

# Appendices



# List of Appendices

## APPENDIX A ACRONYM LIST

Appendix A1: Acronym List

## APPENDIX B PUBLIC OUTREACH

Appendix B1: Public Involvement Plan

Appendix B2: FDOT Letter Accepting PIP

Appendix B3: Outreach Activities

Appendix B4: Paper Survey

Appendix B5: Survey Results

## APPENDIX C ADVISORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Appendix C1: List of ARC Representative Groups

Appendix C2: ARC Meeting Presentations

Appendix C3: ARC Meeting Minutes

## APPENDIX D TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN SUBMISSION ITEMS

Appendix D1: Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners TDP Approval Agenda Item

Appendix D2: Miami-Dade County Transportation Planning Organization TDP Hearing Item

Appendix D3: Transit Development Plan Transmittal letter to FDOT

Appendix D4: FDOT Acceptance Letter

## APPENDIX E PROJECT PRIORITIZATION MODELING

Appendix E1: FDOT Approval of SERPM Regional Model

Appendix E2: Project Prioritization Tables

# Appendix A

# Acronym List



## **APPENDIX A1: ACRONYM LIST**

## ACRONYMS

<b>AC</b>	Air Conditioning
<b>ACS</b>	American Community Survey
<b>ADA</b>	Americans with Disabilities Act
<b>AI</b>	Artificial Intelligence
<b>AMI</b>	Area Median Income
<b>APTA</b>	American Public Transportation Association
<b>ARC</b>	Advisory Review Committee
<b>ARPA</b>	American Rescue Plan Act
<b>ATM</b>	Automated Teller Machine
<b>AVL</b>	Automatic Vehicle Location
<b>BAT</b>	Business Access Transit
<b>BBC</b>	Building Better Communities
<b>BBN</b>	Better Bus Network
<b>BCC</b>	Board of County Commissioners
<b>BCT</b>	Broward County Transit
<b>BERT</b>	Bus Express Rapid Transit
<b>BRT</b>	Bus Rapid Transit
<b>BUILD</b>	Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development
<b>CAD</b>	Computer-Aided Dispatch
<b>CAP</b>	Corrective Action Planning
<b>CARES</b>	Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act
<b>CAV</b>	Connected and Automated Vehicle
<b>CBD</b>	Central Business District
<b>CDMP</b>	Comprehensive Development Master Plan
<b>CEO</b>	Chief Executive Officer

<b>CIE</b>	Capital Improvements Element
<b>CIG</b>	Capital Investment Grants
<b>CIGP</b>	County Incentive Grant Program
<b>CILOGIT</b>	Local Option Gas Tax
<b>CIP</b>	Capital Improvement Program
<b>CITT</b>	Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust
<b>CNG</b>	Compressed Natural Gas
<b>COA</b>	Comprehensive Operations Analysis
<b>CPTED</b>	Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
<b>CRRSAA</b>	Coronavirus Response & Relief Appropriations Act
<b>CTA</b>	Chicago Transit Authority
<b>CTC</b>	Community Transportation Coordinator
<b>CTD</b>	Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged
<b>DB</b>	Design-Build
<b>DBB</b>	Design-Bid-Build
<b>DBF</b>	Design-Build-Finance
<b>DBFOM</b>	Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain
<b>DBOM</b>	Design-Build-Operate-Maintain
<b>DRC</b>	Development Review Committee
<b>DTPW</b>	Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works
<b>EAMS</b>	Enterprise Asset Management System
<b>EO</b>	Entertainment Overlay
<b>FAC</b>	Florida Administrative Code
<b>FAST</b>	Fixing America's Surface Transportation
<b>FFGA</b>	Full-Funding Grant Agreements
<b>FIU</b>	Florida International University

<b>FL</b>	Florida
<b>FLUM</b>	Future Land Use Map
<b>FTA</b>	Federal Transit Administration
<b>FTE</b>	Florida's Turnpike Enterprise
<b>FTIS</b>	Florida Transit Information System
<b>FY</b>	Fiscal Year
<b>GGIF</b>	General Government Improvement Fund
<b>GGMTF</b>	Golden Glades Multimodal Transportation Facility
<b>GIS</b>	Geographic Information Systems
<b>GO Connect</b>	On-demand transit service app
<b>GOB</b>	General Obligation Bond
<b>GRH</b>	Guaranteed Ride Home
<b>GTFS</b>	General Transit Feed Specification
<b>HEFT</b>	Homestead Extension of Florida's Turnpike
<b>HUD</b>	Housing and Urban Development
<b>HVAC</b>	Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning
<b>IA</b>	Interim Agreement
<b>INFRA</b>	Infrastructure for Rebuilding America
<b>IRS</b>	Internal Revenue Service
<b>ITS</b>	Intelligent Transportation Systems
<b>JPA</b>	Joint-Participation Agreement
<b>KPI</b>	Key Performance Indicators
<b>LCB</b>	Local Coordinating Board
<b>LCD</b>	Liquid-Crystal Display
<b>LEED</b>	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
<b>LEHD</b>	Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics

<b>LEP</b>	Limited English Proficiency
<b>LODES</b>	LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics
<b>LOGT</b>	Local Option Gas Tax
<b>LOPP</b>	List of Priority Projects
<b>LPA</b>	Locally Preferred Alternative
<b>LRT</b>	Light Rail Transit
<b>LRTP</b>	Long Range Transportation Plan
<b>LYNX</b>	Transit system serving the greater Orlando, Florida area
<b>MAP</b>	Mobility Advancement Program
<b>MARTA</b>	Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority
<b>MAX</b>	MAX routes are limited stop routes
<b>MCNP</b>	City of Miami's Comprehensive Neighborhood Plan
<b>MDT</b>	Miami-Dade Transit
<b>MDX</b>	Miami-Dade Expressway Authority
<b>MIA</b>	Miami International Airport
<b>MIC</b>	Miami Intermodal Center
<b>MOE</b>	Maintenance of Effort
<b>MPO</b>	Metropolitan Planning Organization
<b>MRCC</b>	Miami Metrorail Control Center
<b>MTA</b>	Maryland Transit Administration
<b>NA</b>	Not Applicable
<b>NEPA</b>	National Environmental Policy Act
<b>NFL</b>	National Football League
<b>NOFO</b>	Notice of Funding Opportunity
<b>NPTSP</b>	National Public Transportation Safety Plan
<b>NSTP</b>	New Starts Transit Program

<b>NTD</b>	National Transit Database
<b>OSHA</b>	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
<b>P3</b>	Public-Private Partnerships
<b>PD</b>	Project Development
<b>PE</b>	Project Engineer
<b>PIP</b>	Public Involvement Plan
<b>PREMO</b>	Premium Mobility Program
<b>PTASP</b>	Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan
<b>PTP</b>	People's Transportation Plan
<b>QOF</b>	Qualified Opportunity Fund
<b>QOZ</b>	Qualified Opportunity Zone
<b>RER</b>	Regulatory and Economic Resources
<b>RIF</b>	Road Impact Fee
<b>ROW</b>	Right of Way
<b>RRIF</b>	Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing
<b>RTDO</b>	Rapid Transit Development Overlay
<b>RTP</b>	Southeast Florida Regional Transportation Plan
<b>RTZ</b>	Rapid Transit Zone
<b>SCADA</b>	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
<b>SEPTA</b>	Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority
<b>SERPM</b>	Southeast Florida Regional Planning Model
<b>SF</b>	Square Feet
<b>SFRC</b>	South Florida Rail Corridor
<b>SGR</b>	State of Good Repair
<b>SHSP</b>	Strategic Highway Safety Plan
<b>SMART</b>	Strategic Miami Area Rapid Transit

<b>SMS</b>	Safety Management Systems
<b>SoFloGO</b>	Regional South Florida transit app
<b>SSI</b>	Supplemental Security Income
<b>STP</b>	Surface Transportation Program
<b>STS</b>	Special Transportation Services
<b>TA</b>	Transportation America
<b>TAM</b>	Transit Asset Management
<b>TAZ</b>	Traffic Analysis Zone
<b>TCRP</b>	Transit Cooperative Research Program
<b>TD</b>	Transportation Disadvantaged
<b>TDP</b>	Transit Development Plan
<b>TDSP</b>	Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan
<b>TDTF</b>	Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund
<b>TIF</b>	Tax Increment Financing
<b>TIFIA</b>	Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act
<b>TIP</b>	Transportation Improvement Plan
<b>TOC</b>	Transit Oriented Community
<b>TOD</b>	Transit Oriented Development
<b>TPA</b>	Transportation Planning Area
<b>TPC</b>	Transportation Planning Council
<b>TPM</b>	Transportation Performance Measures
<b>TPO</b>	Miami-Dade County Transportation Planning Organization
<b>TPTAC</b>	Transportation Planning Technical Advisory Committee
<b>TRB</b>	Transportation Research Board
<b>TSND</b>	Transit Station Neighborhood District
<b>TSP</b>	Transit Signal Priority

<b>TWC</b>	Train Wayside Communication
<b>UPWP</b>	Unified Planning Work Program
<b>US</b>	United States
<b>USDOT</b>	United States Department of Transportation
<b>VMT</b>	Vehicle Miles Traveled
<b>WASD</b>	Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Department
<b>WFH</b>	Work from Home
<b>WISE</b>	Workplace. Innovation. Savings. Efficiency.
<b>WP</b>	Work Program
<b>WPA</b>	Work Program Administration
<b>X</b>	Social media application formerly known as Twitter

This page is intentionally left blank.

# Appendix B

# Public Outreach



## **APPENDIX B1: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN**

# Public Involvement Plan

## **Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works Transit Development Plan**

Major Update FY 2026 – 2035

June 2025

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	i
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Public Involvement Plan .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Rule and Guidelines.....	2
2.2 TDP Project Team .....	2
2.2.1 Project Management Team.....	2
2.2.2 Transit Development Plan Advisory Review Committee (ARC) .....	3
2.2.3 Stakeholders.....	3
2.3 Public Involvement Activities .....	4
2.3.1 Ongoing DTPW Outreach .....	4
2.3.2 Branding .....	4
2.3.3 Public Meetings.....	5
2.3.4 Public Hearing .....	5
2.3.5 TDP Contact Information .....	5
2.3.6 Printed Materials.....	6
2.3.7 Survey.....	6
2.3.8 Community Events and Canvasing .....	7
2.3.9 Electronic Communication .....	7
2.3.10 Additional Outreach.....	7
2.4 Committee Presentation and Coordination .....	8
2.4.1 Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) .....	8
2.4.2 Transportation Planning Technical Advisory Committee (TPTAC) .....	8
2.4.3 Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (TDLCB) .....	8
2.4.4 South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC).....	8
2.4.5 Citizens’ Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) Committee.....	9
2.4.6 Greater Miami Expressway Agency (GMX) .....	9
2.4.7 Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Board.....	9
2.4.8 Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners (BCC) .....	9
2.5 Documentation.....	10
<b>3 Public Involvement Activities Summary .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4 Title VI/Limited English Proficiency (LEP) .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Appendix A – Project Management Team .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Appendix B – Project Advisory Review Committee.....</b>	<b>3</b>

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW) is developing the 2025 Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update, which will guide the planning, development and operations of the county's transit system through the next decade. As required by Florida Administrative Code 14-73.001, DTPW is conducting a major update of its TDP, a process mandated every five years.

The new rule is as follows:

*“(a) Public Involvement Process.*

*The TDP preparation process shall include opportunities for public involvement as outlined in a TDP public involvement plan, approved by the Department, or the local MPO adopted Public Involvement Plan (PIP), approved by both the FTA and the FHWA. The provider is authorized to establish time limits for receipt of comments.*

*The TDP shall include a description of the process used and the public involvement activities undertaken. As required by Section 341.052, F.S., comments must be solicited from local and regional workforce boards established under Chapter 445, F.S.*

*The Department, the local/regional workforce board, local government comprehensive planning departments, and the MPO shall be advised of all public meetings where the TDP is to be presented or discussed, and shall be given an opportunity to review and comment on the TDP during the development of the proposed public transportation projects and services, and a ten-year implementation program.”*

The TDP is a strategic guide for public transportation agencies for a 10-year period. It represents DTPW's vision for transit within its service area and identifies the actions needed to achieve that vision. Specifically, a TDP includes the following major elements:

- Public Involvement Plan (PIP) and process
- Relationship Review to Other Plans
- Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process Coordination Program
- Demand Estimation (Transit Demand and Mobility Needs)
- Ten-Year Annual Projection of Transit Ridership
- Land Use and Corridor Development Assessment
- Ten-Year Operating and Capital Program
- Ten-Year Priority Projects
- Ten-Year Financial Plan (projected costs and revenues)

In accordance with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) guidelines for TDP preparation, the first five years of the plan are expected to include significantly more detail than the latter five years. The second half of the 10-year planning horizon is intended to remain more strategic and high-level in focus.

## 2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

The TDP Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for DTPW is designed to create opportunities for public input and support consensus-building around the agency's long-term vision. Public involvement is a vital part of the transit planning process, to help ensure that decisions reflect the needs, priorities, and concerns of the community.

The specific objectives of the public involvement process shall include the following:

- Educate and present information by promoting proactive and early public involvement.
- Solicit public input throughout the planning process by gathering full and complete information from the public.
- Integrate public feedback into the TDP.
- Monitor and improve the public involvement process.

### 2.1 Rule and Guidelines

The PIP is consistent with the Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization's (TPO) guidelines for public participation in the planning process, and consistent with the FDOT TDP guidelines for public participation.

The TDP rule requires that the transit agency either develop its own PIP and have it approved by FDOT or use the TPO's adopted Public Participation Plan (PPP), approved by both the FTA and the FHWA. The TPO's Public Involvement Plan was developed to cover all TPO needs and, as such, is a general document, not solely focused on transit. As such, DTPW has elected to develop its own PIP to provide a more detailed description of the specific public involvement activities that will be carried out during the development of the TDP. DTPW intends to align with the broader goals of the TPO's Public Participation Plan throughout the development of the TDP. In addition to following the TPO's Public Participation Plan, DTPW will include a TPO representative on the TDP Advisory Review Committee (ARC) to support coordination and ensure consistency.

### 2.2 TDP Project Team

The Project Team responsible for developing the TDP is composed of three groups: The Project Management Team, The Advisory Review Committee, and Stakeholders. Each group plays an important role in shaping the TDP, as described in the following sections.

#### 2.2.1 Project Management Team

The Project Management Team will manage the project on behalf of DTPW, with the primary role being to provide strategic direction and approve work completed by the Consultant Team. This team will meet bi-weekly with the Consultant Team to coordinate efforts, review and approve major deliverables, and ensure all materials are prepared for presentation to the TDP ARC. The DTPW Project Manager will lead this effort, managing the Consultant Team's day-to-day activities, as well as overseeing the study schedule and budget. A list of Project Management Team members is provided in Appendix A, Table A-1.

## 2.2.2 Transit Development Plan Advisory Review Committee (ARC)

The role of the ARC is to provide technical guidance, recommendations, input, and an overall countywide perspective of transportation-related planning issues throughout the development of the TDP. To ensure the project aligns with local objectives and needs, the ARC will review and provide feedback on all major deliverables. The ARC will consist of representatives from major stakeholder groups, as agreed upon by the Project Management Team. Members will be encouraged to actively participate by providing input, comments, and recommendations throughout the TDP development process.

The ARC will meet up to four (4) times during the project. A list of ARC members is listed in Appendix B, Table B-1. In accordance with statutory requirements, representatives from FDOT, the regional workforce board (i.e., CareerSource South Florida), and the TPO are invited to participate on the ARC to ensure they can review and comment on the mission, goals, objectives, alternatives, and the 10-year implementation plan.

Schedule:

- ARC Meeting 1: August
- ARC Meeting 2: September
- ARC Meeting 3: October
- ARC Meeting 4: November/December

*Note: These dates are estimates and subject to change based upon the project needs*

## 2.2.3 Stakeholders

Outreach efforts will focus on two distinct groups: stakeholders and the public. Stakeholders are individuals or organizations with a specific interest in transportation issues and are often more knowledgeable about related topics. In contrast, outreach to the public ensures that everyone, regardless of their affiliation or expertise have an opportunity to participate in shaping transportation decisions in Miami-Dade County.

The term “stakeholders” refers to groups which may include the following:

- Elected officials and government agencies
- CareerSource Florida (the local workforce development board)
- DTPW public transportation service patrons
- Bicycle and pedestrian groups
- Commuter support groups
- Health and human services organizations
- City and county staff and agencies
- Neighborhood associations
- Service and community organizations

- Organizations representing the transportation disadvantaged (e.g., older adults, persons with disabilities, minority groups, the disenfranchised, etc.)
- Non-profit organizations
- Chambers of Commerce and economic development organizations
- Small and large business owners
- Professional associations and labor unions
- School and university representatives
- Tourism representatives
- Media representatives
- State and federal agencies (e.g., environmental, planning, or transportation agencies)

## 2.3 Public Involvement Activities

Public input should be collected in a variety of means including, but not limited to, traditional surveys, mailers, online surveys, electronic surveys (using tablets at local meetings), in-person events/forums, extensive social media promotion, live-polling techniques, public workshops, pop-up booths at community events, neighborhood canvassing, community partnerships aimed at “hard-to-reach” demographic groups, and other innovative approaches designed to drive survey participation rates.

The goal of these outreach methods is to reach people of all ages and backgrounds, from children to senior citizens, including Limited English Proficiency (LEP) populations, low-income residents, residents with disabilities, and persons of all religions and family statuses. The Project Management Team will also provide translation services for, at a minimum, the County’s Spanish and Haitian-Creole populations.

Schedule: Throughout the TDP process

### 2.3.1 Ongoing DTPW Outreach

Through coordinated county-wide efforts, DTPW continues its efforts to educate and provide early and ongoing public involvement opportunities to the residents of Miami-Dade County. DTPW will maintain an outreach program for engaging the public and other stakeholders through various activities and meeting forums. These include the DTPW website and social media platforms, 3-1-1, posters and signs on buses, monitor screens at Metrorail stations, posters at stations, potential Miami-Dade TV coverage, etc.

DTPW will continue to use these mechanisms and, when feasible, use them for promoting participation in the TDP development process. Examples include directing passengers to complete an online survey regarding DTPW or advertising an upcoming public meeting.

Schedule: Ongoing

### 2.3.2 Branding

The first step for the public involvement process will be to develop a branded name for the TDP

Major Update. The branded name will assist individuals in recognizing materials related to the project. This type of recognition allows for more efficient communication between the Project Team, the public, and stakeholders. The branded name will be used on all TDP materials.

Schedule: June/July 2025.

### 2.3.3 Public Meetings

DTPW will hold six (6) public meetings at designated locations throughout the county, aligned with the planning areas identified in the Comprehensive Transportation Master Plan (CTMP). These meetings may take the form of community gatherings and will provide opportunities for the public to offer comments, ask questions, and contribute to identifying unmet regional transportation needs. DTPW will establish specific time limits for submission of public comments.

Schedule: COA workshop schedule TBD.

### 2.3.4 Public Hearing

The TDP will be reviewed by and presented to the following committees and boards during public meetings, as outlined in the project schedule. These meetings will include opportunities for public comment and will be advertised in compliance with statutory requirements.

