FY 2009
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY MONITORING
AND OVERSIGHT REPORT
Commission’s Charge

• In 2007, HB 985 amended Section 20.23, FS, expanding the Commission’s oversight role

• Monitor the efficiency, productivity, and management of the authorities created under Chapters 343 and 348

• In 2009, HB 1213 further expanded the Commission’s role to include the authority created under Chapter 349
Commission’s Charge

• Conduct periodic reviews of each authority’s:
  – Operations and budget
  – Acquisition of property
  – Management of revenue and bond proceeds
  – Compliance with applicable laws and generally accepted accounting principles
Authorities Monitored

• Toll Authorities
  – Miami-Dade Expressway Authority (MDX)
  – Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority (OOCEA)
  – Santa Rosa Bay Bridge Authority (SRBBA)
  – Tampa-Hillsborough County Expressway Authority (THEA)
  – Northwest Florida Transportation Corridor Authority (NFTCA)
  – Southwest Florida Expressway Authority (SWFEA)
  – Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA)

• Transit Authorities
  – Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority (CFRTA / LYNX)
  – Jacksonville Transportation Authority (JTA)
  – South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA / Tri-Rail)
Inactive Authorities

• Toll Authorities
  – Brevard County Expressway Authority
  – Broward County Expressway Authority
  – Pasco County Expressway Authority
  – St. Lucie County Expressway and Bridge Authority
  – Seminole County Expressway Authority

• Transit Authorities
  – Tampa Bay Commuter Transit Authority
Commission’s Approach

• Appointed committee
• Developed “performance measures” and “operating indicators” for all authorities
• Adopted reporting requirements in areas of organizational “governance”
• Staffed by FTC with CUTR support
• Periodically updated, reviewed and refined
FY 2009 Changes

Established Toll Authorities

Safety - recomputed 5-year average objective

Bridge Condition (Weight Restrictions) - describe how Work Program projects address deficiencies

ETC Transactions - changed objective to >75% participation by June 30, 2012

Cost to Collect a Toll Transaction - cost basis for calculation changed

LYNX

Revenue Miles between Safety Incidents - recomputed 5-year average objective

Tri-Rail

Revenue Miles between Failures - changed objective to 10% increase over actual FY 2007 performance
FY 2009 Changes

JTA

• Fixed Route Bus
  – Performance measures and operating indicators same as LYNX
  – Objectives same as LYNX except 5 related to cost measures

• Skyway (Automated Guideway)
  – New mode of transportation under Commission oversight
  – Performance measures and operating indicators same as LYNX
  – Definition of on-time performance modified
  – Objectives same as LYNX except 6 relating to cost measures and the average headway

• Highways
  – 4 performance measures/objectives and right-of-way operating indicators same as toll authorities
MIAMI-DADE EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

✔ MET 16 OF 17 PERFORMANCE MEASURES
  ➢ Met Construction Cost objective this year
  ➢ Not met: Safety measure

✔ OPERATING INDICATORS
  ➢ Revenue decreased 2.5%
  ➢ Routine maintenance expenses increased 18%
  ➢ Toll collection expenses increased 12%
  ➢ Administrative expenses increased $1.9 million
GOVERNANCE

- Adopted Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, Public Records and Open Meetings Policies
- Unqualified Audit - No management recommendations
- Met Bond Covenants
- MDX cash funded deficiencies in Debt Service Reserve as a result of bond insurer’s downgrade
- Delegated Procurement Authority - Executive Director $2 M

OTHER

- Estimates only 45% of vehicles pay a toll on facilities
- Plans to implement ORT on all MDX facilities by 2012
- Plans to issue $300 million in revenue bonds in 2010
MIAMI-DADE EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

Javier Rodriguez, P.E.
Executive Director
Florida Transportation Commission FY 2009

Miami-Dade Expressway Authority
Javier Rodriguez, P.E.
Executive Director
Goals

- Advancing Long-Range Projects
- “It’s a GO” for Open Road Tolling
- ITS Next Steps
- Completing Capacity Improvements
- Partnering
- FTC
Advancing Long-Range Projects

- SR 874 Ramp Connector
- SR 924 Extension West to HEFT
- SR 924 Extension East to I-95
- U.S. 1 Express Lanes
- Connect 4 Xpress
- SR 836 Southwest Extension
“It’s a GO” for Open Road Tolling

