Community, Inc. | 5450 Stirling Rd | Davie | | | |
| Sunrise Opportunities, Inc. | 5450 Stirling Rd | Davie | | | |
| Super Shuttle | 200 NE 2nd St | Fort Lauderdale | | | |
| Sylvia L. Poitier & Theodora S. Williams Senior Center | 2185 NW 19th St | Fort Lauderdale | | | |
| Tender Loving Care Transportation Services, Inc. | 611 NW 31st Ave | Pompano Beach | | | |
| TMS Management Group, Inc. | 13825 Icot Blvd, #613 | Clearwater | | | |
| Total Intervention Early Services | 4699 N SR 7 | Tamarac | | | |
| United Cerebral Palsy of Broward County, Inc. | 3117 SW 13th Ct | Fort Lauderdale | | | |
| USA Executive Taxi of South Florida | 250 Florida Ave | Fort Lauderdale | | | |
| USA Transportation | 3017 Ravenswood Rd, #103 | Fort Lauderdale | | | |
| Woodhouse, Inc. | 1001 NE 3rd Ave | Pompano Beach | | | |

 Table 3-5 (Continued)

 Additional Broward County Private Transportation Service Providers

Sources: Broward County Transportation Department, Broward MPO, Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged, Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport, Aging & Disability Resource Center of Broward County, Greater Fort Lauderdale Convention & Visitors Bureau

TREND ANALYSIS

A trend analysis of critical performance indicators was conducted to examine the performance of BCT and BCCB fixed-route services over time. Data were compiled from the NTD for FY 2008 to 2012 and represent combined figures of Directly Operated (DO) Motorbus and Purchased Transportation (PT) Motorbus. Data from 2012 were provided by BCT for use in the trend analysis. This analysis includes statistics and tables that present selected performance indicators, effectiveness measures, and efficiency measures for the specified time period. Highlights of the trend analysis are presented below, and summary results are provided at the conclusion of this section.

Three categories of indicators were analyzed for the trend analysis:

- *Performance Indicators* quantity of service supply, passenger and fare revenue generation, and resource input
- *Effectiveness Measures* extent to which the service is effectively provided
- Efficiency Measures extent to which cost efficiency is achieved

FIXED-ROUTE TREND ANALYSIS

Table 3-6 lists the measures used in the performance trend analysis conducted for BCT and BCCB fixedroute bus services. Highlights of the trend analysis are presented in the remainder of this section.

| General Performance | Effectiveness | Efficiency |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Passenger Trips | Vehicle Miles per Capita | Operating Expense per Capita |
| Passenger Miles | Passenger Trips per Capita | Operating Expense per Passenger Trip |
| Vehicle Miles | Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | Operating Expense per Passenger Mile |
| Revenue Miles | Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | Operating Expense per Revenue Mile |
| Total Operating Expense | Average Age of Fleet | Operating Expense per Revenue Hour |
| Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service | Average Headway (in minutes) | Farebox Recovery (%) |
| | Number of Vehicle System Failures | Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile |
| | Revenue Miles Between Failures | Revenue Hours per Employee FTE |
| | Weekday Span of Service (in hours) | Vehicle Miles per Gallon |
| | | Average Fare |

Table 3-6Fixed-Route Performance Review Measures for Trend Analysis (2008–2012)

Performance Indicators

The performance indicators are used to gauge the overall system operating performance. Table 3-7 and Figures 3-10 through 3-15 present the selected performance indicators from 2008 to 2012 for BCT. The following is a summary of the trends for BCT that are evident from the performance indicators analysis.

- Passenger trips for BCT decreased from 38.7 million in 2008 to 37.9 million in 2012, a decrease of 2.1 percent. At the same time, passenger miles increased from 178.2 million to 180.3 million, an increase of 1.2 percent. Service area population remained relatively constant during this time period.
- Total vehicle miles of service decreased slightly between 2008 and 2012. Similarly, revenue miles of service decreased by 4.0 percent during this time period.
- Total operating expense (in current dollars) decreased slightly, from \$99.2 million in 2008 to \$97.4 million in 2012, a decrease of 1.8 percent. When removing the effects of inflation, total operating expenses actually decreased by 14.1 percent.
- The total number of vehicles needed to operate peak service increased slightly from 255 in 2008 to 257 in 2012, an increase of 0.8 percent.



| General Performance Indicator | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | % Change (2008-2012) |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Service Area Population | 1,787,636 | 1,751,234 | 1,766,476 | 1,748,066 | 1,780,172 | -0.4% |
| Passenger Trips | 38,716,000 | 36,805,000 | 36,585,000 | 35,943,000 | 37,917,735 | -2.1% |
| Passenger Miles | 178,201,000 | 166,672,000 | 172,113,000 | 169,764,000 | 180,294,000 | 1.2% |
| Vehicle Miles | 15,942,000 | 15,544,000 | 15,837,000 | 15,291,000 | 15,607,558 | -2.1% |
| Revenue Miles | 14,246,000 | 13,878,000 | 14,049,000 | 13,461,000 | 13,675,110 | -4.0% |
| Total Operating Expense | \$99,228,000 | \$93,434,000 | \$98,323,000 | \$100,025,000 | \$97,432,000 | -1.8% |
| Total Operating Expense | \$99,228,000 | \$90,267,000 | \$91,770,000 | \$90,194,000 | \$85,269,000 | -14.1% |
| (in 2008\$) | | | | | | |
| Vehicles Operated in | 255 | 240 | 249 | 245 | 257 | 0.8% |
| Maximum Service | | | | | | |

Table 3-7 2008–2012 Performance Indicators, BCT Fixed-Route Trend Analysis

Notes: Inflation calculated according to changes in Consumer Price Index. Percent change calculations may vary due to rounding. Source: Integrated National Transit Database Analysis System (INTDAS) component from Florida Transit Information System (FTIS), DO, and PT Motorbus combined statistics











Source: National Transit Database



Source: National Transit Database

Table 3-8 and Figures 3-16 through 3-21 present the selected performance indicators from 2008 to 2012 for BCCB. The following is a summary of performance trends for BCCB.

- Although passenger trips declined after 2008, they rebounded by 2011 and 2012. During the same time period, passenger miles increased from 8.4 million to 8.9 million, an increase of 6.8 percent.
- Total vehicle miles of service declined from 3.1 million miles in 2008 to 2.4 million miles in 2012, a decrease of 23.2 percent. Revenue miles of service decreased by 23.1 percent during this time period.



• Total operating expense (in current dollars) decreased from \$8.9 million in 2008 to \$6.3 million in 2012, a decrease of 29.5 percent. When deflated to year 2008 dollars, total operating expense decreased by 38.3 percent.

• Similar to the trends for vehicle miles and revenue miles, the total number of vehicles needed to operate peak service experienced a 17.1 percent decrease, from 76 vehicles in 2008 to 63 in 2012.

| General Performance Indicator | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | % Change (2008- 2012) |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Passenger Trips | 2,336,414 | 2,155,535 | 2,084,976 | 2,336,302 | 2,370,943 | 1.50% |
| Passenger Miles | 8,399,118 | 7,384,600 | 7,510,610 | 8,660,126 | 8,971,474 | 6.80% |
| Vehicle Miles | 3,095,046 | 2,635,524 | 2,488,608 | 2,529,273 | 2,377,188 | -23.20% |
| Revenue Miles | 2,858,239 | 2,455,051 | 2,322,918 | 2,337,768 | 2,197,997 | -23.10% |
| Total Operating Expense | \$8,917,802 | \$7,373,636 | \$6,701,906 | \$6,460,811 | \$6,287,752 | -29.50% |
| Total Operating Expense (in 2008\$) | \$8,917,802 | \$7,123,670 | \$6,255,219 | \$5,825,769 | \$5,502,769 | -38.30% |
| Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service | 76 | 63 | 58 | 64 | 63 | -17.10% |

Table 3-8 2008–2012 Performance Indicators, BCCB Trend Analysis

Note: Percent change calculations may vary due to rounding.

Source: INTDAS component from FTIS, DO, and PT Motorbus combined statistics.

Figure 3-16



Figure 3-17



Source: National Transit Database



Source: National Transit Database

Effectiveness Measures

Table 3-9 presents four categories of effectiveness measures: service supply, service consumption, quality of service, and service availability. Figures 3-22 through 3-30 present trends in effectiveness for BCT. Effectiveness measures for average age of fleet, average headway, and weekday service span of service are presented for DO and PT separately due to the nature of the reporting format for these three measures. Following is a summary of the trends for BCT that are evident from the analysis of effectiveness measures:

Vehicle miles per capita for BCT decreased from 8.92 miles in 2008 to 8.77 miles in 2012, a decrease of 1.7 percent. For the same time period, passenger trips per capita also decreased by 1.7 percent, from 21.66 trips in 2008 to 21.30 trips in 2012.



- Passenger trips per revenue mile increased slightly from 2.72 trips in 2008 to 2.77 trips in 2012, an increase of 2.0 percent. Passenger trips per revenue hour also increased from 36.83 trips in 2008 to 38.16 trips in 2012, an increase of 3.6 percent.
- Average age of fleet for DO motorbus increased slightly from 5.64 years in 2008 to 5.84 years in 2012.
- Average headway for DO motorbus decreased from 19.13 minutes in 2008 to 17.82 minutes in 2012, indicating an improved system-wide level of service.
- The number of vehicle system failures experienced a decrease from 513 in 2008 to 432 in 2012, which resulted in a 14 percent increase in revenue miles between failures during this time period.
- Weekday span of service remained relatively constant during the five-year period for DO motorbus.

| Effectiveness Measures | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | % Change (2008- 2012) |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------------------|
| Service Supply | | | | | | |
| Vehicle Miles per Capita | 8.92 | 8.88 | 8.97 | 8.75 | 8.77 | -1.70% |
| Service Consumption | | | | | | |
| Passenger Trips per Capita | 21.66 | 21.02 | 20.71 | 20.56 | 21.3 | -1.70% |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 2.72 | 2.65 | 2.6 | 2.67 | 2.77 | 2.00% |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 36.83 | 36.28 | 35.71 | 36.5 | 38.16 | 3.60% |
| Quality of Service | | | | | | |
| Average Age of Fleet (DO) | 5.64 | 5.37 | 5.97 | 5.39 | 5.84 | 3.50% |
| Average Age of Fleet (PT) | 4 | N/A | N/A | 1 | 2 | -50.00% |
| Average Headway (in minutes) (DO) | 19.13 | 18.82 | 19.07 | 18.32 | 17.82 | -6.90% |
| Average Headway (in minutes) (PT) | 10.49 | N/A | N/A | 55.37 | N/A | 428.10% |
| Number of Vehicle System Failures | 513 | 404 | 454 | 461 | 432 | -15.80% |
| Revenue Miles Between Failures | 27,770 | 34,353 | 30,945 | 29,201 | 31,655 | 14.00% |
| Service Availability | | | | | | |
| Weekday Span of Service (in hours) (DO) | 19.97 | 19.97 | 19.97 | 19.92 | 19.92 | -0.30% |
| Weekday Span of Service (in hours) (PT) | 13 | N/A | N/A | 13.33 | 13.33 | 2.60% |

Table 3-9

2008–2012 Effectiveness Measures, BCT Fixed-Route Trend Analysis

Note: Percent change calculations may vary due to rounding.

Source: INTDAS component from FTIS, DO, and PT Motorbus combined statistics, unless otherwise noted.





Source: National Transit Database







Fixed-Route Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile

Source: National Transit Database

Fixed-Route Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour



Source: National Transit Database

Draft Transit Development Plan













Source: National Transit Database

Fixed-Route Revenue Miles Between Failures (000)



Source: National Transit Database

Draft Transit Development Plan



Source: National Transit Database

Table 3-10 presents the four categories of effectiveness measures for BCCB. Figures 3-31 through 3-42 present trends in effectiveness for BCCB. As was the case with fixed-route service data, effectiveness measures for average age of fleet, average headway, and weekday span of service are presented for DO and PT separately due to the nature of the reporting format for these three measures. The following is a summary of the trends in effectiveness measures for BCCB.

- Vehicle miles per capita for BCCB decreased from 1.74 miles in 2008 to 1.34 miles in 2012, a decrease of 23.3 percent. For the same time period, passenger trips per capita remained relatively constant.
- Passenger trips per revenue mile increased from 0.82 trips in 2008 to 1.08 trips in 2012, an increase of 32.0 percent. Passenger trips per revenue hour also increased from 10.77 trips in 2008 to 14.85 trips in 2012, an increase of 37.9 percent. Although there was a reduction of service supply during this time period, BCCB experienced a service consumption increase on a per-unit basis of total services provided.
- Average age of fleet for DO motorbus decreased from 2.88 years in 2008 to 2.44 years in 2012, a decrease of 15.3 percent over a five-year period. Average age of fleet for PT motorbus increased from 2.49 years in 2008 to 3.52 years in 2012, an increase of 41.4 percent over the same period.
- Average headway for DO motorbus increased from 43.54 minutes in 2008 to 50.69 minutes in 2012, while average headway for PT motorbus decreased from 32.09 minutes in 2008 to 41.23 minutes in 2011.



• The number of system failures experienced an increase from 150 in 2008 to 303 in 2012, which resulted in a decrease in revenue miles between failures of 61.9 percent during this time period.

Weekday span of service for DO motorbus decreased from 13.45 hours to 12.50 hours from 2008 to 2012, a decrease of 7.1 percent, while weekday span of service for PT motorbus decreased by 21.2 percent from 2008 to 2012, from 18.92 hours to 14.92 hours.

| Effectiveness Measures | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | % Change (2008-2012) |
|---|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------------------------|
| Service Supply | | | | | | |
| Vehicle Miles per Capita | 1.74 | 1.5 | 1.41 | 1.44 | 1.34 | -23.30% |
| Service Consumption | | | | | | |
| Passenger Trips per Capita | 1.3 | 1.23 | 1.18 | 1.34 | 1.33 | 2.50% |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.9 | 1 | 1.08 | 32.00% |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 10.77 | 12.34 | 12.74 | 13.85 | 14.85 | 37.90% |
| Quality of Service | | | | | | |
| Average Age of Fleet (DO) | 2.88 | 2.97 | 3.09 | 3.06 | 2.44 | -15.30% |
| Average Age of Fleet (PT) | 2.49 | 2.9 | 2.24 | 3.23 | 3.52 | 41.40% |
| Average Headway (in minutes) (DO) | 43.54 | 40.32 | 40.56 | 49.9 | 50.69 | 16.40% |
| Average Headway (in minutes) (PT) | 32.09 | 37.45 | 40.09 | 41.23 | N/A | 28.5%* |
| Number of Vehicle System Failures | 150 | 230 | 185 | 245 | 303 | 102.00% |
| Revenue Miles Between Failures | 19,055 | 10,674 | 12,556 | 9,542 | 7,254 | -61.90% |
| Service Availability | | | | | | |
| Weekday Span of Service (in hours) (DO) | 13.45 | 13.45 | 12.83 | 12.5 | 12.5 | -7.10% |
| Weekday Span of Service (in hours) (PT) | 18.92 | 18.92 | 19 | 14.92 | 14.92 | -21.20% |

Table 3-102008–2012 Effectiveness Measures, BCCB Trend Analysis

N/A indicates data are not available for particular year.

*Percent change reflects data from 2008-2011.

Note: Percent change calculations may vary due to rounding.

Source: INTDAS component from FTIS, DO and PT Motorbus combined statistics, unless otherwise noted







Source: National Transit Database

Figure 3-33



Source: National Transit Database



BCCB Passenger Trips per Revenue



Source: National Transit Database













BCCB Average Headway (in



Source: National Transit Database



BCCB Average Headway (in minutes) (PT)



Draft Transit Development Plan



Efficiency Measures

Table 3-11 presents six categories of efficiency measures for BCT: cost efficiency, operating ratios, vehicle utilization, labor productivity, energy utilization, and average fare. Figures 3-43 through 3-52 present trends in efficiency. The following is a summary of the trends in efficiency measures for BCT.

Operating expense per capita decreased from \$55.51 in 2008 to \$54.73 in 2012, a decrease of 1.4 percent. Operating expense per passenger mile decreased from \$0.56 in 2008 to \$0.54 in 2012, a decrease of 2.9 percent. Operating expense per revenue hour increased from \$94.40 in 2008 to \$98.06 in 2012, an increase of 3.9 percent. However, when the effects of inflation are removed, operating expense per capita, operating expense per passenger mile, and operating expense per revenue hour experienced decreases of 14.1, 16.1, and 9.5 percent, respectively,



between 2008 and 2012. These trends suggest that BCT has experienced some success over the last five years in controlling numerous factors impacting the cost of the agency's operations that are within its control.

- Revenue hours per employee full-time equivalent (FTE) decreased by 3.4 percent for DO motorbus.
- The average fare paid per passenger trip increased from \$0.61 in 2008 to \$0.87 in 2012, an increase of 42.1 percent. Similarly, farebox recovery increased by 41.7 percent from 2008 to 2012.

| Table | 3-11 |
|-------|------|
|-------|------|

2008–2012 Efficiency Measures, BCT Fixed-Route Trend Analysis

| Efficiency Measures | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | % Change (2008-2012) |
|--|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|-------------------------|
| Cost Efficiency | | | | | | |
| Operating Expense per Capita | \$55.51 | \$53.35 | \$55.66 | \$57.22 | \$54.73 | -1.40% |
| Operating Expense per Capita (in 2008\$) | \$55.51 | \$51.54 | \$51.95 | \$51.60 | \$47.68 | -14.10% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | \$2.56 | \$2.54 | \$2.69 | \$2.78 | \$2.57 | 0.30% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip (in 2008\$) | \$2.56 | \$2.45 | \$2.51 | \$2.51 | \$2.24 | -12.50% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Mile | \$0.56 | \$0.56 | \$0.57 | \$0.59 | \$0.54 | -2.90% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Mile (in 2008\$) | \$0.56 | \$0.54 | \$0.53 | \$0.53 | \$0.47 | -16.10% |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | \$6.97 | \$6.73 | \$7.00 | \$7.43 | \$7.12 | 2.30% |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Mile (in 2008\$) | \$6.97 | \$6.50 | \$6.53 | \$6.70 | \$6.21 | -10.90% |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | \$94.40 | \$92.10 | \$95.97 | \$101.58 | \$98.06 | 3.90% |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Hour (in 2008\$) | \$94.40 | \$88.98 | \$89.57 | \$91.60 | \$85.42 | -9.50% |
| Operating Ratios | | | | | | |
| Farebox Recovery | 23.90% | 25.30% | 26.90% | 30.40% | 33.90% | 41.70% |
| Vehicle Utilization | | | | | | |
| Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.88 | 0.88 | -1.90% |
| Labor Productivity | | | | | | |
| Revenue Hours per Employee FTE (DO) | 1,071 | 1,135 | 1,079 | 1,065 | 1,035 | -3.40% |
| Energy Utilization | | | | | | |
| Vehicle Miles per Gallon | 3.22 | 3.53 | 3.59 | 3.51 | 3.48 | 8.00% |
| Fare | | | | | | |
| Average Fare | \$0.61 | \$0.64 | \$0.72 | \$0.85 | \$0.87 | 42.10% |

Note: Percent change calculations may vary due to rounding.

Source: INTDAS component from FTIS, DO PT Motorbus combined statistics, unless otherwise noted; Broward County Transit Division



Draft Transit Development Plan











Source: National Transit Database



Source: National Transit Database





Source: National Transit Database

Draft Transit Development Plan



Table 3-12 presents the six categories of efficiency measures for BCCB. Figures 3-53 through 3-62 present trends in efficiency. The following is a summary of the trends for BCCB that are evident from the analysis of efficiency measures.

- All cost efficiency measures experienced decreases in varying degrees during the five-year time period. When removing the effects of inflation, the decreases varied from 16.6 percent to 42.5 percent. These trends indicate that BCCB has improved its efficiency in expenditures from 2008 to 2012.
- Vehicle miles per gallon increased from 7.30 miles to 8.10 miles, an increase of 10.9 percent between 2008 and 2012, indicating an improved energy utilization rate.
- Average fare remained stable from 2008 to 2012. During the same time period, farebox recovery increased from 2.48 to 3.41 percent, an increase of 37.6 percent.



| Efficiency Measures | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | % Change (2008-2012) |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------|
| Cost Efficiency | | | | | | |
| Operating Expense per Capita | \$4.99 | \$4.21 | \$3.79 | \$3.70 | \$3.53 | -29.20% |
| Operating Expense per Capita (in 2008\$) | \$4.99 | \$4.07 | \$3.54 | \$3.33 | \$3.08 | -38.30% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | \$3.82 | \$3.42 | \$3.21 | \$2.77 | \$2.65 | -30.50% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip (in 2008\$) | \$3.82 | \$3.30 | \$3.00 | \$2.49 | \$2.31 | -39.50% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Mile | \$1.06 | \$1.00 | \$0.89 | \$0.75 | \$0.70 | -34.00% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Mile (in 2008\$) | \$1.06 | \$0.96 | \$0.83 | \$0.67 | \$0.61 | -42.50% |
| Operating Expense per | | | | | | |
| Revenue Mile | \$3.12 | \$3.00 | \$2.89 | \$2.76 | \$2.86 | -8.30% |
| Operating Expense per | | | | | | |
| Revenue Mile (in 2008\$) | \$3.12 | \$2.90 | \$2.69 | \$2.49 | \$2.49 | -20.20% |
| Operating Expense per | | | | | | |
| Revenue Hour | \$41.12 | \$42.20 | \$40.94 | \$38.30 | \$39.39 | -4.20% |
| Operating Expense per | | | | | | |
| Revenue Hour (in 2008\$) | \$41.12 | \$40.77 | \$38.21 | \$34.54 | \$34.31 | -16.60% |
| Operating Ratios | | | | | | |
| Farebox Recovery | 2.48% | 2.63% | 3.60% | 3.39% | 3.41% | 37.60% |
| Vehicle Utilization | | | | | | |
| Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile | 0.92 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.10% |
| Labor Productivity | | | | | | |
| Revenue Hours per Employee FTE (DO) | 1,326 | 1,218 | 1,076 | 1,068 | 1,024 | -22.70% |
| Energy Utilization | | | | | | |
| Vehicle Miles per Gallon | 7.3 | 8.26 | 8.01 | 8.02 | 8.1 | 10.90% |
| Fare | | | | | | |
| Average Fare | \$0.09 | \$0.09 | \$0.12 | \$0.09 | \$0.09 | 0.00% |

Table 3-122008–2012 Efficiency Measures, BCCB Trend Analysis









Source: National Transit Database





Source: National Transit Database





Source: National Transit Database



Source: National Transit Database





BCCB Farebox Recovery





Summary Results of Fixed-Route Trend Analysis

The trend analysis provides an evaluation of the system's performance over time. This section includes a summary of BCT and BCCB performance based on the trend analysis in terms of service consumption, service supply and availability, quality of service, cost efficiency, and operating ratio and fare.

- Service Consumption
 - BCT Passenger trips per capita, passenger trips per revenue mile, and passenger trips per revenue hour have shown neutral trends, demonstrating that the the service being supplied has remained relatively stable over the five-year timeframe.

 BCCB – Passenger trips per revenue mile and passenger trips per revenue hour have shown positive trends. This trend indicates that use of BCCB services has become more productive over time in conjunction with the reduction in service being supplied.

• Service Supply and Availability

- **BCT** Vehicle miles per capita have shown a neutral trend from 2008 to 2012. Service availability in terms of service span similarly remained nearly unchanged.
- **BCCB** Vehicle miles per capita has shown a negative trend from 2008 to 2012. Service availability in terms of service span decreased during the same time period.

• Quality of Service

- BCT Average age of fleet (DO) has shown a neutral trend. The number of vehicle system failures decreased, resulting in a positive trend for revenue miles between failures. Average headway (DO) has also shown a positive trend.
- **BCCB** The measures in this category have indicated primarily negative trends, suggesting an aging vehicle fleet with increasing reliability issues.

• Cost Efficiency

- BCT When removing the effects of inflation, operating expense per capita, operating expense per passenger trip, operating expense per revenue mile, and operating expense per revenue hour have shown positive trends from 2008 to 2012. These trends generally suggest that BCT costs have been controlled over the last five-year period, in part by reductions in relatively unproductive service.
- **BCCB** BCCB shows a strong positive trend in this category, indicating that BCCB grew more cost-effective over the trend analysis period.

• Operating Ratio and Fare

- BCT From 2008 to 2012, both average fare and farebox recovery experienced an increase of approximately 42 percent. These two indicators have shown strong positive trends from 2008 to 2012, primarily due to fare increases that occurred in 2009 and 2010.
- BCCB Although the farebox recovery ratio showed a strong positive trend over the five-year timeframe, it is very low by industry standards due to many of the Community Bus services operating with free fares. At the same time, the average fare remained steady.

Tables 3-13 and 3-14 summarize the trend analysis, with positive and negative trends identified for BCT and BCCB, respectively.



Table 3-13

Summary of BCT Fixed-Route Trend Analysis (2008–2012)

| | % Change | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Measure | (2008–2012) | Indicator* | | | | | | |
| General Performance | | | | | | | | |
| Passenger Trips | -2.10% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Passenger Miles | 1.20% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Vehicle Miles | -2.10% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Revenue Miles | -4.00% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Total Operating Expense | -1.80% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service | 0.80% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Service Supply | | | | | | | | |
| Vehicle Miles per Capita | -1.70% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Service Consumptio | n | | | | | | | |
| Passenger Trips per Capita | -1.70% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 2.00% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 3.60% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Quality of Service | | | | | | | | |
| Average Age of Fleet (DO) | 3.50% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Average Age of Fleet (PT) | -50.00% | + | | | | | | |
| Average Headway (in minutes) (DO) | -6.90% | + | | | | | | |
| Average Headway (in minutes) (PT) | 428.10% | + | | | | | | |
| Number of Vehicle System Failures | -15.80% | + | | | | | | |
| Revenue Miles Between Failures | 14.00% | + | | | | | | |
| Service Availability | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Weekday Span of Service (in hours) (DO) | -0.30% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Weekday Span of Service (in hours) (PT) | 2.60% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Cost Efficiency | | - | | | | | | |
| Operating Expense per Capita (in 2008\$) | -14.10% | + | | | | | | |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip (in 2008\$) | -12.50% | + | | | | | | |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Mile (in 2008\$) | -16.10% | + | | | | | | |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Mile (in 2008\$) | -10.90% | + | | | | | | |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Hour (in 2008\$) | -9.50% | + | | | | | | |
| Operating Ratios | | - | | | | | | |
| Farebox Recovery | 41.70% | + | | | | | | |
| Vehicle Utilization | | - | | | | | | |
| Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile | -1.90% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Labor Productivity | | | | | | | | |
| Revenue Hours per Employee FTE (DO) | -3.40% | 0 | | | | | | |
| Energy Utilization | | | | | | | | |
| Vehicle Miles per Gallon | 8.00% | + | | | | | | |
| Fare | | | | | | | | |
| Average Fare | 42.10% | + | | | | | | |
| *Indicates a positive (+) negative (-) or neutral (o) trend | | | | | | | | |

*Indicates a positive (+), negative (-), or neutral (o) trend. A change of less than 5% is considered a neutral trend.

| Table 3-14 |
|--|
| Summary of BCCB Trend Analysis (2008–2012) |

| Measure | % Change (2008–2012) | Indicator* |
|--|-------------------------|------------|
| General Performance | | |
| Passenger Trips | 1.50% | 0 |
| Passenger Miles | 6.80% | + |
| Vehicle Miles | -23.20% | - |
| Revenue Miles | -23.10% | - |
| Total Operating Expense | -29.50% | + |
| Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service | -17.10% | - |
| Service Supply | | |
| Vehicle Miles per Capita | -23.30% | - |
| Service Consumption | | |
| Passenger Trips per Capita | 2.50% | 0 |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 32.00% | + |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 37.90% | + |
| Quality of Service | | |
| Average Age of Fleet (DO) | -15.30% | + |
| Average Age of Fleet (PT) | 41.40% | - |
| Average Headway (in minutes) (DO) | 16.40% | - |
| Average Headway (in minutes) (PT) | 28.5%** | - |
| Number of Vehicle System Failures | 102.00% | - |
| Revenue Miles Between Failures | -61.90% | - |
| Availability | | |
| Weekday Span of Service (in hours) (DO) | -7.10% | - |
| Weekday Span of Service (in hours) (PT) | -21.20% | - |
| Cost Efficiency | | |
| Operating Expense per Capita (in 2008\$) | -29.20% | + |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip (in 2008\$) | -30.50% | + |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Mile (in 2008\$) | -34.00% | + |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Mile (in 2008\$) | -8.30% | + |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Hour (in 2008\$) | -4.20% | 0 |
| Operating Ratios | | |
| Farebox Recovery | 37.60% | + |
| Vehicle Utilization | | |
| Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile | 0.10% | 0 |
| Labor Productivity | | |
| Revenue Hours per Employee FTE | -22.70% | - |
| Energy Utilization | | |
| Vehicle Miles per Gallon | 10.90% | + |
| Fare | | |
| Average Fare | 0.00% | 0 |

*Indicates a positive (+), negative (-), or neutral (o) trend. A change of less than 5% is considered a neutral trend.