- TDP Advisory Review Committee
- TPO Transportation Planning Council
- TPO Governing Board
- Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Schedule: December 2025 / January 2026

### 2.3.5 TDP Contact Information

To support public and stakeholder input during the TDP development process, DTPW will implement several methods for collecting feedback and information:

1. TDP-Specific Email: A dedicated email address([mdt10ahead@miamidade.gov](mailto:mdt10ahead@miamidade.gov)), will be established for the public to submit comments specifically related to the TDP.
2. TDP Webpage: Information about the TDP, including opportunities for engagement, will be available at [www.miamidade.gov/mdt10ahead](http://www.miamidade.gov/mdt10ahead).
3. County Communication Channels: The Miami-Dade County 311 Contact Center can also be leveraged to gather feedback. Comments may be submitted at [www.miamidade.gov/311](http://www.miamidade.gov/311) or through the 311 App available in the App Store and Android, by email at [311@miamidade.gov](mailto:311@miamidade.gov), or by phone at 3-1-1, 305-468-5900, or 7-1-1 (for individuals with hearing or speech disabilities). Any TDP-related comments received through 311 will be forwarded directly to the TDP Project Team for consideration.

Schedule: Ongoing.

### 2.3.6 Printed Materials

DTPW may produce printed materials in English, Spanish, and Haitian-Creole for distribution to members of the public. Materials will be printed with TDP-specific contact information such as the email address and website as listed in the preceding section. The following list describes the printed materials that may be prepared for the TDP:

- A tri-fold brochure with a shorter format survey will be printed in three languages. The community will have the opportunity to fill out the survey and return it to a project team member or mail it back to the project team at Overtown Transit Village North at 701 NW 1st Court Suite 1700 Miami FL 33136 via a postage-paid mailer. The survey can also be completed digitally via a QR code.
- A fact sheet describing the TDP process
- A TDP survey/comment card that provides an overview of the TDP process, provides information on how people can get involved, and includes an abbreviated version of the online survey.
- Meeting notices may be prepared upon request
- Newsletter articles will be written upon request for DTPW publications or those of peer organizations within Miami-Dade County.

Fact sheets and comment cards/surveys will be made available at TDP public meetings, outreach events, public libraries, various County meetings and community events attended by DTPW, as well as at DTPW facilities. Additional efforts will be made to distribute these materials through other channels, including events hosted by the TPO and Miami-Dade County.

Comment cards/surveys may be submitted at any TDP event or returned by mail using pre-paid postage. Each card will also include instructions for accessing a longer, online version of the survey, which can be completed electronically in English, Spanish, or Haitian Creole.

Schedule: Materials will be developed in Summer 2025. Distribution will be ongoing.

### 2.3.7 Survey

DTPW will create a survey in English, Spanish, and Haitian-Creole that will gather public input on the direction of the TDP. The survey will invite feedback from stakeholders and the public to help shape the agency's future priorities.

Access to the survey will be promoted through various channels, including printed materials, social media, the TDP web page, in-person events, flyers distributed at transit hubs, partnerships with municipalities and peer agencies, and newsletter(s).

DTPW will also solicit survey responses at the community events described in Section 2.2.8.

Schedule: Survey to be online by August 18, 2025. Survey will remain open for approximately

2 months.

### 2.3.8 Community Events and Canvasing

To maximize survey participation, DTPW will attend community events and conduct outreach in targeted neighborhoods using tablets pre-loaded with the electronic survey. This approach allows for greater flexibility in reaching traditionally underserved and hard-to-reach demographic groups. Printed materials (as described in Section 2.2.6), promotional items, and other giveaways will be distributed to encourage public participation.

DTPW will also conduct outreach at community events such as farmers markets, events at public parks, and other events identified in conjunction with the DTPW External Affairs Marketing Team. The TDP Team will participate in up to ten (10) engagement events as part of this effort.

Schedule: Fall of 2025.

### 2.3.9 Electronic Communication

DTPW will promote TDP outreach activities and encourage input through its electronic communication outlets. Notices will be posted on DTPW's website, the team will reach out to the TPO and CITT with a request to post on their website as well. DTPW will encourage elected officials and community agencies to provide a link to the survey via their websites and social media channels. DTPW will also post information on its Facebook page ([www.facebook.com/MiamiDadeTransit](http://www.facebook.com/MiamiDadeTransit)) and through its X account (<https://x.com/iridemdt>) as well as Instagram with @GoMiamiDade. The DTPW electronic newsletter, Mobility 305, will promote the TDP and provide a link to the electronic survey. DTPW may also use its mobile app to reach passengers (see example). Electronic flyers will be distributed to actively subscribed contacts through DTPW planning or construction project databases.

Schedule: Ongoing.

### 2.3.10 Additional Outreach

DTPW will offer alternative outreach opportunities for individuals who may face barriers to participating in conventional public meetings or via digital platforms such as web and social media. These barriers may include disabilities, work schedules, lack of childcare, or other personal constraints. To ensure broad access, individuals may obtain information and submit comments through DTPW's TDP website ([www.miamidade.gov/mdt10ahead](http://www.miamidade.gov/mdt10ahead)), the County's 311 Contact Center, the dedicated TDP email address ([mdt10ahead@miamidade.gov](mailto:mdt10ahead@miamidade.gov)), or DTPW's social media platforms.

Additionally, DTPW will continue to participate in public meetings, hearings, and community events across the County to create more opportunities for engagement. TDP-related materials will be made available at public libraries and County Commission offices. The TDP Team is scheduled to attend up to ten (10) engagement events as part of this outreach strategy.

DTPW PM will meet in the summer with municipalities to kick off the effort and a municipal workshop will be conducted in the fall to collect additional input.

Schedule: Ongoing.

## **2.4 Committee Presentation and Coordination**

DTPW expands its public involvement program by engaging members of transportation-related advisory committees established in Miami-Dade County as listed in the following sections. DTPW will engage these committees during their regularly scheduled meetings as informational agenda items to seek input, provide information, and address questions on the development of the TDP. DTPW will make presentations to these committees to ensure that these stakeholders are kept informed with the TDP development.

All meeting dates listed in this section are tentative until confirmed with the individual committee.

### **2.4.1 Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)**

The TPO CTAC ensures that transportation projects in all stages of the planning process adhere to established visions, goals, objectives, and collective needs of the community. This group is comprised of Miami-Dade County residents appointed by the TPO Governing Board members. The CTAC meets once a month and is open to the public. DTPW will attend one meeting of the CTAC to seek input for the TDP based upon a review and formal presentation of the TDP development.

Schedule: September 1, 2025

### **2.4.2 Transportation Planning Technical Advisory Committee (TPTAC)**

The TPO TPTAC provides technical support, via a review process, to the Transportation Planning Council. TPTAC discussions are focused on technical aspects related to the projects. The TPTAC meets once a month and is open to the public. DTPW will attend one meeting of the TPTAC to seek input for the TDP based upon a review and formal presentation of the TDP development.

Schedule: September 26, 2025

### **2.4.3 Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (TDLCB)**

The LCB identifies local service needs and provides information, advice, and direction to the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) on the coordination of services to be provided to the transportation disadvantaged population through the Florida Coordinated Transportation System (FCTS). DTPW will attend one meeting of the TDLCB to seek input for the TDP at a meeting date to be determined.

Schedule: September 28, 2025

### **2.4.4 South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC)**

SFRTA provides commuter rail service, known as Tri-Rail, which operates along 72 miles of the South Florida Rail Corridor (SFRC) and eight (8) miles of the Florida East Coast Railway

(FECR). SFRTA oversees the dispatching of daily rail activity on the SFRC, hosting Amtrak passenger services and CSXT Freight Rail Operations. DTPW will attend one meeting of the PTAC to seek input for the TDP at a meeting date to be determined.

Schedule: October 28, 2025

#### 2.4.5 Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) Committee

The Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (Transportation Trust) is the 15-member body created to oversee the People's Transportation Plan funded with the half-penny sales surtax. DTPW will attend one meeting of the CITT to seek input for the TDP at a meeting date to be determined.

Schedule: October 29, 2025

#### 2.4.6 Greater Miami Expressway Agency (GMX)

The Greater Miami Expressway Agency (GMX), formerly known as the Miami-Dade Expressway Authority (MDX), is an independent state agency responsible for managing and maintaining five key roadways in Miami-Dade and Monroe counties: Airport Expressway SR 112, Dolphin Expressway SR 836, Don Shula Expressway SR 874, Snapper Creek Expressway SR 878, and Gratigny Parkway SR 924 including NW 138th Street. DTPW will attend one meeting of the GMX to seek input for the TDP at a meeting date to be determined.

Schedule: TBD

#### 2.4.7 Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Board

The Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Governing Board approves federally required plans and transportation policies. The development of transportation plans and programs is coordinated through the Transportation Planning Council (TPC) which makes recommendations to the TPO Governing Board. Citizen Involvement and participation occurs through several community Advisory Committees which advise the TPO Governing Board. DTPW will attend one meeting of the TPO Board to seek input for the TDP at a meeting date to be determined.

Schedule: December 2025 / January 2026

#### 2.4.8 Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners (BCC)

The Miami-Dade County BCC is the administrative body for county government that provides policy guidance and the establishment of community laws through ordinances and resolutions. Commissioners are elected by residents to represent each of the 13 districts in Miami-Dade County. The BCC works closely with the public to make certain that their voice is heard, and the needs of the county are addressed.

The TDP will be reviewed by and presented to the BCC for formal adoption prior to the submittal of the TDP document to FDOT for review and approval.

Schedule: December 2025 / January 2026

## **2.5 Documentation**

DTPW is committed to better understanding and hearing the transportation needs of the community it serves. Therefore, as part of the TDP process, comments and recommendations received from the TDP outreach opportunities will be properly logged, maintained, and responded to.

A summary of each public involvement event will be completed after each event and properly logged. Requests received from the public will be forwarded to the appropriate DTPW division for follow-up and resolution.

Schedule: Ongoing.

### 3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES SUMMARY

The following actions and measures will be used achieve DTPW's public involvement goals regarding the TDP.

The first goal is to involve riders, the public, and stakeholders early and regularly in the project by doing the following:

- ✓ Participate in ten (10) community engagement events
- ✓ Facilitate up to 4 TDPARC meetings
- ✓ Present at six (6) public meetings
- ✓ Present at five (5) committee meetings
- ✓ Post on social media platforms
- ✓ Newsletter distribution
- ✓ E-mail blast
- ✓ TDP website QR code on the monitor screens of DTPW transit vehicles
- ✓ Promote TDP information on DTPW mobile applications.

The second goal is to provide all DTPW riders, citizens, and stakeholders with the opportunity to participate throughout the project, including persons with disabilities, older adults, or those who have limited English proficiency (LEP) using the following strategies:

- ✓ Establish project-specific email to receive comments and questions
- ✓ Provide all outreach materials in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole
- ✓ Ensure in-person events are accessible via transit and meet ADA compliance
- ✓ Disseminate a digital survey
- ✓ Distribute in-person paper survey that can be mailed-in
- ✓ Gather in-person survey responses with staff to assist respondents in English, Spanish and Haitian-Creole

## 4 TITLE VI/LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (LEP)

Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, as recipients of federal financial assistance, the Department of Transportation and Public Works, without regard to race, color, or national origin, operates and plans for transit services so that:

- Transit benefits and services are available and provided equitably;
- Transit services are adequate to provide access and mobility for all;
- Opportunities to participate in the transit planning and decision-making process are open and accessible and that remedial and corrective actions are taken to prevent discriminatory treatment of any beneficiary.

### PROTECTIONS OF TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964 AS AMENDED

Miami-Dade County provides equal access and equal opportunity in employment and does not discriminate on the basis of disability, race, color, or national origin in its programs or services. Auxiliary aids and services for communication are available with five days advance notice. For material in alternate format (audiotape, Braille, or computer disk), a sign language interpreter, or other accommodations, please contact:

- Miami-Dade Transit, Office of Civil Rights and Labor Relations, 701 NW 1st Court, Suite 1700, Miami, FL 33136.
- Telephone: 786-469-5476
- E-mail: [DTPW-ADA@miamidade.gov](mailto:DTPW-ADA@miamidade.gov) or [titlevi@miamidade.gov](mailto:titlevi@miamidade.gov)

In accordance with DTPW's Title VI Program, ensuring meaningful participation of minority and low-income populations throughout the TDP process is a major objective of this PIP. The following steps will be taken to provide meaningful access and participation of Title VI protected populations.

- The demographic composition of the ARC will seek to represent the demographic composition of Miami-Dade County.
- Electronic surveys will be created with a Title VI sensitivity to give DTPW a deeper understanding of the needs of transportation disadvantaged residents and passengers. The information collected in these surveys also will be utilized when assessing the impact of future major service changes with respect to Title VI protected populations.
- Meeting locations and times will be sensitive to the needs of each community to ensure access and participation by as many people as possible.
- TDP outreach materials will be available online and in printed form in multiple languages including English, Spanish, and Haitian-Creole.
- A notification that includes the protections under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, will be included at each outreach event.

DTPW is concerned about gathering input from individuals with LEP. To the extent possible, the Consultant Team will make Spanish and Haitian-Creole-speaking individuals available to assist with public outreach events. DTPW will translate the most pertinent materials (e.g., project fact sheet and survey) into Spanish and Haitian-Creole

The website also will indicate that individuals may email questions and comments in Spanish

and Haitian-Creole. Questions will be responded to in Spanish or Haitian-Creole, and comments will be translated into English and recorded.

Should an individual be interested in providing input at an event and the Project Team cannot accommodate their need for a language other than English, the Project Team will guide the individual to email the TDP email address, [mdt10ahead@miamidade.gov](mailto:mdt10ahead@miamidade.gov). After receiving written comments, efforts will be made to have it translated and addressed.

# **APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX A – PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM

*Table A-1 Project Management Team*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency/Firm</b>	<b>Role</b>
Tewari Edmonson	DTPW	DTPW TDP Project Manager
Paola Baez	DTPW	DTPW Chief, Multimodal Development Section
Lisa Colmenares	DTPW	DTPW Chief Planning Officer
Lynda Kompelien Westin	WSP	Project Manager
Thomas Rodrigues	WSP	Technical Lead
Muriah Dekle	WSP	Deputy Project Manager
John Lafferty	Kimley-Horn	Technical Lead
Corinn Beem	Kimley-Horn	Technical Lead
Juan Calderon	CALTRAN Engineering	Public Involvement
Jeannelea Liu	CALTRAN Engineering	Public Involvement

## APPENDIX B – PROJECT ADVISORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

*Table A-2 TDP Project Advisory Review Committee Participants*

No.	Agency	Stakeholder	Representative
1	DTPW	Assistant Director of Rail Services	Scott Nicoll
2	DTPW	Assistant Director of Bus Services	Joel Perez
3	DTPW	Performance Analysis	Yvon Mon
4	DTPW	Safety and Security	Eric Muntan
5	DTPW	Strategic Planning	Tewari Edmonson
6	DTPW	Budgeting	Patricia Prochinicki
7	DTPW	Marketing Projects Coordinator	Luis EspinozaBobbie Crichton
8	DTPW	Assistant Director	Lisa Colmenares
9	DTPW	Paratransit Director	Jarice Rodriguez
10	DTPW	Infrastructure Eng. and Maintenance.	German Arenes
11	CITT	CITT Deputy Director	Monica Cejas
12	Miami TPO*	Executive Director	Aileen Boucle
13	GMX	Senior Transportation Planner	Mayra Diaz
14	MDC Regulatory and Economic Resources – Planning & Zoning	Assistant Director for Planning	Jerry Bell
15	MDC Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces	Director	Chirstina White
16	MDC TPO BPAC	BPAC Committee Chair	Melissa Hege
17	League of Cities	President	Omarr C. Nickerson
18	Agency for Persons with Disabilities	Southern Region Manager	Hillary Jackson
19	City of Miami DDA	Chief Executive Officer/Executive Director	Christina Crespi
20	Miami-Dade Beacon Council	President & CEO	Rodrick Miller
21	Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce	President & CEO	G. Eric Knowles
22	Urban Health Partnerships	Director of Healthy Streets & Public Spaces	Wren A. Ruiz
23	CareerSource Florida*	President & CEO	Adrienne Johnston
24	SFRTA	Director of Strategic Planning	Loraine Cargill
25	South Florida Commuter Services	Project Director	Jeremy Mullings
26	Florida Turnpike Enterprise	Executive Director	Nicola Liquori
27	FDOT District 6*	Modal Development Administrator	Nilia Cartaya
28	Alliance for Aging	President and CEO	Max Rothman
29	Center for Independent Living of South Florida	Florida	Alvin W. Roberts

No.	Agency	Stakeholder	Representative
30	Miami Transit Alliance	Executive Director	Cathy Dos Santos
31	Miami-Dade County Public Schools	School Board	Carlos Sarmiento
32	MDC Housing and Community Development	Interim Director	Amina Newsome
33	Miami International Airport (MIA)	Aviation Planning, Land-Use & Grants	Jose Ramos
34	Brightline Florida	Vice President of Operations	Michael Lefevre
35	City of Aventura	Public Works & Transportation Director	Jake Ozyman
36	Village of Bal Harbour	Director of Public Works & Beautification	John Oldenburg
37	Town of Bay Harbor Islands	Town Manager	Jenice Rosado
38	City of Coral Gables	Assistant Director for Mobility and Sustainability	Matt Anderson
39	Town of Cutler Bay	Public Works Director	Alfredo Quintero
40	City of Doral	Public Works Director	Carlos Arroyo
41	City of Hialeah	Streets Department Director	Jose Sanchez
42	City of Hialeah Gardens	Director of Public Works	Jose M. Lopez
43	City of Homestead	Director of Public Works & Engineering	Eduardo Gonzalez
44	Town of Medley	Town Clerk	Victoria Martinez
45	City of Miami	Assistant Director, Resilience and Public Works Department	Charles M. Alfaro
46	City of Miami Beach	Director of Transportation and Mobility	Jose R. Gonzalez
47	City of Miami Gardens	Director Public Works	Bernard Buxton-Tetteh
48	Village of Miami Shores	Public Works Director	Delroy Peters
49	City of Miami Springs	City Manager	JC Jimenez
50	City of North Miami	Public Works Director	Kerrith Fiddler
51	City of North Miami Beach	Public Works Director	Samuel Zamacona
52	City of Opa-locka	Public Works Director	Airia Austin
53	Village of Palmetto Bay	Director of Public Services	Dionisio Torres
54	Village of Pinecrest	Public Works Director	David J. Mendez
55	City of Sunny Isles Beach	Deputy City Manager	Susan Simpson
56	Town of Surfside	Public Works/CIP Director	Andre Eugent
57	City of Sweetwater	Public Works Director	Allan Abolila
58	Village of Virginia Gardens	Public Works Director	Lazaro Garaboa

\*Inclusion on ARC fulfills statutory requirement

## **APPENDIX B2: FDOT LETTER ACCEPTING PIP**




---

**FW: MD DTPW DRAFT TDP PIP and Survey questions**


---

**From** Freeman, Raymond <Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us>

**Date** Fri 2025-07-11 3:00 PM

**To** Edmonson, Tewari (TPO) <Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov>

**Cc** Baez, Paola (DTPW) <paola.baez@miamidade.gov>; Kompelien Westin, Lynda <Lynda.KompelienWestin@wsp.com>; Rodrigues, Thomas <Thomas.Rodrigues@wsp.com>; Huang, Simon <Simon.Huang@dot.state.fl.us>; nilia.cartaya <nilia.cartaya@dot.state.fl.us>

📎 2 attachments (540 KB)

DTP WTDP Major Update Public Involvement Plan\_250709\_Track Changes.docx; DTP WTDP Major Update Public Involvement Plan\_250709.pdf;

Hi Tewari,

We have reviewed the updated documents provided and have no additional comments. The Major Update PIP Plan is approved.