- SR 924, SR 874 and SR 878 Infrastructure Modifications for ORT
  - Includes toll plaza removal (where existing), installation of gantries, shelters and signage
  - Under construction

- Tentative Opening Dates
  - SR 924 – Spring of 2010
  - SR 874 / SR 878 – Summer of 2010
  - SR 112 – FY 2012
  - SR 836 – FY 2014 (w/ potential of being advanced)

- Launched micro-site for ORT
  - www.mdxort.com
ITS – Next Steps

• **Systemwide Communications & Incident Management/Surveillance**
  Completed in Feb. 2010

• **Next Steps**
  – Systemwide Implementation of Dynamic Message Signs
  – ITS Master Plan
Completing Capacity Projects

- SR 836 Eastbound Auxiliary Lane
- SR 874 / Killian Parkway Interchange Improvements
- SR 836 Interchange Modifications at 87th Ave.
- SR 836 Auxiliary Lanes & Interchange Improvements (Eastbound NW 42nd Ave to NW 17th Ave and westbound NW 57th Ave to NW 27th Ave)
- SR 874 Mainline Reconstruction
Partnering

- **Central Boulevard Reconstruction**
  - MDX will act as a fund partner and grant recipient from FDOT to administer the project on behalf of MDAD
  - MDX/FDOT contributing up to $48.5 Million each
  - Design-Build Start – Spring 2010
- **SR 826 / SR 836 Interchange Improvements**
  - Joint Participation Agreement with FDOT
  - MDX contributing $200 Million
  - Began in the Fall 2009
- **SR 874 / SR 826 Interchange Improvements**
  - Joint Participation Agreement with FDOT
  - MDX contributing $60 Million
  - Construction began in Fall 2008
FTC Criteria Reporting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Actual Results</th>
<th>Meets Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHS Roadway Maintenance Condition Rating</td>
<td>Condition rating of at least 90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition Rating</td>
<td>% SHS lane miles rated “excellent or good”</td>
<td>&gt;85%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Condition - Rating</td>
<td>% bridge structures rated “excellent or good”</td>
<td>&gt;95%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Condition - Weight Restrictions</td>
<td>% SHS bridge structures with posted limit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Toll Collection (ETC) -</td>
<td>Number of ETC transactions as % of total transactions</td>
<td>&gt;75% by 6/30/12</td>
<td>74.8%¹</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Variance</td>
<td>Variance from indicated revenue (without fines)</td>
<td>&lt;4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety²</td>
<td>Fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>&gt;10% below 5 yr. avg (.58)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>% customers satisfied with level of service</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Budget</td>
<td>Percentage (Target)</td>
<td>Performance (Actual)</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Contract Management</td>
<td>Final cost % increase above original award</td>
<td>&lt; 5%</td>
<td>-20.2%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract Adjustments - Time</td>
<td>% contracts completed within 20% above original contract time</td>
<td>≥ 80%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract Adjustments - Cost</td>
<td>% projects completed within 10% above original contract amount</td>
<td>≥ 90%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Collect a Toll Transaction</td>
<td>Total toll collection cost / number of transactions (net of exclusions)</td>
<td>&lt; $0.16</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating, Maintenance and Administrative (OM&amp;A) Forecast Variance</td>
<td>Actual OM&amp;A to annual budget</td>
<td>+/- 10%</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable Laws</th>
<th>Percentage (Target)</th>
<th>Performance (Actual)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Participation[^3]</td>
<td>M/WBE and SBE utilization as % of total expenditures (each agency establishes goal/target)</td>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>100+%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Management and Bond Proceeds</th>
<th>Percentage (Target)</th>
<th>Performance (Actual)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Coverage - Bonded/Commercial Debt</td>
<td>([\frac{(\text{Rev} - \text{interest}) - (\text{toll operating &amp; maintenance expense})}{\text{commercial debt service expense}}])</td>
<td>&gt; 1.5</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Coverage - Comprehensive Debt</td>
<td>([\frac{(\text{Rev} - \text{interest}) - (\text{toll operating &amp; maintenance expense})}{\text{all scheduled debt service expense}}])</td>
<td>&gt; 1.2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Coverage - Compliance with Bond Covenants</td>
<td>Debt service coverage meets or exceeds minimum Bond Covenant requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FTC Criteria:

• MDX has met 16 of 17 Measures
• Staff Reports measures to MDX Governing Board
• FTC Criteria Enhancements – Maintenance
• MDX’s Program on Traffic Safety
FTC Criteria Enhancements - Roadway Maintenance

• In addition to the FDOT Mainline MRP, a custom MDX MRP is performed 3 times a year. The MDX MRP includes:
  – Ramps
  – Bridges

• Monetary disincentives are issued to our Asset Maintenance Firms when measures are not met.
Traffic Safety: MDX’s Program

- Monitoring
- High Crash Locations
- Solutions
  - Safety Reviews
  - Fatal Reviews
  - Field Reviews
- Implementation
Florida Transportation Commission FY 2009

Miami-Dade Expressway Authority
Javier Rodriguez, P.E.
Executive Director
MET 14 OF 16 APPLICABLE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Customer Service survey conducted every 2 years
- Met OM&A Forecast Variance objective this year
- Not met: Safety and Debt Service Coverage - Bonded Debt measures

OPERATING INDICATORS

- Renewal and replacement costs decreased $9 million
- Infrastructure asset additions
- Revenue grew by 0.2% despite a 7.1% decrease in toll transactions
- System-wide toll rate increase of $0.25 on April 5, 2009
- Total operating expenses decreased $17 million (20%)
GOVERNANCE

- Adopted Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, Public Records and Open Meetings Policies
- Ethics Policy related to political activity strengthened
- Unqualified Audit - Both management recommendations implemented
- Implementation of internal audit/review recommendations
- Met Bond Covenants

OTHER

- Fully opened John Land Apopka Expressway (Phase 1)
- Issued $335 million in Revenue Bonds in March 2010
Laura Kelley
Deputy Executive Director
Finance Administration and Planning
Open the car door for your mother
Always say please & thank you

Change lanes when you see someone on the roadside

Gentle reminders from

RESPECT THE RANGER
Change lanes for safety when you see flashing lights.
WHEN YOU SEE MY BACKSIDE
MOVE ASIDE
{ Change lanes for safety }

SEE FLASHING LIGHTS?
Change lanes for safety.
MET 6 OF 12 APPLICABLE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

(Measures not met):

- ETC Transactions, Cost to Collect a Toll Transaction, Annual OM&A Forecast Variance, and all three Debt Service Coverage measures
- In technical default on its bonds
- Revenue is projected insufficient to make debt service payments
- Debt Service Reserve Fund is projected to be depleted in FY 2012

OPERATING INDICATORS

- Transactions and toll revenue decreased approximately 9%
- FDOT is providing limited funding for administrative expenses
- All three rating agencies downgraded SRBBA bonds in FY 2009
✓ GOVERNANCE

- Operating in the “Sunshine” - provisions of various Statutes adopted
- Board did not meet for one year
- Inadequate oversight of Department obligations under the Lease-Purchase Agreement (no Department noncompliance noted)
- Determination Resolution, Material Events Notice and quarterly financial statements not properly filed with Trustee
- Recommendation for toll schedule revisions not properly reviewed
- No Audit - Required financial report not filed with DFS
Garnett M. Breeding
Chairman of the Board of Directors
✓ MET 12 OF 17 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Met Roadway Maintenance Condition Rating and Revenue Variance measures this year.

(Measures not met):
- Bridge Condition Rating
- Safety
- Cost to Collect a Toll Transaction
- Two Debt Service Coverage measures (in compliance with Bonds)

✓ OPERATING INDICATORS

- Decrease in Infrastructure Assets
- Transactions and revenue decreased 3%
- Routine maintenance expenses increased by $0.5 million
✓ GOVERNANCE

- Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, Public Records, Open Meetings
- Unqualified Audit - No management recommendations
- Auditor General Follow-Up Audit - October 2008
- Met Bond Covenants

✓ OTHER

- Plans to implement AET on all facilities by September 2010
- Plans to use $60 million from mediation settlement to partially defease current outstanding bonds
TAMPA-HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

Joseph (Joe) Waggoner
Executive Director
• Transit & Tolling
• A Public Partnership Model To Help Move People & Relieve Traffic Congestion