**Percent change reflects data from 2008-2011.



TOPS SERVICE TREND ANALYSIS

Table 3-15 lists the measures used in the performance trend analysis conducted for TOPS, BCT's complementary paratransit service. Highlights of the trend analysis are presented in the remainder of this section.

Table 3-15

TOPS Performance Review Measures for Trend Analysis (2007–2011)

| General Performance | Effectiveness | Efficiency |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Passenger Trips | Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | Operating Expense per Passenger Trip |
| Passenger Miles | Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | Operating Expense per Passenger Mile |
| Vehicle Miles | | Operating Expense per Revenue Mile |
| Revenue Miles | | Operating Expense per Revenue Hour |
| Total Operating Expense | | |

Table 3-16 includes the trend statistics for paratransit performance indicators. Performance, effectiveness, and efficiency measures are included for the noted time period and percent changes are calculated based on the change between 2007 and 2011. Figures 3-63 through Figure 3-73 present trends in service performance.

| Selected Performance Indicator | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | % Change (2007-2011) |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Performance Measures | | | | | | |
| Passenger Trips | 834,205 | 948,632 | 916,009 | 769,163 | 685,998 | -17.80% |
| Revenue Miles | 7,882,892 | 9,074,306 | 8,310,956 | 7,328,065 | 6,857,322 | -13.00% |
| Vehicle Miles | 9,114,807 | 10,386,904 | 9,649,073 | 8,442,217 | 7,882,936 | -13.50% |
| Revenue Hours | 545,232 | 612,021 | 551,813 | 466,159 | 423,456 | -22.30% |
| Total Operating Expense | \$23,563,309 | \$32,310,979 | \$29,787,765 | \$21,171,147 | \$16,756,333 | -28.90% |
| Effectiveness Measures | | | | | | |
| Passenger Trips per | | | | | | |
| Revenue Mile | 0.11 | 0.1 | 0.11 | 0.1 | 0.1 | -5.50% |
| Passenger Trips per | | | | | | |
| Revenue Hour | 1.53 | 1.55 | 1.66 | 1.65 | 1.62 | 5.90% |
| Efficiency Measures | | | | | | |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | \$28.25 | \$34.06 | \$32.52 | \$27.52 | \$24.43 | -13.50% |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | \$2.99 | \$3.56 | \$3.58 | \$2.89 | \$2.44 | -18.30% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Mile | \$2.62 | \$3.12 | \$3.04 | \$2.87 | \$2.44 | -6.90% |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | \$43.22 | \$52.79 | \$53.98 | \$45.42 | \$39.57 | -8.40% |

Table 3-16TOPS Service Performance Indicators (2007–2011)

Source: INTDAS component from FTIS, Directly Operated Demand Response.









Figure 3-65

Source: National Transit Database

Source: National Transit Database



Figure 3-63

2007 2008 20











Source: National Transit Database



Figure 3-70



Source: National Transit Database

Source: National Transit Database

Draft Transit Development Plan

2010

2011



Source: National Transit Database







Summary Results of TOPS Trend Analysis

This section summarizes paratransit performance trends for BCT based on the trend analysis. Some of the key trends are described below.

- The number of total paratransit trips has decreased from 834,205 trips in 2007 to 685,998 trips in 2011, a decrease of 17.8 percent.
- Overall service supply experienced decreases in terms of revenue miles, vehicle miles, and revenue hours in varying degrees, ranging from 13.0 percent to 22.3 percent. When taking into consideration the decrease in passenger trips, passenger trips per revenue hour slightly



increased from 1.53 to 1.62, an increase of 5.9 percent, suggesting that the combined changes have resulted in improved productivity for service consumption.

• Paratransit operating costs decreased by approximately 29 percent over the trend analysis period. When taking into consideration the decrease in service supply, the four key efficiency measures—operating expense per passenger trip, operating expense per revenue mile, operating expense per passenger mile, and operating expense per revenue hour—experienced decreases of 13.5, 18.3, 6.9, and 8.4 percent, respectively. This indicates that the evident improvements in service utilization effectiveness have helped produce corresponding cost efficiency improvements.

PEER REVIEW

The peer review provides an opportunity for BCT to compare its system-wide effectiveness and efficiency indicators with other peer transit systems to determine how well BCT is performing compared to similar transit agencies. The results of the peer review serve as a starting point for BCT to adjust its operations and/or policies to achieve better system cost efficiency and operating performance.

The 2013–2024 TDP took into account previous peers and also conducted two analyses—a TCRP framework and a methodology developed by Tindale-Oliver & Associates (TOA)—to determine peers. BCT examined the results of the two new analyses plus the prior peers in order to determine the set of eight peers to be used for this TDP. Table 3-17 displays the final peer selection. The process employed to develop the final list of peers is described in detail in Appendix C.

| BCT TDP Final Peers | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Transit Agency | Agency Abbreviation | Location | | | | |
| Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District | AC Transit | Oakland, CA | | | | |
| Board of County Commissioners, Palm Beach County, Palm | | | | | | |
| Tran, Inc. | Palm Tran | West Palm Beach, FL | | | | |
| Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority | LYNX | Orlando, FL | | | | |
| Charlotte Area Transit System | CATS | Charlotte, NC | | | | |
| Miami-Dade Transit | MDT | Miami, FL | | | | |
| Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority | VTA | San Jose, CA | | | | |
| Transportation District Commission of Hampton Roads, dba | | | | | | |
| Hampton Roads Transit | HRT | Norfolk, VA | | | | |
| VIA Metropolitan Transit | VIA | San Antonio, TX | | | | |

Table 3-17 BCT TDP Final Peers

The peer review analysis was conducted using 2011 NTD data, the most recently validated dataset available for all transit agencies. Selected performance indicators, effectiveness measures, and

efficiency measures are summarized in the remainder of this section. The final peers are shown in Table 3-20.

Performance Indicators

Selected performance indicators for the BCT fixed-route bus service are presented in this section. Categories of performance indicators include population, population density, ridership, revenue miles, and vehicles. Table 3-18 includes the performance statistics for the fixed-route peer group. Table 3-19 and Figures 3-74 through 3-80 present the performance indicators for BCT's peer review analysis. The following is a summary of the peer review analysis performance indicators.

- Service area population and population density for BCT are 9.2 and 20.9 percent above the peer group mean, respectively.
- Passenger trips for BCT are consistent with the peer group mean (1.0%). At the same time, revenue miles for BCT are below the peer group mean (-13.2%), and operating expenses are lower than the peer group average by more than 30 percent.
- Passenger fare revenues are generally in line with the peer group average (-2.0%).
- BCT's number of vehicles operated in maximum service is approximately 26 percent lower than the peer group average.

| Transit Agency | Service Area Population | Service Area Population Density | Passenger Trips | Revenue Miles | Total Operating Expense | Passenger Fare Revenue | Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service |
|----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| ВСТ | 1,748,066 | 4,264 | 35,943,338 | 13,461,475 | \$100,025,185 | \$30,429,058 | 245 |
| AC Transit | 1,415,129 | 3,888 | 57,333,196 | 19,203,332 | \$284,897,127 | \$50,669,567 | 493 |
| CATS | 758,927 | 1,705 | 21,767,980 | 10,822,410 | \$77,050,119 | \$18,587,946 | 269 |
| HRT | 1,439,666 | 2,795 | 15,724,596 | 10,790,246 | \$63,294,653 | \$14,212,376 | 221 |
| LYNX | 1,837,359 | 724 | 26,996,158 | 14,714,555 | \$84,196,278 | \$24,539,515 | 225 |
| MDT | 2,496,435 | 8,158 | 75,723,805 | 28,860,941 | \$305,311,580 | \$82,454,846 | 694 |
| Palm Tran | 1,268,782 | 3,476 | 11,143,922 | 6,974,987 | \$48,853,682 | \$7,798,750 | 123 |
| VTA | 1,880,876 | 5,436 | 31,652,434 | 14,561,653 | \$205,807,523 | \$28,890,490 | 343 |
| VIA | 1,555,963 | 1,283 | 44,157,535 | 20,216,646 | \$127,309,485 | \$21,876,377 | 345 |

Table 3-18

Fixed-Route Peer Group Performance Statistics (2011)



Table 3-19

Performance Indicators, BCT Peer Review Analysis (2011)

| Indicator | ВСТ | Peer Group Minimum | Peer Group Maximum | Peer Group Mean | BCT % from Mean |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Service Area Population | 1,748,066 | 758,927 | 2,496,435 | 1,600,134 | 9.20% |
| Service Area Population Density | 4,264 | 724 | 8,158 | 3,525 | 20.90% |
| Passenger Trips | 35,943,338 | 11,143,922 | 75,723,805 | 35,604,774 | 1.00% |
| Revenue Miles | 13,461,475 | 6,974,987 | 28,860,941 | 15,511,805 | -13.20% |
| Total Operating Expense | \$100,025,185 | \$48,853,682 | \$305,311,580 | \$144,082,848 | -30.60% |
| Passenger Fare Revenue | \$30,429,058 | \$7,798,750 | \$82,454,846 | \$31,050,992 | -2.00% |
| Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service | 245 | 123 | 694 | 329 | -25.50% |

Source: National Transit Database

Figure 3-74 Fixed-Route Service Area Population (2011)



Source: National Transit Database



Figure 3-75

Source: National Transit Database

3 – 50 Evaluation of Existing Transit System

Draft Transit Development Plan


Figure 3-76 Fixed-Route Annual Passenger Trips (2011)

Figure 3-77 Fixed-Route Annual Revenue Miles (2011)





Figure 3-78 Fixed-Route Annual Operating Expense (2011)



Figure 3-79 Fixed-Route Annual Passenger Fare Revenue (2011)





Figure 3-80 Fixed-Route Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service (2011)

Effectiveness Measures

Effectiveness measures include service supply, service consumption, and quality of service. Each category is represented by variables including vehicle miles per capita, passenger trips per revenue mile, and revenue miles between failures. Table 3-20 includes the effectiveness statistics for the fixed-route peer group. Table 3-21 and Figures 3-81 through 3-84 present the effectiveness measures for BCT's peer review analysis. The following is a summary of the effectiveness measures for the peer review analysis for BCT.

- Vehicle miles per capita for BCT are 22 percent below the peer group mean. This fact indicates that BCT is providing less bus service per resident, on average, within its service area than its peer systems.
- Passenger trips per revenue hour and passenger trips per revenue mile for BCT are approximately 27 percent and 23 percent above the peer group mean, respectively, showing much higher productivity in the consumption of the service it provides as compared to its peer systems.
- BCT's number of revenue miles between failures represents the peer group maximum, at 29,201 miles. This number is 258.9 percent above the peer group mean, indicating that BCT is doing a commendable job with vehicle maintenance and vehicle replacement, as compared to its peers.



| Transit Agency | Vehicle Miles per Capita | Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | Revenue Miles Between Failures | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| ВСТ | 8.75 | 36.5 | 2.67 | 29,201 | | | |
| AC Transit | 15.9 | 34.01 | 2.99 | 6,778 | | | |
| CATS | 16.37 | 27.88 | 2.01 | 1,463 | | | |
| HRT | 7.52 | 19.96 | 1.46 | 2,476 | | | |
| LYNX | 8.98 | 26.22 | 1.83 | 14,041 | | | |
| MDT | 13.74 | 31.24 | 2.62 | 1,909 | | | |
| Palm Tran | 6.14 | 27.56 | 1.6 | 7,565 | | | |
| VTA | 9.13 | 26.7 | 2.17 | 6,738 | | | |
| VIA | 14.38 | 28.91 | 2.18 | 3,048 | | | |

 Table 3-20

 Fixed-Route Peer Group Effectiveness Statistics (2011)

Table 3-21

Effectiveness Measures, BCT Peer Review Analysis (2011)

| Measure | вст | Peer Group Minimum | Peer Group Maximum | Peer Group Mean | BCT % from Mean |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Vehicle Miles per Capita | 8.75 | 6.14 | 16.37 | 11.21 | -22.0% |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 36.50 | 19.96 | 36.50 | 28.78 | 26.9% |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 2.67 | 1.46 | 2.99 | 2.17 | 23.0% |
| Revenue Miles between Failures | 29,201 | 1,463 | 29,201 | 8,136 | 258.9% |

Source: National Transit Database







Figure 3-82 Fixed-Route Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour (2011)

Figure 3-83 Fixed-Route Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile (2011)







Figure 3-84 Fixed-Route Revenue Miles between Failures (2011)

Efficiency Measures

Categories of efficiency measures include cost efficiency and operating ratios. Table 3-22 includes the efficiency statistics for the fixed-route peer group. Table 3-23 and Figures 3-85 through 3-92 present the efficiency measures for BCT's peer review analysis. The following is a summary of salient issues from the efficiency measures peer review.

- BCT's average fare is in line with the peer group average (0.3%). At the same time, BCT has the peer group maximum for farebox recovery, at 38.1 percent above the peer group average.
- Operating expense per capita, operating expense per revenue hour, operating expense per revenue mile, and operating expense per passenger trip for BCT are approximately 36, 12, 15, and 31 percent below the corresponding peer group means, respectively. This suggests that BCT has done a commendable job in controlling operating costs as compared to its peers.

| | | Operating Expense per | | | eb. | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Transit Agency | Capita | Revenue Hour | Revenue Mile | Passenger Trip | Farebox Recovery Ratio | Revenue Miles Per Vehicle Mile | Revenue Hours Per Employee FTE | Average Fare |
| ВСТ | \$57.22 | \$101.59 | \$7.43 | \$2.78 | 30.42% | 0.88 | 1,065 | \$0.85 |
| AC Transit | \$201.32 | \$169.01 | \$14.84 | \$4.97 | 17.79% | 0.85 | 1,032 | \$0.88 |
| CATS | \$101.53 | \$98.68 | \$7.12 | \$3.54 | 24.12% | 0.87 | 1,024 | \$0.85 |
| HRT | \$43.96 | \$80.33 | \$5.87 | \$4.03 | 22.45% | 1 | 1,115 | \$0.90 |
| LYNX | \$45.82 | \$81.77 | \$5.72 | \$3.12 | 29.15% | 0.89 | 1,135 | \$0.91 |
| MDT | \$122.30 | \$125.95 | \$10.58 | \$4.03 | 27.01% | 0.84 | 869 | \$1.09 |
| Palm Tran | \$38.50 | \$120.80 | \$7.00 | \$4.38 | 15.96% | 0.9 | 973 | \$0.70 |
| VTA | \$109.42 | \$173.63 | \$14.13 | \$6.50 | 14.13% | 0.85 | 1,027 | \$0.92 |
| VIA | \$81.82 | \$83.34 | \$6.30 | \$2.88 | 17.18% | 0.9 | 1,028 | \$0.50 |

Table 3-22Fixed-Route Peer Group Efficiency Statistics (2011)

| Table | 3-23 |
|-------|------|
|-------|------|

Efficiency Measures, BCT Peer Review Analysis (2011)

| Measure | ВСТ | Peer Group Minimum | Peer Group Maximum | Peer Group Mean | BCT % from Mean |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Operating Expense per Capita | \$57.22 | \$38.50 | \$201.32 | \$89.10 | -35.8% |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | \$101.59 | \$80.33 | \$173.63 | \$115.01 | -11.7% |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | \$7.43 | \$5.72 | \$14.84 | \$8.78 | -15.3% |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | \$2.78 | \$2.78 | \$6.50 | \$4.03 | -30.9% |
| Farebox Recovery | 30.42% | 14.13% | 30.42% | 22.02% | 38.1% |
| Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile | 0.88 | 0.84 | 1.00 | 0.89 | -0.7% |
| Revenue Hours per Employee FTE | 1,065 | 869 | 1,135 | 1,030 | 3.4% |
| Average Fare | \$0.85 | \$0.50 | \$1.09 | \$0.84 | 0.3% |



Figure 3-85 Fixed-Route Operating Expense per Capita (2011)









Figure 3-87 Fixed-Route Operating Expense per Revenue Mile (2011)

Figure 3-88 Fixed-Route Operating Expense per Passenger Trip (2011)





Figure 3-89 Fixed-Route Farebox Recovery Ratio (2011)



Figure 3-90 Fixed-Route Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile (2011)





Figure 3-91 Fixed-Route Revenue Hours per Employee FTE (2011)

Figure 3-92 Fixed-Route Average Fare (2011)





Summary Results of Fixed-Route Peer Review Analysis

Table 3-24 provides a summary of the fixed-route peer review analysis for BCT's fixed-route system. The table includes each performance measure and BCT's standing within the peer group. The following strengths and opportunities were identified for BCT based on the peer review.

- **Service Supply** Service supply is an area that provides BCT with an opportunity for improvement. BCT vehicle miles per capita are below the mean for the peer group.
- **Service Consumption** BCT's passenger trips per revenue mile and passenger trips per revenue hour are well above the mean for service consumption.
- **Quality of Service** This area is also indicated as a strength. BCT is above the mean in terms of the number revenue miles between roadcalls and failures.
- **Cost Efficiency** This is noted as a strength, since operating expense per passenger trip, operating expense per revenue hour, and operating expense per revenue mile are below the mean for the peer group.
- Operating Ratio and Fare BCT's farebox recovery ratio is also well above the mean (38%) for the peer group. BCT effectively maintains farebox revenues that support the level of services being provided while having an average fare in line with other peer systems.

| | Percent Away From | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Performance Indicators/Measures | Mean | Indicator* |
| In | dicators | |
| Service Area Population | 9.20% | N/A |
| Service Area Population Density | 20.90% | N/A |
| Passenger Trips | 1.00% | 0 |
| Revenue Miles | -13.20% | - |
| Total Operating Expense | -30.60% | + |
| Passenger Fare Revenue | -2.00% | 0 |
| Vehicles Operated in Maximum Service | -25.50% | - |
| Serv | /ice Supply | |
| Vehicle Miles per Capita | -22.00% | - |
| Service | Consumption | |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 26.90% | + |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 23.00% | + |
| Quali | ty of Service | |
| Revenue Miles between Failures | 258.90% | + |
| Cos | t Efficiency | |
| Operating Expense per Capita | -35.80% | + |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | -11.70% | + |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | -15.30% | + |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | -30.90% | + |
| Орег | rating Ratio | |
| Farebox Recovery | 38.10% | + |
| Vehic | le Utilization | |
| Revenue Miles per Vehicle Mile | -0.70% | 0 |
| Labor | Productivity | |
| Revenue Hours per Employee FTE | 3.40% | 0 |
| | Fare | |
| Average Fare | 0.30% | 0 |
| | | |

Table 3-24

BCT Fixed-Route Peer Review Analysis Summary (2011)

*Indicates a positive (+), negative (-), neutral (o), or not applicable (N/A) standing within the selected peer group. A result less than 5 percent from the peer group mean was considered neutral.

TOPS SERVICE PEER REVIEW

The TOPS peer review was conducted using the same peers selected for the fixed-route service peer review. NTD data from 2011 were used to analyze performance indicators for each peer system's demand-response service. Statistics for both PT and DO demand-response services, as applicable, were compiled to conduct the analysis. Table 3-25 includes the demand-response performance statistics for all of the peers in the fixed-route peer group.



| Paratransit Peer Group Performance Statistics (2011) | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Transit Agency | Passenger Trips | Revenue Miles | Revenue Hours | Operating Expense | | | |
| ВСТ | 685,998 | 6,857,322 | 424,532 | \$16,756,333 | | | |
| AC Transit | 752,693 | 6,365,949 | 411,335 | \$33,500,787 | | | |
| CATS | 229,146 | 2,445,175 | 130,588 | \$7,353,614 | | | |
| HRT | 346,200 | 2,992,991 | 194,220 | \$9,545,758 | | | |
| LYNX | 821,169 | 8,597,624 | 516,283 | \$24,704,331 | | | |
| MDT | 1,593,806 | 13,232,539 | 978,336 | \$46,939,524 | | | |
| Palm Tran | 913,057 | 8,598,446 | 508,405 | \$25,588,096 | | | |
| VTA | 824,813 | 6,010,766 | 319,914 | \$24,648,704 | | | |
| VIA | 1,051,099 | 9,203,155 | 483,497 | \$31,232,458 | | | |

 Table 3-25

 Paratransit Peer Group Performance Statistics (2011)

Table 3-26 summarizes the paratransit peer group analysis performance statistics noted in Table 3-28. For each measure, the table provides BCT's performance, the maximum value among the peer group, the minimum value among the peer group, the mean of the peer group, and BCT's percent difference from the mean value. Peer rankings for each performance indicator are illustrated in Figures 3-93 through 3-96.

 Table 3-26

 Paratransit Peer Review – Performance Indicators (2011)

| | | | | | BCT: Percent |
|-------------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| | | Peer Group | Peer Group | Peer Group | Deviation from |
| Measure | ВСТ | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Mean |
| Passenger Trips | 685 <i>,</i> 998 | 229,146 | 1,593,806 | 801,998 | -14.50% |
| Revenue Miles | 6,857,322 | 2,445,175 | 13,232,539 | 7,144,885 | -4.00% |
| Revenue Hours | 424,532 | 130,588 | 978 <i>,</i> 336 | 440,790 | -3.70% |
| Total Operating Expense | \$16,756,333 | \$7,353,614 | \$46,939,524 | \$24,474,401 | -31.50% |



Figure 3-93 Paratransit Annual Passenger Trips (2011)

Figure 3-94 Paratransit Annual Revenue Miles (2011)





Figure 3-95 Paratransit Annual Revenue Hours (2011)



Figure 3-96 Paratransit Annual Operating Expense (2011)



Source: National Transit Database

Financial and operational performance measures were selected to provide a good indicator of overall system performance. Table 3-27 presents the peer group statistics for the selected financial and operational measures.

| Transit System | Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| вст | \$39.47 | \$2.44 | \$24.43 | 0.1 | 1.62 |
| AC Transit | \$81.44 | \$5.26 | \$44.51 | 0.12 | 1.83 |
| CATS | \$56.31 | \$3.01 | \$32.09 | 0.09 | 1.75 |
| HRT | \$49.15 | \$3.19 | \$27.57 | 0.12 | 1.78 |
| LYNX | \$47.85 | \$2.87 | \$30.08 | 0.1 | 1.59 |
| MDT | \$47.98 | \$3.55 | \$29.45 | 0.12 | 1.63 |
| Palm Tran | \$50.33 | \$2.98 | \$28.02 | 0.11 | 1.8 |
| VTA | \$77.05 | \$4.10 | \$29.88 | 0.14 | 2.58 |
| VIA | \$64.26 | \$3.39 | \$29.63 | 0.12 | 2.18 |

 Table 3-27

 Paratransit Peer Group Financial & Operational Measures (2011)

Table 3-28 summarizes the peer group analysis for the financial and operational measures noted in Table 3-29. Peer rankings for each financial and operational measure are illustrated in Figures 3-97 through 3-101.

Table 3-28

Paratransit Peer Review – Financial & Operational Indicators (2011)

| Measure | вст | Peer Group Minimum | Peer Group Maximum | Peer Group Mean | BCT: % Deviation from Mean |
|--------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | \$39.47 | \$39.47 | \$81.44 | \$57.13 | -30.90% |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | \$2.44 | \$2.44 | \$5.26 | \$3.42 | -28.60% |
| Operating Expense Per Passenger Trip | \$24.43 | \$24.43 | \$44.51 | \$30.64 | -20.30% |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | 0.1 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.11 | -10.10% |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | 1.62 | 1.59 | 2.58 | 1.86 | -13.20% |

Source: National Transit Database



Figure 3-97 Paratransit Operating Expense per Revenue Hour (2011)



Figure 3-98 Paratransit Operating Expense per Revenue Mile (2011)





Figure 3-99 Paratransit Operating Expense per Passenger Trip (2011)



Figure 3-100 Paratransit Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile (2011)

Figure 3-101 Paratransit Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour (2011)



Source: National Transit Database

Summary Results of Paratransit Service Peer Review Analysis

Highlights from the paratransit service peer review analysis are summarized below. Table 3-29 provides a summary of the paratransit service peer review analysis.



| Table | 3-29 |
|-------|------|
|-------|------|

TOPS Paratransit Peer Review Analysis Summary (2011)

| Performance Indicators/Measures | Percent Deviation From Mean | Indicator* |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| Indicat | ors | |
| Passenger Trips | -14.50% | N/A** |
| Revenue Miles | -4.00% | 0 |
| Revenue Hours | -3.70% | 0 |
| Total Operating Expense | -31.50% | + |
| Cost Effic | iency | |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Hour | -30.90% | + |
| Operating Expense per Revenue Mile | -28.60% | + |
| Operating Expense per Passenger Trip | -20.30% | + |
| Service Cons | umption | |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Mile | -10.10% | - |
| Passenger Trips per Revenue Hour | -13.20% | _ |

*Indicates a positive (+), negative (-), neutral (o), or not applicable (N/A) standing within the selected peer group. A result less than 5% from the peer group mean was considered neutral.

**A positive, negative, or neutral indicator could not be determined for passenger trips based on the data analyzed.

- The number of paratransit passenger trips provided by BCT in 2011, 685,998, was 14.5 percent below the peer group mean of 801,998 trips. Additionally, BCT was below the mean for revenue miles and revenue hours of service (about 4% each, respectively). Given that all of the peers have similar service area sizes, these figures suggest that BCT may be experiencing a greater level of success in encouraging paratransit passengers who are able to do so to use fixed-route transit services.
- At the same time, BCT's total operating cost was 31.5 percent below the mean, as was the case for all of the related financial measures. Operating expense per revenue hour, per revenue mile, and per passenger trip were 31, 29, and 20 percent below the corresponding peer group means, respectively, indicating that BCT is providing comparatively more cost-effective paratransit service than many of its peers.
- BCT has some room for improvement when considering the two selected service consumption measures, passenger trips per revenue mile and per revenue hour. BCT is 10 and 13 percent below the corresponding peer group means for these measures.

ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT

As part of the BCT *Connected* process, a general assessment of BCT's organizational structure was completed in order to ensure that staffing levels are sufficient to support enhancements to the transit network as identified in the 10-year vision. BCT's staffing levels were compared with previously identified peer agencies. The organizational assessment includes a general review of current staffing levels by major employment category as identified per NTD reporting requirements.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

BCT operates as a department of Broward County government. According to 2011 NTD data, BCT has a total of 918 employees. As a County department, BCT is governed by the Broward County Board of County Commissioners (BCC), which serves as the transit agency's oversight board. The BCC consists of nine Commissioners elected by district in partisan elections. The BCC appoints the County's Chief Executive Officer, called the County Administrator in Broward County, who implements BCC-approved programs and directs the functions of County government. Figure 3-102 displays Broward County's organizational structure and where BCT fits into the overall structure. A detailed organizational chart can be found in Appendix D.

Figure 3-102 Broward County Organizational Structure

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT



Source: Broward County

ORGANIZATIONAL PEER ANALYSIS

A peer review of staffing levels was performed to compare BCT's staffing levels with other transit agencies of similar size. The peer group used to perform the review was derived from the fixed-route



CONNECTED

peer agencies identified as part of the transit development planning process. This group, which was verified for appropriateness based on the most recent validated NTD information from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), consists of both Florida and non-Florida transit agencies. Using the same peers as shown in Table 3-20, the number of full-time equivalent administrative, vehicle maintenance, and operational staff were obtained for each agency from the 2011 NTD. The 2011 NTD is the most recent validated data currently available.