Thank you,

**Raymond Freeman**  
**Passenger Operations Manager**  
 Modal Development Office  
 Florida Department of Transportation  
 District Six  
 1000 NW 111 Avenue, RM 6108  
 Miami, FL 33172  
 Phone: 305-470-5255  
 Email: [Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us)




---

**From:** Edmonson, Tewari (DTPW) <Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov>

**Sent:** Thursday, July 10, 2025 5:17 PM

**To:** Freeman, Raymond <Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us>

**Cc:** Baez, Paola (DTPW) <paola.baez@miamidade.gov>; Kompelien Westin, Lynda <lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com>; Rodrigues, Thomas <thomas.rodrigues@wsp.com>; Cartaya, Nilia <Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us>; Huang, Simon <Simon.Huang@dot.state.fl.us>; Edmonson, Tewari (TPO) <Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov>

**Subject:** RE: MD DTPW DRAFT TDP PIP and Survey questions

Good Afternoon Raymond,

Thanks for the Teams review of the TDP PIP and corresponding survey.

I received some additional input from our Communications and Title IV Team on the PIP that was sent earlier, and wanted to run the updated document by you for a last review before finalizing.

I have attached a clean PDF and for convenience a tracked-changes Word version showing clearly where the Communications and Title VI modifications were made to the document that was sent earlier.

These changes are not substantial as you will see are mostly related to :

- Grammar, Format and nomenclature
- Public Involvement Services the County can perform
- Minor Title IV verbiage based on guidance from our Title IV team
- Updating of the final project email and website as coordinated with our Communications Team

Requesting the Team give one final review for any additional comments based on the updates.

Thanks again Raymond. Talk soon.

Regards,

**Tewari Edmonson**  
 Systems Planning Manager, Transportation Planning and Policy Division  
**Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works**  
 701 NW 1st Court, Suite 1700, Miami, Florida 33136  
 Office: 786-469-5079 – Mobile: 786-893-2336

---

**From:** Freeman, Raymond <[Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 8, 2025 1:52 PM

**To:** Edmonson, Tewari (DTPW) <[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)>

**Cc:** Baez, Paola (DTPW) <[paola.baez@miamidade.gov](mailto:paola.baez@miamidade.gov)>; Kompelien Westin, Lynda <[lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com](mailto:lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com)>; Rodrigues, Thomas <[thomas.rodrigues@wsp.com](mailto:thomas.rodrigues@wsp.com)>;

Cartaya, Nilia <[Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us)>; Huang, Simon <[Simon.Huang@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Simon.Huang@dot.state.fl.us)>; Edmonson, Tewari (DTPW) <[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: MD DTPW DRAFT TDP PIP and Survey questions

EMAIL RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL SOURCE

Hi Tewari,

Upon review, FDOT has no additional comments and approves the Public Involvement Plan.

Thank you,

**Raymond Freeman**  
**Passenger Operations Manager**  
Modal Development Office  
Florida Department of Transportation  
District Six  
1000 NW 111 Avenue, RM 6108  
Miami, FL 33172  
Phone: 305-470-5255  
Email: [Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us)



---

**From:** Edmonson, Tewari (DTPW) <[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday, July 7, 2025 11:38 AM

**To:** Freeman, Raymond <[Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us)>

**Cc:** Baez, Paola (DTPW) <[paola.baez@miamidade.gov](mailto:paola.baez@miamidade.gov)>; Kompelien Westin, Lynda <[lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com](mailto:lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com)>; Rodrigues, Thomas <[thomas.rodrigues@wsp.com](mailto:thomas.rodrigues@wsp.com)>; Cartaya, Nilia <[Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us)>; Huang, Simon <[Simon.Huang@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Simon.Huang@dot.state.fl.us)>; Edmonson, Tewari (TPO) <[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: MD DTPW DRAFT TDP PIP and Survey questions

Good Morning Raymond,

Hope you enjoyed the holiday weekend.

Raymond, please see attached the revised TDP PIP and corresponding survey questions per the Teams comments.

The Advisory Review Committee (ARC) has been updated, and we have included the additional question on the survey per the districts guidance.

Please let me know if there are any additional comments. We plan to start sending out the ARC invites this week and are looking forward to working further with the Team on this effort.

Thanks again for your time and guidance Raymond. Talk soon.

Regards,

**Tewari Edmonson**  
Systems Planning Manager, Transportation Planning and Policy Division  
**Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works**  
701 NW 1st Court, Suite 1700, Miami, Florida 33136  
Office: 786-469-5079 – Mobile: 786-893-2336

---

**From:** Edmonson, Tewari (DTPW) <[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 1, 2025 12:12 PM

**To:** Freeman, Raymond <[Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us)>

**Cc:** Baez, Paola (DTPW) <[Paola.Baez@miamidade.gov](mailto:Paola.Baez@miamidade.gov)>; Kompelien Westin, Lynda <[lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com](mailto:lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com)>; Rodrigues, Thomas <[thomas.rodrigues@wsp.com](mailto:thomas.rodrigues@wsp.com)>; Cartaya, Nilia <[Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us)>; Huang, Simon <[Simon.Huang@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Simon.Huang@dot.state.fl.us)>

**Subject:** RE: MD DTPW DRAFT TDP PIP and Survey questions

Afternoon Raymond,

Thank you for the follow up and comments. I will address immediately and have the revised updated PIP sent over to FDOT for final approval within the next 2 days.

I will work with the team to address the three comments on the PIP (all related to the Advisory Review Committee ARC – see below)

- **PIP Comments:**

\*\*Municipalities with a population over 50,000.

Please consider adding all municipalities that currently have their own fixed route trolley service, and/or on-demand service(s). They should all have some type of targeted involvement.

Please consider adding a representative from Brightline.

Please consider adding a representative from Miami International Airport. They are a major transportation generator, have the MIC just outside their door, and are served by the MIC-MIA APM connector.

• **Survey Comments:**

- o For the comment on the survey related to adding Tri-Rail – the thought from our side is that we wanted to focus on the DTPW services, as those are the services under our purview that we have implementation jurisdiction. Let me know your thoughts.

g. Transit does not come often enough

h. Other \_\_\_\_

4-5. What type(s) of transit do you use most frequently/and how frequently?

Frequency	4+ Times a Week	1-3 Times a Week	A Few Times a Month	Rarely	Never
Metrobus					
Metromover					
Metrorail					
Municipal circulators					
Special Transit Service					
Go-Connect (on-demand services)					
I don't use public transit					

Thanks again Raymond. Will send over the final PIP by COB on Thursday for final approval.

Talk soon.

Regards,

**Tewari Edmonson**

Systems Planning Manager, Transportation Planning and Policy Division  
Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works  
701 NW 1st Court, Suite 1700, Miami, Florida 33136  
Office: 786-469-5079 – Mobile: 786-893-2336

From: Freeman, Raymond <Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us>

Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 11:59 AM

To: Edmonson, Tewari (DTPW) <Tewari.Edmonson@miamidadegov>

Cc: Baez, Paola (DTPW) <paola.baez@miamidadegov>; Kompelien Westin, Lynda <lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com>; Rodrigues, Thomas <thomas.rodriguez@wsp.com>; Edmonson, Tewari (DTPW) <Tewari.Edmonson@miamidadegov>; Cartaya, Nilia <Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us>; Huang, Simon <Simon.Huang@dot.state.fl.us>

Subject: RE: MD DTPW DRAFT TDP PIP and Survey questions

EMAIL RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL SOURCE

Hi Tewari,

Upon review, please see attached marked up documents with comments.

Let us know if anything else might be needed.

Thank you,

**Raymond Freeman**

Passenger Operations Manager  
Modal Development Office  
Florida Department of Transportation  
District Six  
1000 NW 111 Avenue, RM 6108  
Miami, FL 33172  
Phone: 305-470-5255  
Email: [Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us)



**From:** Edmonson, Tewari (DTPW) <[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2025 4:40 PM

**To:** Cartaya, Nilia <[Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Nilia.Cartaya@dot.state.fl.us)>; Freeman, Raymond <[Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us)>

**Cc:** Baez, Paola (DTPW) <[paola.baez@miamidade.gov](mailto:paola.baez@miamidade.gov)>; Kompelien Westin, Lynda <[lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com](mailto:lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com)>; Rodrigues, Thomas <[thomas.rodrigues@wsp.com](mailto:thomas.rodrigues@wsp.com)>; Edmonson, Tewari (TPO) <[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)>

**Subject:** MD DTPW DRAFT TDP PIP and Survey questions

**EXTERNAL SENDER:** Use caution with links and attachments.

Good Afternoon Nilia and Raymond,

Hope all is well on your end.

Team, please see attached our Draft TDP PIP along with the related survey questions to be used to solicit public input for the effort.

Once the PIP is finalized and approved, we will begin coordination with the respective Advisory Committee Review (ARC) members and schedule the necessary meetings.

Please let me know if you have any questions and thanks for your time and guidance and talk soon.

Regards,

**Tewari Edmonson**

Systems Planning Manager, Transportation Planning and Policy Division

**Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works**

701 NW 1st Court, Suite 1700, Miami, Florida 33136

Office: 786-469-5079 – Mobile: 786-893-2336

## **APPENDIX B3: OUTREACH ACTIVITIES**

# DTPW Social Media Posts

## Instagram

Instagram Post 1



Instagram Post 2



Instagram Post 3



# Facebook

## Facebook Post 1

 Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works •  
September 26, 2025 · 🌐

Help shape the future of Miami-Dade Transit! 🗳️ Take the Transit Development Plan survey today and share your input on how we can improve service for our community. Take the survey here: <https://tinyurl.com/2uh4a625>



## Facebook Post 2

 Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works •  
September 3, 2025 · 🌐

Every survey counts. While the Transportation Development Plan (TDP) is updated each year, this five-year major update is the one that shapes the big picture of public transit in Miami-Dade County. Your feedback today will guide the priorities and improvements for the years ahead. Share your thoughts here:

[https://feedback.miamidade.gov/jfe/form/SV\\_e8VlgN2GBYDdsy](https://feedback.miamidade.gov/jfe/form/SV_e8VlgN2GBYDdsy)



### Facebook Post 3




Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works

August 25, 2025 · 🌐

Every five years, Miami-Dade Transit sets the blueprint for the future—and that moment is now. This is your chance to say what matters most. Don't miss it:

[https://feedback.miamidade.gov/jfe/form/SV\\_e8VllgN2GBYDdsy](https://feedback.miamidade.gov/jfe/form/SV_e8VllgN2GBYDdsy)



### Facebook Post 4



# X (Twitter)

X Post 1



X Post 2



Date	Day	Morning Peak Hour (7-10 AM)	Afternoon Peak Hour (3-6 PM)
8/9/2025	Sat	Miami Lakes Famer's Market	
8/26/2025	Tues	FIU Panthers On the Move Event	
9/4/2025	Thu	Dolphin Station Park & Ride	Dolphin Station Park & Ride
		Government Center	Government Center
9/5/2025	Fri	163rd St Mall	Aventura Brightline Station
		Miami Dade College	Transit Rider - Metromover
9/6/2025	Sat	Northeast Dade-Aventura Branch Library	
		Culmer/Overtown Branch Library	
9/7/2025	Sun	Vizcaya Museum and Gardens Farmers Market	
9/8/2025	Mon	Government Center	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal
			Golden Glades Park & Ride
9/9/2025	Tues	Golden Glades Park & Ride	Golden Glades Library
		Government Center	Northwest 12th Av & Northwest 13th St
9/10/2025	Wed	Government Center	North Dade Regional Library
		South Dade Government Center Transit Hub	Dadeland North Metrorail Station
9/11/2025	Thu	FIU	Tamiami Regional Library
		Allapattah Metrorail	Miami Dade College
9/12/2025	Fri	Miami Airport Station	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal
		Dadeland South Metrorail Station	Government Center
9/13/2025	Sat	Hialeah Library	
		Lincoln Road	
9/14/2025	Sun	Golden Glades Park & Ride	
		South Miami Branch Library	
9/15/2025	Mon	West Flagler Branch Library	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal
		Naranja Branch Library	Dadeland North Metrorail Station
9/16/2025	Tues	Miami Airport Station	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal
		Coral Reef Branch Library	Government Center
9/17/2025	Wed	Tamiami Regional Library	Tamiami Regional Library
		Hispanic Branch Library	Miami Beach Regional Library
9/18/2025	Thu	Hialeah Gardens Library	Aventura Brightline Station
		University of Miami	Government Center
9/19/2025	Fri	Westchester Regional Library	Golden Glades Park & Ride
		Government Center	Brickell Station (East Side)
9/20/2025	Sat	North Dade Regional Library	
		University of Miami	
9/21/2025	Sun	South Miami Library	
		Allapattah Metrorail	
9/22/2025	Mon	Hispanic Branch Library	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal

Date	Day	Morning Peak Hour (7-10 AM)	Afternoon Peak Hour (3-6 PM)
		Government Center	Allapattah Metrorail
9/23/2025	Tues	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal	Golden Glades Park & Ride
		Tamiami Regional Library	Miami Dade College
9/24/2025	Wed	Miami Airport Station	Hialeah Gardens Library
		Brickell Station (East Side)	University of Miami
9/25/2025	Thu	Golden Glades Park & Ride	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal
		Dadeland North Metrorail Station	FIU
9/26/2025	Fri	Miami Airport Station	Golden Glades Park & Ride
		Government Center	Northwest 12th Av & Northwest 13th St
9/29/2025	Mon	Golden Glades Park & Ride	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal
		Government Center	Brickell Station (East Side)
9/30/2025	Tues	Miami Airport Station	Hialeah Gardens Library
		Dadeland North Metrorail Station	Northwest 12th Av & Northwest 13th St
10/1/2025	Wed	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal	Golden Glades Park & Ride
		Miami Airport Station	Dadeland South Metrorail Station
10/2/2025	Thu	Golden Glades Park & Ride	Aventura Mall Bus Terminal
		Miami Dade College	FIU
10/3/2025	Fri	Miami Airport Station	Hialeah Gardens Library
		Government Center	Dadeland North Metrorail Station

## **APPENDIX B4: PAPER SURVEY**

## What is #MDT10Ahead?

Miami-Dade County's Department of Transportation and Public Works' (DTPW) Transit Development Plan (TDP) is a ten-year strategic vision that helps Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) operate and grow a safer, cleaner, quicker, and more connected transportation system. This brief survey uses your input to influence our plans looking forward to the next decade.

**What this survey does?** The TDP evaluates DTPW's existing transit system, identifies ongoing and future service improvements as well as capital investments, and ultimately presents a financial plan based on available funding.

### How you can help?

- Fill out and mail back this short survey to:  
**Department of Transportation and Public Works  
Transit Development Plan**  
701 NW 1st Court, 17th Floor, Miami, FL 33136
- Submit additional comments via email at:  
**MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov**
- Fill out the online survey at: Follow us on social media at **@GoMiamiDade** on Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook. Use **#MDT10Ahead** to join the conversation.



**Recommended Service Plan:** The ten-year implementation plan guides decisions about existing and future services. The plan is based on service standards, citizen input (like this survey), and stakeholder coordination.

**Capital Investment Plan:** This plan prioritizes investments in buses, stations, infrastructure, and equipment needed to preserve and expand the transit system and implement the Recommended Service Plan.

**Financial Plan:** The financial plan identifies all available financial resources and identifies financial needs based on the Recommended Service Plan and Capital Improvement Plan.

**For more details, visit:**

**[www.miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead](http://www.miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead)**

In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the ADA, Miami-Dade County will not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability in its services, programs, activities or facilities. Auxiliary aids and services for communication are available with five days' advance notice. For material in alternate format (audiotape, Braille or computer disk), a sign language interpreter or other accommodations, please contact: Miami-Dade Department of Transportation and Public Works, Office of Civil Rights and Labor Relations, 701 NW 1st Court, Suite 1700, Miami, FL 33136. Attention: ADA Coordinator. Telephone: 786-469-5225, Fax: 786-469-5589. E-mail: [DTPW-ADA@miamidade.gov](mailto:DTPW-ADA@miamidade.gov). If you are Deaf or hard of hearing, you may contact the agency using the Florida Relay Service at 711, or 1-800-955-8771 (TTY) or 1-800-955-8770 (Voice).

PLACE  
STAMP  
HERE



MIAMI-DADE DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION  
AND PUBLIC WORKS  
701 NW 1ST CT FL 17  
MIAMI FL 33136-9809

# MIAMI-DADE COUNTY'S TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN (TDP) SURVEY

[miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead](http://miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead)

# DTPW 2026-2035 TDP Survey

At DTPW, we strive to provide a transportation system that's safe, sustainable, efficient, and connected for all County residents and visitors.

But we can't do it alone! Your feedback is instrumental in improving our County's public transportation system.

We appreciate that time is precious and so this survey should only take a few minutes.

## USAGE CHARACTERISTICS

### 1. Why do you ride Miami-Dade public transportation?

(Check all that apply)

- a. Not applicable / I do not use transit in Miami-Dade
- b. Do not own a car/driver's license
- c. Reliable
- d. Convenient
- e. Good value/saves money
- f. Avoids traffic congestion
- g. Comfortable passenger cars
- h. Saves time
- i. Environmentally friendly
- j. Clean stations/passenger cars
- k. Proximity to home/work/other
- l. Other \_\_\_\_\_

### 2. What places do you most commonly travel to/from when you ride public transportation? (Check all that apply)

- a. Work or work-related location
- b. School grades K-12
- c. Vocational school
- d. College/university
- e. Medical facility (not work related)
- f. Airport
- g. Shopping
- h. Food and dining
- i. Personal errands
- j. Visit friends/family
- k. Entertainment
- l. Recreational/sporting events

### 3. What type(s) of transit do you use most frequently and how frequently?

FREQUENCY	4+ TIMES A WEEK	1-3 TIMES A WEEK	A FEW TIMES A MONTH	RARELY	NEVER
Metrobus/ Metro Express					
Metromover					
Metrorail					
Municipal Circulator					
Special Transit Service (STS)					
MetroConnect (On-Demand Services)					

### 4. How do you usually get to and from your bus/train stop?

- a. Walk
- b. Bike or scooter
- c. I drive to the station / Park and Ride
- d. I get dropped off at the station / Kiss and Ride
- e. Rideshare (Uber, Lyft, etc.)
- f. Other \_\_\_\_\_

### 5. How do you normally access transit service information?

- a. GO Miami-Dade Transit App
- b. DTPW Website
- c. Social Media
- d. Printed Schedules
- e. Miami-Dade Transit Rider Alerts
- f. Map Services (Google/Apple Maps)
- g. Other \_\_\_\_\_

## SATISFACTION

### 6. How satisfied are you with public transportation services?

- a. Very satisfied
- b. Satisfied
- c. Neutral
- d. Dissatisfied
- e. Very dissatisfied

## IMPROVEMENTS

### 7. What improvements would encourage you to use transit more often? Please rank these options from 1 (highest) to 11 (lowest) priority.

- \_\_\_ a. More frequent service
- \_\_\_ b. Shorter wait times
- \_\_\_ c. Bus/train arrives on-time
- \_\_\_ d. Better connectivity to other transit services/modes
- \_\_\_ e. Lower fares
- \_\_\_ f. Cleaner stations/vehicles
- \_\_\_ g. Better first/last mile options
- \_\_\_ h. Expanded hours
- \_\_\_ i. Expanded routes/coverage
- \_\_\_ j. Safety / Security
- \_\_\_ k. More stop amenities including shelters, benches

### 8. What should DTPW's Strategic Priorities be for the next 10 Years? Please rank these options from 1 (highest) to 7 (lowest) priority.