• Joe Waggoner
  • Executive Director, THEA
  • May 2010
• Bus Toll Lanes

- Transit Facility
- Price Managed to Assure Travel and Schedule Reliability
- Equity Based Revenue Sharing
- Provide Transit with a New Sustainable Revenue Source
## Bus Toll Lanes - MOVE PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Vehicles per Hour</th>
<th>Vehicle Speed</th>
<th>Vehicle Occupancy</th>
<th>Passenger Trips per Hour (ptph)</th>
<th>Equivalent Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Toll Lane @ 25* (1.6%)</td>
<td>1,587 **</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Toll Lane @ 50* (3.2%)</td>
<td>1,575 **</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6,242</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Toll Lane @ 100* (6.4%)</td>
<td>1,551 **</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10,134</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes an 80-Passenger Bus

** Assumes 15% HOV3
• Business Rules - Only the BRT is FREE
  • SOV, HOV, Hybrids and Motorcycles Pay...

- Bus Lane Revenue Based on Finite Lane Capacity
- All Passenger Vehicles Use Same Capacity
- Lane Price is an Optional Cost / Non-Transit
  • Customers Set Toll Rates
- Time/Cost Savings Encourage Transit Use, and
  • Ridesharing
- Eliminate Enforcement Issues
- Transit Gets the Competitive Edge
• **Public Partnership (P2) Opportunity**

  - **Project Funding**
    - Working together for common goals
    - Don’t divide the pie - add the slices

  - **Project Operations** – efficient/optimize
    - Transit agency manages bus operations
    - Toll agency collect tolls & maintains highway

  - **Revenue Sharing from Tolls** (equity based)
    - Bus Toll Lane operation & maintenance
    - Bus Toll Lane preservation (R&R)
    - Repayment of capital debt service
    - New Bus Toll Lane construction (future)
    - Supplement to transit operations
• Benefits

• Transit Riders
  • Expense & **Time** Savings
  • Fewer Transfers
  • Reliable Trip Times

• Automobile Drivers
  • Convenience, trip reliability, and time savings
  • Less Congested roadways
  • Choice

• Community
  • Reduced traffic congestion
  • Improved air quality
  • Improved movement of goods & services
  • Reduced demand on taxes for construction, operation & maintenance
  • Investment of excess revenue back into local transportation
• Additional Community Benefits

• Plan and Grow Transit Oriented with
  • Development Sooner in Small Urban Centers
• Emergency Vehicle Access
• Evacuation
  • Expanded Highway Routes
  • Expanded Bus Fleet
• Filling the Toll Function

• Toll Agencies as Partners
  • Experience and Expertise
  • Willing Partner with Transit
  • Transit is Regional Nature
• Bus Toll Lanes

• Concept Statement

This “new transit concept” proposes to move transit forward by making it a partner in the toll road trade. The idea is to create bus lanes with transit agencies as an equity holder, or full-owner, of the required highway infrastructure. The bus lanes would be open to use by all light-duty 2-axle vehicles and would be price managed to assure the desired level of service on the facility. The “Bus Toll Lanes” (BTL) concept could provide transit agencies access to an inflation sensitive toll revenue source that could be used to pay operating costs, or finance construction of new transit service. The transit agency share of “excess” toll revenue would be based on the equity share provided for construction of the BTL facility in a partnership arrangement.

Today and in the future transportation agencies face growing travel demand and are required to address that demand with traditional fund sources that are flat or decreasing in actual buying power. This is occurring in the face of diminishing physical opportunities to establish new routes and alignments for new service and increasing energy costs that are seriously impacting operating budgets and plans.

To meet growing trip demand in our urban centers, an evolution of highways from construction of general purpose “free” lanes, to HOV Lanes, to HOT Lanes is underway. HOV and HOT concepts often include Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service as an element. To date, we are not aware of any situations in the US were agencies have created a bus lane with the initial intent of using its capacity as a revenue generator. There is potential for a Bus-Toll Lane to cover the infrastructure maintenance and operation (M&O) costs, and preservation costs from tolls, and, to create a new revenue source capable of supporting capital-financing.

A public-public (P2) partnership between toll and transit agencies would combine transit and highway funding sources to develop a new facility faster than either agency could do individually. Assembling pieces of the “funding pie” also adds to the potential “buy-down” of construction costs from sources other than the toll revenue. This could mean a greater portion of toll revenue is available sooner as an excess revenue stream.