This analysis is completed with the same set of peers as in the peer review. Because of variability in system size, in order to more fairly compare the number of staff employed by the peer group members and BCT, it was necessary to normalize the number of staff in each employee category using a transit service performance statistic. Typical variables used to compare transit agency service performance characteristics include peak vehicles, revenue hours of service, and revenue miles of service. For the purposes of this peer review, the service performance statistics were tied to staff categories as follows:

- Peak vehicles and administrative staff
- Revenue hours and operations staff
- Revenue miles and vehicle maintenance staff

Table 3-30 shows the performance statistics and staffing levels for the eight peer transit agencies and the corresponding data for BCT. Also included in that table are the average and standard deviation for each variable. Table 3-31 compares BCT staffing levels in each staff category to the peer system averages. Table 3-32 shows that BCT is operating with fewer staff in each staff category than the peer system average. In the operating category, BCT is operating with 35 fewer FTEs than it would be if it were on par with the peer agency average. In the maintenance category, BCT is operating with 27 fewer FTEs than it would be if it were on par with 3 fewer FTEs than it would be if it were on par with the peer agency average. In the peer agency average. In the administrative category, BCT is operating with 3 fewer FTEs than it would be if it were on par with the peer agency average. In the rest of peer agency average. In the operating with 3 fewer FTEs than it would be if it were on par with the peer agency average. In other words, BCT has a very lean and efficient staff composition as compared to the peer group average.

| Transit Agency | Revenue Hours | Revenue Miles | Peak Vehicles | Operating Employees FTEs | Maintenance Employees FTEs | Administrative Employees FTEs |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| вст | 984,624 | 13,461,475 | 245 | 653 | 178 | 87 |
| AC Transit | 1,685,688 | 19,203,332 | 493 | 1,104 | 336 | 193 |
| Palm Tran | 404,415 | 6,974,987 | 123 | 295 | 91 | 30 |
| LYNX | 1,029,676 | 14,714,555 | 225 | 643 | 167 | 97 |
| CATS | 780,795 | 10,822,410 | 269 | 526 | 153 | 83 |
| MDT | 2,424,028 | 28,860,941 | 694 | 2,032 | 523 | 234 |
| VTA | 1,185,310 | 14,561,653 | 343 | 764 | 259 | 115 |
| HRT | 787,888 | 10,790,246 | 221 | 501 | 118 | 87 |
| VIA | 1,527,506 | 20,216,646 | 345 | 1,030 | 298 | 158 |
| Average | 1,201,103 | 15,511,805 | 329 | 839 | 236 | 121 |
| Standard Deviation | 601,615 | 6,489,081 | 172 | 514 | 135 | 63 |

Table 3-30 BCT Staffing Level Peer Review

Table 3-31BCT Staffing versus Peer System Staffing

| Employee Category | Employee FTEs | Operational Characteristics | | FT | E per Operational Characteristic |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| BCT | | | | | |
| Operating | 653 | 984,624 | Revenue Hours | 6.63 | 10,000 Revenue Hours |
| Maintenance | 178 | 13,461,475 | Revenue Miles | 1.32 | 100,000 Revenue Miles |
| Administrative | 87 | 245 | Peak Vehicles | 3.55 | 10 Peak Vehicles |
| Peer System Ave | rage | | | | |
| Operating | 839 | 1,201,103 | Revenue Hours | 6.98 | 10,000 Revenue Hours |
| Maintenance | 236 | 15,511,805 | Revenue Miles | 1.52 | 100,000 Revenue Miles |
| Administrative | 121 | 329 | Peak Vehicles | 3.67 | 10 Peak Vehicles |

Table 3-32 BCT Staff Shortfall and Surplus

| Employee Category | BCT Current Employee FTEs | Projected BCT FTEs Based on Peer System Average | BCT Shortfall/ Surplus versus Peer System Average | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Operating | 653 | 688 | -35 | | | |
| Maintenance | 178 | 205 | -27 | | | |
| Administrative | 87 | 90 | -3 | | | |



CONNECTED

Organizational Assessment Summary

The organizational analysis shows that BCT has fewer employees than many of its peer agencies. While fewer employees can indicate a more efficient operation, it can also be indicative of an agency that is understaffed. BCT management will review staffing levels to ensure that they are appropriate.





Public Involvement



(This page intentionally left blank.)

Public Involvement

Section 4

Extensive public outreach activities were undertaken during the TDP process. In this section, the types of activities undertaken are described and the input received during those outreach activities is detailed. The first step in the public involvement process was to develop a Public Involvement Plan to guide activities. This plan can be found in Appendix E. It was approved by FDOT.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Public involvement activities included the following items:

- Creating a brand,
- Establishing Advisory Review Committee,
- Conducting stakeholder interviews,
- Developing a web page,

- Hosting discussion group workshops,
- Conducting surveys,
- Hosting community drop-ins, and
- Giving presentations.

BRANDING

Figure 4-1 BCT *Connected* Logo

As part of the TDP process, a brand was developed. The name, BCT *Connected*, along with a logo were created and used throughout the process. The logo, as seen in Figure 4-1, allowed individuals to more readily identify the plan and know when activities related to it were being held.



Figure 4-2 ARC Meeting Participants



ADVISORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

To ensure that BCT *Connected* was developed in a logical and thoughtful manner, BCT established an Advisory Review Committee (ARC) to oversee its development. Figures 4-2 and 4-3 are photographs from the first ARC meeting and Table 4-1 lists the members of the ARC. BCT included members of MPO staff and Workforce One, the regional workforce development board, to meet the requirements of rule 14-73.001 which requires BCT to allow these organizations the opportunity to provide comment on the TDP.



The ARC met four times during the development of BCT *Connected*:

- March 4, 2013
- May 13, 2013
- July 29, 2013
- August 19, 2013

Figure 4-3 ARC Meeting Participants



| Member | Organization | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Germaine Smith Baugh | Urban League of Broward County | |
| Kareen Boutros | Broward Workshop | |
| Al Calloway | Current BCT Rider | |
| Sidney Calloway | Transit Advocate | |
| Paul Carpenter | Transit Advocate | |
| Diane Drews | Student, Broward College | |
| Larry Hymowitz | Florida Department of Transportation, District 4 | |
| Mason Jackson | Workforce One | |
| Francois Leconte | Minority Development and Empowerment Organization | |
| Buffy Sanders | Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization | |
| Shirley Snipes | Aging and Disability Resource Center of Broward | |
| Jim Udvardy | South Florida Commuter Services | |
| Natalie Yesbeck | South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | |

Table 4-1 Advisory Review Committee

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Throughout the project, stakeholder interviews were held with individuals who could provide information regarding transportation issues and/or were viewed as having a particular stake in the decisions made with regard to transportation. Table 4-2 contains a list of stakeholders that were interviewed and the organizations they represent. Detailed summaries of the input gathered during these interviews can be found in Appendix F. Themes from the stakeholder interviews included the following:

- Connection is needed for bicyclists and pedestrians,
- Real-time passenger information is needed,
- Increased service and improved service frequency should be a focus for BCT,

- BCT should increase the percentage of hybrid vehicles in its fleet,
- System awareness needs to be increased through marketing efforts, and
- Overall BCT is doing a good job.

| Stakeholder | Title | Organization | Interview Date |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Dan Lindblade | President/CEO | Greater Chamber of Commerce | 3.12.13 |
| Tim Ryan | Commissioner | Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 4.5.13 |
| Dale V. Holness | Commissioner | Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 4.8.13 |
| Martin David Kiar | Commissioner | Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 4.8.13 |
| Stacy Ritter | Commissioner | Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 4.8.13 |
| Suzanne Gunzburger | Commissioner | Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 4.8.13 |
| James Murley | Executive Director | South Florida Regional Planning Council | 4.9.13 |
| Lois Wexler | Commissioner | Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 4.15.13 |
| Chris Wren | Executive Director | Downtown Development Authority of Fort Lauderdale | 4.15.13 |
| Alan Hooper | Chairman | Downtown Fort Lauderdale Transportation Management Association | 4.15.13 |
| Phyllis Zeiler | Executive Director | Downtown Fort Lauderdale Transportation Management Association | 4.15.13 |
| Nicki Grossman | President/CEO | Greater Fort Lauderdale Convention & Visitors Bureau | 4.18.13 |
| Kristin Jacobs | Commissioner | Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 5.6.13 |
| Chip LaMarca | Commissioner | Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 5.13.13 |
| Barbara Sharief | Commissioner | Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 5.13.13 |
| Robert Runcie | Superintendent | | |
| Jeff Moquin | Chief of Staff | Browned County Dublic Cohoolo | 5.29.13 |
| Maurice Woods | Chief of Operations Officer | Broward County Public Schools | |
| Leslie Brown | Chief Portfolio Services Officer |] | |

Table 4-2

Stakeholders

WEBPAGE

As part of the public outreach process, BCT developed a webpage embedded within BCT's website. The page introduced the TDP as well as provided updated information on public outreach activities. In particular, community drop-in events were listed. Snapshots, short summaries of pertinent information, were also uploaded as part of the TDP process. Figure 4-4 displays a screenshot of the website.

DISCUSSION GROUPS

BCT conducted several discussion groups throughout the development of BCT *Connected*. Typically, the

Figure 4-4 BCT TDP Website Screenshot



activity would begin with a short presentation that introduced the TDP and then would lead into a discussion that catered to the particular group assembled. Surveys were often distributed during these exercises and the results of those surveys can be found later in this section. Table 4-3 provides a list of



CONNECTED

the discussion groups conducted and Figure 4-5 is a photograph from the Community Bus Service discussion group. Many of the comments received in the discussion groups echoed those gathered in the stakeholder interviews. More detailed summaries of the information
Figure 4-5
Figure 4-5

gathered during the discussion groups can be found in Appendix F.

_ ..

Figure 4-5 Community Bus Service Discussion Group

| Table 4-3 | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Discussion Groups | | | | |

- -

| Discussion Group | Date |
|---|---------|
| Community Bus Service | 3.12.13 |
| Broward Regional Health Planning Council | 4.15.13 |
| Broward League of Cities Leadership Council | 5.14.13 |
| Community Bus Service | 6.11.13 |
| Hollywood Council of Howeowner Associations | 6.17.13 |
| Broward League of Cities | 6.20.13 |



SURVEYS

Three primary survey types were conducted during BCT *Connected* outreach activities:

- Short surveys that were given in person or via the Internet (see Figure 4-6),
- On-board surveys, and
- Telephone surveys.

Each of the three is described in this section.

Short Surveys

Surveys were distributed at community drop-ins, discussion groups, presentations, and through the webpage. Survey instruments can be found in Appendix F. Survey types varied slightly based on the type of event being attended so not every survey contained the same question set. Overall, 352 in-person surveys were gathered and 185 online surveys were completed for a total of 537, but for each question the number of respondents may vary.



Figure 4-6

| | Very Likely | Likely | Neutral | Not Likely | Not Very Likely |
|------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|------------|--------------------|
| More frequent service | | | | | |
| Fewer/easier transfers | _ | | | | |
| Earlier/later service | | | | | |
| More weekend service | | | | | |
| Bus benches/shelters | | | - | | |
| System safety | 1 | | | | |
| On-time performance | | | | | |
| Cost of trips (fare) | | | | _ | |
| Cleanliness of bus | 1 | | | | |
| WiFi on buses | 0 | 1.1.1.1 | 1 | | |

The first question asked how often the respondent uses BCT's transit services. As seen in Figure 4-7, about 44 percent of respondents indicated that they have never used BCT's services, although approximately 30 percent indicated using BCT regularly.





In the online survey, respondents were asked to indicate how important certain transit features are to them. As seen in Figure 4-8, over 90 percent of respondents indicated that on-time performance and more frequent service were very important or important to BCT's service offering. Only half of respondents thought Wi-Fi (i.e., wireless internet) on buses was a very important or important feature in BCT's features.

For those who indicated that they do not use the bus, the two most common reasons why people do not use BCT's services were "I do not like the bus/I prefer my car" (27%) and "Travel time is too long" (23%). Figure 4-9, also shows that over a quarter of the survey takers responded "Other" to this question. Convenience of the car compared to a bus, was the most frequently mentioned subject for those who responded "Other." Interestingly, no respondent indicated that cost of trip/fares was the reason they did not use BCT. Seventy-nine responses were analyzed for this question.

Respondents were asked to rank how likely service improvements would be to encourage them to start or continue using BCT's transit services. As seen in Figure 4-10, over 75 percent of respondents indicated that improvements to bus stop benches/shelters, improvements to on-time performance, and improvements to frequency of service were very likely or likely to encourage use of BCT's transit services.





Figure 4-8 Importance of the following features to BCT's services?

Figure 4-9 If you do not use BCT services, why not?





Figure 4-10 Improvements that would encourage the use of BCT services?

The surveys asked respondents if they would support long-term sustainable funding for public transportation. Figure 4-11 shows that the overwhelming majority, 79 percent, of respondents indicated they would support long-term sustainable funding for public transit, with only five percent indicating they would not support it.



Figure 4-11 Support long-term sustainable funding for public transportation?

The last question in the surveys asked the respondents to identify their home ZIP code. Overall there were close to 80 different ZIP codes listed. The three most common ZIP codes listed were 33311 (8%) in west-central Ft. Lauderdale, 33023 (5%) in southwest Hollywood, and 33027 (4%) in southwest



Miramar/Pembroke Pines. Map 4-1 provides a more detailed look at where survey respondents' residential ZIP codes.

On-board Survey

The BCT *Connected* on-board survey was conducted between February 26 and March 10, 2013. During this timeframe, a survey plan was designed to gather a 10 percent sample. Following the completion of this effort, it was determined that additional surveying would be conducted on the Community Bus system. This additional surveying work took place between May 2 and 18, 2013. Between the two surveying timeframes, a total of 8,913 completed surveys were completed.

Surveys were offered in English, Spanish, Haitian Creole, and Portuguese. A portion of the English version is shown in Figure 4-12. As displayed in Table 4-4, over 92 percent of the surveys were returned in English with 6.3 percent returned in Spanish, 0.1 percent returned in Portuguese, and 1.3 percent returned in Haitian Creole.

| Language | Completed Surveys | Language Distribution of Completed Surveys |
|----------------|-------------------|---|
| English | 8,226 | 92.3% |
| Spanish | 563 | 6.3% |
| Haitian Creole | 117 | 1.3% |
| Portugese | 7 | 0.1% |
| Total | 8,913 | 100.0% |

Table 4-4On-board Survey Completion by Language

For the majority of users, travel to work was their trip purpose and they accessed the bus stop by walking. A plurality paid using the regular cash fare. Approximately one-third of users were able to complete their trip without a transfer.

More riders use the system four or more days per week and have been riders for two or more years. If the BCT route were not available, riders would ride with someone (26.3%), not make the trip (22.0%), or drive (14.1%). The most important part of transit service was on-time performance followed by more frequent service.

Approximately 30 percent of respondents live in households with annual incomes less than \$10,000, although 61 percent of express service riders live in households with annual incomes of \$60,000 or greater. Over 42 percent live in households with no vehicles present.





Figure 4-12 **On-board Survey Instrument** BR WARD BCT BUS RIDER SURVEY transit DEAR BUS RIDER: BCT needs your help to provide improved bus service in Broward County. Please complete this survey and return it to the surveyor. If you have already filled out a survey, you do not need to fill out another one. I. What is the main purpose of your trip today? 10. Please indicate how important each of the following features are to your enjoyment of BCT services, Personal Business Visiting/Recreation Other Work Shopping School Medical Please milicate More Proquent Service Fewer/Easien Transfers Earlier/Later Service More Weekend Service Bus Stop Benches/Shelter 2. How did you get to the bus stop where you got on this bus? Walked Blocks Walked Bl Got a Ride Drove Myself System Safety On-Time Performance Cost of Trips Cleanliness of Buses Wi Fi on Buses Transferred from BCT Route Transferred from Community Bus Route Transferred from Miami-Dade Transf Route Transferred from Palm Tran Bus Transferred from Tri-Rail Commuter Train Transferred from Tri-Rail Commeter Shuttle If, For each of the following types of services, please indicate where you would like to see new or improved services? Express service from New service from to Other (specify, such as bievele, etc.) 3. What is the name or sip code of the place you are COMING New or enhanced neighborhood circulator service FROM now? Where' a____More Frequency. Which routes? 100 Other For statistical purposes, tell us a little about yourself. All replies are confidential. 4. What is the name or zip code of the place you are GOING 12. Your age ts.. 11111

The largest ethnic group is Black/African American (45.7%) followed by White/Caucasian (23.2%), and Hispanic (21.2%). Users are half female and half male. The largest age group to use the system is between 18 and 24. Over 37 percent of riders live in homes where a language other than English is spoken.

More detailed results from the onboard survey displayed by system type (e.g., all routes, Breeze, express, local, and community bus) are provided in Appendix G.

Telephone Survey

In addition to the on-board and other surveys, BCT conducted a telephone survey of 500 registered voters in Broward County. The survey took place between July 15 and 18, 2013. Adjustments were made to weight the results to fully represent the demographic and geographic characteristics of the county. The estimated margin of error of the survey is ± 4.38 percent. The full survey results and responses can be found in Appendix H. The survey had 37 questions, including socio-economic questions. Below is brief analysis of the public opinion telephone survey questions.

Question 8 of the survey asked respondents to indicate how frequently they use public transportation services, including Breeze Limited Stop, Community Bus, and/or I-95 Express. As seen in Figure 4-13, close to two-thirds of those surveyed indicated not using public transit at all while about 15 percent use bus and public transit services very or somewhat frequently.


Figure 4-13 Use of Bus and Public Transit Services

Question 14 asked survey takers, compared to other needs and priorities, how important is it to provide additional funding to improve public transit services in Broward County. Figure 4-14 shows that over 60 percent of respondents indicated that additional funding for public transportation in Broward County was of "High" or "Medium" importance. Only one percent responded that it was not a priority.



Figure 4-14 Priority for Additional Funding for Public Transit

Question 26 asked respondents how much of a priority it is to expand the hours of service of public transportation in order to serve people working a second or third shift. As seen in Figure 4-15, close to 85 percent of respondents indicated that expanding hours of service of public transportation was of "High" or "Medium" priority.





Figure 4-15

In the early stages of the telephone survey, respondents were asked if they favored or opposed a halfcent sales tax increase to help pay for improvements to bus and public transit services. The question was asked again in the latter stages of the survey after respondents had been educated about transit services in Broward County. By the end of the survey, there was a nine percent point increase in respondents who supported the sales tax increase to fund bus service improvements in Broward County. The full results are shown in Figure 4-16.



Figure 4-16 Support for Sales Tax Increase to Improve Bus Services

The last question of the telephone survey asked the survey taker if they agreed or disagreed that even if they may never use it, everyone benefits from improved bus and public transit services in Broward

County. Figure 4-17 shows that over three quarters (77%) of respondents indicated that they agreed with this statement.



Figure 4-17 Believe in the Benefits of Public Transit

COMMUNITY DROP-INS

BCT hosted numerous community drop-in events. Photographs from the Lauderhill Mall, Marando Farms Green Market, and Miramar Green Market are displayed in Figure 4-18. For these events, BCT participated in previously scheduled and advertised events, where BCT can setup presentation boards, distribute surveys, and have staff speak with event participants. Table 4-4 provides a list of events BCT attended.



Figure 4-18 Community Drop-in Events





Table 4-5

Community Drop-ins

| Community Drop-in | Date |
|--|---------|
| Oakland Park Blvd Transit Alternatives Analysis | 4.11.13 |
| Jamaican Women of Florida | 4.19.13 |
| Broward MPO 2040 LRTP Transportation Open House (Emma Lou Olson Civic Center) | 4.23.13 |
| Broward MPO 2040 LRTP Transportation Open House (Jaco Pastorius Community Center) | 4.25.13 |
| 17th Annual Waterway Clean Up | 4.27.13 |
| Central Broward Kiwanis Club | 4.30.13 |
| Broward MPO 2040 LRTP Transportation Open House (Hallandale Beach Cultural Community Center) | 5.2.13 |
| Josh's Organic Market | 5.5.13 |
| Broward MPO 2040 LRTP Transportation Open House (Miramar Cultural Center) | 5.7.13 |
| Lauderhill Mall | 5.10.13 |
| Miramar Green Market | 5.11.13 |
| Broward MPO 2040 LRTP Transportation Open House (Tamarac Community Center) | 5.15.13 |
| Pompano Green Market | 5.18.13 |
| Miramar/Memorial Health Green Market | 5.19.13 |
| United Neighbors of Eastern Miramar | 5.22.13 |
| Cleveland Clinic Green Market | 6.13.13 |
| Marando Farms Green Market | 6.15.13 |
| Sunday Brunch Jazz (Riverwalk) | 7.7.13 |

PRESENTATIONS

The final type of activity was presentations to boards and groups. These activities were primarily targeted at groups whose purview is transportation. Table 4-6 provides a list of presentations that occurred in the production of this document.

Table 4-6

Presentations

| Presentation | Date |
|--|---------|
| Broward MPO Board | 4.11.13 |
| Broward MPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) | 4.24.13 |
| Broward MPO Community Involvement Roundtable (CIR) | 4.24.13 |
| Broward Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) | 5.8.13 |
| SFRTA Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) | 5.15.13 |
| WorkForce One | 5.29.13 |
| Broward County Local Coordinating Board | 6.17.13 |
| Broward County Board of County Commissioners | 8.27.13 |
| Broward MPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) | 8.28.13 |
| Broward MPO Community Involvement Roundtable (CIR) | 8.28.13 |
| Broward MPO Board | 9.12.13 |
| SFRTA Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) | 9.18.13 |

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

In total, BCT *Connected* hosted approximately 56 opportunities for individuals to provide input in to its development. Surveys were completed by 9,950 respondents. In total, BCT connected with over 10,000 individuals during the development of BCT *Connected*. Each survey asked respondents to provide their residential ZIP code. For those that provided one, Map 4-2 provides an indication of how many surveys were returned from each ZIP code.

| Type of Outreach | Number of Events |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Advisory Review Committee Meeting | 4 |
| Stakeholder Interview | 16 |
| Discussion Group | 6 |
| Community Drop-in | 18 |
| Presentation | 12 |
| Total Number of Events | 56 |
| | |
| Surveys | Number of Surveys |
| Surveys On-board | Number of Surveys 8,913 |
| | |
| On-board | 8,913 |
| On-board In-person | 8,913 352 |

Table 4-7 Public Involvement Summary

As noted in the PIP, the TDP had a number of goals and objectives that BCT would strive to meet during the TDP process. The results of BCT's efforts are displayed in Table 4-8.





Table 4-8Public Involvement Goal Accomplishment

| Strategy | Objectives | Measures | Targets | Accomplishments | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Goal 1 Early and Consistent Involvement: Involvement | ioal 1 Early and Consistent Involvement: Involve riders, the public, and stakeholders early and regularly in the project. | | | | | | | |
| Stratify a variety of public involvement and outreach activities to provide opportunity throughout the project | and outreach activities to provide | | • Zero cancelled events | Accomplished: Zero cancelled events | | | | |
| Increase the number of individuals providing input and requesting information as the project progresses through development | Catalog the number of interactions throughout the project. Interactions are defined as input received through face-to- face communication with a TDP team member, completion of a TDP survey, emailing a question, etc. | • Number of interactions | • Greater than 5,000 interactions | • Accomplished: A total of 9,950 surveys were completed through an on-board survey, in-person/public meeting survey distribution, or electronic distribution | | | | |
| Catalog the number of opportunities provided to participate throughout the project. Providing an opportunity to participate is defined as one-way communication between the TDP Team and the potential participant. Examples include sending out newsletters, posting TDP material on a website, posting a TDP notice in a newspaper, etc. | | • Number of opportunities provided to participate | • Greater than 10,000 opportunities provided to participate | • Accomplished: Transit Flash newsletter with TDP information distributed to more than 6,000 people, more than 20,000 on- board surveys printed, 56 events hosted, and online survey available for more than three months | | | | |
| Goal 2 Opportunity: Provide all BCT riders, or disabilities, older adults, or those who have | itizens, and stakeholders with the opportunit imited English proficiency (LEP). | y to participate throughout the project, inclu | uding those in traditionally under-represente | ed populations, such as youth, persons with | | | | |
| Provide multiple opportunities for input so that if a person cannot attend a meeting or activity in person, he/she can still provide input via the website or a secondary forum | Establish project-specific email address so participants can submit comments and questions any time. | • Establishment of a project-specific email address | Maintenance of a project-specific email address throughout the duration of the project. Review comments and questions received. | Accomplished: Maintained a project- specific email address throughout the duration of the project. Comments were reviewed and questions answered | | | | |
| • Ensure participation from people who live in all parts of the county | Request ZIP code information from all public involvement participants | Map ZIP code data from time-to-time throughout the project to ensure input is from individuals geographically distributed throughout the county | • Participation from at least 90% of all ZIP codes with at least 20 or more participants from 50% of the ZIP codes | Accomplished: Participation from 100% of ZIP codes and more than 20 participatnts from 85% of the ZIP codes | | | | |
| • Provide opportunity for traditionally under-represented groups to participate | Identify under-represented groups early in the process and include members in the stakeholder database | Number of members of the stakeholder database that fall into an under- represented group | Greater than 5% of stakeholder database members are members of an under-represented group | Accomplished: Greater than 5% of stakeholder database members are members of an under-represented group | | | | |





| Table 4-8 (Continued) |
|---|
| Public Involvement Goal Accomplishment |

| Strategy | Objectives | Measures | Targets | Accomplishments | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| oal 2 Opportunity: Continued | | | | | | | | | |
| | Provide printed survey materials in English, Spanish, Portuguese, and Haitian/Creole | nglish, Spanish, Portuguese, and | | Accomplished: 7.7% of returned surveys are alternative language surveys | | | | | |
| Provide opportunity for non-English speaking individuals to participate | Provide translators at meetings where persons with LEP are expected | Number of individuals not served due to lack of translation services | Zero people turned away due to lack of translation services | Accomplished: Zero people turned away due to lack of translation services | | | | | |
| | Provide a language translation function on TDP website | Number of languages the website can be translated into | Greater than four alternative languages | Accomplished: Website can be translated into more than four languages. | | | | | |
| • Provide opportunity for persons with disabilities to participate | • Ensure in-person events are held at locations accessible by at least one transit route and are ADA accessible | Percent of events held at locations accessible by at least one transit route and are ADA accessible | • 100% of all events are held at locations accessible by at least one transit route and are ADA accessible | • Accomplished: 100% of all events are held at locations accessible by at least one transit route and are ADA accessible | | | | | |
| Goal 3 Information and Communication: Pro | vide all citizens and interested stakeholder a | gency groups with clear, timely, and accurate | nformation relating to the project as it progresses. | | | | | | |
| • Provide information in accessible format | Provide printed copies of materials when requested by those who do not have access to the internet. | Number of individuals not provided printed copies when requested | Zero individuals not provided printed copies when requested | Accomplished: Zero individuals not provided printed copies when requested | | | | | |
| • Provide regular updates on the TDP's progress | Provide summaries of technical information in a format that is easily understood by the public | Percent of TDP technical documents summarized in easy-to-understand brochures | At least four technical documents summarized in easy-to-understand brochures | Accomplished: Four technical documents summarized in easy-to- understand brochures | | | | | |
| F 0 | Update the TDP website on a regular basis | • Frequency of updates to the TDP website | • Update the TDP website more than once per month | Accomplished: TDP website updated more than once per month | | | | | |
| • Provide opportunities for the public to ask questions | Establish means for the public to submit questions via the website and in- person | Percent of questions responded to within two business days | • Greater than 90% of questions responded to within two business days | Accomplished: Greater than 95% of questions responded to within two business days | | | | | |
| Goal 4 Range of Techniques: Use a broad-spectrum of techniques to gather input from a diverse population within the project area. | | | | | | | | | |
| • Provide opportunity for the public to critique public involvement opportunities | Provide comment forms that participants can submit in writing or via website during the TDP process | Percent of public outreach opportunities where comment cards are provided | Greater than 25% of public outreach opportunities have comment cards available | Accomplished: 100% of public outreach opportunities have comment cards available | | | | | |
| • Employ the techniques identified in this PIP to provide a broad range of opportunities | • Assess whether or not the goals of this PIP have been met | Percent of goals met by the conclusion of the TDP process | • Greater than 75% of goals met by the conclusion of the TDP process | • Accomplished: 100% of goals met by the conclusion of the TDP process | | | | | |

Draft Transit Development Plan

Public Involvement 4 - 18





Situation Appraisal



WAVE ALIGNMENT

| | LEGEND |
|-------|---|
| - | Proposed Alignment |
| - | Alternative Alignments |
| ۲ | Station |
| | Potential East/West Transit Alignment |
| - | Potential FEC Transit Alignment |
| | Broward County Transit Transfer Station |
| - | Optional Maintenance and Storage Site |
| | Drawbridge |
| []]] | At-Grade Railroad Crossing |
| 62222 | Existing Parking Facility |
| - | Proposed Rim Intercept Parking Facility |



(This page intentionally left blank.)

Situation Appraisal

Section 5

In preparing this TDP Update, a review of applicable federal, state, regional, and local plans, programs, and studies that influence BCT operations, infrastructure, policy, or funding were reviewed. Findings of this review have been summarized and are incorporated into the development of the TDP through the situation appraisal. A situation appraisal, which is required during a major TDP update under the TDP Rule, is an evaluation of the environment in which the transit agency operates. One of the key components of the situation appraisal is this review of relevant plans, programs, and studies, in which factors and influences that will help BCT better understand its environment are identified.

PLAN REVIEW

Table 5-1 provides a summary of the key findings and considerations from the plans, programs, and studies reviewed as part of this effort. Essentially, this table provides the pertinent "take-aways" from each to be considered during the situation appraisal. A more detailed summary of the primary plans, programs, and studies listed above is provided in Appendix I.

(This page intentionally left blank.)