- \_\_\_ a. More rail service
- \_\_\_ b. Expanded bus service
- \_\_\_ c. Reduced-fare options
- \_\_\_ d. Safer stops/stations
- \_\_\_ e. Bike lanes and scooter-friendly routes
- \_\_\_ f. Zero-emission vehicles
- \_\_\_ g. More bus stop amenities including shelters, benches

## SAFETY

### 9. How would you rate the overall safety of public transportation system in Miami-Dade County?

- a. Very safe
- b. Safe
- c. Neutral
- d. Unsafe
- e. Very unsafe

Please explain your answer: \_\_\_\_\_

### 10. The sidewalks, bike paths, or other ways of getting to your nearest transit stop are safe and easy to use.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Agree
- c. Neutral
- d. Disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

**Great job! You are almost done.**  
**The next few are optional.**

## DEMOGRAPHICS OPTIONAL QUESTIONS

### 11. Which gender do you identify with?

- a. Male
- b. Female
- c. Prefer not to answer

### 12. What is your age group?

- a. Under 16
- b. 16-24
- c. 25-34
- d. 35-44
- e. 45-54
- f. 55-64
- g. Over 65

### 13. Which best describes your race/ethnicity

(Select all that apply)

- a. Asian
- b. Black/African American
- c. White
- d. Spanish/Latino/Hispanic
- e. American Indian
- f. Other

### 14. What is your household's approximate total annual income?

- a. Less than \$15,000
- b. \$15,000-\$24,999
- c. \$25,000-\$34,999
- d. \$35,000-\$44,999
- e. \$45,000-\$54,999
- f. \$55,000-\$74,999
- g. \$75,000-\$99,999
- h. \$100,000+
- i. Prefer not to answer

### 15. How many working motor vehicles are available in your household?

- a. None
- b. One
- c. Two
- d. More than two

## **APPENDIX B5: SURVEY RESULTS**

# Appendix B.5 – Transit Development Plan Survey Results

## 1. Q1 - How often do you use public transportation in Miami-Dade County?

Frequent riders accounted for the majority of survey participants and, when combining daily and weekly users, accounted for roughly 70% of those responding to the survey.

Figure 1-1 Q1 How often do you use public transportation in Miami-Dade County?





Table 1-1 Q1 How often do you use public transportation in Miami-Dade County?

Answer	Count	% of responses
Daily	2711	51.24%
A few times per week	1000	18.90%
A few times per month	606	11.45%
Rarely	673	12.72%
Never	301	5.69%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5291</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## 2. Q2 - Why do you ride Miami-Dade public transportation?

On average, users chose 2 or more answers for reasons that they use Miami-Dade Transit. Nearly half of the respondents indicated they did not have a car or driver's license.

Figure 2-1 Q2 Why do you ride Miami-Dade public transportation?




*Table 2-1 Q2 Why do you ride Miami-Dade public transportation?*

Answer	Count	% of overall responses	% of users who selected this choice
Do not own a car/driver's license	1893	19.35%	48%
Avoids traffic congestion	1312	13.41%	34%
Convenient	1300	13.29%	33%
Other	1126	11.51%	29%
Good value/saves money	1017	10.39%	26%
Proximity to home/work/other	847	8.66%	22%
Reliable	680	6.95%	17%
Environmentally friendly	621	6.35%	16%
Saves time	617	6.31%	16%
Clean stations/passenger cars	200	2.04%	5%
Comfortable passenger cars	172	1.76%	4%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>9785</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>250.00%</b>
<b>Total Users Responding</b>	<b>3914</b>		

### 3. Q3 - What places do you most commonly travel to/from when you ride public transportation? Check all that apply.

A vast majority (76%) of respondents indicated that they use public transportation for their work commute followed by personal errands (32%).

Figure 3-1 Q3 What places do you most commonly travel to/from when you ride public transportation?



*Table 3-1 Q3 What places do you most commonly travel to/from when you ride public transportation?*

Answer	Count	% of overall responses	% of users who selected this choice
Work or work-related location	2979	32.41%	76%
Personal errands	1233	13.41%	32%
Shopping	792	8.62%	20%
Entertainment	736	8.01%	19%
Food and dining	623	6.78%	16%
Medical facility (not work-related)	573	6.23%	15%
Visit friends/family	560	6.09%	14%
Airport	526	5.72%	13%
Recreational/sporting events	463	5.04%	12%
College/university	344	3.74%	9%
School grades K-12	161	1.75%	4%
Other	153	1.66%	4%
Vocational school	50	0.54%	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9193</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>234.87%</b>
<b>Total Respondents w Answers</b>	<b>3914</b>		

#### 4. Q4 - What types of transit do you use most often, and how frequently?

Metrobus showed the highest frequency of use among its ridership, with 61% of respondents using the service multiple times a week. This weekly frequency was followed by Metrorail (48%) and Metromover (37%).

Figure 4-1 Q4 - What types of transit do you use most often, and how frequently?




Table 4-1 Q4 - What types of transit do you use most often, and how frequently?

Question	4+ times a week	Never	Rarely	A few times a month	1-3 times a week	total
Metrobus / Metro Express	1876	414	629	399	431	3749
Metromover	593	691	1135	497	286	3202
Metrorail	1184	511	879	494	461	3529
Municipal circulators	201	1623	595	227	158	2804
Special Transit Service (STS)	89	2322	259	65	33	2768
MetroConnect (on-demand services)	145	1913	489	151	70	2768


Table 4-2 Q4 - What types of transit do you use most often, and how frequently? (Percentage-based)

Question	4+ times a week	1-3 times a week	A few times a month	Rarely	Never
Metrobus / Metro Express	50%	11%	11%	17%	11%
Metrorail	34%	14%	14%	25%	14%
Metromover	19%	16%	16%	35%	22%
Municipal circulators	7%	8%	8%	21%	58%
MetroConnect (on-demand services)	5%	5%	5%	18%	69%
Special Transit Service (STS)	3%	2%	2%	9%	84%

## 5. Q5 - How do you usually get to and from your bus/train stop?

Most Miami-Dade transportation riders (nearly 80%) walk to their bus or train stops, followed by park and ride (19%) and getting dropped off by family or rideshare services.

Figure 5-1. Q5 - How do you usually get to and from your bus/train stop?



*Table 5-1 Q5 - How do you usually get to and from your bus/train stop?*

Answer	Count	% of total responses	% of responses/Users responding
Other	121	2.43%	3%
Bike or scooter	281	5.65%	7%
Rideshare	387	7.78%	10%
Kiss and Ride	394	7.92%	10%
Park and Ride	755	15.19%	19%
Walk	3034	61.02%	77%
Total Responses	4972	100%	<b>126.97%</b>
<b>Total Users Responding</b>	<b>3916</b>		

## 6. Q6 - For what reasons are you not using/rarely using transit?

The most common reason cited for rare transit use is that the trip takes too long for them to reach the destination (22%) followed by transit not coming often enough (18%).

Figure 6-1 Q6 - For what reasons are you not using/rarely using transit?




Table 6-1 Q6 - For what reasons are you not using/rarely using transit?

Answer	Count	% of total responses	% of responses/Users responding
I feel unsafe getting to my nearest transit station	227	3.80%	6%
Other; please explain in the box below	371	6.21%	9%
Transit does not operate service at the times I need	416	6.96%	10%
There is no transit stop near where I live or work	528	8.83%	13%
Using my car is more convenient	532	8.90%	13%
Transit does not come often enough	725	12.13%	18%
Transit takes too long to reach my destination	918	15.36%	22%
Not Applicable/I use transit regularly	2261	37.82%	55%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5978</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>146.23%</b>
<b>Total Users Responding</b>	<b>4088</b>		

## 7. Q7 - Do any of the following affect your ability to use public transportation?

The most significant barrier to using public transportation is the lack of benches or shelter at bus stops (29%), followed closely by the nearest station being too far (28%).

Figure 7-1 Q7 - Do any of the following affect your ability to use public transportation?




Table 7-1 Q7 - Do any of the following affect your ability to use public transportation?

Answer	Count	% of total responses	% of responses/ Users responding
Fares are too expensive	234	4.58%	6%
Lack of ADA accessibility	280	5.48%	7%
Lack of first/last mile options (taxis, Uber, scooters, bicycles, etc.)	344	6.73%	8%
Lack of information on public transportation options/schedules	519	10.15%	13%
Other	646	12.63%	16%
Lack of crosswalks/sidewalks	760	14.86%	19%
Nearest station too far	1141	22.32%	28%
Lack of benches/shelter at bus stops	1189	23.25%	29%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5113</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>125.07%</b>
<b>Total Users Responding</b>	<b>4088</b>		

## 8. Q8 - How do you usually access transit service information? (Multiple Select)

The most common way riders access transit information is the GO Miami-Dade Transit app (65%), followed by Google/Apple Maps (34%). Reported usage of the County app, even over third-party solutions, suggests that this resource is highly valuable to riders.

Figure 8-1. Q8 - How do you usually access transit service information?




Table 8-1 5. Q8 - How do you usually access transit service information?

Answer	Count	% of overall responses	% of users who selected this choice
Printed Schedules	215	3.69%	5%
Miami-Dade Transit Rider Alerts	289	4.96%	7%
Social Media	344	5.90%	8%
Other	370	6.35%	9%
DTPW Website	587	10.07%	14%
Map Services (Google/Apple Maps)	1374	23.56%	34%
GO Miami-Dade Transit App	2652	45.48%	65%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5831</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>142.64%</b>
<b>Total Users Responding</b>	<b>4088</b>		

### 9. Q9 - How satisfied are you with public transportation services?

Most riders do not express strong opinions in either direction, with the largest share reporting they feel neutral (35%) about public transportation services. Among those with stronger views, 29% are satisfied or very satisfied, while a slightly larger 36% are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, indicating that negative sentiment modestly outweighs positive sentiment among riders who feel strongly.

Figure 9-1 Q9 - How satisfied are you with public transportation services?





Table 9-1 Q9 - How satisfied are you with public transportation services?

Answer	Count	% of of responses
Very satisfied	292	7.14%
Satisfied	901	22.05%
Neutral	1420	34.74%
Dissatisfied	853	20.87%
Very dissatisfied	621	15.19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4087</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## 10. Q10 - What improvements would encourage you to use transit more often? (Ranking)

The strongest priorities for increasing transit ridership are more frequent service, shorter wait times, and ensuring buses/trains arrive on time, each receiving far higher top-rank scores than all other improvements. Mid-tier priorities include better connectivity to other transit services and lower fares, while stop amenities, expanded hours, cleaner stations/vehicles, and first/last-mile options are generally viewed as lower-priority enhancements. Notably, safety and security, though important, receives comparatively fewer top-rank votes, suggesting reliability and speed are the dominant factors shaping riders' willingness to use transit more often.

Figure 10-1 Q10 - What improvements would encourage you to use transit more often?



*Table 10-1 Q10 - What improvements would encourage you to use transit more often?*

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6 or lower
More frequent service	23.32%	32.42%	24.55%	7.44%	4.14%	6.39%
Shorter wait times	17.21%	28.42%	23.81%	9.78%	7.94%	10.22%
Bus/train arrives on time	21.74%	13.56%	23.64%	13.22%	9.45%	15.45%
Better connectivity to other transit services/modes	4.14%	5.62%	6.60%	48.35%	19.04%	29.61%
Lower fares	2.63%	2.04%	2.07%	2.56%	26.38%	63.72%
Expanded hours	14.51%	5.20%	4.64%	4.07%	5.30%	65.30%
More stop amenities, including shelters and benches	7.34%	3.51%	3.97%	3.41%	3.86%	76.92%
Expanded routes/coverage	1.72%	2.39%	2.49%	3.11%	11.42%	77.91%
Cleaner stations/vehicles	2.04%	2.74%	3.27%	3.19%	5.13%	82.79%
Better first/last mile options	3.69%	2.11%	2.70%	3.30%	4.29%	83.07%
Safety and security	1.65%	2.00%	2.25%	1.58%	3.06%	88.62%

**11. Q11 - What should be DTPW's strategic priorities for the next 10 years? Rank these from most important to least by dragging the most important to the top of the list.**

The strongest 10-year strategic priorities identified by riders are more rail service, which overwhelmingly receives the highest top-rank scores, followed by expanded bus service. Mid-tier priorities include reduced-fare options and safer stops/stations.

Figure 11-1 Q11 - What should be DTPW's strategic priorities for the next 10 years?




Table 11-1 Q11 - What should be DTPW's strategic priorities for the next 10 years?

Question	1	2	3	4 or lower	Total
More rail service	1088	927	233	222	2470
Expanded bus service	887	669	485	429	2470
Reduced-fare options	84	186	713	1487	2470
Safer stops/stations	172	285	483	1530	2470
More station amenities, including shelters and benches	153	174	276	1867	2470
Bike lanes and scooter-friendly routes	62	169	193	2046	2470
Zero-emission vehicles	24	60	87	2299	2470

**12. Q12 - How would you rate the overall safety of the public transportation system in Miami-Dade County?**

Most riders feel neutral (44%) or generally safe (34%) when using Miami-Dade’s public transportation system, with only 10% describing it as very safe. Negative perceptions are less common but still notable, with 9% rating the system as unsafe and 3% as very unsafe, suggesting that while major safety concerns are not widespread, confidence is not especially strong either.

Figure 12-1 Q12 - How would you rate the overall safety of the public transportation system in Miami-Dade County?





Table 12-1 Q12 - How would you rate the overall safety of the public transportation system in Miami-Dade County?

Answer	Count	% of responses
Very safe	426	10.50%
Safe	1361	33.56%
Neutral	1797	44.30%
Unsafe	363	8.95%
Very unsafe	109	2.69%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4056</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**13. Q13 - How would you rate the safety and security of public transportation stations?**

Most respondents feel neutral (46%) or safe (32%) about the safety and security of transit stations, while a smaller share (9%) consider them very safe. Negative perceptions—unsafe (10%) or very unsafe (3%)—are present but less common, indicating that although major safety concerns at stations do exist for some riders, most neither strongly endorse nor strongly doubt station safety.

*Figure 13-1 Q13 - How would you rate the safety and security of public transportation stations?*



*Table 13-1 Q12 - Q13 - How would you rate the safety and security of public transportation stations?*

Answer	Count	% of overall responses
Very safe	381	9.32%
Safe	1306	31.95%
Neutral	1875	45.88%
Unsafe	409	10.01%
Very unsafe	116	2.84%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4087</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**14. Q14 - How would you rate the safety of the sidewalks, bike paths, or other ways of getting to your nearest transit stop?**

Most respondents feel neutral (49%) about the safety of sidewalks, bike paths, and other ways of getting to transit, while about one-third (33%) view these access routes as safe or very safe. Still, a meaningful share (18%) consider them unsafe or very unsafe, indicating that although outright fear is not widespread, many riders experience uncertainty or concerns about the safety of the walking and biking environment leading to transit.

Figure 14-1 Q14 - How would you rate the safety of the sidewalks, bike paths, or other ways of getting to your nearest transit stop?




Table 14-1 Q14 - How would you rate the safety of the sidewalks, bike paths, or other ways of getting to your nearest transit stop?

Answer	Count	% of responses
Very safe	284	6.95%
Safe	1065	26.06%
Neutral	1985	48.57%
Unsafe	505	12.36%
Very unsafe	248	6.07%
Total	4087	100.00%

**15. Q15 - What specific safety improvements would make you more likely to use transit? (Optional)**

Primary concerns that surveyors cited for improving their likelihood to use transit were related to Homeless/Vagrancy (19%) and requests for increased Security/Police Presence (17%).

Figure 15-1 Q15 - What specific safety improvements would make you more likely to use transit?




Table 15-1 Q15 - What specific safety improvements would make you more likely to use transit?

Rank	Category	Approximate Count	% of Total
1	Homeless/Vagrancy Issues	320	15.20%
2	Security/Police Presence	285	13.5%
3	Poor Lighting	165	7.80%
4	Pedestrian/Bike Safety	155	7.40%
5	Weather Protection/Shelters	145	6.90%
6	Rail Expansion Requests	140	6.60%
7	Bus Punctuality/Reliability	135	6.40%
8	Cleanliness/Maintenance	130	6.20%
9	Disruptive Passengers	115	5.50%
10	Service Frequency/Coverage	110	5.20%
	Total	1700	67.20%

## 16. Annual Income

Nearly half of all respondents (44%) skipped the income question entirely, and another 25% chose not to disclose their income, meaning only 31% of survey participants provided usable income information. Among those who did answer, income levels are broadly distributed across all brackets, with no single income range dominating—ranging from 3% to 7% per bracket and with 7% reporting incomes of \$100,000+.

Figure 16-1 Annual Income




Table 16-1 Annual Income

Annual Income Range	#
Marked prefer not to answer	1318
Less than \$15,000	174
\$15,000-\$24,999	279
\$25,000-\$34,999	231
\$35,000-\$44,999	142
\$45,000-\$54,999	146
\$55,000-\$74,999	174
\$75,000-\$99,999	159
\$100,000+	349
Skipped	2321

## 17. Age Range of Participants

Among those who provided their age, participants are predominantly adults between 25 and 64, with the largest groups in the 45–54 (725 respondents) and 35–44 (681 respondents) ranges. Younger adults (25–34, at 494 respondents) and older adults (55–64, at 624 respondents) are also well represented, while very young participants (under 16) and seniors (over 65) make up much smaller shares. Notably, a large portion of respondents (2,249) did not report their age.

Figure 17-1 Age Range of Participants




Table 17-1 Age Range of Participants

Age Range of Participants	Totals
Under 16	12
16-24	194
25-34	494
35-44	681
45-54	725
55-64	624
Over 65	315
<b>No Answer</b>	<b>2249</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3045</b>

## 18. Gender of Participants

Most respondents who answered the gender question identified as female (53%) or male (43%), with a small share (4%) choosing not to disclose their gender. Overall, the gender distribution among those who provided an answer is fairly balanced, with a slight majority of female participants.

Figure 18-1 Gender of Participants




Table 18-1 Gender of Participants

Participant Gender Ratio	Total
Female	1623
Male	1315
Prefer not to answer	118
Total Answering	3056

## 19. Language Preference

Most respondents prefer to receive information in English (73%), with Spanish (27%) as the next most common language preference. Only a very small share (0.2%) indicated a preference for Haitian Creole, showing that while English dominates, there is still a substantial Spanish-speaking audience that should be accommodated in outreach and communications.

Figure 19-1 Language Preference




Table 19-1 Language Preference

Language	Total
English	3875
Spanish	1407
Haitian Creole	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>5293</b>

## 20. Racial/Ethnic Demographics

The survey sample is predominantly Latino/Hispanic (54%), making up over half of all respondents. Black/African American (17%) and White (17%) participants form the next largest groups, while smaller shares identify as Asian (2%), Native American (2%), Other (2%), or two or more races (6%), indicating a diverse but strongly Latino/Hispanic-leaning respondent pool.

Figure 20-1 Racial/Ethnic Demographics




Table 20-1 Language Preference

Racial/Ethnic Demographics	Total
Asian	59
Black/African American	512
White	496
Latino/Hispanic	1627
Native American	50
Other	77
2 or more	171
<b>Total</b>	<b>2992</b>

## 21. Complete to Incomplete Ratio

Most participants completed the electronic survey (75%) with 25% leaving some mandatory answers empty or incomplete.