Typically enterprise activities have been tangential to most transit agencies and have involved advertising and joint development activities. Applying sound “business” decisions to the tolling policy in a BTL would assure that transit remains the primary focus with the main beneficiary being the transit user and the transit agency. The potential revenue stream from tolling on the BTL is based on a finite lane capacity determined by the targeted level-of-service that price management is set to assure.
These Are Not Your Grandparent’s Buses

- Customer Comfort
- High Capacity
- Alternative Fuel
CENTRAL FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY - LYNX

✓ MET 5 OF 12 PERFORMANCE MEASURES
(Measures not met):
- Average Headway
- Operating Expense per Revenue Mile
- Operating Expense per Revenue Hour
- Operating Expense per Passenger Trip
- Operating Expense per Passenger Mile
- Revenue Miles between Failures
- Revenue Miles versus Vehicle Miles

✓ OPERATING INDICATORS
- Operating expenses increased 18.1%
- Operating revenue increased 2.4%
- Decreased Ridership, Revenue Miles, Revenue Hours, Passenger Trips
- Farebox Recovery, Passenger Miles, Average Fare, Average age of Fleet
✓ GOVERNANCE

- Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, Public Records, Open Meetings
- Unqualified financial statement audit
- Deficiency noted in Auditor’s Report on Compliance
- FTA follow-up to procurement review noted deficiencies
- FTA Disadvantaged Business Enterprise compliance review

✓ OTHER

- Increased fares in January 2009
- American Public Transportation Association Peer Review
- Revised data
Bert J. Francis II, CPA
Chief Financial Officer
LYNX
Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority

Bert Francis, CPA
Chief Financial Officer

May 6, 2010
## Two Year Trend for Operating Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING</th>
<th>As Reported 2008</th>
<th>As Reported 2009</th>
<th>Revised 2008</th>
<th>Revised 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$87,150,449</td>
<td>$102,882,269</td>
<td>$90,795,044</td>
<td>$87,231,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$41,247,382</td>
<td>$42,216,981</td>
<td>$32,818,381</td>
<td>$32,842,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Expenses DECREASED 4% in FY09

Operating Revenue INCREASED 1% in FY09
## Two Year Trend for Transit Authority Performance Measures and Reportable Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>As Reported</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Headway (minutes)</td>
<td>&lt;60 Minutes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Exp. per Rev. Mile</td>
<td>&lt;$5.30</td>
<td>$5.82</td>
<td>$7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Exp. Per Rev. Hour</td>
<td>&lt;$75</td>
<td>$80.81</td>
<td>$99.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oper. Rev. Per Oper. Exp.</td>
<td>&lt;30%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Exp. Per Pass. Trip</td>
<td>&lt;$3</td>
<td>$3.30</td>
<td>$4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Exp. Per Pass. Mile</td>
<td>&lt;$0.47</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev Miles Between Incidents</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
<td>118,001</td>
<td>118,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 yr avg 114,469
## Two Year Trend for Transit Authority Performance Measures and Reportable Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>As Reported</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Miles Between Failures</td>
<td>&gt;10,500</td>
<td>11,396</td>
<td>8,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Miles vs Vehicle Miles</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>14 Days</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>&lt;1 per 5,000 boardings</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dealing With Budget Cuts
3 Year Trend

• Reduced Administrative Staff by 9%
• No Raises or Step Increases For 2 Years
• Department Budgets Slashed
• Fares Raised 17% And 14% In Consecutive Years
• Tapped Into Reserve Funds 2 Years
• Used Federal Capital Funds for Operations
• Reduced Overtime
• Reduced Service and Implemented Additional Service Efficiencies
• Utilized Stimulus Money
Service Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link 1</th>
<th>Cut Service</th>
<th>Link 20</th>
<th>Cut Frequency 30-60 Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link 2</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td>Link 21</td>
<td>Cut Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 5</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td>Link 24</td>
<td>Cut Frequency 30-60 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 6</td>
<td>Cut Service</td>
<td>Link 27</td>
<td>Eliminated*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 8</td>
<td>Cut Frequency 10-15 Min</td>
<td>Link 32</td>
<td>Eliminated*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 9</td>
<td>Cut Service</td>
<td>Link 43</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 11</td>
<td>Cut Service</td>
<td>Link 47</td>
<td>Eliminated*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 12</td>
<td>Eliminated*</td>
<td>Link 48</td>
<td>Cut Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 13</td>
<td>Cut Frequency 30-60 Min</td>
<td>Link 49</td>
<td>Cut Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 14</td>
<td>Cut Service</td>
<td>Link 51</td>
<td>Cut Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 16</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td>Link 52</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link 19</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td>Link 53</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Link 414</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Replaced portion with PickUpLine
What is Flex Service (PickUpLine)?