Table 5-1

Plan Review

| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | Overview | Key Con |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP 21) | Federal | Implemented July 6, 2012 | FTA, FDOT | • MAP-21 extends federal highway and transit funding through federal fiscal year 2014. | MAP-21 consolidates or el new funds for transit capit New Freedom funds are co Access and Rewerse Comm projects are now eligible for |
| Clean Air Act of 1990 | Federal | Revisions to National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) proposed in 2010; not yet implemented | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) | The Clean Air Act of 1990 and subsequent amendments determine the NAAQS for six pollutants, including carbon monoxide and ozone. | Broward County is current Enhanced transit options r County to remain classifie |
| Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) Circulators | Federal | EJ Circulator, effective August 15, 2012 Title VI Circulator, effective October 1, 2012 | U.S. DOT, FTA | The new EJ Circular issued by FTA provides recipients of FTA financial assistance with guidance for incorporating EJ principles into FTA-funded plans, projects, and activities. The revised Title VI Circular includes the removal of several references to EJ, which are now incorporated into the separate EJ Circular, to better understand the distinctions between Title VI and EJ. | BCT is required to submit 1 operating 50 or more fixed area of more than 200,000 equity changes or monitor BCT's public involvement p meaning full participation |
| DOT Livability Initiative and Federal Sustainable Communities Program | Federal | Partnership for Sustainable Communities formed in 2009 | U.S. DOT, FTA, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and EPA | The goal of this joint-initiative is to improve access to affordable housing, better transportation choices, and lower transportation costs while protecting the environment – essentially making communities throughout the United States more livable. | The US DOT and FTA support communities improve liva encourage Trainsit Oriente |
| Florida Transportation Plan: Horizon 2060 (FTP) | State | 2010 | FDOT | • The Florida Transportation Plan looks at a 50-year transportation planning horizon and calls for a fundamental change in how and where Florida invests in transportation. | The FTP supports the dever a series of relaited goals an by all modes to meet the r |
| State of Florida Transportation Disadvantaged Five- Year/Twenty-Year Plan | State | 2005 | Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged | The plan, required under the Florida Statutes, includes the following elements: Explanation of the Florida Coordinated Transportation System Five-Year Report Card Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability Review Strategic Vision and Goals, Objectives, and Measures | Short-term strætegic vision transportation system for Long-range strætegic vision transportation system with and implemented regional |

onsiderations for the Situation Appraisal

eliminates a number of existing funds and provides several pital and operating programs, in which BCT may be a recipient.

e combined with Section 5310 program funds, while the Job nmute (JARC) program is eliminated; however, many JARC e for funding under 5307 and 5311 funds.

ently classified as an-attainment area.

s reduce travel by single-occupant vehicle, helping Broward ied as an attainment area.

it Title VI programs every three years as a transit provider xed route vehicles in peak service and located in an urbanized DOO persons. BCT also is required to evaluate service and fare tor transit service for Title VI impacts.

It plan should incorporate outreach designed to encourage on from members of the EJ population.

oport a number of policies and initiatives intended to help vability and overall quality of life, including programs to nted Development (TOD) enhanced mobility options, etc.

evelopment of state, regional, and local transit services through and objectives, emphasizing new and innovative approaches e needs today and in the future.

on includes developing and field-testing a model community or persons who are Transportation Disadvantaged.

ion includes developing a universal cost-effective vith a uniform funding system and services that are designed nally throughout the state.

Situation Appraisal 5 – 2



| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | Overview | Key Con |
|--|---|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| FDOT FY 2013-2017 Work Program | State (specific project list developed for FDOT District Four and Broward County) | February 12, 2013 | FDOT | The Five-Year Work Program is developed annually by FDOT and is a project-specific list of transportation activities and improvements developed in cooperation with the Broward MPO and local transportation agencies. The Work Program must be consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with the capital improvement elements of local government comprehensive plans. | A summary off transit pro- Work Plan was compiled for Types of transit projects route realignments, oper- park-and-ride llot improver |
| State Growth Management Legislation (House Bill 7207) | State | June 2, 2011 | Florida Legislature and local governments | • HB 7207 repeals most of the State-mandated growth management planning laws that have governed development activities within Florida since the original Growth Management Act of 1975, including transportation concurrency. | The repeal of state-manda with the opportunity to o with the development and HB 7207 strengthens legi transportation by stating provide for a siafe, conveni |
| South Florida East Coast Corridor (SFEEC) Study | Regional | In Progress | FTA, Southeast Florida Transportation Council, FDOT, SFRTA, Broward MPO, BCT, Palm Tran, Palm Beach MPO, Miami- Dade MPO, MDT | The SFECC Study proposes reintroducing passenger service along an 85-mile stretch of the Florida East Coast (FEC) Railway corridor between downtown Miami and Jupiter. | This regional corridor comand MDT, and rail transities integrate with the various proposed Wawe in downto East-West Connection. The System Mlaster Plan is phases for implementatio Next Steps include recommendation. BCT is a Project Partner or |
| All Aboard Florida | Regional | In Progress | Private Initiative led by Florida East Coast Industries | All Aboard Florida is looking at the feasibility of implementing a privately owned, operated, and maintained intercity passenger rail service along a 240-mile section of the existing FEC between Miami and the Space Coast and the creation of new tracks into Orlando. | Study requires coordination agencies (including BCT) re a proposed station in Fort |
| 95 Express Managed Lanes (Phase 2) | Regional | In Progress | FDOT | 95 Express Phase 2 will extend the existing express lanes north from Golden Glades interchange in Miami-Dade County to Broward Boulevard in Broward County. | The 95 Express operated by downtown Milami within of from the Miami-Dade Cour route to continue traveling lanes. |
| Regional Transit System Master Plan (RTSMP) | Regional | In Progress | South Florida Transportation Council (SFTC) | A key component of the SEFTC-led 2040 Southeast Florida Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP). Project will identify the most significant regional investment needed to meet travel demands throughout the Southeast Florida region. | The RTSMP, when complete transit travel demands an region. It is expected that of future regional express |

onsiderations for the Situation Appraisal

rojects by type of work found in the adopted FY 2013-2017 for consideration in the TDP update.

ts included in the FY 2013-2017 Work Program include BCT perational improvements, fixed-route capital, transit studies, vements, etc.

dated transportation concurrency provides local governments develop a more localized concurrency program that aligns nd mobility goals of the community.

gislative language that supports multi-modal approaches to ng that Comprehensive Plan Transportation Elements "shall enient multi-modal transportation system."

onnects to the existing bus systems, including ECT, Palm Tran it systems including both Tri-Rail and Metrorail. It will also us transit systems including the new Miami Trolley, the ntown Fort Lauderdale, and the proposed Central Broward

n is currently being refined to identify and evaluate initial cion, start-up infrastructure, stations, and preliminary costs. mmending a preferred alternative.

on this study and sits on the SFFEC Steering Committee.

tion between with FEC and local transit/transportation regarding connecting service at proposed stations (including ort Lauderdale).

d by BCT provides Express Bus service from Broward County to a current express lanes. The extension of the 95 Express lanes punty line to Broward Boulevard will allow BCT's 95 Express ing at higher average travel speeds via uninterrupted express

bleted in early 2014, will provide a thorough analysis of unmet and other regional transit opportunities in the three-county at this analysis will be particularly helpful for the development ss bus service.



| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | Overview | Key Co |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Regional Transit Interoperability/Universal Fare Technology Study | Regional | In Progress | FDOT, BCT, MPO, SFRTA, MDT, and Palm Tran | Purpose of this study is to evaluate and implement a regional fare card using smart card technologies for BCT, SFRTA, MDT, and Palm Tran, along with evaluating the business case and total cost drivers associated with realizing the technical integration solution. SFRTA and MDT utilizing EasyCard system; BCT and Palm Tran now accept SFRTA transfer ticket. Regional travel is complex where separate fare media, different fares and transfer policies make travel difficult for existing riders and daunting for new customers | The next steps for implement Decision-makærs from tregional trips Define limitations to accontent Launch pilot program to Focus to devellop robust |
| Broward County Comprehensive Plan | Broward County | 2006 | Broward County, Broward County Planning Council | The Broward County Comprehensive Plan is the primary policy document concerning land use, transportation, and other planning matters for unincorporated Broward County. | |
| Broward County Land Use Plan | Broward County | 2013 | Broward County, Broward County Planning Council | Under the Broward County Charter, the Broward County Planning Council is charged with preparing a land use plan. The County Charter requires all local land use plans to conform to the Broward County Land Use Plan. | • The Land Use Plan est redevelopment of Brow within the county. |
| Broward County Trafficways Plan | Broward County | 2013 | Broward County, Broward County Planning Council | The Broward County Trafficways Plan serves as the roadway right-of-way preservation plan for Broward County. Dedication of right-of-way may be required through the development review process to provide for an adequate regional roadway network. | The Broward County Tra road network that is req |
| City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan | City of Fort Lauderdale | 2008 | City of Fort Lauderdale | The City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan is the primary policy document concerning land use, transportation, and other planning matters for the City of Fort Lauderdale. | |

Section 5 | Situation Appraisal

onsiderations for the Situation Appraisal

enting a regional fare system include: transit stakeholders to draft a fare policy for multi-modal

- cessing Easy Card encryption key
- evaluate use and administrative functions
- system that is extensible to emerging technologies

an Land Use Element identifies parameters for land use ote or enhance transit, such as Regional Activity Centers, Local Oriented Corridors (TOC), and TODs.

- Transportation Element defines the County's Transportation providing a concurrency designation for multi-modal which assign secondary priority to vehicle mobility and and interconnectivity of alternative modes.
- tablishes the framework for the future development and vard County and for the provision of facilities and services

e consistent with the uses, the densities and the intensities of use designations that promote or enhance transit will need to oward County Land Use Plan to be implemented at the local

afficways Plan identifies adequate right-of-way for the regional quired to ensure that necessary facilities are or can be put into lar, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes of travel.

d four Regional Activity Centers, with the Downtown Regional ng the highest level of transit and regional connectivity to stems/routes. There are currently no specific sites designated s, TOCs, or TODs in the city.



| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | | Overview | | Key Co |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| City of Hollywood Comprehensive Plan | City of Hollywood | 2008 | City of Hollywood | primary poli | Hollywood Lauderdale Com cy document concerning lar anning matters for the City c | d use, transportation, | The City has established Hollywood to encourage use development, encour travel. A TOC is designated along Hollywood limits. The go with access to transit star guidelines with the TOC transit facilities. |
| City of Miramar Comprehensive Plan | City of Miramar | 2010 | City of Miramar | The City of Miramar Comprehensive Plan is the primary policy document concerning land use, transportation, and other planning matters for the City of Miramar. | | The City has established Creek Road bætween Pal Regional Activiity Center of The City has established Plan, which is located ea Road, on the east by SR 7 The City has established city. The City seeks to con community shuttle servic central, and eastern community | |
| City of Coral Springs Comprehensive Plan | City of Coral Springs | 2008 | City of Coral Springs | The City of Coral Springs Comprehensive Plan is the primary policy document concerning land use, transportation, and other planning matters for the City of Coral Springs. | | The City seeks to create that will combine a commwalkways, and transit state. The City looks to maximiz identifying opportunities within the city, which magnets bus Services. | |
| Broward MPO 2035 & 2040 LRTP | Broward County | 2009, next update in 2014 | Broward MPO | branded "Transformat investments other mobil that complete The Broward | e Broward MPO Board add ansformation." ion is a transit-focuse in BRT, premium rapid bu ity options (bicycle, pedest ment transit. d MPO is in the process of ed "Commitment 2040." | d LRTP, proposing s, mobility hubs, and rian, and greenways) | The 2035 LRTP Cost Feasi Bus, 20 Gateway Hubs, 2 routes. A portion of Broward Co costs are funded in the service is funded. BCT will work with Browa TDP update for FY 2014-2 appropriate. |

Section 5 | Situation Appraisal

onsiderations for the Situation Appraisal

ed a Regional Activity Center in and around downtown redevelopment in a way that facilitates multi-use and mixedurages mass transit, and reduces the need for automobile

gside SR 7/US 441 between the northern and southern City of oal of this designation is to facilitate mixed-use development ations or stops along this corridor. There are specific design C specified to encourage connectivity between uses and to

the Miramar Regional Activity Center, located north of Bass alm Avenue and Flamingo Road, under the Broward County designation.

a TOC, consistent with the Broward County Comprehensive ast of SW 66th Avenue and bound by the north by Pembroke 7/US 441, and on the south by County Line Road.

a Town Center to serve as the focal point of activity in the ontinue to develop and enhance, in cooperation with BCT, the ces to effectively serve the Town Center and also the western, munity centers.

e a multimodal transit center within downtown Coral Springs muter drop-off zone, BCT routes, bicycle facilities, pedestrian ation with seating and other amenities.

ize BCT and SFRTA services for its employees and residents by s for park-and-ride lot locations that are in proximity to or ay offer transit services, such as the Tri-Rail and BCT Express

sible Plan includes 81 miles of BRT, 75 miles of Premium Rapid 20 Anchor Hubs, 63 Community Hubs and 8 new local bus

County Transit's Operations and Maintenance and all capital e Cost Feasible Plan. One third of BCT's FY 2009-2018 TDP

ard MPO staff to ensure that transit projects identified in this -2023 will be incorporated into the 2040 LRTP Needs Plan, as

Situation Appraisal 5 – 5



| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | Overview | Key Con |
|---|---|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Broward MPO Congestion Management Process/Livability Planning Studies (Hollywood Pines Corridor Project) | Hollywood/ Pines Boulevard Corridor from SR A1A to US 27 | In Progress | Broward MPO, in coordination with the Cities of Hollywood and Pembroke Pines, and other state, regional and local agencies | The Broward MPO's integration of Congestion Management Processes and Livability Planning focus on enhancing the quality of life by reducing congestion, improving safety and increasing mobility and livability along the corridor. The Hollywood Pines Corridor Study Area includes a major east- west travel corridor (Hollywood/Pines Boulevard) served by several BCT/Breeze routes, as well as connections to I-95 Express, Tri-Rail, and potential the FEC corridor. | Short-term improvement connections and amenitie queue jump bypass lanes. Long-term improvements |
| Broward County Climate Change Action Plan | Broward County | 2010 | Broward County | In June 2008, the BCC formed the Broward County Climate Change Task Force. The mission of the Task Force was to develop recommendations for a coordinated countywide strategy in mitigating the causes and addressing local implications of global climate change. The Broward County Climate Change Action Plan, contains 126 recommended actions to be brought before the Board for approval and implementation. Recommendations were ranked into three categories—high (critical), medium, and low. | A total of 65 recommend some type of action has a Major topic a reas that th have an implication for tra Amend zoning and supportive/walkable l Create a flunctional m the Commission's go current levels by 2050 Support llocal, region regional climate cha processes, including E |
| Regional Climate Change Action Plan | Regional | 2012 | Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact (Compact), | Compact is a collaborative effort among Palm Beach, Broward, Miami-Dade, Monroe Counties, their municipalities and partners to develop a regional action plan for Southeast Florida to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to regional and local impacts of a changing climate. | The Regional Climate Char action items identified by emissions by planning, de supported by sustainable items associated with thi infrastructure investment The Regional Climate Cha entities in the four-cour planning, operation, and i options and land use poli coordination among these |
| Fort Lauderdale – Hollywood International Airport Master Plan | Broward County | 2010 | Broward County | The objective of the report is to plan the terminal airport area facilities through 2020. | Development at the airport |
| Port Everglades Master Plan | Broward County | 2011 | Broward County | The goal of the plan is to Create a plan to maximize market share and revenue through a realistic 5-year facility development program within a framework of 10- and 20- year vision plans. | The master plian assesses cargo, non-comtainerized of Connection wiith the airpo |

onsiderations for the Situation Appraisal

prridor Project will identify ways to improve transit operations e land uses through short and long-term strategies and

ents for the corridor may include bus stop placement, ities; park-and-ride locations; and transit signal priority and es.

ts for the corridor may include premium transit, connection to location/design of mobility hubs; and linkage with future 5.

endations were ranked as critical and given a "high" ranking; s already been taken on 52 of the 65 high ranked action items. these 65 high ranked recommendations fall under and that transit include:

nd building recommendations to support TOD and transit le land uses.

mass transportation system as a major component to achieve goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 80% below 050.

ional, and state planning entities that integrate and adopt hange mitigation and adaptation goals into their planning g BCT.

hange Action Plan establishes seven goals to categorize the 110 by the Plan. One of the goals is to "reduce greenhouse gas designing, and prioritizing walkable, affordable communities ble multimodal transportation options." There are 16 action this goal that address both land use policy and multimodal nt strategies.

Change Action Plan recognizes that there are more than 100 bunty region that exercise governance over transportation id investment decisions. Continued enhancement of mobility policy to support alternative modes will require inter-regional ese agencies, including BCT.

port is to accommodate connections to local transit service.

es the market for the Port's four business lines: containerized d cargo, liquid bulk, and cruise ships.

port for cruise passengers is important to the Port.

Situation Appraisal 5 – 6



| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | | Overview | | Key Con: |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Seven50 Regional Plan | Broward County | In Progress | South Florida Regional Planning Council – Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council | • | Led by the South Florida and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Councils and the Southeast Florida Regional Partnership (SFRP). The SFRP is a voluntary, broad-based and growing collaboration of more than 200 public, private, and civic stakeholders from the Southeast Florida region. The plan is being devised through a series of public summits, workshops, online outreach, and high-impact studies and will identify a blueprint for growing the Southeast Florida region into a prosperous and desirable place for the next 50 years and beyond. | • | Concept is based on the strategic planning at loca Supply and Education, In Growth Leadership, Busi Systems, and Quality of L Identifies a meed to dev transportation systems to improvement. The Comprehensive Eco South Floridia and Treas pillars, will be integrated plan for the entire seven- |
| Broward Complete Streets Initiative | Broward County | 2013 | Broward County Planning Council | • | Broward County has developed model guidelines for developing complete streets | • | The Complete Streets Initi several Broward County or Broward County Commiss and includes the developn |
| Oakland Park Boulevard Transit Alternatives Analysis Study | Oakland Park Boulevard Corridor from the Sawgrass Expressway to SR A1A | In Progress | BCT, SFRTA, Broward MPO, FDOT, and affected municipalities | | This is a multi-agency project to evaluate premium transit projects along the high-ridership Oakland Park Boulevard corridor from the Sawgrass Expressway to SR A1A. Study outcomes will be to identify the most feasible and effective transit projects that will improve mobility, congestion, and better link points of connection. | • | The study is currently eva operational improvement anticipated to be complete BCT sits on the Technical A |
| University Drive Mobility Improvements Planning Study | University Drive Corridor, from Sample Road to NW 215 th Street | In Progress | BCT, SFRTA, Broward MPO, FDOT, MDT, and affected municipalities | • | This study will evaluate mobility improvements and transit projects along University Drive, from Sample Road in Broward County to south of the Miramar Parkway at NW 215 th Street in Miami-Dade County. | | This study is im its initial st enhanced transit alternati accessibility to stations, cc and feasibility'. Selection completed by January 201 BCT sits on the Project Adv |
| Central Broward East-West Transit Study | Central Broward County | Locally Preferred Alternative approved in October 2012 | Broward MPO, FDOT, SFRTA and BCT | • | Project goal is to develop a premium transit service in Central Broward County. Study area boundaries include the central part of Broward County, located between Oakland Park Boulevard in the north, the Weston-Sawgrass area in the west, Griffin Road/Stirling Road in the south, and the Intracoastal Waterway in the east. | • | The Broward IMPO approvevaluate a combination of Premium bus will be consumer by and n Education Cemter to the service to the Fort Lau Lauderdale connecting with the service to the connecting with the service to the service to the service to the fort Lau Lauderdale connecting with the service to the servi |

onsiderations for the Situation Appraisal

he "six pillars" designed to serve as an organizing force for ocal, regional, and state levels. The six pillars include: Talent Innovation and Economic Development, Infrastructure and usiness Climate and Competitiveness, Civic and Governance f Life and Quality Places.

evelop and maintain multimodal, interconnected trade and s to support a globally competitive economy and focus on

conomic Development Strategies (CEDS) completed by the easure Coast Regional Planning Councils, addressing the six ed into the Seven50 Plan to form a comprehensive 2060 vision en- county Southeast Florida Region.

itiative is an ongoing educational process that is supported by organizations.

ssion approved the Complete Streets Initiative in March 2013 pment of an inter-departmental Complete Streets Team.

valuating short- and long-term transit mode alternatives and nts. Selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) is eted by Spring 2014.

Advisory Committee (TAC) for this study.

stages, but when completed will define the range of potential atives for the corridor, including reviews of station locations, connectivity by different modes, costs, technologies, benefits, on of the Locally Preferred Alternative is anticipated to be 014.

dvisory Committee (PAC) for this study.

oved the Griffin Road Alternative in October 2012, which will of premium bus and modern streetcar services.

nsidered from Sunrise to the South Florida Education Center. modern streetcar will be considered from the South Florida e Griffin Road Tri-Rail Station. Modern Streetcar will provide auderdale-Hollywood International Airport, downtown Fort with the Wave, and the Broward Boulevard Tri-Rail Station.



| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | | | Overview | | | Key Con |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| The Wave Streetcar | Downtown Fort Lauderdale | In Progress | Broward County, BCT, SFRTA, Broward MPO, FDOT, City of Fort Lauderdale, and Fort Lauderdale Downtown Development Authority (DDA) | RTA, Broward MPO, FDOT, f Fort Lauderdale, and auderdale Downtown The Wave route will include 10 stations, streetscape improvements, and a traffic signalization package to help | | • | The Wave will connect po including BCT routes. The Wave will maintain 7 headways during off-peak | | |
| BCT I-95 Express Bus Service | Service from Hollywood/ Miramar to downtown Miami | In Operation | Service operated by BCT in cooperation with FDOT and other agencies | • | The 95 Express operated by BCT provides BRT service from Broward County to downtown Miami via a combination of High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/express lanes along I-95. | | • | The 95 Express currently Miami Gardens Drive/NE 2 I-95 express lanes to Brow traveling at higher average 95 Express Bus Service p along the major intersta morning and afternoon pe | |
| MDT I-95 Express Bus Service | Service between downtown Miami and Sheridan St. and Ft. Lauderdale Tri-Rail Stations | In operation | Service operated by MDT in cooperation with FDOT and other agencies | • | express week service. Th downtown M Broward Cou | Service (Existing Route 195) kday rush-hour service and le first leg provides expr Miami and Sheridan Stree unty via I-95. The second een downtown Miami and I 95. | features two legs of ess service between t Tri-Rail Station in leg provides express | | This MDT Expiress Bus ser Rail Station) aind BCT Rout |
| BCT I-595 Express Bus Service | Service from downtown Fort Lauderdale to downtown Miami and Sunrise to the Miami Civic Center | In Operation | Service operated by BCT in cooperation with FDOT and other agencies | • | Lauderdale t Park-and-Rid Currently bu traffic; howe completed a lanes being b | s provides BRT service fi to downtown Miami/Brickell de to the Miami Civic Center. uses travel in regular lanes ever, in 2014 the reconstru and the 595 Express will u built in the median. On I-95 avel lanes as the 95 Express. | and Westgate Square on I-595 with mixed ction of I-595 will be ise reversible express , the 595 Express uses | • | Construction of the I-595 express lanes will allow E speeds via uniinterrupted lanes will be fully construct 595 Express Bus Service p along the major interstate Dade County on weekdays |
| MDT Northeast Corridor (Biscayne Blvd.) Enhanced Bus Phase 1 | Service from downtown Miami to Aventura Mall via Biscayne Blvd./US 1 | Revenue service expected in 2014 | Service to be operated by MDT | • | This route w along Biscay Aventura Ma Arsht Perforn cities of Litt Miami Beach Service head hour and 20 anticipated diesel/electri (CNG), or o | will provide premium limite yne Boulevard/US-1 from all. This route provides ser ming Arts Center, and a dir tle Haiti, Miami Shores, No | d stop transit service downtown Miami to vice to the Adrienne ect connection to the rth Miami and North ring the AM/PM peak- ay. Revenue service is ig 11 new 60-foot mpressed natural gas s. The bus purchase | • | This forthcoming MDT E Route's 1/US 1 Breeze/28 the Aventura Mall. The forthcoming (2013-1 options/plans for MDT's f service solutions into and |

onsiderations for the Situation Appraisal

points of interest along route to the regional transit network,

7.5-minute headways during peak periods and 10 minute ak periods by providing transit priority at traffic signals.

ly travels in the I-95 express lanes from downtown Miami to E 183rd Street and travels in HOV lanes north. Extension of the oward Boulevard will allow BCT's 95 Express route to continue age travel speeds via uninterrupted express lanes.

provides free commuter park-and-ride locations, and travel tate highways to Miami-Dade County on weekdays during peak travel hours.

ervice provides connections to BCT Route 12 (Sheridan St. Triute 22 (Ft. Lauderdale Tri-Rail Station).

P5 reversible express lanes as well as the extension of the I-95 w BCT's 595 Express route to travel at higher average traveled express lanes for the entire route. It is expected that these ructed and operational by mid-2014.

e provides free commuter park and ride locations, and travel ate highways between downtown Fort Lauderdale and Miamiays during morning and afternoon peak travel hours.

Enhanced service will directly benefit patrons using BCT 28 that currently serve the same transfer location as MDT at

8-14) BCT-led US 1 BRT Improvements Study will review all s Northeast Corridor Enhanced Bus service for optimal transit nd out of this corridor.



| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | Overview | Кеу Со |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| MDT I-95 Express Bus Service Broward Blvd. Expansion | New service from Broward Blvd. Tri-Rail Station to Miami Civic Center | Revenue service expected in 2014 | Service to be operated by MDT | This route would provide express commuter transit service between the Fort Lauderdale Tri-Rail Station located at Broward Boulevard in Broward County and the Civic Center Metrorail Station in Miami-Dade County via I-95. Service headways will be 30 minutes during the AM/PM peakhour. Revenue service is anticipated to begin in 2014. | New Express Bus Se Lauderdale/Broward Co Miami. |
| MDT I-95 Express Bus Service Sheridan Street Expansion | New service from Sheridan St. Tri-Rail Station to Miami Civic Center | Revenue service expected in 2014 | Service to be operated by MDT | This route would provide express commuter transit service between the Sheridan Street Tri-Rail Station in Broward County and the Civic Center Metrorail Station in Miami-Dade County via I-95. Service headways will be 30 minutes during the AM/PM peakhour. Revenue service is anticipated to begin in 2014. | New Express Bus Servic County to the Civic Center |
| MDT NW 7 th Ave. Enhanced Bus Service | Service between downtown Miami and Golden Glades | Revenue service expected in 2015 | Service to be operated by MDT | This route will provide premium limited-stop transit service along NW 7th Avenue between downtown Miami and the parkand-ride lot located at the Golden Glades Interchange. Service headways will be 15 minutes during the AM/PM peak-hour and 30 minutes during the mid-day. This route will provide a premium transit connection to the NW 7th Avenue Transit Village located at NW 7th Avenue and NW 62nd Street. Revenue service is anticipated to begin in 2015. | This planned service wil routes at the Golden Gland BCT. |
| MDT I-295 Express Bus | Service from Miami- Dade/Broward Co. Line at 215 th St./NW 27 th Ave. and downtown Miami via the HEFT and I-95 | Revenue service expected in 2016 | Service to be operated by MDT | This route would provide express commuter transit service between the Miami-Dade/Broward County Line (NW 215th Street and NW 27th Avenue) and downtown Miami via the HEFT and I-95. Service headways will be 15 minutes during the AM/PM peak-hour. Revenue service is anticipated to begin in 2016. | This planned service will routes at the planned M at 215th St/NW 27th Ave, |
| MDT North Corridor (NW 27 th Ave.) Enhanced Bus | Service from Miami- Dade/Broward County Line (NW 215 th St. & NW 27 th Ave.) to Miami Intermodal Center (MIC) | Revenue service expected in 2017 | Service to be operated by MDT | This route would provide premium limited-stop transit service along the NW 27th Avenue corridor from the Miami-Dade/Broward County Line (NW 215th Street and NW 27th Avenue) to the MIC. A park-and-ride/bus terminal station is proposed at the northern terminus of the route at NW 215th Street. Service headways will be 10 minutes during the AM/PM peak hour and 20 minutes during the mid-day. Revenue service is anticipated to begin in 2017 using 11 new 60-foot diesel/electric hybrid, clean diesel, CNG, or other alternative fuel buses. | This forthcoming MDT E BCT Route 2 (University explore sendiing these terminal station at NW 2 |

| Section 5 Situation Appraisal | |
|---|--|
| nsiderations for the Situation Appraisal | |
| rvice would provide direct connection between Fort unty to the Civic Center employment area in downtown | |
| e would provide direct connection from southeast Broward er employment area in downtown Miami. | |
| l provide connections to BCT's University and US 441 Breeze ades transfer location, enhancing connectivity between MDT | |
| provide connections to BCT's Route 2 and University Breeze DT park-and-ride facility at the Miami-Dade/Broward Co. Line enhancing connectivity between MDT and BCT. | |
| nhanced Bus service will directly benefit patrons utilizing the | |

two routes to serve MDT's proposed park-and-ride/bus 215 St.



| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | Overview Key Co |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| I-75 Express Bus Service | Service from Sawgrass Mills/I- 595 area into Miami-Dade County | Revenue service expected in 2018 | Operating agency to be determined by FDOT Dist. IV | |
| MDT Northeast Corridor (Biscayne Blvd.) Enhanced Bus Phase 2 | Service from downtown Miami to Aventura Mall via Biscayne Blvd./US 1 | Revenue service expected in 2020 | Partnership between Miami-Dade MPO and MDT | The Miami-Dade MPO in cooperation with MDT is performing an Implementation Plan for the Biscayne Boulevard Enhanced Bus Service (EBS) project. This EBS route will feature robust stations, Wi-Fi, real-time "Where is the Bus?" arrival times via the internet or on web enabled mobile devices, real-time "Next Bus" arrival information via electronic signs, Transit Signal Priority (TSP), and Park-and-Rides. Phase II for the Biscayne Enhanced Bus Service project will feature 10 minute service headways during the AM/PM peak- hour and 20 minutes during the mid-day using an additional five (5) new 60-foot diesel/electric hybrid buses, clean diesel, CNG or other alternative fuel buses. Phase II is expected to be completed by 2020. |
| MDT Palmetto Express Bus | Service from FDOT Park-n- Ride Lot at I-75 to Palmetto Metrorail Station | Revenue service expected in 2022 | Partnership between Miami-Dade MPO, FDOT Dist. VI and MDT | This route would provide express commuter transit service between the proposed FDOT park-and-ride lot at I-75 (as proposed by the FDOT I-75 Express Bus Service Alternatives This proposed service all |
| SR 7/US 441 Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study | SR 7/US 441 from SR 834/Sample Road to SR 808/Glades Road | In Progress | FDOT | SR 7 between the Broward County Line and Glades Road is designated as a TOC in the Broward County Comprehensive Plan. Broward County policy requires the addition of two dedicated transit/special use lanes when projected level of service (LOS) falls below LOS D within a five-year period. The purpose of this st environmental analysis, perform a financial an |
| US 1 Bus Rapid Transit Improvements Study | US 1 (between downtown Fort Lauderdale and Aventura Mall) | In Progress (2013-14) | BCT, Broward MPO, FDOT, MDT, Miami-Dade MPO, SFRTA, and affected municipalities | BCT received a \$686,000 FTA Earmark to study BCT's third busiest bus route by daily trip activity. Current BCT local service (Route 1) in this corridor experiences overcrowding, faces upmitigated traffic congestion and consequently suffers Improve transit service (Route 1) in this corridor experiences overcrowding, faces upmitigated traffic congestion and consequently suffers |

Section 5 | Situation Appraisal

onsiderations for the Situation Appraisal

rating costs are projected to be funded by toll revenue from Lanes project.

uting has not been finalized but is generally expected to ward County and terminate in western Miami-Dade County.

type of buses to provide this service have not yet been

Enhanced service will directly benefit patrons using BCT 28 that currently serve the same transfer location as MDT at

-14) BCT-led US 1 BRT Improvements Study will review all s Northeast Corridor Enhanced Bus service for optimal transit d out of this corridor.

llows the opportunity for future I-75 Express Bus Service from important connections to either the MDT Express Bus or

tudy will be to analyze traffic/land use data; perform an develop engineering concepts, conduct a noise study, and ysis.

nsider an evaluation of premium transit within the corridor, as ild/no-build alternative based on the findings.