Figure 21-1 Complete to Incomplete Ratio




Table 21-1 Complete to Incomplete Ratio

Status	#
Completed	3981
Incomplete	1312
<b>Total</b>	<b>5293</b>

This page is intentionally left blank.

# Advisory Review Committee

## Appendix C



## **APPENDIX C1: LIST OF ARC REPRESENTATIVE GROUPS**

**TDP Project Advisory Review Committee Representative Groups**

ARC Meeting Committees			
<b>1</b>	Brightline Florida	<b>26</b>	Village of Virginia Gardens
<b>2</b>	Miami International Airport (MIA)	<b>27</b>	City of Sweetwater
<b>3</b>	Miami-Dade County Housing and Community Development	<b>28</b>	Town of Surfside
<b>4</b>	Miami-Dade County Public Schools	<b>29</b>	City of Sunny Isles Beach
<b>5</b>	Miami Transit Alliance	<b>30</b>	Village of Pinecrest
<b>6</b>	Center for Independent Living of South Florida	<b>31</b>	Village of Palmetto Bay
<b>7</b>	Alliance for Aging	<b>32</b>	City of Opa-locka
<b>8</b>	Florida Department of Transportation District 6	<b>33</b>	City of North Miami Beach
<b>9</b>	Florida Turnpike Enterprise	<b>34</b>	City of North Miami
<b>10</b>	South Florida Commuter Services	<b>35</b>	City of Miami Springs
<b>11</b>	South Florida Regional Transportation Authority	<b>36</b>	Village of Miami Shores
<b>12</b>	CareerSource South Florida	<b>37</b>	City of Miami Gardens
<b>13</b>	Urban Health Partnerships	<b>38</b>	City of Miami Beach
<b>14</b>	Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce	<b>39</b>	City of Miami
<b>15</b>	Miami-Dade Beacon Council	<b>40</b>	Town of Medley
<b>16</b>	City of Miami Downtown Development Authority	<b>41</b>	City of Homestead
<b>17</b>	Agency for Persons with Disabilities Southern Region Office	<b>42</b>	City of Hialeah Gardens
<b>18</b>	Miami-Dade County League of Cities	<b>43</b>	City of Hialeah
<b>19</b>	Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee	<b>44</b>	City of Doral
<b>20</b>	Miami-Dade County Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department	<b>45</b>	Town of Cutler Bay
<b>21</b>	Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory & Economic Resources - Planning & Zoning	<b>46</b>	City of Coral Gables
<b>22</b>	Greater Miami Expressway Agency	<b>47</b>	Town of Bay Harbor Islands
<b>23</b>	Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization	<b>48</b>	Village of Bal Harbour
<b>24</b>	Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust	<b>49</b>	City of Aventura
<b>25</b>	Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works		

## **APPENDIX C2: ARC MEETING PRESENTATIONS**

Please note: this meeting will be recorded



# DTPW Transit Development Plan 2026-2035 Major Update

Study Advisory Review Committee  
Meeting #1  
Monday August 18, 2025



# M Agenda

- Project Overview
- TDP Major Update Components
- Comprehensive Effort
- Role of the Advisory Review Committee
- Public Involvement
- How You Can Help
- Timeline
- Interactive Session



# Project Overview




- **Transit Development Plan (TDP)** serves as DTPW’s strategic development, and operational guidance document for a **10-year planning horizon**.
- This TDP covers Fiscal Years **2026-2035**.

- Required by Florida Statute Rule 14-73.001, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.)
- DTPW receives an average of \$20.5M annually from State Grant Programs.

- The TDP must be consistent with state documents (FDOT Work Program and STIP)
- Coordinated with county and TPO documents such as the LRTP, TIP, CITT Implementation Plan and the County’s Capital plan.


- Major Update completed every five years;
- Annual Progress Reports (APRs) must be submitted during interim years.



# M TDP Major Update Components



In 2024, FDOT revised the TDP Rule, streamlining requirements for TDP Major Updates



Source: [FDOT TDP Handbook, 2025](#)

# TDP Major Update Outline

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Public Involvement Process

Chapter 3: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process Coordination Program

Chapter 4: Operating Environment

Chapter 5: Relationship To Other Plans

Chapter 6: Land Use and Corridor Development Assessment

Chapter 7: Demand Estimation

Chapter 8: Ten Year Operating and Capital Program

# Comprehensive Effort

Ensures the TDP is data-driven, community-informed, and regionally integrated



Public Involvement Process	Engage community stakeholders through outreach and feedback opportunities.
Relationship to Other Plans	Review and align with existing transportation and land use plans
Transportation Process Coordination	Coordinate with MPO and regional agencies to ensure plan consistency
Demand Estimation	Analyze future travel needs using demographic and employment forecasts
Land Use & Corridor Development	Assess land use conditions and potential for transit-supportive growth
10-Year Operating & Capital Program	Develop a financially constrained operating and capital investment plan
Plan Submission & Approval	Finalize, submit, and secure approvals for plan adoption and implementation



# Role of the Advisory Review Committee



## Who is on the ARC

- Representatives from major stakeholder groups
- All municipalities providing transit services

## Why an ARC

- Provide guidance, technical expertise, and local perspectives to shape the TDP
- Ensure municipal and agency priorities are reflected
- Support coordination across jurisdictions and modes
- Serve as a sounding board for draft recommendations

## Role of the Committee

- Advisory (not decision-making)
- Provide feedback on:
  - Needs assessment
  - Project service recommendations
  - Funding strategies
- Facilitate communication between your municipality/agency and DTPW project team.

## Committee Benefits

- Influence the future of transit in Miami-Dade County
- Ensure your community's needs are considered
- Build stronger interagency collaboration
- Early awareness of projects and funding opportunities

# M Public Involvement



The TDP PIP for DTPW is designed to create opportunities for public input and support consensus-building around the agency's long-term vision.

## Specific outreach activities:

- Survey**  
Available in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole
- Public Meetings**  
We need your help! Invite us to meet
- Social Media**  
Twitter and Instagram @GoMiamiDade, use #MDT10Ahead
- Community Events**  
Transit hubs and farmer's markets

**YOUR OPINION MATTERS!**  
Take Miami-Dade County's  
Transit Development Plan (TDP) Survey



[miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead](http://miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead)

Follow us on social media @GoMiamiDade on Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook; use #MDT10Ahead to join the conversation.

Submit general comments via email at:  
[MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov](mailto:MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov)





# Feedback Being Solicited

Survey will collect details pertaining to:

Usage  
Characteristics

Satisfaction

Improvements

Safety

Demographics  
(Optional)


## Examples of Outreach Methods:

- In-person survey distribution at 10 transit hubs and stations
- Presentations to:
  - TPO Transportation Planning Technical Advisory Committee (TPTAC) – September 10
  - Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (LCB) – September 17
  - SFRTA Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) -
  - TPO's Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) – October 16
  - Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) – October 22
- Social Media:
  - @GoMiamiDade on Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook
  - #MDT10ahead
- Email: [MDT10ahead@miamidade.gov](mailto:MDT10ahead@miamidade.gov)
- Phone:
  - 305-468-5900
  - 888-311-DADE (3233)
  - 311
  - TTD/TTY: 305-468-5402

## How You Can Help

- Identify public meetings
- Complete the survey & provide other feedback
- Promote the survey
  - Please share the link on social media,
  - Place QR code posters on your transit facilities
  - Digital sign PSA opportunities
- Identify transit needs (future ARC meeting)
- Project prioritization (future ARC meeting)

# M Timeline



# Interactive Session

Questions and answers are displayed in a different format during presentation

1. What are the most pressing Transit service needs in your Municipality/Agency/Region?  
*(Frequency Improvements/Route Expansion/First/Last Mile Connectivity/Accessibility/ Other)*
2. Are there infrastructure or facility needs that should be addressed in the next 10 years?  
*(Transit Hubs/shelters/ADA Upgrades/Other)*
3. How can municipalities and regional partners work together to deliver service more effectively? *(open-ended)*
4. What are your safety and security concerns about the existing transit network? *(open-ended)*
5. What first/last mile connections would improve your agency/municipality's connectivity to the transit network? *(open-ended)*
6. Where should we do outreach in your community/Region? *(open-ended)*
7. Which groups should we prioritize outreach to in your community/Region *(open-ended)*

# Questions?

- **Project Contact Information**

DTPW Project Manager:

**Tewari Edmonson**

[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)

Consultant Project Manager:

**Lynda Kompelien Westin, AICP**

[lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com](mailto:lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com)

- **Learn more about the TDP**

[www.miamidade.gov/global/transportation/mdt-ahead.page](http://www.miamidade.gov/global/transportation/mdt-ahead.page)

Submit Feedback to:

[MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov](mailto:MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov)







[miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead](https://miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead)

Survey QR Code



Please note: this meeting will be recorded



# DTPW Transit Development Plan 2026-2035 Major Update

Study Advisory Review Committee  
Meeting #2  
Friday September 26, 2025



# Agenda

- Project Overview
- TDP Major Update Outline & Status
  - Current Conditions
  - Plans Overview
  - Deeper dive into Safety/Security
  - Public Involvement
- Interactive Session
- Timeline
- Next Steps




# M Project Overview


## Recap from First Meeting



- **Transit Development Plan (TDP)** serves as DTPW’s strategic development, and operational guidance document for a **10-year planning horizon**.
  - This TDP covers Fiscal Years **2026-2035**.
- Required by Florida Statute Rule 14-73.001, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.)
  - DTPW receives an average of \$20.5M annually from State Grant Programs.
- The TDP must be consistent with state documents (FDOT Work Program and STIP)
  - Coordinated with county and TPO documents such as the LRTP, TIP, CITT Implementation Plan and the County’s Capital plan.
- Major Update completed every five years;
  - Annual Progress Reports (APRs) must be submitted during interim years.



# TDP Major Update Outline & Status



*Length of color of bars indicates approximate level of completion* 100%


# Chapter 4 - Operating Environment



## Transportation Disadvantaged Population

As part of **Chapter - 4 Operating Environment** which document existing conditions a map series is being developed.

- *Transportation Disadvantaged Map is an early example of this analysis*
- *The map shows that the transportation disadvantaged population is generally clustered in the City of Miami and in Hialeah with pockets throughout the county.*
- *More analysis will follow as the map series is finalized.*



# M Plans Overview



**Plans Review** (42 documents reviewed and summarized from partner agencies – FDOT, County, Municipal, SFRTA, TPO)

Plan, Policy, Document	Agency
Strategic Plan	DTPW
Countywide Transportation Master Plan (CTMP)	
Comprehensive Development Master Plan	
Comprehensive Operations Analysis	
Transit Development Plan 2025-2034	
Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan	
Workplace. Innovation. Savings. Efficiency. 305	Miami-Dade County
Florida Transportation Plan	FDOT
Florida Transportation Plan Draft Performance Report	
FDOT District 6 Work Program	
Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Policy Plan	
Strategic Highway Safety Plan	
Southeast Florida Regional Transportation Plan	SEFTC
SFRTA TDP Major Update	SFRTA
Long Range Transportation Plan	TPO
Transportation Improvement Program	
Strategic Miami Area Rapid Transit Plan	
SMART Plan PD&E studies	
Unified Planning Work Program Fiscal Years 2025 and 2026	
Safety Performance Measures (PM1)	
Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan	
Premium Mobility Program - Broward County	Broward County
21 Municipal Comprehensive Plans	Municipal

## Reviewed plans generally align with TDP objectives and emphasize:

- Multimodal Connectivity and Safety
- Financial Sustainability
- Safety

# M Deeper dive into Safety & Security Events

## Peer Analysis



Data obtained from the National Transit Database (NTD S&S-40 Major Event Report).

**Security events** on this form include suicides, homicides, assaults, terror events, and other security-related events. A **“safety event** means an unexpected outcome resulting in injury or death; damage to or loss of the facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure of a public transportation system; or damage to the environment.”

Peers identified in the previous TDP Major Update

Broward County, Florida	Broward County Transit (BCT)
Orlando, Florida	Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority (LYNX)
Chicago, Illinois	Chicago Transit Authority (CTA)
Baltimore, Maryland	Maryland Transit Administration (MTA)
Atlanta, Georgia	Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)
Philadelphia, PA	Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA)
Washington DC	Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)




# Deeper dive into Safety & Security Events

## Peer Analysis



Total Safety and Security Events per Million Unlinked Passenger Trips  
(NTD S&S-40 Major Event Report)




# M Deeper dive into DTPW Safety & Security Events




- DTPW Trend Analysis uses 2018 – 2023 data (most recent available)

**MB-DO (Motorbus: DTPW Operated Metrobus Routes)**



**HR-DO (Heavy Rail: Metrorail)**




● Total Major Events (Safety and Security)  
● Total Security Events

**Security events** on this form include suicides, homicides, assaults, terror events, and other security-related events. A **safety event** means an unexpected outcome resulting in injury or death; damage to or loss of the facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure of a public transportation system; or damage to the environment.”

Data Source: NTD S&S-40 Form, 2018 – 2023

**MG-DO (Monorail/Automated Guideway: Metromover)**



# M Public Involvement Recap from First Meeting



The TDP PIP for DTPW is designed to create opportunities for public input and support consensus-building around the agency's long-term vision.

## Specific outreach activities:

- Survey**  
Available in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole
- Public Meetings**  
We need your help! Invite us to meet
- Social Media**  
Twitter and Instagram @GoMiamiDade, use #MDT10Ahead
- Community Events**  
Transit hubs and farmer's markets

**YOUR OPINION MATTERS!**  
Take Miami-Dade County's  
Transit Development Plan (TDP) Survey



miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead

Follow us on social media @GoMiamiDade on  
Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook;  
use #MDT10Ahead to join the conversation.

Submit general comments via email at:  
[MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov](mailto:MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov)




# M Public Involvement

## Outreach Meetings & Events



Planning Area	Meeting / Event Location	Date / Time
<b>Beach</b>	Aventura Bus Terminal	TBD
<b>North</b>	North Corridor TOD Meeting	<b>October 22</b> , Sherbondy Village Community Center
	<i>Alternate: Golden Glades P&amp;R</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<b>Northwest</b>	Hialeah Metrorail Station	<i>TBD</i>
	<i>Alternate: Doral Parks For Pollinator Market</i>	<b>October 4</b> , Doral Central Park Market
<b>Central</b>	Dadeland North Metrorail Station	TBD
<b>CBD</b>	Stephen P Clark Center (Government Center)	TBD
<b>South</b>	Pinecrest Farmer's Market	<b>October 5</b>
	<i>Alternate: TransitWay &amp; SW 152 ST</i>	<i>TBD</i>




# M Public Involvement

## Sneak Peak at Survey Responses – as of 9/15



How often do you use public transportation in Miami-Dade County?




# M Public Involvement

## Sneak Peak at Survey Responses – as of 9/15



### Why do you ride Miami-Dade public transportation?



- I live downtown and value having public transportation. Showing my support and appreciation.
- It is very convenient to work by skipping the traffic and be there in my work on time
- No tengo dinero para comprar auto "I don't have money to buy a car"
- Only if it is convenient and most of the time it is not.
- To not park in downtown
- For sporting events and Ultra
- I believe in public transit. I wished i could use it every time.
- No choice
- Have a disability
- Miami manejan como locos "In Miami they drive like they're crazy"


# M Public Involvement

## Sneak Peak at Survey Responses – as of 9/15



How would you rate the overall safety of the public transportation system in Miami-Dade County?

How would you rate the safety of the sidewalks, bike paths, or other ways of getting to your nearest transit stop?



# **Public Involvement**

## Sneak Peak at Survey Responses – as of 9/15



**Do you have any other feedback or suggestions to improve public transportation?**

### **Operations**

- More routes and coverage for all modes.
- Better station and stop maintenance.
- More First/Last Mile Connections.
- Better ADA accessibility for all modes.
- More connectivity between trolleys, trains, buses, Brightline, and Tri-Rail.

### **Customer Experience**

- Increased perception of safety
- Zero or reduced fares
- Use technology to improve communication – apps, notifications, real time tracking
- Clean, well-maintained stations, stops, and vehicles
- Improved customer service – drivers and staff

# Interactive Session

Join via Web



[PollEv.com/input](https://PollEv.com/input)

**Practice Question: Please rank these sports venues from most to least accessible by transit.**

Florida Panthers (Amerant Bank Arena)

Miami Heat (Kaseya Center)

Miami Dolphins / University of Miami Hurricanes (Hard Rock Stadium)

Miami Marlins (LoanDepot Park)

1. Please rank the following *operational* priorities from most to least important.



Expand rail service

Expand bus service

Increase frequency and reliability of buses/trains

Enhance connectivity between transit modes

Improve infrastructure and maintenance (elevators, shelters, bike lanes)

Improve accessibility for seniors and people with disabilities

2. Please rank the following *customer service & experience* priorities from most to least important.



Improve safety and security (lighting, enforcement, cameras)

Enhance cleanliness of vehicles and stations

Upgrade technology and communication (real-time tracking, app improvements)

Provide better customer service and staff training


Make fares more affordable

3. What initiatives or strategies have successfully improved the perception of safety in your community?

 0

Nobody has responded yet.  
Hang tight! Responses are coming in.

# M Timeline



## **Next Steps**

- Complete Existing Conditions Chapters
- Complete Public Outreach Effort (by end of October)
  - Continue Survey Efforts
  - Please share the link on social media,
  - Place QR code posters on your transit facilities
  - Conduct Outreach Meetings
- Next ARC Meetings (tentative, subject to confirmation)
  - **3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting: Week of October 27**
  - **4<sup>th</sup>/Final Meeting: Week of December 1**

# Questions?

- **Project Contact Information**

DTPW Project Manager:

**Tewari Edmonson**

[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)

Consultant Project Manager:

**Lynda Kompelien Westin, AICP**

[lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com](mailto:lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com)

- **Learn more about the TDP**

[www.miamidade.gov/global/transportation/mdt-ahead.page](http://www.miamidade.gov/global/transportation/mdt-ahead.page)

Submit Feedback to:

[MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov](mailto:MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov)







[miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead](https://miamidade.gov/MDT10Ahead)

Survey QR Code



Please note: this meeting will be recorded




# DTPW Transit Development Plan 2026-2035 Major Update

Study Advisory Review Committee  
Meeting #3  
Thursday November 6, 2025




# Agenda

- Project Outline/Status
- Key Findings
- Timeline
- Next Steps
- Q&A



# TDP Major Update Outline & Status



*Length of color of bars indicates approximate level of completion* 100%



# Key Findings



# M Public Involvement Outreach Meetings & Events



## 102 Survey Distribution Touch Points


- Transit Stations, Park & Rides and Libraries, FIU Fair, and Miami Lakes Farmer’s Market

## 5 Stakeholder Committee Presentations

## 3 ARC Meetings

## 6 Pop Up Events (Locations in the table below.)

Planning Area	Meeting / Event Location	Date
Beach	Aventura Bus Terminal	Monday 10/20
Northwest	Hialeah Metrorail Station	Tuesday 10/21
North	North Corridor TOD Meeting	Wednesday 10/22
CBD	Stephen P Clark Center (Government Center)	Thursday 10/23
Central	Dadeland North Metrorail Station	Friday 10/24
South	Pinecrest Farmer’s Market	Sunday 10/26







# Chapter 2 – Public Involvement Process

## Pop-Up Events Input

What should be DTPW's priorities for the next 10 years?