Flex Service routes operate to and from Super Stops or Transit Centers.

- **Flex Service Area**

- **Flex Service Route (PickUpLine)**
  - Flex at curb pick ups and drop offs

- **Timed connections to fixed route bus lines (Links)**
How Biodiesel Can Improve Public Health and Help Protect our Planet
Public Transportation & Renewable Fuel

• **BIOFUEL** is a liquid fuel derived from renewable resources that can replace fossil fuels.

• **BIODEisel** is a biodegradable and non-toxic biofuel that can be produced domestically from:
  – Plant/vegetable oils
  – Animal fats
  – Recycled greases (cooking oil)

• Biodiesel can be used in diesel engines as a pure fuel or blended with petroleum with little or no modification.
Biodiesel & the Environment

• By replacing conventional diesel fuel, the use of biodiesel can **lower GHG emissions** from the transportation sector.

• Depending on the feedstock used, one gallon of biodiesel can reduce GHG emissions **by 30% to over 90%**
Program Objectives/Highlights

• 1st Transit agency to own/operate on-demand blending facility
• Assess impact of biodiesel use on the environment
• Improve emissions of LYNX bus fleet
• Reduce maintenance costs due to lubricating qualities of biodiesel
• Improve Emissions
• Support “Florida Green Local Government”
• Offer other agencies access to biodiesel fuel
• Stimulate in-state investment on renewable fuel supplies
THANK YOU!
MET 7 OF 12 PERFORMANCE MEASURES
(Measures not met):
- Operating Revenue per Operating Expense
- Operating Expense per Passenger Mile
- Revenue Miles between Safety Incidents
- Revenue Miles between Failures
- On-time Performance

OPERATING INDICATORS
- Operating expenses decreased 18.7%
- Operating revenue increased 6.0%
- Decreased Revenue Miles, Revenue Hours, Passenger Trips, Trip Length, Passenger Miles, Average Fare
- Farebox Recovery, Average age of Fleet
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✓ MET 5 OF 12 PERFORMANCE MEASURES
(Measures not met):

- Operating Expense per Revenue Mile
- Operating Expense per Revenue Hour
- Operating Revenue per Operating Expense
- Operating Expense per Passenger Trip
- Operating Expense per Passenger Mile
- Revenue Miles between Safety Incidents
- Revenue Miles between Failures

✓ OPERATING INDICATORS

- Operating expenses decreased 5.8%
- Operating revenue decreased 18.5%
- Decline in Ridership, Revenue Miles, Revenue Hours, Passenger Trips, Farebox Recovery
✓ MET 4 OF 4 PERFORMANCE MEASURES
✓ OPERATING INDICATOR
  ➢ Parcels totaling $3.8 million acquired through ROW Program
✓ GOVERNANCE
  ➢ Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, Public Records, Open Meetings
  ➢ Unqualified financial statement audit - Management recommendations
  ➢ Deficiencies in internal controls
  ➢ Federal Transit Administration Triennial Review
✓ OTHER
  ➢ Northeast Florida Regional Transportation Agency Study
✓ MET 8 OF 11 PERFORMANCE MEASURES
(Measures not met):
- Operating Revenue/Operating Expense
- Customer Service - Complaint response time
- On-Time Performance

✓ OPERATING INDICATORS
- Operating expenses decreased 7.5%
- Operating revenues increased 9.7%
- Increased Ridership, Revenue Miles, Passenger Trips, Farebox Recovery and Average Fare
- Decreased Average Trip Length and Passenger Miles
✓ GOVERNANCE

- Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, Public Records, Open Meetings
- Unqualified financial statement audit - Management recommendations
- Federal Transit Administration Triennial Review