- ravel time in a highly-utilized transit travel corridor; ervice reliability;
- projected transit capacity needs;
- sit passenger experience utilizing transit on corridor;
- nability, livability and transit-oriented development concepts the corridor.

Situation Appraisal 5 – 10



| Plan/Program/Study Reviewed | Geographic Applicability | Most Recent Update/Timeframe | Responsible/Partner Agencies | | | Overview | | | Key Co |
|---|---|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| Broward Boulevard Livable Mobility Plan | Broward Boulevard | In Progress (until end of 2014) | ВСТ | • | Broward County received \$8 million in federal funding from FT/ for transit capital and operating improvements on Broward Boulevard. | | | | Improvements programs efficient hybriid-electric implementing; Transit Sig pedestrian facilities/con Advanced Trafffic Manage |
| Broward Boulevard Corridor Transit Study | Broward Boulevard from US 1 to Pine Island Road | Final Report July 2012 | FDOT, Broward MPO, BCT, SFRTA, and affected municipalities | • | The purpose of this study is to explore transit options for th Broward Boulevard corridor to improve mobility, reliev congestion, and improve air quality. | | | | Selected Alternative inc stops at high demand sto of Broward Boulevard fr (BAT) lanes. Operating and Maintena |
| Broward Boulevard Gateway Implementation Plan | Broward Boulevard from NE 8 th Avenue to NW 27 th Avenue | In Progress | City of Fort Lauderdale, Fort Lauderdale DDA, Fort Lauderdale Transportation Management Authority, Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA), South Florida Regional Planning Council (SFRPC), Broward County, Broward MPO, FDOT, and BCT | • | The project goal is to improve mobility, accessibility, connectivity, and quality of life through specific implementable projects along Broward Boulevard, with the goal of creating a gateway to downtown Fort Lauderdale. | | | • | Potential implementatio that will impæct BCT, T additional amenities, ser |
| Bus Queue Jump Lanes Pilot Demonstration Project | SR 7 and Prospect Road | Mid-2013 | Broward County, BCT, FDOT and affected municipalities | • | In late 2012, a pilot project was implemented to introduce new traffic signal for buses in order to reduce bus delay an improve service delivery and traffic flow. | | | Data collected during the benefits of this technolog county. | |
| BCT Shelters and Amenities Program | Broward County | 2010 | Broward County, BCT | • | areas, and tra | ctive is to increase the num ansit amenities at BCT bus s locations with identified fun | stops at a minimum of | • | This countywicle action p at bus stops; plan includ affected municipalities. Bus stops are prioritized safety, Americans with D accessibility (siidewalks). BCT will have over 1,0 completed at the end of total bus stops will have a |

Section 5 | Situation Appraisal

onsiderations for the Situation Appraisal

med with federal funding include purchasing nine energybuses to operate along Broward Boulevard (BCT Route 22), gnal Priority along Broward Boulevard, enhancing bicycle and nections, developing a car sharing program, and making gement System (ATMS) improvements.

cludes adding an overlay service on BCT Route 22 that only cops. A longer-term Alternative includes dedicating curb lanes rom SR 7 to Andrews Avenue as Business Access and Transit

ance costs remain unidentified for the selected Alternative.

on projects will likely include transit-related recommendations Tri-Rail, and the future Wave route, such as park-and-ride, rvice improvements, etc.

the two-week pilot project will be analyzed to assess the gy and if similar applications are appropriate elsewhere in the

blan will increase the number of shelters and transit amenities des specific shelter designs adopted by Broward County and

based on daily ridership figures, right-of-way availability, site Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility and connecting pedestrian

000 total shelters in the system-wide once the project is f 2014. Once this project is completed, nearly 20% of BCT's a shelter.

Situation Appraisal 5 – 11

SITUATION APPRAISAL

The requirements for a TDP major update include the need for a situation appraisal of the environment in which the transit agency operates. The purpose of this appraisal is to help develop an understanding of the BCT operating environment in the context of the following elements:

- Regional transportation issues;
- Socioeconomic trends;
- Travel behavior;
- Land use;
- Public Involvement; and
- Technology.

The following situation appraisal provides an overview of the environment in which BCT operates. While this list cannot possibly be exhaustive, it includes the primary circumstances shaping BCT's operating environment. The assessment of these elements resulted in the identification of possible implications for BCT. The assessment and resulting implications are drawn from the following sources:

- Review of relevant plans, studies, and programs prepared at all levels of government;
- Results of technical evaluation performed as part of the transit development planning process;
- Outcomes of discussions with BCT staff and administration; and
- Input gathered through public involvement activities.

Socioeconomic Trends

Broward County population grew at a rate of 7.7 percent between 2000 and 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau). The number of employed persons in Broward County increased by over 12 percent during this same time period. The growth in transportation disadvantaged persons between 2008 and 2013 in Broward County was over 10 percent.

Implications – BCT must strive to meet transit demand as the number of people living and working in Broward County continues to grow. As population grows and more employment opportunities become available, the role of transit will become an increasingly more important component of the overall transportation solution in the county. The increase in transportation disadvantaged individuals in the population may increase the demand for paratransit services, as well.



Travel Markets

Transit markets can be organized into three major categories: traditional markets, discretionary markets, and regional markets. The traditional market includes individuals who have no or limited transportation alternatives and rely on public transit for essential and recreational trips. This market includes the elderly, youth, low-income, and no/limited vehicle populations. The discretionary market refers to individuals who have a choice of transportation alternatives and may choose transit if the service is competitive with the automobile in terms of travel time, convenience, cost, and/or other factors. The regional market refers to the demand for commuter travel to other counties in the region.

While BCT currently serves all three markets, the largest group it serves is the traditional market. In recent years, BCT has been making a concerted effort to serve more and more of the discretionary and regional markets. To serve these groups, BCT has to offer services that are more competitive with the automobile and move people regionally.

Implications – BCT should continue to target traditional markets and continue efforts to increase its share of discretionary and regional riders. As economic development efforts in the county continue to mature, BCT should continue to modify its services in order to capture new riders and new transit markets.

Transportation Network

While BCT provides local and regional travel options, it also contributes to a larger transportation network that enables travel beyond the region. This network includes regional rail, airports, and seaports. SFRTA operates the Tri-Rail system, which provides transportation along a 70.9-mile corridor from Miami to West Palm Beach. Several studies are looking at adding passenger rail service between Miami and other destinations such as Jupiter and Space Coast. The Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood Airport's Master Plan includes plans for future growth that will include accommodations for regional transit connections. As with many other seaports, the deepening of the Panama Canal has impact for Port Everglades. As such, it is also planning to expand its operation. Public comment included the need to provide transportation to and from all of these facilities.

Implications: As these projects progress, there will be increasing demand for BCT services to support them. These demands will have operational and financial impacts for BCT as the system's route network grows and evolves to meet such increased demand.

Complete Streets

Developed through a grant from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the Broward County Complete Streets Initiative was approved by the Broward County Commission on March 12,

2013. The unanimously-approved measure calls for adopting the Broward Complete Streets Guidelines, which provide community design standards to make streets safe for all users.

The Complete Streets Initiative was created through a partnership of the Broward Regional Health Planning Council, Broward MPO, the Health Foundation of South Florida, and the Smart Growth Partnership. As part of this initiative, FDOT has developed a lane elimination process and the County has hired a Complete Streets Coordinator to review all resurfacing and capital improvement projects.

Implications – Throughout the public involvement activities conducted as part of the TDP process, many individuals mentioned the need to improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to the transit system and the safety of those modes. This initiative will assist BCT in making the transit system more accessible.

The Wave

On March 13, 2013, the Broward County Commission approved The Wave, which committed Broward County to fund annual cost to operate and maintain the system. The initial 1.4-mile streetcar segment will be constructed for approximately \$83 million with an anticipated opening date in late 2016. The Wave is a modern streetcar system that is intended to circulate people around downtown and act as both a transportation mechanism and an economic development tool. Additional phases are being studied as to the appropriate locations for expansion.

Implications – BCT will be the owner and operator of The Wave system, which will add a new mode to the BCT system. As the operator, BCT will have to manage funding for The Wave, including the processing of grants. BCT also will need to determine how best to connect the existing fixed-route motorbus service to the streetcar line to ensure system connectivity.

Express Lane Development

In addition to express lanes already in operation, FDOT Districts Four and Six are implementing express lanes on 27 miles of I-75 and SR 826 from I-595 to SR 836. The express lanes will open in FY 2018. One of the stated purposes of the express lanes is to improve transit service in the area. Further expansion of the Managed Lane system from Broward Blvd. north through Palm Beach County to the Martin County line will also be studied by FDOT within the next few years.

Implications – BCT will be able to add and improve express bus service in this corridor by operating in the express lanes. Funding for such service remains unidentified.



Fixed Route Local Bus Service

BCT is currently having significant issues with on-time performance on a number of key corridors. In some instances the problem with schedule adherence is due to traffic congestion, in some instances it is due to increased ridership demand, and in some instances it is both. Ridership demand can become a problem when there is too much demand for the amount of service being provided on a given route; the bus has to stop more frequently, which slows its progression on the route. Additionally, on some trips it is so overcrowded that some potential passengers have to be passed up until the next bus.

Implications – BCT needs to add service annually on a number of its key routes in order to improve ontime performance and help ensure that these routes can actually provide the level of service that is published in BCT's schedule.

Community Bus System

BCT assists 18 municipalities with the funding of community bus routes. These services are managed by their respective communities while BCT provides \$15 per hour of service to support the costs of operating the system. BCT assists each of these 18 partners with developing routing, schedules and other service-related logistics while the municipalities generally manage the operational contract for their respective routes.

Implications – Given the unique nature of every contract BCT has with the 18 different community bus partners, it has become very cumbersome for BCT to manage these contracts. It will be necessary for BCT to develop two or three boilerplate contracts I the near-term from which the communities can choose.

Jitney Service

Jitney service, independently operated and privately owned transit-like service, is making an entry into the local economy. Broward County Code of Ordinances Ch. 22½-7 permits jitney service under certain conditions with approval of the Transit Director. Jitneys must operate along a fixed route, are not permitted to have a schedule, and may not board/discharge passengers within 200 feet of a bus stop or taxicab zone. Service development standards by BCT provide that proposed jitney routes should complement BCT services by expanding transportation access primarily during hours when public transit is not available or in communities that are currently underserved by transit.

Implications – Jitney service could be a benefit to the community by providing transportation options in currently underserved areas or during hours when traditional transit service is not currently financially feasible.

Funding

Funding of BCT operations has been a concern for a few years. Services have been cut in recent years due to lack of funding for the system. The LRTP's 2035 cost feasible transit plan, as noted in the plan review section, identifies funding for only a portion of transit needs. A portion of BCT's operations and maintenance and all capital costs are funded in the Cost Feasible Plan. Only one-third of BCT's FY 2009-2018 TDP service is funded.

Implications – BCT will have to identify new funding sources to be able to continue operating current services without modification or service cuts. Such new resources will be necessary for BCT to be able to enhance or expand existing services, as well.

Housing And Transportation Costs

Using 2006 through 2010 American Community Survey data, the Center for Neighborhood Technology and Center for Housing Policy found that the Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL, metropolitan statistical area (MSA) has the highest level of housing costs for any MSA in the country. For the average resident in this MSA, housing and transportation costs are equivalent to 72 percent of household For 90 percent of the income. households, housing and transportation costs are greater than 45 percent of their monthly income.

For commuters using public transportation, the average commute time is 47 minutes as compared to those who are driving alone, which is 26 minutes. A greater proportion of commuters using public transportation are minority residents. This means that a greater proportion of minority commuters have less time to spend doing other activities.



Figure 5-1 Housing and Transportation Costs

Source: Center for Neighborhood Technology and Center for Housing Policy.



Implications – Broward County residents are cost-burdened by housing and transportation costs. BCT has an opportunity to provide low-cost transportation services to alleviate some of this burden. If service frequency were improved, this could reduce the "penalty" paid by those individuals using public transportation as a commute alternative.

Long-term Sustainable Funding Source

Many of BCT's routes are "standing room only" during peak periods due to long headways. While crowded buses increase farebox recovery ratios, they may negatively impact total fare revenue. Long headways and standing-room-only conditions do not encourage transit usage and may reduce overall passenger loads. Standing-room-only conditions also negatively impact on-time performance. An overcrowded vehicle stops more frequently to allow passengers to board and alight; this constant stopping slows the progress of the bus, increases travel time, and makes it difficult to maintain on-time performance.

Implications – In order to provide more frequent service to address existing overcapacity and projected future demands, BCT must identify a long-term sustainable funding source. Without a sustainable funding source, BCT cannot begin to fully tackle existing capacity issues and projected increases in ridership over the near and long-term.

Six Pillars

Broward County has joined the State's Six Pillars initiative led by the Florida Chamber Foundation. One of the six pillars is Infrastructure & Growth Leadership, which has a goal of providing a variety of diverse, accessible, interconnected transportation options for residents, visitors, and the business community. This goal is to be measured by the miles of new rail line installed, number of new bus routes, and transit ridership levels.

Implications – As evidenced by this initiative, Broward County has begun the important process of garnering business support for greater transportation choices and investments.

Voter Opinions

From April 17-24, 2013, the Broward County MPO conducted a telephone survey of voters in Broward County. Of the 502 respondents, 10 percent of respondents indicated that the top issue of local concern is traffic, transportation and infrastructure/roads; 53 percent indicated that Broward's transportation system is inadequate; and 76 percent indicated that traffic congestion is a serious problem. For 45 percent of the respondents, adding more transportation options is the best way to address traffic congestion. In addition, 77 percent of respondents say that expanding public transportation should be a priority for Broward County.

Of those surveyed, 24 percent believe that they will be better off financially in the upcoming year than they are this year; 50 percent believe they will be about the same. Forty-seven percent indicated that they would support paying more in taxes or fees to improve the transportation system while 42 percent would oppose paying more.

Implications – Transportation and traffic congestion are important issues to the citizens of Broward County and they have concerns about them. These results are very similar to the public opinion poll findings from BCT's telephone survey (see Section 4).

Road Construction

Road construction projects will continue to change the operating landscape for BCT throughout the 10year timeframe of the TDP. These projects may cause temporary impediments to on-time travel during construction periods. Once completed, they may offer better travel conditions. For example, the expansion of the southern part of State Road 7 to six lanes in Broward County will impact traffic flow on that portion of the roadway and potentially improve the on-time performance of Route 18 and Breeze US 441. The extension of the I-95 express lanes will ensure that BCT's 95 Express will be able to travel at higher average speeds for a longer distance.

Implications – BCT will continuously have to monitor the on-time performance of each route to ensure that on-time system performance goals are being met. Temporary and permanent adjustments may need to be made throughout the 10-year period based on known roadway construction schedules.

Transportation System Management and Operation (TSM&O) Program

BCT will be coordinating with FDOT and Broward County Traffic Engineering Division (BCTED) on the implementation of the TSM&O program. The program is scheduled to begin monitoring and implementing real-time strategies on Broward County arterials in the fall of 2013. The focus of the system is to improve travel time reliability for users of the arterial network by actively managing the corridor. Other expected benefits include reduced incident duration and fewer crashes.

Implications – BCT will work with FDOT and BCTED to determine the best methods for coordinating between them on this project.

School Children Transportation

The transportation of school children has been a discussion for sometime in Broward County. While BCT is prohibited by FTA rules from providing service designed to move school children between school and home if there is a private school bus operator conducting business in the county, BCT's services are



certainly used by school children. These children may be going to school, home, or other destinations. Discussions between the school system and BCT are ongoing.

Implications – BCT will need to continue to meet with and discuss this transportation issue with school system officials.

Alternative Fuel Vehicles

Public outreach activities revealed strong interest in BCT using vehicles fueled with alternative fuels. BCT has been exploring its options and owns over 80 hybrid buses at this time. BCT also has a goal to keep 25 percent of its vehicle fleet using a hybrid propulsion system.

Implications – BCT should continue to its explore options for alternative fuel use, while maintaining at least a quarter of its fleet as hybrid vehicles.

Technology

Many comments were received during the public involvement phase that BCT needed to invest in technology upgrades to improve the passenger experience. BCT is making an effort to implement stateof-the-art technology to enhance the customer experience. BCT is exploring the implementation of realtime passenger information systems, fare integration with other transit systems, mobile telephone ticketing options/technology, and wireless internet on express and Breeze buses, among other options. These upgrades will allow for passengers to more easily access the system and use their time more efficiently while on the system.

Implications – BCT continues to emphasize technology implementation in order to enhance customer service. As such, staff will need to keep the agency's technology plan up to date and ensure that appropriate resources are dedicated, as available to the advancement of this program in the future.

Economic Benefits of Transit

The 2011 study, *Economic and Community Benefits of Urban Fixed-Route Transit in Florida*, conducted by FDOT and the Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR), measured the impacts of public transportation on local economies. Using the nationally-recognized IMPLAN Input-Output (I-O) model data from the NTD, data from the American Automobile Association (AAA), and data from the Texas Technology Institute's Urban Mobility Report, the study measured the economic impacts of federal spending, of savings to transit users, and of savings to highway users based on the operational and capital spending by the 28 fixed-route transit agencies in the state.

On average, about \$200 million federal dollars are spent every year by Florida transit agencies, which generates approximately 4,000 jobs and \$464 million dollars in the production of goods and services in the state. In other words, for every dollar spent on transit, \$2.30 of economic activity is generated.

Those who use public transportation enjoy the benefits of reduced travel costs, including savings in car ownership and operation. Reduced travel costs increase a transit user's disposable income, but decrease demand for goods of some industry sectors, like the automobile sector. Taking this into account, the I-O model estimates that the use of public transportation has a net positive impact on the state's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of approximately \$160 million annually.

Highway users experience the benefits of transit in increased transportation capacity and less congestion, travel time savings, and reduction in the amount of fuel wasted, among other things. Savings in wasted fuel and time savings produce on average between \$115-\$130 million dollars in GDP growth annually.

Implications: Increasing and improving BCT's services will have economic benefits to Broward County, as well as benefits to all of its residents, including users or non-users.

(This page intentionally left blank.)





Goals and Objectives



(This page intentionally left blank.)

Goals and Objectives

<u>Section 6</u>

The identification of goals and objectives for a transit agency is a fundamental but critical step in the preparation of a TDP. It is necessary for establishing the framework within which the agency will pursue its established TDP-inspired vision over time. BCT went through the goal-setting process during the agency's previous TDP major update; however, staff has indicated a desire to revisit the prior goals and modify them to better reflect the agency's current situation and vision for the future. As such, the TDP presents the updated goals and objectives that have been developed and are proposed for BCT.

It is important to note that a key input to the development of these goals and objectives is the range of comments and policy issues that have been identified during the TDP's public outreach process. As documented in the TDP's Public Involvement Plan, many discussions have been held with community leaders, key stakeholders, the Advisory Review Committee, BCT staff, and the general public, among other organizations and individuals. The issues highlighted during these discussions help form the basis for the proposed BCT goals. In addition, this list of goals has been supplemented by an examination of existing transit-related policies assembled from BCT's 2010 COA, as well as results from the 2013 on-board survey of BCT passengers systemwide and the household poll of randomly-selected Broward County residents (see Sections 5 and 4 for details on these results).

In developing original goals and objectives, or even modifying existing ones, it is beneficial to consider the definitions of these items to ensure that they are prepared in an appropriate manner. As such, following are general definitions of the terms to consider when developing when developing "goals" and "objectives":

- *Goal* A long-term end toward which programs or activities are ultimately directed.
- *Objective* A specific, measurable, intermediate end that is achievable and allows measurement of progress toward a goal.
- Action A prescribed step for achieving a given goal.

BCT MISSION STATEMENT

BCT's current Mission Statement is as follows:

The mission of Broward County Transit is to provide clean, safe, reliable and efficient transit service to the community by being responsive to changing needs and focusing on customer service as our highest priority.

Goals and Objectives 6 - 1



GOALS

BCT has established five major goals for the transit agency. Each goal is supported by objectives, actions, and performance measures. Each goal is presented with its related objectives and actions. A complete listing of each goal and its objectives, actions, performance measures, metrics, responsible parties, and targets can be found in Appendix J.

Goal 1: Promote and Advocate Economic Development and Livability Through Transit Investments

Public transportation is a critical component in the support of both regional economic vitality and growth and livability principles. Transit services can help support increased economic activity by providing mobility for an expanded workforce while also working in conjunction with local area land use regulations (in the form of planning, zoning, and design standards) to encourage high density, mixed use development around transit nodes. Broward County is especially interested in this last concept and has been examining the implementation of Complete Streets enhancements and transit-supportive land use changes and development on major corridors, which can help provide economic benefit by promoting infill/redevelopment and by enhancing the value of existing land uses. This goal seeks to ensure that BCT continues to coordinate with the County and other partners in supporting the ongoing economic development and livability activities in the region.

In the case of livability, which seeks to make communities more livable and sustainable by integrating and balancing economic, social, and environmental needs, transit services can employ "green" practices in capital infrastructure design and construction, ensure energy-efficient vehicles, and employ strategies to encourage land use and transit-oriented development designed to increase ridership. BCT is also committed to creating a culture of sustainability in its administrative and operational facilities.
Table 6-1

Goal 1 with Objectives and Actions

| Goal | Goal 1 Promote and Advocate Economic Development and Livability Through | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Trans | Transit Investments | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective 1.2 Coor | | Advocate regional connectivity by promoting BCT's role as a transit service provider Coordinate link multimodal transportation with land use decisions Integrate BCT's service planning efforts with other local and regional plans | | | | | | | | |
| Object | ive 1.4 Action 1 | op long-term transportation services beneficial to the region Promote transit as a benefit to the business community | | | | | | | | |
| | Action 1 | .2 Become an active participant in organizations with local and regional partners with a focus on economic development and livability | | | | | | | | |
| | Action 1 | Actively work with local communities to ensure that transit is an integral part of the comprehensive planning process | | | | | | | | |
| | Action 1 | .4 Monitor development for new transit markets in coordination with local and regional organizations | | | | | | | | |

Goal 2: Make BCT a Transportation Provider of Choice for Current and Potential Customers

This goal focuses on the delivery of a transit service that presents a high level of quality to all of its customers. Meeting this goal includes such aspects as clean and well-maintained vehicles, frequent and on-time service, accessible bus stops and facilities with appropriate infrastructure, and even real-time passenger information at transfer centers and/or on mobile devices, among others. The key policy objectives under this goal address these aspects using selected metrics that relate to such considerations. It is important to recognize that the various aspects of service focused on for this goal come from much the public input received during the community outreach efforts of this TDP.



Table 6-2

Goal 2 with Objectives and Actions

| Goal 2 Make BCT a Transportation Provider of Choice for Current and Potential | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Custo | mers | | | | | | | |
| Objectiv | Objective 2.1 Increase frequency of service to meet customer demand | | | | | | | |
| Objectiv | ve 2.2 | Expand coverage of services to meet customer demand | | | | | | |
| Objectiv | ve 2.3 | Improve productivity of services | | | | | | |
| Objectiv | ve 2.4 | Improve customer service | | | | | | |
| Objectiv | ve 2.5 | Maintain proactive communication with customers and stakeholders | | | | | | |
| Objecti | ve 2.6 | Improve the perception of public transportation | | | | | | |
| | Action 2. | 1 Monitor customer complaints on a regular basis and determine trends | | | | | | |
| | Action 2. | 2 Monitor and improve on-time performance | | | | | | |
| | Action 2. | 3 Enhance marketing and community involvement campaigns | | | | | | |
| | Action 2. | 4 Monitor low-performing routes against performance standards | | | | | | |
| | Action 2. | 5 Invest in capital projects that will improve customer satisfaction and convenience | | | | | | |
| | Action 2. | 6 Coordinate with regional partners to create an interoperable fare collection system | | | | | | |

Goal 3: Achieve Financial Stability and Efficiency

This goal focuses most importantly on BCT's long-term financial stability. The pursuit and securement of a dedicated funding source has come up during some of the outreach activity discussions, and this would be an important activity in the successful achievement of this particular goal. From key stakeholder interviews that were conducted, some of the ideas for possible sources of dedicated local revenue for transit include sales tax and revenues from a managed lanes toll surcharge. Regardless of the ultimate source, the goal for the dedicated funding would be to establish an annually-occurring stream of resources that would enable BCT to meet its many needs brought on by existing and growing demand, as identified for the 10-year time period of this plan, as well as address other needs that may arise in the future.

Draft Transit Development Plan

Table 6-3

Goal 3 with Objectives and Actions

| Goal | Goal 3 Achieve Financial Stability and Efficiency | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Objective 3.1 | | /ork with community stakeholders to establish the need to identify and implement a ustainable dedicated funding source for transit | | | | | | | |
| Object | | nsure business practices provide funding partners and stakeholders with the maximum enefit for their investment | | | | | | | |
| Object | ive 3.3 | Increase farebox recovery and ridership | | | | | | | |
| | Action 3 | 9.1 Present frequently updated reports on BCT's unfunded programs | | | | | | | |
| | Action 3 | 2 Work with community stakeholders to develop a coordinated approach to seekir dedicated funding source for transit | | | | | | | |
| | Action 3 | Actively seek additional and sustainable funding opportunities for new and expanded services | | | | | | | |

Goal 4: Develop a BCT Workforce that is Highly Qualified, Efficient, and Motivated by Excellence

BCT is dedicated to being an exemplary employer that continues to hold its staff to the highest standards. It is important for BCT to continue to develop a culture of accountability that is demanded at all levels of employment. BCT has committed to investing in its employees through training programs. These training programs will assist BCT in reducing potential accidents and increasing customer satisfaction.