Category	Ranking			Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	
Bus Stop Amenities	36	32	24	92
Expand Bus Service	46	28	17	91
More Rail Service	42	26	15	83
Safer Stops/Stations	34	29	18	81
Bike/Scooter Routes	22	20	16	58
Zero-Emission Vehicles	22	18	10	50



How would you rate the safety/security of public transportation stations?



# M Chapter 2 – Public Involvement Process

## 311 Feedback

During FY2024 (2024 Oct to 2025 Sep), 311 received **8,361** customer feedback entries for Transit:



### Source of Feedback

- 88% Metrobus
- 6% Metrorail
- 6% Contracted routes
- 1% Metromover


# Chapter 2 – Public Involvement Process

## Survey

Over 4900 Survey Responses Were Received – Sample Survey Question is Shown Below

**Takeaway:** *More frequent and efficient service along with an expanded service area may attract additional riders*



For what reasons are you not using/rarely using transit?  
(Check all that apply)



# M Chapter 2 – Public Involvement Process

## CITT Ambassador Program

Volunteer transit riders complete surveys to document their experiences – data from October 2024 – September 2025



# Chapter 2 – Public Involvement Process

## Preliminary Key Outreach Takeaways

### Key themes were heard across all outreach activities

- Improve transit service reliability
  - More frequent service
  - Faster service
- Riders generally feel safe
  - Targeted first/last mile improvements would improve perception of safety
  - One off experiences influence people’s perceptions of safety
- Enhance first/last mile connectivity
- 311 data points to a needed focus on improving the customer service experience
- Provide more amenities at transit stops to improve trip comfort
- Strong support for rapid transit service expansion – especially rail

*Input above is based on survey, ARC meetings, pop-up public meetings, CITT feedback and 311 data  
Final analysis will be provided at the 4<sup>th</sup> ARC meeting, based on final survey input*



# **Chapter 3 – Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process Coordination Program**

## **Key Takeaways**

*14-73.001, Part (3)(c): Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process Coordination Program. The TDP shall include a detailed coordination program defining collaborative participation and consistency in developing and implementing both the TDP and LRTP with the local Metropolitan Planning Organization, as well as other related MPO multi-modal planning and programming including the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), and Corridor Development Studies.*


### **Partner Collaboration is Strong – Examples include:**

- Interagency Coordination between DTPW and the TPO
  - Committees: TPC, TPTAC, LRTP, TIP
  - LRTP/TIP collaboration
  - UPWP Development
- Regional Mobility Partnerships
  - RTP, SoFloGo
- DTPW corridor and feasibility studies
  - SMART Program Corridors

# M Chapter 4 - Operating Environment




**Population Density**




Source: US Census Bureau - 2023 ACS 5-year Estimates

**Employment Density**



Source: US Census Bureau - LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (Beginning of Quarter Employment, 2nd Quarter of 2022)

**Zero-Vehicle Households**




Source: US Census Bureau - 2023 ACS 5-year Estimates

- Miami, Hialeah, and Miami Beach have high concentrations of population, employment, and Transit Dependent populations and should be considered for service expansion and infrastructure upgrades.
- The major job hubs in Miami-Dade County are in Aventura, the Civic Center/Health Center District, Downtown Miami, Miami Beach, Coconut Grove, Coral Gables, South Miami and Dadeland.

# Chapter 4 – Operating Environment

- FY 2024: Ridership surpassed pre-pandemic levels
  - 85.6 million boardings
  - 53% above FY 2019-2020
- FY 2022-2023 +39% YOY
- FY 2023-2024, +10% YOY
- Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) findings related to ridership will inform final recommendations

*DTPW Yearly Boardings from FY 2019-2020 to FY 2023-2024*



# Chapter 5 - Plans Overview

## Key Takeaways



### 44 Plans were reviewed

- Plans included federal, state, county and municipal plans

**Respective Plan goals are generally consistent with DTPW's mission, goals, and priorities as identified in the Strategic Plan:**

- Multimodal Connectivity and Safety
- Financial Sustainability
- Safety
- Limited inconsistencies between plan – ie potential inter-county connections



**FIVE-YEAR WORK PROGRAM**




# Chapter 6 – Land Use and Corridor Development Assessment

## Land Use Policy Initiatives Reviewed:

- Rapid Transit Zones:
  - County overlay district designed to synchronize land use planning with Miami-Dade’s rapid transit infrastructure
- Florida Enterprise Zone Program
  - State-designated areas that target economic revitalization in communities with high poverty and unemployment rates
- Miami-Dade County Qualified Opportunity Zones
  - Federally-designated areas aimed at stimulating long-term investment in economically distressed communities

## SMART Program Corridors are consistent with TDP & LRTP priorities

- Beach Corridor
- East-West Corridor
- Kendall Corridor
- North Corridor
- Northeast Corridor
- South Dade Transitway Corridor




# **Chapter 6 – Land Use and Corridor Development Assessment**

## **Key Takeaways**

### **Miami-Dade County's land use initiatives support multimodal transportation.**

- Land use and transportation planning are integrated - Rapid Transit Zones are an example
  - The strong TOD program aligns policy, infrastructure, and investment - TOD master plans are an example
  - The SMART Program integrates land use planning with the development of a premium transit network. Land use studies were done for each SMART Program corridor to promote TOD, first and last mile connectivity, and align zoning and density goals. This will maximize the effectiveness of transit infrastructure
  - Mobility hubs initiatives are moving forward – these facilitate transfers between transportation modes
- 

# M Timeline



## **Next Steps**

- Complete Modeling to estimate transit demand in 2035
- Develop Ten-Year Implementation Plan
  - Leverage observations from first six chapters and prioritize projects
  - Refine recommendations based on 2035 Transit Demand, Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) and Public Input
- 4<sup>th</sup> ARC Meeting: **Tentative Date Week of December 1**
  - **Recap the TDP Process**
  - **Review draft recommendations and the 10 Year Implementation Plan**
  - **Discuss TDP approval process**
  - **Address any additional ARC Feedback**

# Questions?

- **Project Contact Information**

DTPW Project Manager:

**Tewari Edmonson**

[Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov](mailto:Tewari.Edmonson@miamidade.gov)

Consultant Project Manager:

**Lynda Kompelien Westin, AICP**

[lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com](mailto:lynda.kompelienwestin@wsp.com)

- **Learn more about the TDP**

[www.miamidade.gov/global/transportation/mdt-ahead.page](http://www.miamidade.gov/global/transportation/mdt-ahead.page)

Submit Feedback to:

[MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov](mailto:MDT10Ahead@miamidade.gov)



## **APPENDIX C3: ARC MEETING MINUTES**

# Meeting Minutes

## Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update – ARC Meeting #1

Date: Monday, August 18, 2025

Time: 2:00 PM

Location: Hybrid – Online and In-Person: 701 NW 1st Court, 2nd Floor Training Room, Miami, FL 33136

Notes prepared by: TDP Consulting Team

### Attendees

#### Project Team:

- DTPW: Tewari Edmonson, Jorge Caballero
- Consultant Team:
  - WSP: Thomas Rodrigues, Chun Xu, Lynda Westin, Murriah Dekle (Online), David Wells (Online)
  - Caltran: Daniel Chacon, Juan Calderon (Online), Nicole Seiden (Online)
  - Kimley-Horn: Corinn Beem

#### Meeting Attendance

In-Person Committee Attendees		Online Committee Attendees	
1	Lisa Colmenares – DTPW	1	Hillary Jackson – Agency for Persons with Disabilities
2	Sean Adgeron – DTPW	2	Airia Austin – Opa-locka
3	Jason Lisewski – DTPW	3	Yenier Vega – Cutler Bay
4	Armando Gonzalez – DTPW	4	Amy Canales – City of Sunny Isles Beach
5	Wren Ruiz – Urban Health Partnerships	5	Kerrith Fiddler – North Miami
6	Charles Alfaro – City of Miami	6	Dionisio Torres – Palmetto Bay
7	Matt Anderson – Coral Gables	7	Chris Rosenberg – Miami-Dade TPO
8	Jeremy Mullings – South Florida Commuter Services	8	Lorena Puche – Downtown Miami DDA
9	Vinod Sandanasamy – MDC RER	9	Nicoll, Scott – DTPW
10	Julio Piti – MDBC	10	Andrea Melotti – Brightline
11	Franchesca Taylor – Miami-Dade TPO	11	Mikhail Ryabov – Miami Beach
12	Beth Goldsmith – DTPW	12	Arenes, German A. – DTPW
13	Fortuna Smukler – MDC LOC / City NMB Commissioner	13	Cathy Dos Santos – Transit Alliance Miami
14	Raymond Freeman – FDOT D6	14	Jessica Vargas – SFRTA/Tri-Rail
15	Bryan Eichler – MDC RER	15	Rafael G. Casals – Cutler Bay
16	Shang Yang – CTS	16	Yvon Mon – DTPW
17	Jessica J. Lopez – Miami-Dade TPO	17	Morris, Linda – DTPW
18	Jerry Jackson – Miami-Dade TPO	18	Alexander Orta – Alliance for Aging

<b>19</b> Jess Lim – MDC Housing	<b>19</b> Neal Schafers – Miami DDA
<b>20</b> Jose R. Gonzalez – City of Miami Beach	<b>20</b> Carlos Arroyo – Doral
	<b>21</b> David Mendez – Pinecrest
	<b>22</b> Cristina Brito – Brightline
	<b>23</b> Kiranmai Chirumamilla – CITT
	<b>24</b> Maria Teresita Vilches – Miami-Dade TPO
	<b>25</b> Kevin C Walford – Miami-Dade TPO
	<b>26</b> Jose Sanchez (COH) – Hialeah
	<b>27</b> Melissa Hege – CTAC

## Agenda

- TDP Project Overview & Major Update Components
- TDP Major Update Outline & Comprehensive Efforts
- Role of the Advisory Review Committee (ARC)
- Project Timeline & Next Steps
- Interactive Polling & Needs Assessment

## Discussion Summary

### 1. TDP Major Update Overview

**Presenters:** Lisa Colmenares, Tewari Edmonson, Thomas Rodrigues

**Purpose & Scope:** The TDP is a state-required 10-year strategic plan (FY 2016–2035). Required for state grant eligibility, updated every 5 years with interim updates annually. Must align with LRTP, TIP, and county capital plans.

**Stakeholder Involvement:** Lisa emphasized collaboration with municipalities, county departments, and partner agencies. Thomas highlighted the role of ARC members for expertise and insight.

**Process & Timeline:** Four advisory meetings over four months. Draft TDP due December 2025; final submission to FDOT by March 1, 2026.

**Document Structure:** Eight chapters covering public involvement, planning process, operating environment, land use, demand estimation, and 10-year program.

**Goal:** Data-driven, community-informed, regionally integrated.

### 2. Public Involvement & Outreach Strategy

**Surveys:** 15–17 questions, multilingual, distributed online/QR codes. Topics include satisfaction, safety, and improvement needs.


**Outreach Activities:** Farmers market outreach showed limited transit-user turnout. Future focus: transit hubs, community centers, libraries, special events.

**Committee Roles:** Assist in identifying public meetings and outreach opportunities.  
**Suggestions:** city commission meetings, senior centers, universities, utility bills for survey promotion.

**Target Audiences:** Commuters, seniors, disabled individuals, zero-car households, students, low-income populations.

### 3. Interactive Polling & Needs Assessment (Audience Participation)

**Practice question:** Tell us how you arrived today



**Question 1:** What are the most pressing transit service needs in your municipality/agency/region?



**Question 2:** Are there infrastructure or facility needs that should be addressed in the next 10 years?



**Question 3:** How can municipalities and regional partners work together to deliver service more effectively?

**Summary of the participant responses:**

- Enhanced Collaboration and Coordination
- Improved Communication and Public Engagement
- Strategic Funding and Resource Integration
- Connectivity and First/Last Mile Solutions
- Technology Integration and Real-Time Information

**Question 4:** What are your safety and security concerns about the existing transit network?

**Summary of the participant responses:**

- Crime and Personal Security
- Bike and Pedestrian Infrastructure
- Lighting and Environmental Protection
- Accessibility and Maintenance Issues

**Question 5:** What first/last mile connections would improve your agency/municipality's connectivity to the transit network?

**Summary of the participant responses:**

- Enhanced Bike Infrastructure
- Pedestrian Infrastructure and Safety
- Circulator and Shuttle Services
- Rideshare and On-Demand Mobility Options

**Question 6:** Where should we do outreach in your community/region?

**Summary of the participant responses**

- Transit-Related Locations
- Community Centers and Public Institutions
- Local Events and Gatherings
- Digital and Media Channels
- Other Public Spaces and Strategies

**Question 7:** Which groups should we prioritize outreach to in your community/region?

**Summary of the participant responses**

- Students and Educational Institutions
- Seniors, Elderly, and Disability Groups
- Low-Income and Transit-Dependent Population
- Major Employers and Workforce

**Project Timeline & Next Steps**

**Kickoff:** May 2025

**Outreach:** August – November 2025

**Draft TDP:** December 2025

**Final TDP** submission to FDOT: March 1, 2026

Four total advisory meetings planned, three more by end of 2025.

**Action Items**

- **Public Outreach Opportunities:** Schedule meetings with North Miami Beach, North Miami, Sunny Isles Beach, and Aventura municipal facilities; explore city commission meetings. (Project Team)
- **Survey Promotion via water utility bills:** Coordinate with county offices for inserts/messages in water and waste bills. (DTPW/Project Team)
- **CITT Ambassadors Program:** Reach out to CITT (Javier and Monica) to leverage ambassadors for outreach. (Project Team)
- **Distribution of Minutes:** Send meeting minutes to all ARC members, including online participants. (Project Team)

# **DTPW Transit Development Plan (TDP) 2026-2035 Major Update**

## **Advisory Review Committee (ARC) Meeting #2 Minutes**

**Date:** September 26, 2025

**Time:** 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

**Location:** 701 NW 1st Court, 2nd Floor Training Room, Miami, FL 33136 and Hybrid (via Microsoft Teams)

### **Attendees**

#### **In-Person:**

- Tewari Edmonson – Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW) (Presenter)
- Lisa Colmenares - DTPW
- Sean Adgerson - DTPW
- Beth Goldsmith – DTPW
- Malcolm Moyse Jr. – Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization (TPO)
- Karlene Peyton - Alliance for Aging, Inc.
- Barbara Suarez - Alliance for Aging, Inc.
- Noah Brown – South Florida Commuter Services (SFCS)
- Catherine Dos Santos – Transit Alliance Miami (TAM)
- Wren Ruiz – Urban Health Partnerships (UHP)
- Thomas Rodrigues – WSP (Presenter)
- Lynda Westin - WSP
- Chun Xu – WSP
- Daniel Chacon - Caltran
- Stevan Gonzalez - Caltran

#### **Online:**

- German A. Arenes – DTPW
- Quimet Custals – DTPW
- Jason Lisiewski – DTPW
- Scott Nicoll – DTPW
- Yvon Mon – DTPW
- Monica Cejas – CITT
- Vinod Sandanasamy – Department of Regulatory and Environmental Resources (RER)
- Kevin C. Walford – TPO
- Melissa Hege, TPO Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Jessica Vargas – SFRTA
- Airia Austin – City of Opa-locka
- Alfredo Quintero – Town of Cutler Bay
- Yenier Vega – Town of Cutler Bay
- Carlos Arroyo – City of Doral
- Jose Sanchez – City of Hialeah
- Neal Schafers – Miami DDA

- Delroy Peters – Village of Miami Shores
- Matthew Anderson - Mosaic Miami
- Gregory Christian - City of North Miami Beach
- Marjorie J. Edwards - City of North Miami Beach
- Nick Marano – Village of Palmetto Bay
- Daniela Garcia – Village of Pinecrest
- Jeremy Mullings, SFCS
- Amy Canales – City of Sunny Isles Beach
- James Fox – WSP
- David Wells - WSP
- Nicole Seiden – Caltran

## Agenda

- Welcome & Meeting Objectives
- Project Overview (FY 2026–2035 TDP) & Plan Requirements
- Chapter Status & Alignment with Partner Plans
- Current Conditions & Equity (ACS 2023)
- Safety & Security Deep Dive (NTD peer comparison)
- Public Involvement & Survey Insights
- Interactive Polling Session (4 questions)
- Timeline & Next Steps

## Discussion Summary (Presentation)

Tewari Edmonson welcomed attendees and outlined meeting objectives: provide an update on the TDP 2026–2035 Major Update, share safety and public involvement findings, and collect additional ARC feedback via an interactive session.

**Project Overview & Requirements:** The TDP is Miami-Dade’s state-required 10-year strategic plan (FY 2026–2035), necessary to maintain eligibility for approximately \$20 million annually in state block grants. The plan must be consistent with FDOT’s Work Program and STIP, and coordinated with regional/local plans (examples include but are not limited to TPO LRTP, CITT, SFRTA, Broward, and municipal comprehensive plans). Major updates occur every 5 years with annual updates.

**Plan Chapters & Status:** Eight chapters are being advanced in alignment with FDOT requirements. Introduction, Operating Environment, Relationship to Other Plans, and Public Involvement are well underway (≈60–90%). Transportation Coordination ≈70–80%. Demand Estimation is beginning; the 10-Year Operating & Capital Program will proceed post budget adoption and integration of final funding assumptions.

Current Conditions & Equity Analysis is part of the Operating Environment Analysis. Using 2023 ACS data, the team is able to see that transportation-disadvantaged populations (zero-car households, low-income, 65+, under 18) are concentrated in the City of Miami and Hialeah with pockets countywide. A gap analysis will compare existing services to these clusters to identify where to enhance service, coordinate with municipalities, or adjust coverage for overall system efficiency.

The team also reviewed the latest 2023 ACS data in detail to visualize the distribution of transportation-disadvantaged populations across Miami-Dade County. These findings support the upcoming gap analysis and will help prioritize areas where improved service coordination or municipal partnerships can better meet community needs. A draft Transportation Disadvantaged Populations map is shown below.




Figure 1. Transportation Disadvantaged Populations (ACS 2023)

**Plan Reviews & Consistency:** The team is reviewing DTPW, County, FDOT, regional (Broward/SFRTA/TPO), and municipal plans. The TDP will include a matrix showing how recommendations address multimodal connectivity, safety, and financial sustainability objectives across partner plans.

**Safety & Security (NTD Peer Comparison):** In response to ARC feedback, the team compared safety (accidents, injuries) and security (assaults, suicides, homicides, terrorism-related events) across peer agencies (Broward, Orlando, Chicago, Baltimore, Atlanta, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C.). Miami-Dade’s events per million unlinked passenger trips are among the lowest for Metrobus; heavy rail is comparable to peers. Post-COVID spikes have been trending downward with returning ridership.

**System Safety vs. Access Safety:** Survey results show roughly half of respondents rate the overall transit system as safe/very safe, while a smaller share rate the bike/walk access to stations as safe/very safe. This may indicate the need to prioritize first/last-mile safety (lighting, crossings, paths, station approaches).

**Public Involvement Survey:** >2,100 responses (growing toward ~3,000) and 700+ written comments to date. Outreach includes social media, partnerships (Transit Alliance, South Florida Commuter Services), and community events (FIU, Pinecrest Farmers Market), plus pop-ups at high-ridership stations in each of the six planning areas. 311 complaint data is being analyzed to complement the survey feedback.

Sample Survey Insights: “Why Riders Use Transit”: top reasons include lacking a car/driver’s license, avoiding congestion, convenience, and saving time/money; multilingual comments include affordability and event travel.

Sample Survey feedback covered all aspect: Operations—more routes/coverage, station/stop maintenance, first/last-mile connections, ADA, and connectivity were suggested. Customer Experience—adopt zero/reduced fares, increase safety perception, incorporate technology/real-time notifications, cleaner stations, improved customer service and staff training.