✓ OTHER

- Florida Rail Commission
- Dedicated funding
Joseph (Joe) Giulietti
Executive Director
✓ PERFORMANCE MEASURES – Not yet applicable
✓ OPERATING INDICATORS – Not yet applicable
✓ GOVERNANCE
  ➢ Ethics and Conflict of Interest Policies
  ➢ Public Records/Open Meetings
  ➢ Financial Statement Audit underway
  ➢ Annual financial report not filed with DFS
  ➢ Master Plan Adoption and Annual Update
✓ OTHER
  ➢ Feasibility Study for Northwest Florida Bypass
  ➢ $1.2 million JPA for administrative expenses
Robert B. Montgomery
Chairman of the Board of Directors
✓ PERFORMANCE MEASURES – Not yet applicable
✓ OPERATING INDICATORS – Not yet applicable
✓ GOVERNANCE
  ✓ Adopted polices on Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, Public Records and Open Meetings
  ✓ Operating in the “Sunshine”
  ✓ Unqualified Audit with a “going concern” paragraph
  ✓ As of November 2008, Board will meet only to fulfill legislative requirements
✓ OTHER
  ✓ Will consider impacts of early termination of SWFEA at the June 2010 Board meeting
PERFORMANCE MEASURES – Not yet applicable

OPERATING INDICATORS – Not yet applicable

GOVERNANCE

- Adopted polices on Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, Open Meetings and Procurement
- Delegated procurement authority - Executive Director $50K
- FY 2009 financial statement audit currently underway
- Regional Master Plan and other statutory requirements

OTHER

- $2 million appropriation for administrative expenses
- Bay Area Commuter Services merger with TBARTA
Robert (Bob) Clifford, AICP
Executive Director
Florida Transportation Commission
Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority Regional Transportation Master Plan
TBARTA Vision

“A world class transportation network for the Tampa Bay region that will connect people and places, move goods and services, enhance the quality of life, and offer transportation options that are safe, sustainable, affordable, and efficient. We will act as a catalyst for a vibrant economic future through leadership, collaboration, and partnerships.”
TBARTA Master Plan

Develop the Plan

↓

Work the Plan
A Connected Region for Tampa Bay’s Future

Convener
Maintain Accountability for Regional Transportation

Collaborator
Building, Creating, Supporting Partnerships
A Connected Region for Tampa Bay’s Future

Communicator
Information Resource / Clearinghouse for the Region

Catalyst
Leader for Innovative Regional Thinking
A Connected Region for Tampa Bay’s Future

TBARTA is:

**Partnering and Leveraging** so the Region can...

...**C O M P E T E**
TBARTA’s Next Steps

• Bay Area Commuter Services (BACS) Merger
  • TBARTA is now responsible for a variety of commuter services
  • The union will help improve mobility and provide transportation options for people in the Tampa Bay region

• Project Prioritization
  • Group One Project Priorities – approved Dec 2009
  • 2010 – Alternatives Evaluation for multiple corridor studies
Group One Recommended Studies/Projects

**Approved December 11, 2009**

- **Bus Rapid Transit**: Extension of Sarasota BRT to Bradenton
- **Express Bus: Managed Lanes**: SR 54/SR 56 Corridor Study
  - I-75 Regional Bus Downtown to SR 54
  - I-75 Regional Bus Tampa (crosstown) to Bradenton and Sarasota via SR 64 and Fruitville/Beed Ridge
- **Express Bus**: Extension of Sarasota BRT as Express to North Port Veterans/Suncoast: Westshore to Pasco, Hernando, Citrus via SR 50, US 19, SR 44
- **Express Bus Option**: Extension of Sarasota BRT as Express to North Port Veterans/Suncoast: Westshore to Pasco, Hernando, Citrus via SR 50, US 19, SR 44
- **Short Distance Rail**: Gateway to St. Petersburg via I-275/4th Street
  - USF to Wesley Chapel/Wiregrass via Bruce B. Downs Howard Frank Bridge (study in concert with new roadway span)
  - Clearwater to Gateway via Ulmerton/East Bay

---

**Ongoing Studies**
- HART AA
- SCAT BRT
- PSTA Central Ave BRT
- **High Speed Rail - Tampa to Orlando**
- **TBARTA Mid-Term Network**
- **Supporting Network**
- **Major Roads**
- **Major Airports**

---

**State and Federal Lands**
- Water
- Water Management District Lands
- Botanical and Federal Lands
Opportunities

- ALL Modes
- Private Sector
- Super Region
SUMMARY

• Although similarly created, each transportation authority is unique
  – Span of control
  – Bond covenants
  – Lease-purchase agreements

• Each authority does have control over Governance of the organization
FY 2009
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT REPORT