Table 6-4

Goal 4 with Objectives and Actions

| Goal | Goal 4 Develop a Workforce that is Highly Qualified, Efficient, Productive, and | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Moti | vated t | o Customer Service Excellence | | | | | | |
| Object | ive 4.1 | Attract, recruit, and retain professional, diverse, and skilled employees | | | | | | |
| Object | ive 4.2 | Promote opportunities for continuous training to support workforce development | | | | | | |
| Object | ive 4.3 | Promote accountability with a focus on customer service and safety as a culture | | | | | | |
| | Action 4 | .1 Monitor workplace safety | | | | | | |
| | Action 4 | .2 Reduce preventable operator accidents through annual operator safety training | | | | | | |
| | Action 4 | .3 Implement all aspects of BCT safety and security plans | | | | | | |
| | Action 4 | Provide opportunities for supplemental training and employee recognition | | | | | | |

Goal 5: Increase and Improve Capital Assets

BCT is dedicated to maintaining its capital assets in good operating condition in order to provide for a pleasant experience by the passenger. Capital assets include rolling stock, facilities, and information technology (IT) equipment. For rolling stock, this goal includes a commitment to maintain a younger



average fleet age. It also includes a commitment to strive for a 25-percent hybrid ratio in the vehicle fleet.

Table 6-5 Goal 5 with Objectives and Actions

| Goal | Goal 5 Implement Capital Program Plan to Maintain State of Good Repair and | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Intro | Introduce New Technologies | | | | | | | | |
| Object | ive 5.1 | Replace vehicles according to established life cycles | | | | | | | |
| Object | ive 5.2 | Maintain all vehicles and facilities in a state of good repair | | | | | | | |
| Object | ive 5.3 | Practice and promote the enhancement of environmental sustainability as a culture | | | | | | | |
| Object | ive 5.4 | Implement new Information Technologies to enhance provision of customer service | | | | | | | |
| | Action 5 | .1 Manage the average age of vehicles to be within FTA guidelines | | | | | | | |
| | Action 5 | 2 Improve system reliability by improving mean distance between road failures | | | | | | | |
| | Action 5 | 3 Develop and implement a 10-year capital improvement plan | | | | | | | |
| Action 5.4 Action 5.5 | | 4 Create a schedule for capital asset inspections and ensure that critical inspection recommendations are completed in a timely manner | | | | | | | |
| | | 5 Construct all new facilities to "green building" standards for energy efficiency and sustainable design | | | | | | | |

SUMMARY

The goals and policy objectives presented herein reflect the strategic focus of BCT in its transit development planning process and are purposely designed to address the broad concepts of transit system operation that were identified using public and stakeholder outreach during the initial goal-setting process. Consequently, the policy objectives and related actions range in their level of specificity. It is envisioned that these goals and objectives, and accompanying actions, will provide the framework with which BCT can continue to grow, develop, and operate its various transit services so that they will continue to benefit BCT's stakeholders and patrons.





Alternatives



(This page intentionally left blank.)

Alternatives

Section 7

This section provides an overview of the alternatives developed for implementation during the 10-year TDP. For organizational purposes, the alternatives have been organized into two categories: Status Quo Plan and Vision Plan. Improvements in each category are detailed in this section. The projects in the Status Quo Plan are necessary to keeping the current system operational through the 10-year period. The Vision Plan projects are those that go beyond basic necessities and move the system toward more completely meeting the needs of Broward County residents.

The process to develop the alternatives included consultation with BCT staff, public outreach activities, a needs assessment based on the trend and peer analyses, and input from the ARC and local elected officials. The improvements are need-based improvements and therefore funding may not necessarily have been identified for them. Section 8, Financial Plan, will provide information on the costs associated with these improvements and funding available for them.

Following a description of the potential improvements, BCT provides analyses regarding ridership projections. Two tools are used; one is a Passengers per Hour (PPH) calculation while the other is the FDOT-required ridership model, Transit Boardings Estimation and Simulation Tool (TBEST), analysis.

STATUS QUO PLAN

The following projects are meant to ensure the current transit system is operational for the 10-year TDP timeframe.

Reliability/Capacity Adjustments

To improve on-time performance on routes that are experiencing schedule adherence issues, BCT plans to put more buses on the road to allow for greater capacity on the routes. For some routes, it is hard for drivers to maintain the schedule due to traffic congestion, for others it is due to over-crowding which causes performance delays by requiring many stops so passengers can board or alight, or it is a combination of the two. This alternative puts more buses out on the street on these routes in order to allow for better schedule adherence. These improvements are targeted for Routes 1, 10, 18, 22, 34, 36, 50, 72 and 441 Breeze. Map 7-1 provides a map of the affected routes.

New Service - The Wave

In 2013, the Broward County BCC reiterated its support for providing \$2.5 million annually to operate and maintain The Wave Streetcar system. The Wave Streetcar is a 2.7-mile local circulator planned for downtown Fort Lauderdale. As of August 2013, capital funding has been secured for the construction of the first phase of the project, a 1.4-mile portion that will extend from the Broward Central Terminal south to the Broward Courthouse area.

Map 7-1 Reliability/Capacity Adjustments







The initial line will provide circulator service in downtown Fort Lauderdale between 10 stations, with proposed 7.5-minute headways on weekdays and 15-minute headways during evenings and weekends. Following the construction of this initial 1.4-mile line by SFRTA in late 2016, BCT will become the owner and operator of the system.

The Wave Streetcar aims to create a livable community by integrating existing and planned transitsupportive land use, transportation, economic development, and environmental sustainability decisions in downtown Fort Lauderdale. By providing rail circulation between surrounding neighborhoods and downtown residents, and for regional transit users utilizing the Broward Terminal and connectivity to major employers, the WAVE Streetcar will accelerate the livability of the downtown and areas along the line.

Vehicle Replacement – Fixed Route

Each vehicle in the BCT fleet has a certain useful life and will need to be replaced when its useful life comes to a close. For the larger vehicles used on fixed route services, the useful life is about 14 years. Based on the age of BCT's current fleet and their replacement cycles, BCT developed a Fixed Route Fleet Replacement Plan.

Vehicle Replacement – Community Bus

As vehicles in the Community Bus system reach their useful lives and need to be replaced, BCT will begin to replace some of them with larger 30-foot buses. These larger buses will alleviate some of the overcrowding occurring in routes in these areas and allow for ridership growth with added capacity. Larger buses will be purchased for routes in Lauderdale Lakes, Lauderhill, Hallandale Beach, Pompano Beach, Deerfield Beach, Davie, and Fort Lauderdale.

Vehicle Purchase - Paratransit

BCT currently contracts out paratransit service, which includes the ownership of paratransit vehicles. BCT will slowly acquire paratransit vehicles in order to negotiate a new contract to allow for BCT to own the vehicles while a third party maintains and operates them. As such, BCT plans to purchase 234 new paratransit vehicles over the next one to two years. By moving to BCT ownership, equipment specific to BCT and its operations that is installed on the vehicle can be maintained on a vehicle even if the contract for paratransit operations changes between vendors. This avoids the situation where BCT is installing its equipment on vendor-owned vehicles. It also allows BCT to employ a better ratio of capital funds versus operating funds.

Cypress Creek Tri-Rail Station Access Improvements

Currently, the BCT station that serves the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail Station is across Andrews Avenue from the Tri-Rail station. In order to improve access for transferring passengers, BCT needs to realign the



CONNECTED

routes in that area to enter the Tri-Rail area directly. The improvement will require a redesign and improvement of access roads into the Station as well as the purchase of three new vehicles to facilitate the realignment of routes serving the station.

Lauderhill Mall Transit Center

A new transit center is needed at Lauderhill Mall to accommodate community shuttle buses, 40-foot vehicles, 60-foot vehicles, restroom facilities, and ticketing areas. The facility is scheduled for FY 2014. The facility will continue to serve Routes 18, 36, 40, 441 Breeze, and 81 as well as Community Bus routes from Lauderhill, Lauderdale Lakes, and Plantation.

Park-and-Ride Lots

Two park-and-ride lots are planned for the near future: Miramar and Westgate. The Miramar facility will service I-95 Express Routes and the Westgate facility will serve I-595 and I-95 Express routes.

Copans Road Facility Administrative Building #4 Rehabilitation

BCT's Building #4 on its current Copans Road Maintenance and Operations Facility will be rehabilitated in 2014 in order to better house BCT's overall Operations Department.

Copans Road Maintenance and Operations Facility Rehabilitation/Upgrade

The Copans Road Operations and Maintenance Facility campus currently in use needs to be upgraded, modernized, and expanded. It is expected that these improvements will allow the capacity for 80 additional buses.

B-Cycle Expansion

Broward B-Cycle launched on December 14th, 2011, with 20 stations in three cities (Hollywood, Fort Lauderdale, and Pompano Beach). Within its first year, the program grew to a total of 26 stations with the addition of stations in the cities of Dania Beach, Hallandale Beach, and the Town of Lauderdale-by-the-Sea. The 275-bike system now has 27 stations in six cities within the County with additional stations to be added. Since Broward B-Cycle launched, over 29,809 riders have taken more than 45,000 bike rides, saving more than 7,700 gallons of gas, offsetting more than 143,000 pounds of carbon emissions, and burning more than 5.9 million calories.

Bikesharing offers residents and visitors an alternative and active form of public transportation, which is good for their health, environmentally friendly, and affordable. BCT estimates that a minimum of two additional stations per year will facilitate more uses of the system if stations are placed in favorable locations. Locations of future stations will be based on connectivity with other B-Cycle Stations, area uses with higher ridership potential, local codes or other permitting requirements/regulations, and funding availability.

Bus Shelter/Stop Replacement

BCT will complete its first major bus shelter expansion plan by the end of FY 2014. Once completed, over 1,000 BCT bus stops throughout the county will have some type of bus shelter. Beyond FY 2014, BCT anticipates a minimum of fifty new bus shelters and/or upgraded bus stops per year where feasible.

Computer-Aided Dispatch/Automatic Vehicle Locator/Single Sign-On/Real Time Passenger Information System

BCT has an existing Computer-Aided Dispatch/Automatic Vehicle Locator (CAD/AVL) system that helps manage fleet operations, track vehicle movements, and facilitate communication. Working in conjunction with this system is the agency's Automatic Passenger Counter (APC) technology, which counts passengers as they board and leave buses, and Voice Annunciation System (VAS), which gives English/Spanish/Haitian Creole on-board automatic voice announcements for major stops, transfer points, landmarks, and safety advisories. BCT is currently working toward replacing the existing system with enhanced capabilities including Real-Time Bus/Passenger Information System, Yard Management System, and other beneficial functions. The real-time information system will provide patrons with accurate bus arrival information and allow them to plan their travel more efficiently. It also will help BCT staff support the agency's operational activities. The new system is expected to be deployed in FY 2015, with planned system upgrades subsequently occurring in FY 2017 and FY 2020.

AssetWorks Fleet Anywhere (FA) Suites

Fleet Anywhere from AssetWorks is a computer-based fleet management system that tracks all functions related to the inventory and the maintenance of vehicles and equipment. For a transit agency, it can help staff process repair and preventive maintenance work orders, capture operating expenses by maintenance category, manage the parts inventory, and track warranty schedules and repairs, among other capabilities. After implementation in FY 2013, BCT will need to upgrade the system in FY 2018.

Fare System Interoperability (Open Fare Payment System)

BCT's current fareboxes allow the agency to accommodate electronic fare payment, whereby electronic communication, data processing, and data storage techniques are used to automate manual fare collection processes. To further enhance the fare payment process and make it even more convenient for patrons, BCT will be pursuing the integration of Smart Card technology to these devices, which would also support the ongoing fare interoperability efforts in the region and allow for the transferability of fare payments across transit systems in Southeast Florida (e.g., Miami-Dade Transit's Easy Pass program). It is estimated that this project would be completed in FY 2016. In addition, BCT is also researching the potential feasibility of an open fare payment system (e.g., "Mobile Ticket" technology) to further expand the array of payment methods that it can offer to riders. BCT will participate in a pilot project in partnership with Palm Tran and then proceed with full deployment based on the outcome of the pilot.



CONNECTED

Personal Computer Replacement and Growth

Like all other capital equipment used by a transit agency, computer and technology-related equipment has a distinct life cycle and must be maintained and replaced accordingly. BCT intends to develop and maintain a scheduled replacement plan and to support any future personnel increases. Such a plan will allow the agency to ensure that it has an up-to-date and functional computer and technology infrastructure to support its services and operations in an ongoing fashion. This will be an annual priority project for BCT for FY 2015-23.

eLearning Solution for Computer-based Training (CBT)

BCT will implement an internal e-learning solution for Transit Operations & Maintenance employees focusing on service and operation improvements in FY 2015. This initiative will enable BCT to conduct ongoing CBT as needed.

Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) - Campus Surveillance System

BCT plans to upgrade to Internet Protocol (IP) Camera Technology from coaxial Point to Point in FY 2015, where possible. This upgrade will also include expanded channel counts for Digital Video Recorders as a part of the life cycle replacement program.

On-Board Vehicle Surveillance System

BCT has been using an on-board, closed circuit camera surveillance system on its buses since 2010. The system is used to record passenger and operator behavior, help deter crimes and disruptive behavior, and boost the overall safety and security of the vehicles while in service. The surveillance system recordings provide BCT staff with the ability to review occurrences for investigative and risk management purposes. A desired add-in, Live Look-in, is planned for acquisition in FY 2013, which will provide the additional capability to view and listen, in real-time, to the activities occurring on any one of the equipped BCT buses. This additional capability will enable transit, law enforcement, and security personnel with the ability to better assess situations as they unfold, thereby helping the agencies devise and implement appropriate responses. Thereafter, the entire camera system will be slated for an upgrade or replacement in FY 2016.

Real-Time Information Monitors at Employee Facilities (Digital Signage)

BCT intends to implement real-time information monitors at its major transit employee facilities. The monitors will be used to provide training, internal news, and job related information to the transit staff in FY 2015.

Trapeze Midas-BD Bidding & Dispatching Software

BCT currently uses Midas-Bidding and Dispatch Software, a vendor provided software package, to manage its operator bidding processes, operator dispatching, and timekeeping function. This work-force management software tool is slated to be upgraded or replaced in FY 2016.

Genfare Odyssey Electronic Validating Fareboxes

BCT's bus fleet is equipped with electronic validating fareboxes used to accept fares and bus passes. These fareboxes, have a built-in electronic identification system that can accept and validate coins, tokens, and bills. They also have the capability to accept and process magnetic fare cards; accept, issue, and validate electronic transfers. BCT has planned a replacement for the fareboxes in FY 2016-17 which will follow the Fare Systems Interoperability project.

Business Continuity

BCT intends to establish a backup Disaster Recovery Site to the existing Category 5 Rated Data Center site in FY 2015.

Security Assessment

After deployment of key Strategic Initiatives in FY 2015 (e.g. CAD AVL), BCT will initiate a Security Assessment and Evaluation for Cyber/Network Security Risk and recommended actions for mitigation in FY 2016-17.

Radio Lifecycle

As a part of Lifecycle replacement, BCT will replace the existing radios with newer technology based on technology advancements in FY 2017 and FY 2021.

Paratransit Virtual Desktop

BCT intends to virtualize paratransit personal computers to clientless technology and upgrade backend infrastructure in FY 2014. Upgrades of the hardware and software will be considered in FY 2019.

Real-Time Information for Downtown Kiosks

The Fort Lauderdale DDA, in a pass through arrangement with BCT, is enhancing the provision of transit services in the downtown area by strategically placing kiosks that would provide real-time bus schedule information for the local BCT routes serving this area. Real-time bus schedule information technology is designed to improve customer service by disseminating timely and accurate service information about projected bus arrival and departure times, disruptions and delays, transfers, and other transportation services at key locations. BCT will be coordinating with the DDA on its implementation of the kiosks so that they can be coordinated with the transit agency's planned real-time information system deployment in FY 2015.

Wi-Fi Hardware Upgrade on Express/Breeze Buses

BCT's current Express and Breeze bus services provide patrons with Wi-Fi on-board the vehicles to help accentuate the premium nature of these services. The existing Wi-Fi hardware on the vehicles is in need of upgrade to make the Wi-Fi service more reliable. BCT is still working on the schedule for this particular improvement; however, it is clear from staff that the agency's 10-year vision includes Wi-Fi only for Breeze, Express, and all other future premium bus services and not the entire fleet.



Workers Compensation Upgrade

BCT will upgrade the existing system in FY 2015 to provide employees with first level reporting of onthe-job injuries and track standard NCCI codes for reporting.

Document Management System

By implementing a document management system in FY 2015, BCT will be able to reduce the storage requirements for physical documents, enhance productivity; reduce paper printing and convert e-File for easy access. BCT will be able to store a version history of all documents and record change logs. An upgrade of the system is programmed for FY 2019.

Video Conferencing

Video conferencing capabilities will improve communications between BCT staff and will reduce the need for travel to and from BCT or County office locations, further enhancing productivity levels across dispersed workforces and teams in all BCT departments. Video conferencing equipment would only be installed at select locations and is scheduled for implementation in FY 2015.

Net Backup and Network Upgrades

BCT will maintain and upgrade backup and recovery systems along with Network Upgrades which will increase bandwidth for ease of access. These upgrades are scheduled for FY 2015.

End of Life Server Replacement

BCT plans the development of a Life Cycle Replacement Plan for server infrastructure, which would include cost estimates and procedures for end-of-life replacement, as well as upgrades and maintenance of software and hardware components where necessary. This will be an annual priority project for BCT for FY 2015-23.

The Wave Streetcar Technology Needs

The Wave Streetcar system is expected to be operational in late 2016 and includes a number of Advanced Public Transportation System (APTS) technologies to attract and assist riders and make their travel experience more convenient. Among the technology needs for which BCT will need to plan in conjunction with system start-up are real-time information monitors, information kiosks, video cameras, APCs, AVLs, automated annunciators, and potential signal priority applications, among other elements.

Community Bus Technology Needs

The aforementioned CAD/AVL/APC/Annunciation system upgrade that BCT is planning for FY 2015 will benefit the agency's existing local and premium bus services. The upgrade will also be expanded to the Community Bus service as necessary to ensure compatibility of technology and operations across all modes/services. This technology expansion to the Community Bus vehicles will occur sometime after the overall system upgrade has been completed and will be accommodated by new vehicle purchases for the program, as well. Exact costs for this need are to be determined in future years.

Transit Signal Priority Implementation

TSP is a technology strategy that gives buses preference at selected traffic signals when they arrive at the intersections, potentially dependent on some set of pre-established conditions. Since signal delay presents a major impact to bus operations, this technology has the potential to help BCT better maintain its bus schedules on key corridors with minimum impact on cross street traffic. To this end, FDOT and BCTED have been working in conjunction with BCT in a pilot project to test the technology and assess its potential uses, benefits, and impacts. To date, TSP is not widely used; however, BCT is interested in expanding the application of the technology to major corridors across the county in coming years as part of its 10-year vision. A future expansion plan will need to be developed.

The expansion of TSP will likely occur on a corridor-by-corridor basis following detailed transit corridor studies such as those being scheduled, underway, or completed on Broward Boulevard, Oakland Park Boulevard, University Drive, and US 1. Corridors such as Hollywood/Pines Boulevard, State Road 7/US 441, and Hallandale Beach Boulevard will also have more detailed corridor planning in the next one to three years. An estimated cost for TSP deployment is factored into the overall capital costs of Enhanced Bus service (see Table 7-1).

Additional IT Personnel and IT Temporary Staff

Any organization with a robust technology infrastructure will require an equivalent IT staff with which to maintain it. This equivalence matters in both the quantity and the quality of the staff. Given BCT's commitment to customer-service-based technology as well as its planned enhancements, it also will be prudent for the agency to develop an IT staffing plan to ensure appropriate and sufficient support for both current and new/upgraded equipment with the proper mix of permanent and temporary staffing. This staffing plan will be developed in FY 2014 and adjusted annually as different technologies become imbedded in BCT's day-to-day business.

Maintenance and Support Services

BCT continues to provide IT Support Services for routine maintenance, security services and upgrades of software and hardware systems through various vendor agreements. Needs under this category will remain an annual priority for BCT for FY 2015-23.

Software Tools and Database Licenses

BCT will continue to maintain compliance with software license agreements for databases and programs such as Business Objects, Crystal, and Toad that are used for various support and project related functions. Needs under this category will remain an annual priority for BCT for FY 2015-23.



Real Time Communications (Service)

With the implementation of the new CAD/AVL System, Real Time Communications requirements will increase. The additional carrier services are accounted for within this line item. Needs under this category will remain an annual priority for BCT for FY 2015-23.

Comprehensive Operational Analysis

A COA will examine the operational aspects of the current system and determine changes that would improve efficiencies and better address changing rider needs. COAs make recommendations that range from schedule alterations, route realignments, new service needs, and other operationally-based improvements that enhance the customer experience and increase ridership. BCT will fund and development an updated COA every five years, with FY 2014 and FY 2019 as the target years.

Park-and-Ride Lot Study

BCT will conduct a market analysis study to determine the need for park-and-ride lots for current or planned Express Bus services. At a minimum, the study will need to identify available parcels, including parcels currently owned by governmental entities, locations or development opportunities that provide optimal access and amenities that are attractive to BCT's customers, and sites that encourage or are part of local or regional transit-supportive land use developments. This study will include a solid review of all past, current, or future park-and-ride and/or hub development studies completed by a municipality, the Broward MPO, FDOT, or other parties as needed.

Intermodal Facility Study

BCT intends to build a new downtown Fort Lauderdale intermodal facility by FY 2016 as well as up to six new intermodal transfer facilities around Broward County. A study is needed to determine the best available locations for these new facilities collectively.

ADA Accessibility Study

In order to ensure BCT is in continued compliance with the ADA, BCT will complete an ADA accessibility study. An accessibility study with a prioritization plan will assist BCT in understanding what needs to be done throughout the system to remain compliant with ADA.

VISION PLAN

The following improvements are intended to improve the transit system beyond its current capabilities, level of service, and current funding levels.

Frequency Improvements

Frequency improvements, also called headway improvements, are needed on many routes to

7 – 10 Alternatives

accommodate demand for more service. Frequency improvements generally include the reduction in headways. Most headway adjustments in this plan are to provide 10-, 20-, or 30-minute headways. Frequency adjustments are based on existing demand for the service coupled with estimated demands for service through FY 2023. Demand was estimated using the PPH methodology and TBEST as described later in this section. Frequency improvements are needed for Routes 1, 2, 7, 10, 14, 18, 28, 30, 31, 34, 36, 40, 42, 50, 55, 60, 72, 81, 108X, and 109X. Map 7-2 provides a map of the affected routes.

Service Span Improvements

Service span improvements extend service later in the evening, extend service earlier in the morning, add service during mid-day, or add service on the weekends on routes that are currently in operation. Service span improvements are targeted for 35 routes: 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 28, 30, 31, 34, 36, 40, 42, 48, 50, 55, 56, 60, 62, 72, 81, 83, 88, 108x, 109x, and 441 Breeze. Map 7-3 provides a map of the affected routes.

Route Realignments

Several routes will be re-aligned, extended, or truncated in order to improve efficiency of operations or better serve passengers. For example, Routes 14, 60, and 62 are scheduled to be realigned to directly serve the new bus terminal at the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail Station. This improvement will allow passengers to board and alight from BCT routes without having to cross a major roadway to access the Tri-Rail station. Other realignments for Routes 9, 11, 12, 20, 42, 48, 55, 81, 108X, and 109X are detailed in the service plan found in Appendix L. Map 7-4 provides a map of the affected routes.

Map 7-2 Frequency Improvements







Map 7-3 Service Span Improvements















New Service – Enhanced Bus

BCT will implement a number of Enhanced Bus routes during the TDP timeframe. The planned Enhanced Bus layer of service is different than the current limited stop BCT Breeze service. Enhanced Bus is characterized by providing a higher level of service than the current Breeze service, including the additions of transit service enhancements such as real-time information signage, more frequent service (10- to 15-minute headways during the peak periods), TSP, branding, and station amenities such as payment kiosks. The Table 7-1 provides an overview of these routes while Map 7-5 displays their alignments. The Enhanced Bus routes will replace Breeze routes operating in the corridor, but the local fixed route service layer will continue in each corridor.

The priority of each Enhanced Bus route was determined via an analysis of current levels of demand on each corridor (current and projected PPH) coupled with estimated demand (TBEST) by FY 2023. Demand was estimated using the PPH methodology and TBEST as described later in this section. It should be noted that any exact service plan and terminus of Enhanced Bus routes on each respective corridor will depend on the completion of a robust transit corridor study, an extensive on-board/origin-destination survey, and a clear analysis of the market demand and need for such planned activities.

| | | | Implementation Year |
|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Primary Corridor | Terminus #1 | Terminus #2 | (Fiscal Year) |
| US 441 | Sandalfoot Boulevard | Golden Glades | 2017 |
| Oakland Park Boulevard | Sawgrass Mills Mall | State Road A1A | 2018 |
| Federal Highway (US 1) | Broward Terminal | Aventura Mall (Miami-Dade County) | 2019 |
| University Drive | Sample Road | Golden Glades | 2020 |
| Broward Boulevard | Sawgrass Mills Mall | Broward Terminal | 2021 |
| Sunrise Boulevard | Sawgrass Mills Mall | SR A1A | 2022 |
| Pines/Hollywood Boulevard | Pembroke Lakes Mall | Young Circle | 2023 |
| Sample Road | Coral Ridge Drive | Federal Highway (US 1) | 2023 |

Table 7-1 Enhanced Bus Routes

New Service - Express

BCT would like to expand express bus service in the I-75 corridor in southwest Broward County and into Miami-Dade County. Currently, FDOT has listed the operating funding needed to operate an I-75 Express route in its latest Work Program for FY 2018. Although an operating agency has not been identified for utilization of these funds, BCT will be prepared to seek this funding to provide an express bus connection between Broward County (I-595/I-75 area) to the job center(s) in and around the Miami-Dade International Airport (MIA). Service would operate during the weekdays on 30-minute headways beginning in FY 2018 and use the Managed Lanes soon to be under construction on I-75.

Map 7-5 Service Improvements







1

New Service - Fixed Route

Scheduled for implementation in FY 2020, new local fixed route service on Nob Hill Road is planned between Broward Boulevard and Holmberg Road. Also in FY 2020, service is planned for McNab Road and Cypress Creek Boulevard between Federal Highway and Hiatus Road. Both of these routes are planned to operate with 30-minute frequencies during the weekday peak period and 60-minute frequencies during the off-peak weekday and weekend periods.

New Service - Community Bus Improvements

There are a number of Community Bus improvements planned for the next 10 years. One priority is to improve the frequency of all routes to at least 60-minute headways by FY 2023. This would positively benefit routes in Davie (Green), Miramar (Green, Red, Yellow, Orange), and Pembroke Pines (Blue West). In addition, BCT received a number of requests from participating and community bus partners for new or expanded service by FY 2023. These municipalities include Fort Lauderdale, Hallandale Beach, Hillsboro Beach, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, and Lauderdale Lakes. Lastly, BCT has recently received unfunded service requests from new partners, including Hollywood, Sunrise, and West Park. In total, BCT anticipates that all of these improvements will provide better service for local residents trying to circulate within their respective area as well as provide better connectivity to the rest of the BCT system.

Downtown Intermodal Center

The introduction of passenger rail on the FEC Railway corridor has been proposed by both the FEC, Inc.'s All Aboard Florida (AAF) and SFRTA's Tri-Rail Coastal Link/SFFEC projects. Both of these efforts identify BCT's Broward Central Terminal (BT) site and surrounding parcels as a potential major passenger rail station for FEC passenger rail corridor service. In addition, it is expected that the development of The Wave Streetcar alignment and potential maintenance facilities near the BT offer further multimodal connections in and around the BT. In total, all of these forthcoming passenger rail efforts offer tremendous opportunity for redevelopment of the BT site, such as public-private joint development in and around the BT site, and an exciting opportunity for all transit users to have a world-class array of transit services and related amenities in one site or area. Further redevelopment plans for the BT and surrounding parcels will continue through FY 2016. At this time, exact plans, designs, costs, and funding sources for all potential changes to this site and surrounding area are not yet identified.

Maintenance/Operations Facility

Once BCT is able to access a dedicated funding source to increase the number of vehicles in its fleet per the TDP Vision Plan, a third maintenance/operations facility will need to be constructed to accommodate the expanded fleet. An exact location for this facility is to be determined.