## **Q&A After Presentation**

- Cathy Dos Santos asked how “enhanced connectivity” is defined. Edmonson described the Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA), which discussed integration with municipal services to avoid duplication, and first/last-mile improvements (trails, bike/ped via Mobility Impact Fee) and services such as MetroConnect/Freebee.
- Malcolm Moyse Jr. emphasized educating the public on how to use transit and building a culture of transit from youth to adults; recommended a dedicated transit-only website and improved operator training for bus lanes and incident handling/customer service.
- Beth Goldsmith clarified ridership data: buses use Automated Passenger Counters (APCs) while rail uses tap data; ridership county methods vary by mode and meet federal reporting requirements.
- Sean Adgerson noted the County should focus on accurate, open data and let industry apps (Transit, Google, Apple) handle UX; the greater need is telling the story of affordability, safety, and cleanliness so people know where to find information.
- Monica Cejas highlighted the CITT Ambassador program/app that captures real-time rider feedback; among respondents, >95% report feeling safe. She offered to share KPIs and the master dataset with the team.

## Interactive Session

The interactive session was facilitated by David Wells with in-room moderation by Thomas Rodrigues. Participants used Poll Everywhere via QR Code/URL; a practice ranking question was followed by three questions on operational priorities, customer experience, and safety perception strategies.


### 1) Operational priorities (ranking):



Top results ( $\approx 25$  responses): expand rail service; increase frequency/reliability of buses and trains; enhance connectivity; improve infrastructure and maintenance (elevators, shelters, lighting); expand bus service; improve accessibility for seniors and people with disabilities.

Discussion highlights: Wren Ruiz observed rail ranked highest while bus expansion ranked lowest; Beth Goldsmith and Sean Adgeron noted cost/feasibility differences; Catherine Dos Santos asked about connectivity, leading to Edmonson's clarification on COA, municipal integration, and first/last-mile.

### 2) Customer service & experience priorities (ranking):



Preliminary Priorities ranking: technology/communication (real-time tracking, app improvements) led; followed by safety and security; customer service/staff training; cleanliness; affordability of fares.

Discussion highlights: Malcolm Moyse Jr. emphasized culture/education, dedicated website, and driver training; Beth Goldsmith reiterated data methods; Sean Adgerson emphasized open data and outreach; Wren Ruiz and Catherine Dos Santos recommended human-centered communications and better access to fare programs.

### 3) Strategies to improve perception of safety (open responses):



Common themes: increase visible security/ambassadors; improve lighting; cameras/call boxes; cleanliness/maintenance and landscaping; group walks/public realm activations; marketing with trusted partners/major events; grow ridership for safety in numbers.

### 4) First/Last Mile Connections (open discussion):

Participants discussed strategies to improve connectivity between local neighborhoods and the regional transit network. Many agreed that improved sidewalks, lighting, and protected bike lanes are essential to making walking or cycling to transit stations safer and more appealing.

Several members highlighted the importance of coordination with municipalities to expand programs like MetroConnect and Freebee to fill service gaps in areas with limited fixed-route coverage. Catherine Dos Santos emphasized that reliable first/last mile options are critical for riders who depend on transit for work and healthcare access.

Monica Cejas noted that the CITT Ambassador Program has identified frequent complaints related to poor pedestrian access and lack of real-time information about connecting services. Sean Adgerson added that technology integration, such as shared trip planning across transit and micro-mobility platforms, could significantly improve user experience.

Tewari Edmonson acknowledged these comments, emphasizing that the COA and the TDP Major Update are aligning to identify high-priority corridors where first/last mile investments can have the greatest impact.

## **Timeline & Next Steps**

- September–October 2025: finalize existing conditions; begin demand estimation and corridor development.
- Late October/Early November 2025: next ARC meeting.
- Early December 2025: final ARC meeting before submittal.
- Early 2026: present to Board of County Commissioners.
- March 1, 2026: submit final TDP Major Update to FDOT.

# **DTPW Transit Development Plan (TDP) 2026-2035 Major Update**

## **ARC Meeting Minutes #3**

**Date:** November 6, 2025

**Time:** 12:30 PM – 2:00 PM

**Location:** 701 NW 1st Court, 2nd Floor Training Room, Miami, FL 33136 and Hybrid (via Microsoft Teams)

**Prepared by:** Caltran Group

## **Attendees**

### **Project Team:**

- DTPW: Tewari Edmonson
- WSP: Linda Westin, Chun Xu
- Caltran Engineering Group: Stevan Gonzalez

### **In-Person**

- Ilona Vega (Miami-Dade Beacon Council)
- Raymond Freeman (FDOT D6)
- Beth Goldsmith (DTPW)
- Corinn Beem (Kimley-Horn)
- Jorge Caballero (DTPW)
- Sean Adgerson (DTPW)

### **Online:**

- Alfredo Quintero (Cutler Bay)
- Amy Canales (Sunny Isles Beach)
- Andre Eugent (Surfside)
- Camela Glean-Jones (Beacon Council)
- Choueiry, Ghassan (Miami Beach)
- Comm'r Fortuna Smukler (Miami-Dade League of Cities)
- Delroy Peters (Miami Shores Village)
- Dionisio Torres (Palmetto Bay)
- Frank V Ruiz (Miami Shores Village)
- Jeremy Mullings (South Florida Commuter Services)
- Jessica Vargas (SFRTA)
- Karlene Peyton (Alliance For Aging)
- Linn, Jess (Miami-Dade County)
- Lorfils, John (City of North Miami)
- Maria Lorena Puche (Miami DDA)

- Mayra Diaz (GMX)
- Michael Lefevre (Brightline)
- Muntan, Eric (DTPW)
- Newsome, Amina N (Miami-Dade County)
- Noah Brown (South Florida Commuter Services)
- Rick Beasley (CareerSource South Florida)
- Tala Habash (Tranist Alliance)
- Teipel, Katherine (Miami Beach)
- Wren Ruiz (Urban Health Partnerships)

## 1. Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update

DTPW hosted the third Advisory Review Committee (ARC) meeting to present key findings and progress on the TDP Major Update. Tewari Edmonson (DTPW) led the presentation, focusing on tangible outcomes to date, near-term milestones, and the path to submitting a draft TDP to FDOT by late January.

## 2. Key Topics Covered

- **Project Status:** Most chapters are substantially complete (Intro, Public Involvement, MPO/TPO coordination, Operating Environment, Plans Review). Remaining work centers on the 10-year operating & capital program and ridership demand estimation.
  - **Public Outreach:** 102+ survey touchpoints across six planning areas (stations, park-and-rides, libraries, pop-ups), plus committee presentations.
  - **Survey Results:** Top priorities—bus stop amenities and expanded bus service. Most respondents reported feeling safe or neutral at stations; station access/first-last mile emerged as a concern.
  - **311 Feedback:** As expected, mostly complaints. Dominant themes: on-time performance (buses not showing/late) and operator behavior. Findings are being integrated alongside outreach results.
  - **CITT Ambassador Program:** Majority report excellent/acceptable experiences and feeling safe; DTPW is drilling into the small share of “unsafe” reports by route/time of day.
  - **Regional Coordination:** Strong alignment with TPO processes (TIP/LRTP), SEFTC/RTP collaboration, and tools like SoFloGo.
  - **Operating Environment:** Density maps for population, employment, and zero-vehicle households reviewed to guide priorities.
  - **Ridership Trends:** System ridership has surpassed 2019 (pre-pandemic) levels; growth attributed to the Better Bus Network and weekend service investments.
  - **Land Use & Corridor Development:** SMART corridors, RTZ/TOD policies, and station-area plans are coordinated with TDP/LRTP objectives.
- ### 3. Public Involvement Highlights

- Public engagement efforts included surveys, community events, and analysis of 311 feedback. DTPW collected over 4,900 survey responses. Pop-up events reached all six planning areas. Feedback emphasized the need for better frequency, safety, amenities, and improved service experience.

### 3. Public Involvement Highlights

- Public engagement activities included outreach at stations, community events, and committee meetings, along with evaluation of 311 and CITT Ambassador feedback.
- Over 4,900 survey responses were received. Results emphasized the need for more frequent service, better safety, enhanced bus stop amenities, and improved customer experience.
- Respondents who do not currently use transit cited long travel times and infrequent service as key barriers.
- Ambassador and 311 data confirmed the need to enhance customer service training, prioritize lighting improvements, and strengthen access to transit stations.

### 4. Questions and Discussion

- FDOT (Raymond Freeman): Recommended more southern outreach (Palmetto Bay to Homestead) recognizing growth trends; requested the Dade-Monroe Express be analyzed for demand and cost-sharing/coordination with Monroe County given its essential role (Florida City ↔ Upper Keys workforce).
- DTPW (T. Edmonson): Agreed to scrutinize Dade-Monroe Express in the demand analysis and include a coordination recommendation with Monroe County on funding and service needs.
- Beacon Council (Ilona Vega): Asked about the ~50% ridership increase and encouraged minimizing acronyms for broader audiences.
- DTPW (T. Edmonson / S. Adgerson): Growth driven by the network redesign shifting to 15-minute corridors, plus weekend upgrades; next steps include improving access via municipal circulators as feeders to the high-frequency network.
- General Discussion: Emphasis on aligning municipal circulators, improving first-last mile safety/lighting, communicating safety data to address perception gaps, and continuing data-driven COA integration.

### 5. Next Steps

- Finalize demand modeling and integrate findings from the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA).
- Complete the 10-year capital and operating plan for submission.
- Submit draft TDP to FDOT for review by January 2026.
- Schedule the final ARC meeting for early December or early January to finalize recommendations and discuss adoption steps.

Appendix D

Transit Development Plan Submission Items



**APPENDIX D1: MIAMI-DADE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY  
COMMISSIONERS TDP APPROVAL AGENDA ITEM**

PENDING

**APPENDIX D2: MIAMI-DADE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION  
PLANNING ORGANIZATION TDP HEARING ITEM**

PENDING

**APPENDIX D3: TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN TRANSMITTAL  
LETTER TO FDOT**

PENDING

## **APPENDIX D4: FDOT ACCEPTANCE LETTER**

PENDING

This page is intentionally left blank.

# Appendix E

# Project Prioritization Modeling



**APPENDIX E1: FDOT APPROVAL OF SERPM REGIONAL  
MODEL**



*Florida Department of Transportation*

RON DESANTIS  
GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

JARED W. PERDUE, P.E.  
SECRETARY

September 30, 2025

Mr. Tewari Edmonson  
Systems Planning Manager  
Miami-Dade Department of Transportation and Public Works  
701 NW 1<sup>st</sup> Court, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Miami, FL 33136

Re: Approval to use SERPM 9.0 for Miami-Dade DTPW 2025 Transit Development Plan (TDP)  
Major Update

Dear Mr. Edmonson:

The Modal Development Office (MDO) has received your request for Miami-Dade Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW) to utilize the Southeast Florida Regional Planning Model (SERPM) Version 9 for developing ridership estimates in support of the 2026-2035 Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update.

Upon review of the request and the information provided, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District Six MDO approves DTPW to use the SERPM Version 9 for the 2025 TDP Major Update.

Feel free to contact me at 305-640-7557 if you have any additional concerns.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:  
  
B723CBBF130045E...

Nilia Cartaya, AICP  
Modal Development Administrator

cc: Lisa Colmenares, DPA, AICP, Chief Planning Officer, DTPW  
Raymond Freeman, Passenger Operations Manager, FDOT  
Simon Huang, Passenger Operations Specialist IV

## **APPENDIX E2: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION TABLES**



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

## 2026 Scenario – Miami-Dade County

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>Miami-Dade County</b>	2,863,376	1,470,480	41,196,600	1,986,196	55,245,480	175,892	7,508,884	2.0%	28.5	5.6%	7.7	16.4
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	403,580	158,332	4,377,032	226,588	6,211,280	32,244	898,948	3.0%	27.7	X	6.5	14.2
\$25,001-\$50,000	474,796	213,096	5,942,688	304,528	8,424,276	38,148	1,184,884	2.7%	28.3	X	7.1	15.1
\$50,001-\$75,000	435,004	224,940	6,316,616	303,104	8,453,612	25,368	1,167,156	1.9%	28.5	X	7.5	15.9
\$75,001-\$100,000	332,824	182,724	5,162,324	240,948	6,758,808	16,960	905,952	1.7%	28.8	X	7.9	16.6
\$100,001 or More	1,217,172	691,400	19,397,956	911,044	25,397,520	63,172	3,351,944	1.7%	28.6	X	8.1	17.0
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	481,432	56,772	1,510,320	178,168	4,660,980	14,512	707,332	1.2%	25.7	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	302,324	151,228	4,226,120	211,480	5,864,988	26,864	832,628	2.8%	28.0	X	7.5	15.9
25 to 34 Years	418,504	279,184	7,874,240	346,028	9,723,956	31,592	1,262,728	2.3%	28.8	X	7.6	16.1
35 to 44 Years	375,904	261,464	7,351,324	329,704	9,246,560	27,364	1,213,100	2.1%	28.7	X	7.8	16.4
45 to 54 Years	425,512	287,712	8,080,572	360,472	10,101,444	29,992	1,318,008	2.1%	28.7	X	7.9	16.7
55 to 64 Years	364,596	233,348	6,569,356	291,356	8,179,636	25,652	1,088,220	2.2%	28.7	X	7.8	16.5
65 Years and Over	495,104	200,796	5,584,688	269,008	7,467,940	19,916	1,086,868	1.7%	28.3	X	7.6	16.3
Car Ownership												
0	187,640	29,456	821,684	88,688	2,390,708	65,968	241,292	14.5%	28.6	X	6.1	13.3
1	831,352	425,660	11,777,736	550,032	15,112,512	42,288	2,151,508	1.7%	28.3	X	7.2	15.3
2	1,076,276	596,960	16,772,812	788,924	22,038,332	36,824	3,016,284	1.1%	28.5	X	8.0	16.8
3+	768,108	418,416	11,824,380	558,568	15,703,940	30,812	2,099,800	1.3%	28.7	X	8.2	17.2
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	1,618,420	705,876	19,828,520	1,019,924	28,365,992	141,876	3,777,720	3.2%	28.5	X	7.7	16.3
1	1,151,276	700,004	19,553,688	887,288	24,670,912	31,076	3,433,516	0.8%	28.5	X	7.8	16.4
>1	93,680	64,608	1,814,396	78,996	2,208,584	2,940	297,648	0.9%	28.7	X	7.9	16.7



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2026 Scenario – Beach Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>BEACH</b>	247,420	105,644	2,855,212	145,500	3,908,492	19,200	551,288	2.9%	27.6	6.2%	6.7	14.8
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	30,296	9,784	259,496	14,252	375,740	3,404	55,288	4.9%	26.9	X	5.3	12.1
\$25,001-\$50,000	38,112	13,884	371,544	20,928	556,028	4,976	78,216	5.0%	27.2	X	5.9	13.2
\$50,001-\$75,000	35,848	15,584	420,428	21,656	580,168	2,852	81,392	2.9%	27.4	X	6.4	14.2
\$75,001-\$100,000	28,232	12,712	343,164	16,860	452,292	1,772	65,756	2.3%	27.6	X	6.4	14.3
\$100,001 or More	114,932	53,696	1,460,596	71,820	1,944,280	6,196	270,636	2.0%	27.8	X	7.3	15.8
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	39,608	4,524	115,788	14,668	371,120	1,360	50,008	1.5%	25.5	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	21,340	8,752	235,124	13,016	348,372	2,240	48,200	3.7%	27.1	X	5.7	13.1
25 to 34 Years	35,608	19,408	530,936	24,144	658,088	3,260	90,580	3.2%	28.0	X	6.7	14.6
35 to 44 Years	32,680	18,024	489,936	22,996	624,156	3,168	87,388	3.3%	27.8	X	6.8	15.0
45 to 54 Years	37,272	19,796	536,448	25,176	681,400	3,236	95,572	3.1%	27.5	X	6.8	15.0
55 to 64 Years	31,460	16,576	449,708	20,832	565,092	2,708	79,904	3.1%	27.6	X	7.0	15.3
65 Years and Over	49,452	18,584	497,300	24,700	660,284	3,228	99,636	3.0%	27.6	X	6.5	14.5
Car Ownership												
0	21,804	3,024	82,068	9,744	257,184	9,964	23,148	20.9%	27.9	X	6.0	13.6
1	90,124	42,456	1,141,536	53,840	1,439,872	4,204	212,832	1.7%	27.5	X	6.4	14.3
2	85,300	40,092	1,086,292	53,260	1,437,472	2,700	207,004	1.1%	27.7	X	6.9	15.2
3+	50,192	20,080	545,328	28,672	773,976	2,332	108,304	1.8%	27.5	X	7.1	15.6
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	135,196	46,612	1,260,984	71,988	1,930,356	17,104	257,824	5.2%	27.5	X	6.8	14.9
1	103,996	54,224	1,463,904	67,752	1,822,728	1,916	270,556	0.6%	27.7	X	6.7	14.7
>1	8,228	4,816	130,332	5,768	155,416	180	22,908	0.7%	27.4	X	6.6	14.5



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2026 Scenario – CBD Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>CBD</b>	498,272	223,088	5,829,308	316,140	8,127,700	62,840	1,191,184	4.0%	27.5	6.7%	6.0	13.4
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	85,292	30,276	783,264	44,664	1,138,704	10,776	177,412	4.7%	26.8	X	5.2	12.0
\$25,001-\$50,000	89,964	35,872	928,788	53,732	1,370,184	12,200	204,624	4.5%	27.1	X	5.5	12.7
\$50,001-\$75,000	74,240	35,404	928,192	49,292	1,272,840	8,712	187,964	3.6%	27.4	X	6.0	13.5
\$75,001-\$100,000	55,628	27,128	712,216	37,448	968,152	6,212	141,060	3.5%	27.9	X	6.2	13.9
\$100,001 or More	193,148	94,424	2,476,864	131,020	3,377,840	24,940	480,124	3.9%	27.7	X	6.1	13.7
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	73,972	8,136	201,628	24,912	600,940	6,492	97,068	3.6%	24.3	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	46,020	18,172	472,656	28,340	719,248	6,516	103,184	4.3%	27.1	X	5.9	13.1
25 to 34 Years	85,612	48,580	1,283,776	63,504	1,652,760	12,160	232,560	4.0%	27.9	X	5.8	12.9
35 to 44 Years	70,828	41,968	1,101,532	55,836	1,449,412	11,208	207,500	4.4%	27.6	X	6.1	13.6
45 to 54 Years	74,820	43,224	1,128,572	57,176	1,478,928	11,196	212,556	4.3%	27.6	X	6.1	13.8
55 to 64 Years	61,960	33,028	864,708	44,224	1,144,768	8,944	168,304	4.4%	27.7	X	6.0	13.5
65 Years and Over	85,060	30,008	776,464	42,168	1,081,668	6,324	170,012	3.1%	27.3	X	5.9	13.4
Car Ownership												
0	57,968	6,984	187,512	23,652	595,968	22,740	56,932	14.9%	28.7	X	4.4	10.2
1	188,076	90,128	2,362,904	119,288	3,077,600	19,492	464,792	3.3%	27.6	X	5.7	12.9
2	150,868	78,276	2,033,840	106,052	2,724,184	12,016	413,072	2.4%	27.3	X	6.4	14.4
3+	101,360	47,712	1,245,064	67,160	1,729,964	8,592	256,388	2.8%	27.5	X	6.5	14.6
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	314,412	112,904	2,963,708	176,780	4,541,148	48,416	638,252	5.4%	27.7	X	5.8	13.1
1	171,704	101,960	2,649,944	129,216	3,323,536	13,328	513,440	2.2%	27.3	X	6.1	13.7
>1	12,156	8,232	215,664	10,152	263,024	1,096	39,492	2.4%	27.4	X	6.2	13.9