Park-and-Ride Lots

Beyond the facilities planned in Miramar and Westgate, other park-and-ride lots are also needed. A study to determine locations and sizes will be undertaken.

Transit Intermodal Centers

BCT estimates that the expanded system as detailed in the TDP Vision Plan may require the development of additional intermodal transit centers to accommodate transfers between BCT services and other modes. Future locations of such intermodal centers remain unidentified at this time. Such locations will depend heavily on a number of factors that BCT will monitor, such as the likely progress of transit-supportive land use developments, future regional express bus or passenger rail investments, or specific operating needs within BCT's system.

Pedestrian/Complete Streets Improvements

BCT is committed to improving the passenger experience by improving pedestrian connectivity with BCT services. Pedestrian improvements such as the addition of connecting sidewalks or other access improvements will remain a perennial investment for BCT, particularly around existing BCT bus stops. In addition, BCT will continue to partner with other Broward County departments, municipalities, and FDOT on initiating and completing Complete Streets projects that also will enhance the BCT passenger experience.

BCCB Contractual Reorganization

Over the next several years, BCT will work with its local community bus partners to create two or three standard contractual agreements for providing community bus service. At present, there are 18 different contracts that BCT must administer. In adherence with FTA policy, BCT will move toward the use of a much smaller number of standardized contracts.

Driver Training

Recent complaints filed by passengers have suggested that drivers need ongoing training to ensure they are following proper procedures with regard to ADA assistance, safety, and etiquette. Drivers are the primary source of interaction with BCT riders so they need to be trained to assist passengers.

Business Analysts

BCT would like to add between up to six business analysts to its staff over the next 10 years. Business analysts will assist the agency with detailed budgetary, service planning, and operational analysis.

Draft Transit Development Plan

RIDERSHIP PROJECTIONS

Two ridership projection tools were used to prioritize improvements. The first, a PPH analysis, uses historical ridership rates and growth rate to project future ridership levels. The second, TBEST, is the FDOT-required method for projecting ridership impacts from changes to a transit network.

PASSENGERS PER HOUR ANALYSIS

BCT staff conducted an analysis of projected PPH by route in order to determine which routes might be ready for more premium level service in the future. By looking at passenger loads, BCT can better determine if a bus is standing room only such that more service on the route may be required. BCT staff started with current PPH levels on the network and then assumed a 1.5 percent annual growth rate. Table 7-2 displays the passengers per hour by route and time of day. It is color-coded to indicate differing levels of ridership.

On Table 7-2, green font indicates ridership levels above 50 PPH, red font indicates ridership levels above 60 PPH, and purple font indicates ridership levels above 70 PPH. These levels are such that greater service on the route may be necessary to avoid overcrowded and standing room only conditions.



Table 7-2 Passengers per Hour Analysis

| | | | | | | U . | | | · | | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------|-----|----------|----------|-------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|------|--------------|-------------|-------------|------|
| | | | dway | | icles | 2012 Actual | 0040 | 0011 | | | | | | ections | | | 0000 |
| Route | Period | · · | Proposed | <u> </u> | | PPH | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| 18 | Sat Eve | 30 | 20 | 9 | 14 | 68.4 | 69.4 | 70.5 | 71.5 | 72.6 | 73.7 | 74.8 | 75.9 | 77.1 | 78.2 | 79.4 | 80.6 |
| 72 | PM Peak | 15 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 63.5 | 64.5 | 65.4 | 66.4 | 67.4 | 68.4 | 69.4 | 70.5 | 71.5 | 72.6 | 73.7 | 74.8 |
| 18 | PM Peak | 15 | 12 | 17 | 23 | 59.3 | 60.2 | 61.1 | 62.0 | 62.9 | 63.9 | 64.8 | 65.8 | 66.8 | 67.8 | 68.8 | 69.9 |
| 18 | AM Peak | 15 | 12 | 17 | 21 | 58.6 | 59.5 | 60.4 | 61.3 | 62.2 | 63.1 | 64.1 | 65.0 | 66.0 | 67.0 | 68.0 | 69.0 |
| 18 | Sat Base | 20 | 15 | 13 | 19 | 56.2 | 57.0 | 57.9 | 58.8 | 59.6 | 60.5 | 61.5 | 62.4 | 63.3 | 64.3 | 65.2 | 66.2 |
| 18 | Wkd Base | 15 | 12 | 17 | 22 | 56.1 | 56.9 | 57.8 | 58.7 | 59.5 | 60.4 | 61.3 | 62.3 | 63.2 | 64.1 | 65.1 | 66.1 |
| 1 | Sat Eve | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 55.3 | 56.1 | 57.0 | 57.8 | 58.7 | 59.6 | 60.5 | 61.4 | 62.3 | 63.2 | 64.2 | 65.1 |
| 34 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 6 | 9 | 55.2 | 56.0 | 56.9 | 57.7 | 58.6 | 59.5 | 60.4 | 61.3 | 62.2 | 63.1 | 64.1 | 65.0 |
| 1 | PM Peak | 15 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 54.5 | 55.3 | 56.1 | 57.0 | 57.8 | 58.7 | 59.6 | 60.5 | 61.4 | 62.3 | 63.2 | 64.2 |
| 10 | PM Peak | 30 | 20 | 6 | 10 | 54.3 | 55.1 | 55.9 | 56.8 | 57.6 | 58.5 | 59.4 | 60.3 | 61.2 | 62.1 | 63.0 | 64.0 |
| 72 | Sat Base | 20 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 54.3 | 55.1 | 55.9 | 56.8 | 57.6 | 58.5 | 59.4 | 60.3 | 61.2 | 62.1 | 63.0 | 64.0 |
| 50 | Sat Base | 45 | 30 | 3 | 5 | 54.2 | 55.0 | 55.8 | 56.7 | 57.5 | 58.4 | 59.3 | 60.2 | 61.1 | 62.0 | 62.9 | 63.8 |
| 72 | Sat Eve | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 54.2 | 55.0 | 55.8 | 56.7 | 57.5 | 58.4 | 59.3 | 60.2 | 61.1 | 62.0 | 62.9 | 63.8 |
| 1 | Sat Base | 20 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 53.2 | 54.0 | 54.8 | 55.6 | 56.5 | 57.3 | 58.2 | 59.0 | 59.9 | 60.8 | 61.7 | 62.7 |
| 1 | WkdEve | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 53.1 | 53.9 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 56.4 | 57.2 | 58.1 | 58.9 | 59.8 | 60.7 | 61.6 | 62.5 |
| 18 | Sun Base | 30 | 20 | 8 | 13 | 53.1 | 53.9 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 56.4 | 57.2 | 58.1 | 58.9 | 59.8 | 60.7 | 61.6 | 62.5 |
| 1 | Sun Base | 20 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 53.1 | 53.9 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 56.4 | 57.2 | 58.1 | 58.9 | 59.8 | 60.7 | 61.6 | 62.5 |
| 18 | Wkd Eve | 30 | 20 | 9 | 14 | 51.8 | 52.6 | 53.4 | 54.2 | 55.0 | 55.8 | 56.6 | 57.5 | 58.4 | 59.2 | 60.1 | 61.0 |
| 14 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 7 | 10 | 51.5 | 52.3 | 53.1 | 53.9 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 56.3 | 57.2 | 58.0 | 58.9 | 59.8 | 60.7 |
| 34 | AM Peak | 20 | 15 | 6 | 9 | 51.5 | 52.3 | 53.1 | 53.9 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 56.3 | 57.2 | 58.0 | 58.9 | 59.8 | 60.7 |
| 72 | AM Peak | 15 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 50.8 | 51.6 | 52.3 | 53.1 | 53.9 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 56.4 | 57.2 | 58.1 | 59.0 | 59.8 |
| 72 | Sun Eve | 45 | 30 | 3 | 5 | 50.6 | 51.4 | 52.1 | 52.9 | 53.7 | 54.5 | 55.3 | 56.2 | 57.0 | 57.9 | 58.7 | 59.6 |
| 72 | WkdEve | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 50.3 | 51.1 | 51.8 | 52.6 | 53.4 | 54.2 | 55.0 | 55.8 | 56.7 | 57.5 | 58.4 | 59.3 |
| 50 | Wkd Base | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 50.1 | 50.9 | 51.6 | 52.4 | 53.2 | 54.0 | 54.8 | 55.6 | 56.4 | 57.3 | 58.1 | 59.0 |
| 36 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 9 | 12 | 50.0 | 50.8 | 51.5 | 52.3 | 53.1 | 53.9 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 56.3 | 57.2 | 58.0 | 58.9 |
| 36 | Sat Base | 30 | 20 | 7 | 11 | 49.9 | 50.6 | 51.4 | 52.2 | 53.0 | 53.8 | 54.6 | 55.4 | 56.2 | 57.1 | 57.9 | 58.8 |
| 14 | Wkd Base | 30 | 20 | 4 | 7 | 49.4 | 50.1 | 50.9 | 51.7 | 52.4 | 53.2 | 54.0 | 54.8 | 55.6 | 56.5 | 57.3 | 58.2 |
| 1 | Wkd Base | 15 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 49.4 | 50.1 | 50.9 | 51.7 | 52.4 | 53.2 | 54.0 | 54.8 | 55.6 | 56.5 | 57.3 | 58.2 |
| 18 | Sat Nite | 45 | 30 | 5 | 8 | 49.3 | 50.0 | 50.8 | 51.6 | 52.3 | 53.1 | 53.9 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 56.4 | 57.2 | 58.1 |
| 50 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 49.0 | 49.7 | 50.5 | 51.2 | 52.0 | 52.8 | 53.6 | 54.4 | 55.2 | 56.0 | 56.9 | 57.7 |
| 72 | Wkd Base | 15 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 49.0 | 49.7 | 50.5 | 51.2 | 52.0 | 52.8 | 53.6 | 54.4 | 55.2 | 56.0 | 56.9 | 57.7 |
| 42 | PM Peak | 30 | 20 | 4 | 7 | 49.0 | 49.7 | 50.5 | 51.2 | 52.0 | 52.8 | 53.6 | 54.4 | 55.2 | 56.0 | 56.9 | 57.7 |
| 72 | Sun Base | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 48.5 | 49.2 | 50.0 | 50.7 | 51.5 | 52.2 | 53.0 | 53.8 | 54.6 | 55.5 | 56.3 | 57.1 |
| 18 | Sun Eve | 30 | 20 | 8 | 12 | 48.2 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 50.4 | 51.2 | 51.9 | 52.7 | 53.5 | 54.3 | 55.1 | 55.9 | 56.8 |
| 34 | Wkd Base | 30 | 20 | 4 | 7 | 48.0 | 48.7 | 49.5 | 50.2 | 50.9 | 51.7 | 52.5 | 53.3 | 54.1 | 54.9 | 55.7 | 56.5 |
| 7 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 47.9 | 48.6 | 49.3 | 50.2 | 50.8 | 51.6 | 52.4 | 53.2 | 54.0 | 54.8 | 55.6 | 56.4 |
| 60 | Wkd Base | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 47.8 | 48.5 | 49.3 | 50.0 | 50.7 | 51.5 | 52.3 | 53.1 | 53.8 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 56.3 |
| | | | 15 | | | | | | | | | | 52.8 | | - | | _ |
| 50 | AM Peak | 20 | | 8 | 11 | 47.6 | 48.3 | 49.0 | 49.8 | 50.5 | 51.3 | 52.0 | | 53.6 | 54.4 | 55.2 | 56.1 |
| 60 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 47.5 | 48.2 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 50.4 | 51.2 | 51.9 | 52.7 | 53.5 | 54.3 | 55.1 | 56.0 |
| 2 | Wkd Base | 30 | 20 | 8 | 13 | 47.2 | 47.9 | 48.6 | 49.4 | 50.1 | 50.8 | 51.6 | 52.4 | 53.2 | 54.0 | 54.8 | 55.6 |
| 28 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 9 | 13 | 46.9 | 47.6 | 48.3 | 49.0 | 49.8 | 50.5 | 51.3 | 52.1 | 52.8 | 53.6 | 54.4 | 55.2 |
| 72 | Sat Nite | 45 | 30 | 3 | 5 | 46.9 | 47.6 | 48.3 | 49.0 | 49.8 | 50.5 | 51.3 | 52.1 | 52.8 | 53.6 | 54.4 | 55.2 |
| 30 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 5 | 7 | 46.8 | 47.5 | 48.2 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 50.4 | 51.2 | 51.9 | 52.7 | 53.5 | 54.3 | 55.1 |
| 441 | PM Peak | 30 | 20 | 7 | 11 | 46.7 | 47.4 | 48.1 | 48.8 | 49.6 | 50.3 | 51.1 | 51.8 | 52.6 | 53.4 | 54.2 | 55.0 |
| 55 | PM Peak | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 46.2 | 46.9 | 47.6 | 48.3 | 49.0 | 49.8 | 50.5 | 51.3 | 52.0 | 52.8 | 53.6 | 54.4 |
| 40 | Wkd Base | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 46.1 | 46.8 | 47.5 | 48.2 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 50.4 | 51.2 | 51.9 | 52.7 | 53.5 | 54.3 |
| 2 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 12 | 17 | 45.9 | 46.6 | 47.3 | 48.0 | 48.7 | 49.4 | 50.2 | 50.9 | 51.7 | 52.5 | 53.3 | 54.1 |
| 441 | AM Peak | 30 | 20 | 6 | 10 | 45.4 | 46.1 | 46.8 | 47.5 | 48.2 | 48.9 | 49.6 | 50.4 | 51.1 | 51.9 | 52.7 | 53.5 |
| 40 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 44.9 | 45.6 | 46.3 | 47.0 | 47.7 | 48.4 | 49.1 | 49.8 | 50.6 | 51.3 | 52.1 | 52.9 |
| 60 | AM Peak | 20 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 44.9 | 45.6 | 46.3 | 47.0 | 47.7 | 48.4 | 49.1 | 49.8 | 50.6 | 51.3 | 52.1 | 52.9 |
| 42 | Sat Base | 60 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 44.8 | 45.5 | 46.2 | 46.8 | 47.5 | 48.3 | 49.0 | 49.7 | 50.5 | 51.2 | 52.0 | 52.8 |
| 18 | Wkd Nite | 30 | 20 | 8 | 13 | 44.7 | 45.4 | 46.1 | 46.7 | 47.4 | 48.2 | 48.9 | 49.6 | 50.4 | 51.1 | 51.9 | 52.7 |
| 81 | PM Peak | 20 | 15 | 9 | 13 | 44.2 | 44.9 | 45.5 | 46.2 | 46.9 | 47.6 | 48.3 | 49.1 | 49.8 | 50.5 | 51.3 | 52.1 |
| 1 | AM Peak | 15 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 44.1 | 44.8 | 45.4 | 46.1 | 46.8 | 47.5 | 48.2 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 50.4 | 51.2 | 51.9 |
| 55 | AM Peak | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 44.1 | 44.8 | 45.4 | 46.1 | 46.8 | 47.5 | 48.2 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 50.4 | 51.2 | 51.9 |
| 14 | Sat Base | 45 | 30 | 3 | 5 | 44.0 | 44.7 | 45.3 | 46.0 | 46.7 | 47.4 | 48.1 | 48.8 | 49.6 | 50.3 | 51.1 | 51.8 |
| 1 | Sun Eve | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 43.9 | 44.6 | 45.2 | 45.9 | 46.6 | 47.3 | 48.0 | 48.7 | 49.5 | 50.2 | 50.9 | 51.7 |
| 10 | Wkd Base | 30 | 20 | 6 | 10 | 43.4 | 44.1 | 44.7 | 45.4 | 46.1 | 46.8 | 47.5 | 48.2 | 48.9 | 49.6 | 50.4 | 51.1 |
| 28 | AM Peak | 20 | 15 | 9 | 13 | 43.0 | 43.6 | 44.3 | 45.0 | 45.6 | 46.3 | 47.0 | 47.7 | 48.4 | 49.2 | 49.9 | 50.7 |
| 31 | Wkd Base | 30 | 20 | 5 | 8 | 43.0 | 43.6 | 44.3 | 45.0 | 45.6 | 46.3 | 47.0 | 47.7 | 48.4 | 49.2 | 49.9 | 50.7 |
| 50 | Sat Eve | 45 | 30 | 3 | 5 | 43.0 | 43.2 | 44.3 | 44.5 | 45.2 | 45.9 | 46.6 | 47.3 | 48.0 | 49.2 | 49.9 | 50.2 |
| BCT | | -5 | | | | 38.3 | 43.2 38.9 | 39.5 | 44 .5 | 40.7 | 40.9 41.3 | 40.0 41.9 | 47.5 | 40.0 43.1 | | 49.4 | 45.1 |
| | Average | | | | | JO.J | 30. 9 | ა ჟ.ე | 40.0 | 40.7 | 41.3 | 41.9 | 42.3 | 43.1 | 43.8 | 44.4 | 43.1 |

TBEST MODELING

Ridership forecasts were prepared using the FDOT-approved transit demand forecasting tool, TBEST. TBEST is a comprehensive transit analysis and ridership-forecasting model that is capable of simulating travel demand at the individual route level. The software was designed to provide near- and mid-term forecasts of transit ridership consistent with the needs of transit operational planning and TDP development. In producing model outputs, TBEST also considers the following:

- *Transit network connectivity* Refers to the level of connectivity between routes within the bus network. The greater the connectivity between bus routes, the more efficient the bus service becomes.
- Spatial and temporal accessibility Refers to service frequency and to distance between stops. The larger the physical distance between potential bus riders and bus stops, the lower the level of service utilization. Similarly, less frequent service is perceived as less reliable and, in turn, utilization decreases.
- *Time-of-day variations* TBEST accommodates peak-period travel patterns by rewarding peak service periods with greater service utilization forecasts.
- Route competition and route complementarities TBEST accounts for competition between routes. Routes connecting to the same destinations or anchor points, or that travel on common corridors, experience decreases in service utilization. Conversely, routes that are synchronized and support each other in terms of service to major destinations or transfer locations and schedule benefit from that complementary relationship.

The following section outlines the model input and assumptions used, includes a description of the TBEST scenario run performed using the model, and summarizes the ridership forecasts produced by TBEST.

TBEST uses various demographic and transit network data as model inputs. The inputs and the assumptions made in modeling the BCT system in TBEST are presented below. The BCT model utilized the recently released TBEST Land Use Model structure. The TBEST Land Use model is supported by parcel-level data developed from the Florida Department of Revenue (DOR) statewide tax database. The DOR parcel data contain land use designations and supporting attributes which allow the application of ITE-based trip generation rates at the parcel level as an indicator of travel activity.

It should be noted, however, that the model is not interactive with roadway network conditions. Therefore, ridership forecasts will not show direct sensitivity to changes in the roadway traffic conditions or speeds.



CONNECTED

- Transit Network The BCT transit route network was created to reflect 2013 base conditions. The BCT fixed and express bus routes were developed using the TBEST GTFS Network Import tool. The imported routes contain all necessary model input parameters including route alignments for each unique trip path per route and direction, stop locations, stop name and description, service span, headway, and in-vehicle travel time. The imported GTFS routes were in service from January 6, 2013 to May 11, 2013. Community Bus alignments were provided by BCT in shapefile format and routes were input using TBEST network coding tools. Community Bus service characteristics were derived from published schedules and input as part of the network coding process. The Tri-Rail network alignment was also included as part of the BCT network to allow for bus service network accessibility to be calculated for those routes which service Tri-Rail stations. Tri-Rail ridership forecasts are not included as part of this document. Terminal and transfer station locations were provided by BCT and coded into the TBEST network. BCT also provided observed average daily ridership numbers as input into the TBEST model validation.
- Demographic Data The demographics used as the base input for the TBEST model are derived from Census 2010 geography and population characteristics, American Community Survey 5year Estimates (2006-2010), 2011 InfoUSA employment data and 2011 parcel-level land use data from Florida Department of Revenue. Using the data inputs above, the model captures market demand (population, demographics, employment and land use characteristics) within ¼ mile of each stop.
- Population and Employment Growth Rates TBEST uses a socio-economic data growth function to project population and employment data. A population growth rate and an employment growth rate were calculated using the 2040 TAZ forecasts developed for the Broward County LRTP. As indicated previously, population and employment data are hard-coded into the model and cannot be modified by end-users. As applied, the growth rates do not reflect fluctuating economic conditions as experienced in real time.
- TBEST Model Limitations According to Rule 14-73.001 Florida Administrative Code, TBEST is the FDOT-approved model for transit ridership forecasting as part of TDPs in Florida. It has long been a desire of FDOT to have a standard modeling tool for transit demand that could be standardized across the state similar to the Florida Standard Urban Transportation Model Structure (FSUTMS) model used by MPOs in developing LRTPs. However, while TBEST is an important tool for evaluating improvements to existing and future transit services, model outputs do not account for latent demand for transit that could yield significantly higher ridership, and, correspondingly, model outputs may over-estimate demand in isolated cases. In

addition, TBEST cannot display sensitivities to external factors such as an improved marketing and advertising program, changes in pricing service for customers, and other local conditions.

Although TBEST provides ridership projections at the route and bus stop levels, its strength lies more in its ability to facilitate relative comparisons of ridership productivity. As a result, model outputs are not absolute ridership projections, but rather are comparative for evaluation in actual service implementation decisions. TBEST has generated interest with DOTs in other states and continues to be a work in progress that will become more useful as its capabilities are enhanced in future updates to the model. Consequently, it is important for the transit agency to integrate sound planning judgment and experience when interpreting TBEST results.

Using these inputs, assumptions, and actual ridership data, the TBEST model was validated. Using the validation model as the base model, TBEST ridership forecasts for the TDP planning horizon year, FY 2023, were developed. The generated annual ridership forecasts reflect the estimated level of service utilization if no changes were to be made to any of the fixed-route services.

Table 7-3 shows the projected number of annual weekday riders by mode for three scenarios. The base year represents current ridership levels. Future Year – Status Quo provides the results of running the model for 2023 with the current transit system and no improvements. Ridership increases in this category are driven by population growth, employment growth, and land use changes for the future year. The Future Year – Improved column provides results for the new system plus all of the service improvements described at the beginning of this section.

The results of the analysis show that by replacing the Breeze network with the more premium Enhanced Bus network that ridership increases dramatically. Community Bus has the smallest increase at 18 percent over the 10-year period. Systemwide the improvements lead to a 67 percent increase in ridership

Ridership modeling results by mode and route by weekday, Saturday, or Sunday service can be found in Appendix M.



| Table 7-3 |
|---|
| TBEST Average Weekday Ridership Projections |

| Mode | Base Year | Future Year - Status Quo | Future Year - Improved | Percent Change (Base Year to Future Year - Improved) |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Fixed Routes | 119,276 | 128,126 | 162,141 | 36% |
| The Wave | 0 | 0 | 3,597 | N/A |
| Express | 1,941 | 2,237 | 2,482 | 28% |
| Breeze/Enhanced | 4,323 | 4,812 | 45,926 | 962% |
| Community Bus | 8,472 | 9,098 | 9,980 | 18% |
| Systemwide | 134,012 | 144,273 | 224,126 | 67% |

Note: Enhanced Bus Routes replace Breeze Routes by FY 2023. Source: TBEST





Financial Plan



(This page intentionally left blank.)

Financial Plan

Section 8

This final section of the TDP contains the financial information with regard to the improvements described in Section 7, Alternatives. The financial information is divided into two plans:

- Status Quo Plan: In this plan, the focus is maintaining current service levels.
- Vision Plan: The Vision Plan focuses on improving the system so that it truly meets the needs of the citizens of Broward County.

STATUS QUO PLAN

The Status Quo Plan examines the financial impacts of operating a transit system similar in nature to today's system over the next 10 years. In order to maintain the current system, investments in infrastructure and operations will need to be made. Increasing demand for services will require further investment in additional services just to maintain current, published schedules. Operating costs are projected to continue to increase with inflation over the 10-year timeframe. Infrastructure is expected to reach the end of its useful life and need to be replaced.

STATUS QUO PLAN ASSUMPTIONS

There are several assumptions being made in the Status Quo Plan:

- Current services are maintained.
- Increased demand may require additional service to be operated in order to maintain current, published schedules.
- Inflation will continue to increase the cost of operating the transit system.
- No new revenue streams will be added to the budget.
- Any shortfall between projected costs and revenues will be covered by an additional transfer from the General Fund (Ad Valorem).

STATUS QUO PLAN BUDGET ITEMS

The following items are included in the Status Quo Plan:

- Maintenance of Existing Service: Under the Status Quo Plan, all of the services currently in operation are assumed to continue to operate.
- Reliability/Capacity Adjustments: As described in Section 7, several BCT routes are struggling with on-time performance due to congested roadways and overcrowded buses. It is assumed



that this issue will begin to affect other routes as demand for service and congestion increase. By adding service, BCT can begin to conform to its schedule and alleviate over-crowding situations. Funding for additional service to maintain current schedules is included in this plan.

- The Wave: Streetcar service in downtown Fort Lauderdale is added in the Status Quo plan in FY 2016 because the County Commission has committed to funding it.
- IT Improvements: The cry for IT improvements was particularly obvious during public outreach sessions. Passengers need to know when the next bus is coming so they can make educated decisions concerning their time. Operators need more information about bus running times, historical schedule adherence, and driver performance to make better management decisions. These improvements, as detailed in the IT Plan in Appendix K, are included in the Status Quo Plan.
- Plans: A number of studies and plans are scheduled to be undertaken under the Status Quo Plan. These plans allow BCT to investigate the need for improvements as well as the appropriate characteristics of the improvements.
- Infrastructure: There are several infrastructure improvements that are required during the 10year period to keep BCT operating at its current level of service. The infrastructure projects to be included in the Status Quo Plan are listed in Table 8-1.

| Infrastructure Improvement | Implementation Year (FY) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Cypress Creek Tri-Rail Station Service - Access Improvements | 2014 | | | |
| Lauderhill Mall Transit Center | 2014-15 | | | |
| Miramar Park-and-Ride Lot | 2014 | | | |
| Westgate Park-and-Ride Lot | 2014 | | | |
| Copans Facility Rehabilitation/Upgrade | 2015-16 | | | |
| Copans Facility Administrative Building #4 Rehabilitation | 2014 | | | |
| B-Cycle Expansion | Ongoing | | | |
| Bus Shelter/Stop Replacement | Ongoing | | | |

Table 8-1 Status Quo Plan Infrastructure Improvements

STATUS QUO PLAN OPERATING COSTS

The operating costs are divided into 12 categories. Each is described in the following bullets with the actual costs detailed by year in Table 8-2. Supporting documentation for the budget can be found in Appendix L.

• Personal Services: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. It includes salaries and fringe benefits for all BCT staff at the current staffing levels.

- Overtime: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. It includes payment for all overtime accrued by drivers. Some overtime is planned overtime due to the demands of certain routes or schedules while other overtime is unscheduled to cover employees who are unable to work their shift.
- Operating Expenses: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. These expenses relate to operating BCT's services, but do not include fuel or contractual payments. They include utilities, minor supplies, etc.
- Fuel: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. It includes the costs for fueling the vehicles.
- Paratransit Service: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. This line item covers the contractual cost of paying a third party to operate paratransit services.
- Other Contractual Services: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. This also pertains to paratransit services, but it provides payment for the third-party operator who manages the eligibility of paratransit passengers.
- Other Governmental Operators: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. BCT provides annual funding to Tri-Rail and the Community Bus system through this line item.
- Fuel and Other Reserves: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. This line item assumes that the reserves captured in the revenue projections are spent in a manner consistent with their respective reserve funds.
- Reliability/Capacity Adjustments: These costs are based on improvements detailed in the Service Plan found in Appendix L. This cost provides more service to certain routes to increase their reliability and alleviate overcrowding situations. Broward County has already committed to funding the FY 2014 amount.
- The Wave Streetcar: These costs are associated with operating The Wave. FY 2016 operating costs were taken from the analysis done to seek funding for the system. It is assumed that costs increase by three percent annually, a figure based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).
- IT Improvements: These costs were taken from the IT Plan provided in Appendix K. The costs cover all operating expenses associated with implementing the plan. It should be noted that all items scheduled for implementation in FY 2014 in the IT Plan were budgeted in FY 2015 in the TDP.



STATUS QUO PLAN OPERATING REVENUES

There are 11 categories for operating revenues. Each is described in the following bullets with the actual revenues by year displayed in Table 8-2.

- Farebox Revenues: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. There are three categories related to farebox revenues. This category represents the fares collected from current services without the addition of The Wave or the Reliability/ Capacity Adjustments.
- Farebox Revenues (The Wave Streetcar): These farebox revenues are related to the implementation of the new streetcar service in downtown Fort Lauderdale. Using a conservative farebox recovery ratio of 30 percent, the streetcar is projected to recoup about 30 percent of its operating costs through the farebox.
- Farebox Revenues (Reliability/Capacity Adjustments): These farebox revenues are related to the implementation of the reliability/capacity adjustments planned for certain routes over the 10year period. Using a conservative farebox recovery ratio of 30 percent, these new services are projected to recoup about 30 percent of their operating costs through the farebox.
- General Fund (Ad Valorem): The FY 2014 figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. A conservative assumption that there is no growth in this revenue source was assumed for the 10-year timeframe. General fund revenues come from property taxes collected by Broward County.
- Gas Tax: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. Revenues from gas taxes are projected to decrease over the 10-year timeframe. These revenues come from the taxes paid by purchasers of gasoline and other fuels.
- Concurrency Fund: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. The Concurrency Fund is only projected to provide revenue for two years of the 10 years. Concurrency funds are collected from development impact fees and used to fund transportation improvements in the impacted areas.
- Fuel and Other Reserves: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. Reserves were built up over the last several years and expected to be depleted by BCT in the next few years.
- Applied Fund Balance: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget.
- State Grants: The FY 2014 figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. A conservative growth rate of one percent was then added annually. State grants are provided by FDOT on an annual basis to assist in funding transit services. These grants include block grants and TD funding.
- All Other Revenues: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. These revenues include those from advertising on buses as well as selling surplus vehicles.
- 5% Contingency Adjustment: This figure was provided by Broward County's Office of Management and Budget. This adjustment allows for a more conservative budgeting approach by assuming that revenues may have been overstated, but that costs have not.

STATUS QUO PLAN OPERATING CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be made from Table 8-2 with regards to the projected Status Quo Plan operating budget:

- BCT's projected total operating costs for the 10-year period exceed \$1.4 billion.
- BCT's projected total operating revenues for the 10-year period are projected to be over \$1.2 billion.
- BCT's budget is balanced for FY 2014.
- BCT's conservatively projected revenues indicate that BCT will need additional revenue beginning in FY 2015 from Broward County's General Fund (Ad Valorem) in order to balance its budget for the remaining nine years of the plan. In total, BCT would need approximately \$185 million in additional funds from the General Fund (Ad Valorem) to implement the Status Quo Plan.

STATUS QUO PLAN CAPITAL COSTS

The capital costs are divided into 10 categories. Each is described in the following bullets with the actual costs detailed by year in Table 8-2.

- Fixed Route Vehicle Replacement: Each vehicle in the BCT fleet has a certain useful life and will need to be replaced when its useful life comes to a close. For the larger vehicles used on fixed route services, the useful life is about 14 years. Based on the age of BCT's current fleet and their replacement cycles, BCT developed annual cost estimates for replacing its current vehicle fleet.
- Community Bus Vehicle Replacement: For smaller vehicles used in the Community Bus system the useful life may only be five or six years. Based on the age of BCT's current Community Bus fleet and their replacement cycles, BCT developed annual cost estimates for replacing its current vehicle fleet. In cases where a Community Bus route is projected to reach over 20 PPH during the FY 2014-23 timeframe, the additional cost of purchasing 30-foot replacement vehicles for extra capacity is included.



CONNECTED

- Paratransit Vehicle Acquisition: As described in Section 7, BCT is in the process of purchasing the vehicles for use by its third-party contractors that are operating the paratransit system. BCT determined the costs of purchasing these vehicles.
- Parts and Preventative Maintenance: Based on current purchasing levels, the cost of vehicle parts and preventative maintenance were projected. It is assumed that the third-party paratransit contractors will be responsible for maintenance of the paratransit vehicles.
- Tire Leasing: Based on current fleet numbers, BCT staff projected the cost of leasing tires for the fleet over the 10-year period. The cost is based on current costs and a three percent CPI-based escalation rate.
- Reliability/Capacity Adjustments Vehicles: In order to implement the additional services needed to ensure the reliability of certain routes and alleviate over-crowding conditions, BCT will need to purchase several new vehicles. The cost of these new vehicles is projected in this line item. Vehicle purchases for this purpose only occur in the first three years of the plan.
- IT Improvements: As detailed in Appendix K, the IT plan has numerous capital costs associated with it. These costs are provided on an annual basis here.
- Concurrency Infrastructure and Bus Replacement Projects: These costs are associated with the concurrency revenues received annually. They are projected to remain constant throughout the 10-year period.
- Infrastructure: These costs support the infrastructure needs of the system as detailed in Table 8-1 over the 10-year period.
- Planning Studies: The costs of producing several studies needed during the 10-year period are included in this line item. Studies are often required to seek state and federal funding.

STATUS QUO PLAN CAPITAL REVENUES

The capital revenues are divided into two categories. Each is described in the following bullets with the actual revenues detailed by year in Table 8-2.

- Concurrency Fund: These revenues are assumed to remain constant throughout the 10-year period. Concurrency funds are collected from development impact fees and used to fund capital transportation improvements throughout the County.
- Federal 5307 for Capital: Funding is based on historical Federal 5307 funding levels. Escalation is assumed to be one percent annually.

On the capital side, there are also several grants that BCT has been awarded, but they have not been expended to date. These funds are noted as "carryover" in the capital analysis.

STATUS QUO PLAN CAPITAL CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be made from Table 8-2 with regards to the projected Status Quo Plan capital budget:

- BCT's capital budget is balanced in FY 2014.
- Federal and state grants that have carried over from prior years will cover the costs of funding needed in FY 2014.
- Beginning in FY 2015 and continuing through the entire timeframe, BCT's budgeted capital costs exceed its capital revenues.
- Over the 10-year timeframe, total capital costs exceed \$519 million.
- Over the 10-year timeframe, total capital revenues are projected to be approximately \$293 million plus carryover of approximately \$85 million.



CONNECTED

Table 8-2Status Quo Plan: Operating and Capital Budgets (FY 2014-2023)

| OPERATING | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Costs | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 10-Year Period |
| Personal Services | \$63,152,940 | \$65,687,070 | \$65,454,250 | \$67,081,230 | \$68,748,603 | \$70,457,367 | \$72,208,561 | \$74,003,221 | \$75,842,432 | \$77,727,297 | \$700,362,970 |
| Overtime | \$5,520,110 | \$5,529,460 | \$5,658,110 | \$5,667,700 | \$5,799,560 | \$5,809,390 | \$5,944,550 | \$5,954,620 | \$6,093,160 | \$6,103,490 | \$58,080,150 |
| Operating Expenses | \$9,911,230 | \$9,836,800 | \$10,082,720 | \$10,008,940 | \$10,259,170 | \$10,184,100 | \$10,438,710 | \$10,362,320 | \$10,621,390 | \$10,543,660 | \$102,249,040 |
| Fuel | \$16,128,210 | \$16,704,800 | \$16,497,420 | \$17,283,400 | \$17,947,968 | \$18,089,716 | \$18,703,987 | \$19,282,464 | \$19,879,677 | \$20, 466, 859 | \$180,984,500 |
| Paratransit Service | \$17,320,060 | \$17,527,900 | \$17,738,230 | \$17,951,090 | \$18,166,500 | \$18,384,500 | \$18,605,110 | \$18,828,370 | \$19,054,310 | \$19,282,960 | \$182,859,030 |
| Other Contractual Services | \$4,030,390 | \$4,100,920 | \$4,172,690 | \$4,245,710 | \$4,320,010 | \$4,395,610 | \$4,472,530 | \$4,550,800 | \$4,630,440 | \$4,711,470 | \$43,630,570 |
| Other Governmental Operators (i.e., Tri-Rail, Comm. Bus) | \$6,959,250 | \$6,780,740 | \$6,780,740 | \$6,799,830 | \$6,819,070 | \$6,838,450 | \$6,870,990 | \$6,903,940 | \$6,937,300 | \$6,971,080 | \$68,661,390 |
| Fuel and Other Reserves | \$7,812,250 | \$5,979,250 | \$4,146,250 | \$2,313,250 | \$480,250 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,731,250 |
| Reliability/Capacity Adjustments | \$1,242,680 | \$1,919,763 | \$1,965,848 | \$522,330 | \$538,016 | \$554,143 | \$570,765 | \$587,882 | \$605,000 | \$622,612 | \$9,129,039 |
| The Wave Streetcar | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,500,000 | \$2,575,000 | \$2,652,250 | \$2,731,818 | \$2,813,772 | \$2,898,185 | \$2,985,131 | \$3,074,685 | \$22,230,840 |
| IT Improvements | \$0 | \$3,949,943 | \$4,073,905 | \$4,196,122 | \$4,322,006 | \$4,451,666 | \$4,585,216 | \$4,722,772 | \$4,864,455 | \$5,010,389 | \$40,176,473 |
| Total Operating Costs | \$132,077,120 | \$138,016,646 | \$139,070,163 | \$138,644,602 | \$140,053,402 | \$141,896,758 | \$145,214,191 | \$148,094,574 | \$151,513,295 | \$154,514,502 | \$1,429,095,252 |
| Revenues | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 10-Year Period |
| Farebox Revenues | \$34,226,896 | \$35,118,700 | \$35,645,480 | \$36,180,160 | \$36,722,860 | \$37,702,140 | \$38,267,670 | \$38,841,680 | \$39,424,310 | \$40,015,670 | \$372,145,566 |
| Farebox Revenues (The Wave Streetcar) | \$0 | \$0 | \$750,000 | \$772,500 | \$795,675 | \$819,545 | \$844,132 | \$869,456 | \$895,539 | \$922,405 | \$6,669,252 |
| Farebox Revenues (Reliability/Capacity Adjustments) | \$372,804 | \$575,929 | \$589,754 | \$156,699 | \$161,405 | \$166,243 | \$171,229 | \$176,365 | \$181,500 | \$186,784 | \$2,738,712 |
| General Fund (Ad Valorem) | \$21,162,900 | \$21,162,900 | \$21,162,900 | \$21,162,900 | \$21,162,900 | \$21,162,900 | \$21,162,900 | \$21,162,900 | \$21,162,900 | \$21,162,900 | \$211,629,000 |
| Gas Tax | \$54,000,000 | \$52,920,000 | \$51,861,600 | \$50,824,370 | \$49,807,880 | \$48,811,720 | \$47,835,490 | \$46,878,780 | \$45,941,200 | \$45,022,380 | \$493,903,420 |
| Concurrency Fund | \$622,120 | \$114,180 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$736,300 |
| Fuel and Other Reserves | \$7,812,250 | \$5,979,250 | \$4,146,250 | \$2,313,250 | \$480,250 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,731,250 |
| Applied Fund Balance | \$1,833,000 | \$1,833,000 | \$1,833,000 | \$1,833,000 | \$1,833,000 | \$480,250 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,645,250 |
| State Grants | \$13,007,640 | \$13,137,716 | \$13,269,094 | \$13,401,784 | \$13,535,802 | \$13,671,160 | \$13,807,872 | \$13,945,951 | \$14,085,410 | \$14,226,264 | \$136,088,694 |
| All Other Revenues | \$810,000 | \$818,100 | \$826,280 | \$834,540 | \$842,890 | \$851,320 | \$859,830 | \$868,430 | \$877,110 | \$885,880 | \$8,474,380 |
| 5% Contingency Adjustment | (\$1,770,490) | (\$1,796,840) | (\$1,823,590) | (\$1,850,740) | (\$1,878,290) | (\$1,927,670) | (\$1,956,380) | (\$1,985,510) | (\$2,015,070) | (\$2,045,080) | (\$19,049,660) |
| Total Operating Revenues | \$132,077,120 | \$129,862,935 | \$128,260,768 | \$125,628,463 | \$123,464,372 | \$121,737,608 | \$120,992,743 | \$120,758,051 | \$120,552,899 | \$120,377,203 | \$1,243,712,164 |
| Revenues Minus Costs | \$0 | (\$8,153,711) | (\$10,809,395) | (\$13,016,138) | (\$16,589,029) | (\$20,159,150) | (\$24,221,448) | (\$27,336,524) | (\$30,960,396) | (\$34,137,298) | (\$185,383,088) |
| Additional General Fund (Ad Valorem) Transfer | \$0 | \$8,153,711 | \$10,809,395 | \$13,016,138 | \$16,589,029 | \$20,159,150 | \$24,221,448 | \$27,336,524 | \$30,960,396 | \$34,137,298 | \$185,383,088 |
| Surplus/Deficit | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| CAPITAL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Costs | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 10-Year Period |
| Fixed Route Vehicle Replacement | \$27,840,787 | \$29,543,010 | \$27,875,900 | \$23,969,742 | \$19,451,227 | \$23,876,380 | \$24,592,672 | \$25,330,452 | \$26,090,366 | \$26,873,077 | \$255,443,612 |
| Community Bus Vehicle Replacement | \$2,551,766 | \$3,369,843 | \$1,314,964 | \$1,130,729 | \$3,065,117 | \$1,205,449 | \$4,881,803 | \$1,394,892 | \$1,030,806 | \$2,037,050 | \$21,982,419 |
| Paratransit Vehicle Acquisition | \$14,235,915 | \$732,810 | \$784,839 | \$840,563 | \$900,243 | \$8,447,509 | \$9,581,218 | \$1,105,931 | \$1,027,696 | \$3,904,948 | \$41,561,671 |
| Parts and Preventative Maintenance | \$1,935,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$3,090,000 | \$3,182,700 | \$3,278,181 | \$3,376,526 | \$3,477,822 | \$3,582,157 | \$3,689,622 | \$3,800,310 | \$32,412,318 |
| Tire Leasing | \$1,670,000 | \$1,720,100 | \$1,771,703 | \$1,824,854 | \$1,879,600 | \$1,935,988 | \$1,994,067 | \$2,053,889 | \$2,115,506 | \$2,178,971 | \$19,144,678 |
| Reliability/Capacity Adjustments - Vehicles | \$6,126,826 | \$4,156,840 | \$6,957,509 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$17,241,175 |
| IT Improvements | \$11,373,000 | \$4,171,000 | \$11,370,000 | \$7,695,000 | \$1,365,000 | \$3,195,000 | \$2,345,000 | \$1,545,000 | \$945,000 | \$945,000 | \$44,949,000 |
| Concurrency Infrastructure and Bus Replacement Projects | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$29,760,000 |
| Infrastructure (e.g., operations facilities) | \$22,694,247 | \$6,480,000 | \$14,580,000 | \$1,580,000 | \$1,580,000 | \$1,580,000 | \$1,580,000 | \$1,580,000 | \$1,580,000 | \$1,580,000 | \$54,814,247 |
| Planning Studies | \$500,000 | \$250,000 | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,250,000 |
| Total Capital Costs | \$91,903,541 | \$56,399,602 | \$71,220,915 | \$43,199,587 | \$34,995,366 | \$47,092,853 | \$51,428,583 | \$39,568,321 | \$39,454,996 | \$44,295,357 | \$519,559,120 |
| Revenues | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 10-Year Period |
| Concurrency Fund | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$2,976,000 | \$29,760,000 |
| | | | \$25,639,856 | \$25,896,254 | \$26,155,217 | \$26,416,769 | \$26,680,937 | \$26,947,746 | \$27,217,224 | \$27,489,396 | \$262,964,043 |
| Federal 5307 for Capital | \$25,134,649 | \$25,385,996 | \$23,037,030 | \$20/070/201 | | | | | | | |
| Federal 5307 for Capital Total Capital Revenues | \$25,134,649 \$28,110,649 | \$25,385,996 \$28,361,996 | \$28,615,856 | \$28,872,254 | \$29,131,217 | \$29,392,769 | \$29,656,937 | \$29,923,746 | \$30,193,224 | \$30,465,396 | \$292,724,043 |
| | | | | | \$29,131,217 \$0 | \$29,392,769 \$0 | \$29,656,937 \$0 | \$29,923,746 \$0 | \$30,193,224 \$0 | \$30,465,396 \$0 | \$292,724,043 N/A |
| Total Capital Revenues | \$28,110,649 | \$28,361,996 | \$28,615,856 | \$28,872,254 | | | | | | | |
| Total Capital Revenues Federal 5307 Carryover from Previous Year | \$28,110,649 \$74,335,556 | \$28,361,996 \$21,446,498 | \$28,615,856 \$0 | \$28,872,254 \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | N/A |

Figures 8-1 and 8-2 display the operating and cost budgets for the Status Quo Plan in a slightly different manner. The figures show the amount of the Status Quo Plan that is funded and the shortfall in funding.



Figure 8-1 Status Quo Plan Operating Budget



Figure 8-2 Status Quo Plan Capital Budget

VISION PLAN

While the Status Quo Plan focuses on continuing current levels of service, the Vision Plan focuses on implementing a number of additional services and infrastructure projects that are needed to improve the system. This plan offers a vision of what transit in Broward County could look like if additional funding sources were identified.



VISION PLAN ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made regarding the Vision Plan:

- All budget items included in the Status Quo Plan were carried over into the Vision Plan.
- All needed improvements, described in Section 7, were included in the Vision Plan.
- The only difference in assumed revenues between the Vision Plan and the Status Quo Plan were the addition of farebox revenues from new services implemented in the Vision Plan.

VISION PLAN BUDGET ITEMS

The following improvements are included in the Vision Plan.

- All current service needs identified in the Status Quo Plan are included in the Vision Plan.
- All of the new Fixed, Express, and Enhanced Bus routes included in the Service Plan (Appendix L) are included in the Vision Plan. The vehicles necessary to implement these improvements are also included in the Vision Plan.
- Service improvements that reduce all headways on the Community Bus system to a maximum of 60-minute headways are implemented beginning in FY 2018.
- Infrastructure: The infrastructure projects to be included in the Vision Plan are listed in Table 8-3.

Table 8-3

Vision Plan Infrastructure Improvements

| Infrastructure Improvement | Implementation Year (FY) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Downtown Intermodal Center | 2015-16 | | | | |
| Third Maintenance/Operations Facility | 2019-21 | | | | |
| Park-and-Ride Lots | 2016-23 | | | | |
| Transit Intermodal Centers | 2018-19; 2022-23 | | | | |
| Bus Stops/Pedestrian Improvements | Ongoing | | | | |

VISION PLAN OPERATING COSTS

The operating costs are divided into five categories. Each is described in the following bullets with the actual costs detailed by year in Table 8-4.

- Status Quo Plan: This line item is the total operating cost from the Status Quo Plan. It includes all of the operating items that were included in the Status Quo Plan.
- New Service Implementation Fixed Route: This line item covers the costs of implementing all of the fixed route service improvements detailed in the service plan found in Appendix L. Costs were based on a fully allocated operating cost per revenue hour.
- New Service Implementation Express: Express service is to be extended along I-75 into Miami's Brickell District and the MIC. This line item covers the operating costs of extending this service. Costs were based on a fully allocated operating cost per revenue hour.
- New Service Implementation Enhanced Bus: There are eight new routes to be implemented under the Vision Plan. Details are provided in Section 7 and the Service Plan in Appendix L. Costs were based on a fully allocated operating cost per revenue hour.
- New Service Implementation Community Bus: Operating costs for improvements to the Community Bus system are listed in this line item. Costs were based on a fully allocated operating cost per revenue hour.

VISION PLAN OPERATING REVENUES

The operating revenues are divided into two categories. Each is described in the following bullets with the actual revenues detailed by year in Table 8-4.

- Status Quo Plan: All of the revenues projected to be available under the Status Quo Plan are also projected to be available under the Vision Plan.
- Farebox Revenues (New Fixed Route, Express, and Enhanced Bus): A conservative 30 percent farebox recovery rate was assumed for the new Fixed Route, Express, and Enhanced Bus services. No farebox recovery was assumed for community bus services as that revenue is collected by the respective community operators.

VISION PLAN OPERATING CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be made from Table 8-4 with regards to the projected Vision Plan operating budget:

- The same level of transfer from the General Fund (Ad Valorem) was assumed as in the Status Quo Plan.
- The FY 2014 operating budget is balanced under the Vision Plan.



• A total of approximately \$50 million in operating costs are projected beyond the Status Quo Plan to operate the Vision Plan.

VISION PLAN CAPITAL COSTS

The capital costs are divided into seven categories. Each is described in the following bullets with the actual costs detailed by year in Table 8-4.

- Status Quo Plan: This line item is the total capital cost from the Status Quo Plan. It includes all of the capital items that were included in the Status Quo Plan.
- New Service Vehicles Fixed Route: This line item includes the purchase of all vehicles necessary to implement the new fixed route services detailed in the Service Plan in Appendix L.
- New Service Vehicles Express: This line item includes the purchase of all vehicles necessary to implement the new express services detailed in the Service Plan in Appendix L.
- New Service Vehicles Enhanced Bus: This line item includes the purchase of all vehicles necessary to implement the new Enhanced Bus services detailed in the Service Plan in Appendix L.
- New Service Vehicles Community Bus: This line item includes the purchase of all vehicles necessary to implement the new community bus services such as increased frequencies.
- Infrastructure: This line item totals the costs of the infrastructure improvements detailed in Table 8-3. More detail on the cost of individual facilities can be found in Appendix L.
- Enhanced Bus Infrastructure: In addition to the vehicles necessary to implement this new layer of Enhanced Bus service, other infrastructure such as TSP installation, station and stop infrastructure (design and construction), land acquisition for the stations (does not include guideway), and pedestrian connectivity improvements is required. Based on recent Rapid Bus construction efforts in Kansas City and Tampa, these costs are estimated to be \$2 million per mile.

VISION PLAN CAPITAL REVENUES

The capital revenues are divided into two categories. Each is described in the following bullets with the actual revenues detailed by year in Table 8-4.

• Status Quo Plan: All of the revenues projected to be available under the Status Quo Plan are also projected to be available under the Vision Plan.

• New Revenues: At present, no new revenues have been identified for the capital projects under the Vision Plan. It is possible BCT will pursue local, state, and federal funding for certain projects, but no assumptions as to their award has been made in the capital Vision Plan.

VISION PLAN CAPITAL CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be made from Table 8-4 with regards to the projected Vision Plan capital budget:

- The FY 2014 capital budget is balanced under the Vision Plan.
- The total 10-year capital costs in the Vision Plan are projected at \$1,048 million.
- To fund the capital portion of the Vision Plan, it would take approximately \$529 million beyond the Status Quo Plan.

| | Table 8-4 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Vision Plan: Operating a | nd Capital Budgets (FY 2014-2023) |

| OPERATING | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Costs | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 10-Year Period |
| Status Quo Plan | \$132,077,120 | \$138,016,646 | \$139,070,163 | \$138,644,602 | \$140,053,402 | \$141,896,758 | \$145,214,191 | \$148,094,574 | \$151,513,295 | \$154,514,502 | \$1,429,095,252 |
| New Service Implementation - Fixed Route | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,969,224 | \$3,503,947 | \$1,282,965 | \$4,382,777 | \$1,502,176 | \$1,567,239 | \$1,703,135 | \$17,911,462 |
| New Service Implementation - Express | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,196,460 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,196,460 |
| New Service Implementation - Enhanced Bus | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,049,137 | \$3,439,823 | \$2,002,525 | \$1,507,280 | \$1,797,612 | \$840,888 | \$4,384,531 | \$17,021,796 |
| New Service Implementation - Community Bus | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,768,053 | \$3,881,094 | \$3,997,527 | \$4,117,453 | \$4,240,977 | \$4,368,206 | \$24,373,309 |
| Total Operating Costs | \$132,077,120 | \$138,016,646 | \$139,070,163 | \$145,662,963 | \$151,961,683 | \$149,063,343 | \$155,101,774 | \$155,511,816 | \$158,162,399 | \$164,970,373 | \$1,489,598,279 |
| Revenues | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 10-Year Period |
| Status Quo Plan | \$132,077,120 | \$129,862,935 | \$128,260,768 | \$125,628,463 | \$123,464,372 | \$121,737,608 | \$120,992,743 | \$120,758,051 | \$120,552,899 | \$120,377,203 | \$1,243,712,164 |
| Farebox Revenues (New Fixed Route, Express, and Enhanced Bus) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,105,508 | \$2,442,069 | \$985,647 | \$1,767,017 | \$989,936 | \$722,438 | \$1,826,300 | \$10,838,915 |
| Total Operating Revenues | \$132,077,120 | \$129,862,935 | \$128,260,768 | \$127,733,972 | \$125,906,441 | \$122,723,256 | \$122,759,760 | \$121,747,987 | \$121,275,338 | \$122,203,503 | \$1,254,551,079 |
| Revenues Minus Costs | \$0 | (\$8,153,711) | (\$10,809,395) | (\$17,928,991) | (\$26,055,242) | (\$26,340,088) | (\$32,342,014) | (\$33,763,828) | (\$36,887,061) | (\$42,766,870) | (\$235,047,200) |
| General Fund Transfer (Cost Feasible) | \$0 | \$8,153,711 | \$10,809,395 | \$13,016,138 | \$16,589,029 | \$20,159,150 | \$24,221,448 | \$27,336,524 | \$30,960,396 | \$34,137,298 | \$185,383,088 |
| Surplus/Deficit | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$4,912,853) | (\$9,466,213) | (\$6,180,938) | (\$8,120,567) | (\$6,427,305) | (\$5,926,666) | (\$8,629,572) | (\$49,664,112) |
| CAPITAL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Costs | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 10-Year Period |
| Status Quo Plan | \$91,903,541 | \$56,399,602 | \$71,220,915 | \$43,199,587 | \$34,995,366 | \$47,092,853 | \$51,428,583 | \$39,568,321 | \$39,454,996 | \$44,295,357 | \$519,559,120 |
| New Service Vehicles - Fixed Route | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,268,735 | \$10,220,148 | \$6,433,020 | \$6,626,004 | \$4,963,480 | \$7,023,566 | \$5,256,952 | \$48,791,905 |
| New Service Vehicles - Express | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,552,870 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,552,870 |
| New Service Vehicles - Enhanced Bus | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,323,878 | \$7,105,740 | \$2,439,636 | \$1,256,412 | \$3,882,318 | \$1,997,697 | \$8,223,720 | \$31,229,401 |
| New Service Vehicles - Community Bus | \$2,551,766 | \$3,369,843 | \$1,314,964 | \$1,130,729 | \$3,065,117 | \$1,205,449 | \$4,881,803 | \$1,394,892 | \$1,030,806 | \$2,037,050 | \$21,982,419 |
| Infrastructure (e.g., operations facilities) | \$0 | \$3,300,000 | \$33,450,000 | \$4,500,000 | \$5,550,000 | \$24,300,000 | \$39,550,000 | \$17,400,000 | \$10,850,000 | \$11,900,000 | \$150,800,000 |
| Enhanced Bus Infrastructure (not including vehicles) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$59,000,000 | \$32,000,000 | \$26,000,000 | \$53,000,000 | \$16,000,000 | \$30,000,000 | \$57,000,000 | \$273,000,000 |
| Total Capital Costs | \$94,455,307 | \$63,069,444 | \$105,985,880 | \$122,422,929 | \$96,489,241 | \$107,470,957 | \$156,742,802 | \$83,209,011 | \$90,357,065 | \$128,713,079 | \$1,048,915,715 |
| Revenues | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 10-Year Period |
| Status Quo Plan | \$28,110,649 | \$28,361,996 | \$28,615,856 | \$28,872,254 | \$29,131,217 | \$29,392,769 | \$29,656,937 | \$29,923,746 | \$30,193,224 | \$30,465,396 | \$292,724,043 |
| New Revenues | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Capital Revenues | \$28,110,649 | \$28,361,996 | \$28,615,856 | \$28,872,254 | \$29,131,217 | \$29,392,769 | \$29,656,937 | \$29,923,746 | \$30,193,224 | \$30,465,396 | \$292,724,043 |
| Federal 5307 Carryover from Previous Year | \$74,335,556 | \$18,894,732 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | N/A |
| FTA and FDOT Capital Grants Carryover | \$10,903,834 | | | | | | | | | | \$10,903,834 |
| Total Capital Revenues Plus Carryover | \$113,350,039 | \$47,256,728 | \$28,615,856 | \$28,872,254 | \$29,131,217 | \$29,392,769 | \$29,656,937 | \$29,923,746 | \$30,193,224 | \$30,465,396 | \$377,963,433 |
| Revenues Minus Costs | \$18,894,732 | (\$15,812,716) | (\$77,370,024) | (\$93,550,675) | (\$67,358,024) | (\$78,078,188) | (\$127,085,865) | (\$53,285,265) | (\$60,163,841) | (\$98,247,683) | (\$670,952,282) |
| Surplus/Deficit | \$18,894,732 | (\$15,812,716) | (\$77,370,024) | (\$93,550,675) | (\$67,358,024) | (\$78,078,188) | (\$127,085,865) | (\$53,285,265) | (\$60,163,841) | (\$98,247,683) | (\$670,952,282) |

Figures 8-3 and 8-4 display the operating and cost budgets for the Vision Plan in a slightly different manner. The figures show the amount of the Vision Plan that is funded and the shortfall in funding.



Figure 8-3 Vision Plan Operating Budget

Figure 8-4 Vision Plan Capital Budget