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2026 Scenario – Central Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>CENTRAL</b>	659,796	400,988	10,898,612	525,708	14,249,068	32,640	1,968,980	1.5%	27.6	7.9%	8.0	17.2
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	83,120	39,620	1,069,208	54,372	1,459,896	6,468	210,636	2.6%	26.9	X	6.9	15.5
\$25,001-\$50,000	89,252	48,652	1,317,000	66,528	1,796,628	6,008	254,432	2.1%	27.4	X	7.5	16.4
\$50,001-\$75,000	89,800	54,664	1,484,812	71,440	1,936,192	4,564	271,328	1.5%	27.5	X	7.8	16.9
\$75,001-\$100,000	77,792	49,344	1,347,672	63,848	1,739,876	2,916	239,580	1.1%	27.6	X	8.0	17.3
\$100,001 or More	319,832	208,724	5,679,932	269,536	7,316,496	12,684	993,004	1.2%	27.7	X	8.1	17.6
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	100,380	13,288	346,900	40,668	1,052,128	1,572	161,672	0.6%	25.6	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	74,944	43,712	1,176,304	59,368	1,590,300	7,252	236,264	2.7%	26.8	X	7.5	16.4
25 to 34 Years	91,248	72,804	1,985,600	87,992	2,400,616	5,140	315,332	1.5%	27.8	X	8.0	17.2
35 to 44 Years	83,504	69,460	1,887,864	85,336	2,319,704	4,492	308,008	1.4%	27.7	X	8.0	17.4
45 to 54 Years	98,344	78,496	2,143,060	96,592	2,639,252	5,652	346,228	1.6%	27.9	X	8.1	17.5
55 to 64 Years	86,852	65,844	1,797,292	80,188	2,189,204	4,856	296,112	1.6%	27.7	X	7.9	17.1
65 Years and Over	124,524	57,404	1,561,620	75,588	2,057,888	3,676	305,364	1.2%	27.5	X	7.7	16.7
Car Ownership												
0	32,548	6,736	183,608	18,836	502,448	11,828	52,164	13.7%	27.5	X	7.3	15.9
1	170,672	104,900	2,838,732	131,284	3,543,016	6,580	502,904	1.2%	27.5	X	7.7	16.9
2	260,088	165,320	4,488,616	214,172	5,801,820	7,628	809,896	0.9%	27.6	X	7.9	17.2
3+	196,488	124,044	3,387,664	161,428	4,401,796	6,604	604,016	1.0%	27.7	X	8.2	17.6
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	357,320	189,904	5,196,808	263,128	7,168,088	26,344	967,968	2.4%	27.7	X	8.1	17.4
1	277,144	191,784	5,180,396	239,084	6,446,608	5,644	913,804	0.6%	27.5	X	7.8	17.0
>1	25,332	19,304	521,412	23,504	634,380	652	87,208	0.7%	27.7	X	7.9	17.2



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2026 Scenario – North Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>NORTH</b>	430,340	165,124	4,618,304	233,944	6,533,016	22,076	914,364	2.1%	28.2	3.8%	7.5	15.9
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	68,280	22,920	636,200	34,080	942,336	4,696	136,104	2.8%	27.6	X	6.7	14.6
\$25,001-\$50,000	85,480	31,500	877,768	46,536	1,294,156	5,440	183,952	2.5%	28.0	X	7.0	15.0
\$50,001-\$75,000	74,092	29,528	826,480	41,332	1,155,948	3,388	162,920	1.8%	28.2	X	7.4	15.7
\$75,001-\$100,000	53,392	21,352	600,208	29,840	837,436	2,268	114,960	1.7%	28.3	X	7.6	16.1
\$100,001 or More	149,096	59,844	1,677,664	82,176	2,303,156	6,284	316,428	1.8%	28.4	X	7.8	16.4
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	79,764	8,372	222,856	27,144	717,280	2,176	106,376	1.2%	26.0	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	49,668	19,188	533,892	27,784	772,872	3,944	116,176	2.9%	27.6	X	7.1	15.3
25 to 34 Years	64,240	31,096	873,740	39,944	1,125,240	3,988	152,240	2.5%	28.5	X	7.5	15.8
35 to 44 Years	54,120	27,016	757,572	35,128	989,520	3,000	134,904	2.1%	28.3	X	7.5	15.8
45 to 54 Years	57,820	28,444	796,852	36,720	1,032,524	3,360	139,576	2.3%	28.4	X	7.6	16.1
55 to 64 Years	54,972	26,812	754,284	34,444	973,512	3,160	132,136	2.3%	28.5	X	7.5	15.9
65 Years and Over	69,756	24,220	679,136	32,800	922,092	2,448	132,956	1.8%	28.4	X	7.5	15.9
Car Ownership												
0	24,388	3,612	101,676	10,636	295,756	8,580	30,112	16.7%	28.0	X	7.3	15.4
1	118,640	48,404	1,342,672	65,132	1,802,552	4,424	259,040	1.5%	27.9	X	7.2	15.5
2	162,792	65,536	1,833,856	90,852	2,537,528	4,384	361,072	1.1%	28.2	X	7.5	15.9
3+	124,520	47,584	1,340,116	67,336	1,897,188	4,688	264,140	1.6%	28.5	X	7.7	16.2
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	250,008	82,340	2,312,700	125,128	3,507,512	18,980	480,108	3.4%	28.3	X	7.6	16.1
1	167,576	76,280	2,122,476	100,724	2,798,044	2,808	402,348	0.6%	28.1	X	7.3	15.6
>1	12,756	6,512	183,136	8,104	227,468	288	31,908	0.8%	28.5	X	7.4	15.5



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2026 Scenario – Northwest Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>NORTHWEST</b>	472,552	225,588	6,275,284	307,048	8,531,636	16,324	1,222,772	1.2%	28.4	3.6%	7.4	15.8
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	66,620	25,564	700,728	36,276	991,416	3,172	147,908	1.9%	27.6	X	6.6	14.5
\$25,001-\$50,000	83,952	37,016	1,018,092	52,580	1,444,448	4,556	214,428	1.9%	28.0	X	6.9	14.8
\$50,001-\$75,000	77,344	37,748	1,046,364	51,228	1,418,524	2,560	208,428	1.1%	28.2	X	7.2	15.4
\$75,001-\$100,000	51,792	26,764	748,144	35,328	986,632	1,332	140,228	0.9%	28.6	X	7.4	15.8
\$100,001 or More	192,844	98,516	2,761,968	131,656	3,690,628	4,704	511,780	0.8%	28.6	X	7.7	16.4
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	76,192	8,608	231,092	26,388	696,424	960	114,396	0.5%	25.6	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	49,756	23,448	652,692	32,472	904,568	2,696	137,004	1.8%	28.0	X	7.2	15.4
25 to 34 Years	64,016	39,808	1,110,852	49,540	1,384,696	2,652	190,796	1.3%	28.7	X	7.3	15.6
35 to 44 Years	62,272	40,212	1,121,972	51,932	1,454,860	2,304	201,068	1.1%	28.6	X	7.4	15.8
45 to 54 Years	76,800	47,096	1,311,976	59,792	1,670,228	3,164	229,356	1.3%	28.5	X	7.5	16.0
55 to 64 Years	61,016	36,040	1,003,740	45,548	1,271,312	2,484	178,200	1.3%	28.6	X	7.4	15.7
65 Years and Over	82,500	30,396	842,980	41,396	1,149,572	2,064	171,952	1.1%	28.1	X	7.4	16.0
Car Ownership												
0	28,988	4,948	137,560	13,832	379,712	6,928	42,656	10.7%	28.1	X	7.0	15.0
1	140,352	67,688	1,871,924	88,376	2,440,408	3,172	360,836	0.8%	28.2	X	7.2	15.4
2	173,376	87,668	2,442,468	117,012	3,256,436	3,008	470,124	0.6%	28.4	X	7.5	15.9
3+	129,836	65,296	1,823,344	87,840	2,455,088	3,216	349,156	0.9%	28.5	X	7.6	16.1
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	287,784	122,072	3,398,408	174,648	4,854,252	14,656	688,640	1.9%	28.4	X	7.4	15.8
1	172,912	96,192	2,672,904	123,312	3,424,444	1,584	498,260	0.3%	28.4	X	7.4	15.8
>1	11,856	7,336	203,980	9,100	252,948	84	35,872	0.2%	28.5	X	7.4	15.8



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2026 Scenario – South Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>SOUTH</b>	552,912	346,632	10,640,560	453,072	13,784,492	22,812	1,655,608	1.3%	30.4	5.2%	9.8	19.0
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	69,720	29,724	916,820	42,320	1,287,908	3,728	170,972	1.9%	29.9	X	8.1	16.0
\$25,001-\$50,000	87,756	45,804	1,420,832	63,576	1,947,724	4,968	248,560	1.8%	30.4	X	9.0	17.3
\$50,001-\$75,000	83,412	51,504	1,598,408	67,492	2,074,392	3,292	254,384	1.2%	30.7	X	9.5	18.4
\$75,001-\$100,000	65,660	44,912	1,398,388	56,968	1,758,516	2,460	203,748	1.1%	31.0	X	10.1	19.4
\$100,001 or More	246,364	174,708	5,306,128	222,728	6,715,968	8,364	777,944	1.0%	30.3	X	10.0	19.7
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	111,324	13,748	389,604	43,988	1,213,752	1,952	177,568	0.7%	26.3	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	60,212	37,320	1,140,308	49,636	1,508,952	4,216	191,000	2.1%	29.8	X	9.5	18.4
25 to 34 Years	77,380	66,660	2,069,464	79,900	2,478,452	4,392	280,180	1.5%	30.9	X	9.7	18.8
35 to 44 Years	72,304	64,416	1,983,460	77,964	2,396,572	3,192	273,588	1.1%	30.7	X	9.8	19.0
45 to 54 Years	80,080	70,052	2,149,916	84,192	2,580,460	3,384	293,816	1.1%	30.6	X	9.8	19.2
55 to 64 Years	68,020	54,552	1,687,604	65,424	2,019,044	3,500	232,868	1.5%	30.8	X	9.8	19.0
65 Years and Over	83,592	39,904	1,220,232	51,992	1,587,284	2,176	206,588	1.0%	30.4	X	9.9	19.4
Car Ownership												
0	21,860	4,104	127,764	11,824	355,400	5,928	36,096	11.1%	30.6	X	9.0	17.6
1	123,148	71,556	2,207,200	91,452	2,793,340	4,416	350,404	1.1%	30.6	X	9.4	18.2
2	243,072	158,732	4,856,424	205,692	6,236,928	7,088	753,220	0.9%	30.4	X	9.7	19.0
3+	164,832	112,256	3,449,184	144,120	4,398,836	5,380	515,888	1.0%	30.5	X	10.1	19.5
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	272,200	149,888	4,645,876	205,144	6,292,492	16,376	741,924	2.0%	30.6	X	9.9	19.2
1	257,380	178,328	5,434,856	225,548	6,816,700	5,796	833,432	0.6%	30.3	X	9.6	18.8
>1	23,332	18,424	559,836	22,388	675,308	640	80,252	0.7%	30.3	X	9.7	19.1



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2035 Scenario – Miami-Dade County

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>MD County</b>	3,071,080	1,635,240	44,279,664	2,220,816	59,719,356	207,500	8,075,652	2.2%	27.5	7.1%	7.7	16.9
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	463,752	186,020	4,990,512	269,244	7,170,716	35,760	1,030,756	2.9%	26.9	X	6.6	14.7
\$25,001-\$50,000	508,848	236,896	6,402,876	339,988	9,114,512	42,332	1,270,856	2.8%	27.2	X	7.1	15.7
\$50,001-\$75,000	433,360	232,896	6,308,928	314,956	8,478,312	27,780	1,159,928	2.1%	27.5	X	7.5	16.4
\$75,001-\$100,000	329,164	188,656	5,134,216	249,980	6,755,680	19,928	902,792	1.9%	27.7	X	7.9	17.1
\$100,001 or More	1,335,956	790,788	21,443,148	1,046,668	28,200,148	81,700	3,711,320	1.9%	27.6	X	8.0	17.5
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	490,748	60,712	1,559,648	190,412	4,815,012	19,456	726,048	1.6%	25.0	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	315,232	160,448	4,328,044	227,576	6,082,420	34,336	852,968	3.4%	27.0	X	7.5	16.5
25 to 34 Years	442,996	305,960	8,321,972	383,068	10,383,388	35,756	1,341,976	2.4%	27.6	X	7.6	16.7
35 to 44 Years	397,872	285,384	7,747,520	362,688	9,825,820	31,084	1,286,196	2.2%	27.6	X	7.7	16.9
45 to 54 Years	460,276	323,144	8,767,336	407,064	11,021,200	35,436	1,430,188	2.3%	27.7	X	7.8	17.1
55 to 64 Years	398,692	263,988	7,189,928	331,936	9,018,628	29,060	1,195,584	2.3%	27.7	X	7.8	17.2
65 Years and Over	565,264	235,628	6,365,240	318,096	8,572,912	22,372	1,242,692	1.7%	27.5	X	7.4	16.4
Car Ownership												
0	210,480	32,724	882,288	99,228	2,587,532	69,472	265,372	13.8%	27.5	X	6.0	13.7
1	903,440	468,200	12,525,308	613,476	16,301,488	51,276	2,313,120	1.9%	27.3	X	7.1	15.8
2	1,140,164	659,676	17,920,116	875,640	23,660,524	47,324	3,217,720	1.3%	27.5	X	7.9	17.3
3+	816,996	474,652	12,951,964	632,488	17,169,820	39,428	2,279,440	1.6%	27.6	X	8.2	17.8
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	1,712,900	778,116	21,078,632	1,128,020	30,263,704	165,652	4,010,904	3.5%	27.5	X	7.6	16.7
1	1,260,440	788,088	21,330,852	1,007,352	27,149,200	38,452	3,755,064	0.9%	27.4	X	7.8	17.0
>1	97,740	69,044	1,870,188	85,452	2,306,460	3,396	309,684	1.0%	27.5	X	8.0	17.5



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2035 Scenario – Beach Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>BEACH</b>	259,024	111,188	2,904,096	155,416	4,041,508	20,452	564,876	3.0%	26.7	7.2%	6.6	15.2
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	30,456	10,396	268,136	14,792	380,260	2,988	55,352	4.4%	26.2	X	5.5	12.9
\$25,001-\$50,000	36,208	13,828	357,380	20,660	530,784	4,396	75,368	4.6%	26.1	X	5.8	13.5
\$50,001-\$75,000	34,252	15,088	391,936	21,152	547,404	2,692	76,576	2.9%	26.5	X	6.4	14.8
\$75,001-\$100,000	30,472	13,160	346,152	18,212	475,652	2,332	67,688	2.9%	26.8	X	6.4	14.5
\$100,001 or More	127,636	58,732	1,540,508	80,616	2,107,424	8,044	289,892	2.4%	26.8	X	7.1	16.0
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	39,372	4,948	123,108	15,580	382,824	1,288	51,464	1.4%	25.0	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	24,484	9,668	251,368	15,036	389,452	2,572	53,120	3.7%	25.9	X	5.7	13.3
25 to 34 Years	36,860	19,444	512,104	24,708	649,920	3,448	88,348	3.4%	27.0	X	6.7	15.1
35 to 44 Years	32,928	18,264	477,960	23,536	615,636	3,004	85,996	3.1%	26.8	X	6.6	15.1
45 to 54 Years	40,916	21,668	568,924	28,188	740,284	4,236	101,192	3.7%	26.9	X	6.9	15.7
55 to 64 Years	32,500	17,340	453,872	22,124	580,300	2,836	82,348	3.1%	26.7	X	6.7	15.3
65 Years and Over	51,964	19,876	516,788	26,268	683,116	3,068	102,408	2.7%	26.6	X	6.3	14.7
Car Ownership												
0	21,524	2,768	72,736	9,468	243,208	9,556	21,476	20.5%	27.3	X	5.9	13.5
1	88,620	42,632	1,107,812	54,108	1,400,268	4,036	205,600	1.7%	26.6	X	6.5	14.8
2	84,976	40,320	1,057,204	54,264	1,418,044	3,352	202,060	1.4%	26.7	X	6.8	15.5
3+	63,904	25,480	666,356	37,588	980,000	3,508	135,740	2.1%	26.6	X	6.9	15.6
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	156,120	54,548	1,428,044	85,068	2,211,952	18,488	294,100	4.9%	26.7	X	6.6	15.1
1	95,852	52,028	1,355,888	64,904	1,687,872	1,800	249,980	0.6%	26.7	X	6.7	15.2
>1	7,052	4,620	120,176	5,452	141,692	164	20,796	0.7%	26.4	X	6.7	15.3



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2035 Scenario – Central Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>CENTRAL</b>	706,424	444,032	11,648,904	587,412	15,366,748	42,620	2,099,764	1.8%	26.6	9.6%	8.0	18.0
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	103,088	48,876	1,272,720	68,720	1,780,316	8,640	256,396	2.9%	26.0	X	6.9	16.0
\$25,001-\$50,000	104,876	57,984	1,514,996	80,296	2,091,748	7,800	295,512	2.3%	26.2	X	7.4	17.1
\$50,001-\$75,000	90,936	58,368	1,534,788	76,704	2,013,496	5,352	275,564	1.8%	26.6	X	7.8	17.6
\$75,001-\$100,000	76,200	50,972	1,342,760	66,284	1,741,964	3,956	236,656	1.5%	26.7	X	8.2	18.2
\$100,001 or More	331,324	227,844	5,983,656	295,420	7,739,236	16,872	1,035,636	1.5%	26.7	X	8.2	18.3
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	106,300	14,452	365,724	44,852	1,122,852	2,340	170,608	0.8%	25.0	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	77,596	46,780	1,214,860	64,296	1,657,912	10,696	239,132	3.8%	25.9	X	7.7	17.4
25 to 34 Years	97,380	79,600	2,090,520	97,592	2,561,620	6,864	333,416	1.9%	26.7	X	7.9	17.8
35 to 44 Years	89,472	76,908	2,019,324	95,772	2,517,768	5,408	332,340	1.6%	26.7	X	8.0	18.0
45 to 54 Years	105,328	87,912	2,311,152	108,456	2,853,364	6,428	373,688	1.6%	26.7	X	8.1	18.2
55 to 64 Years	93,608	73,300	1,930,912	90,096	2,375,644	6,008	315,332	1.8%	26.7	X	8.0	18.1
65 Years and Over	136,740	65,104	1,716,432	86,376	2,277,612	4,876	335,248	1.4%	26.7	X	7.7	17.5
Car Ownership												
0	37,140	7,772	204,208	22,000	565,584	12,424	59,400	12.8%	26.5	X	7.3	16.7
1	188,556	116,264	3,035,224	148,360	3,861,848	9,656	545,844	1.6%	26.5	X	7.7	17.4
2	277,424	181,224	4,750,724	236,856	6,198,248	11,096	854,388	1.2%	26.5	X	8.0	18.0
3+	203,304	138,784	3,658,760	180,208	4,741,080	9,444	640,132	1.4%	26.6	X	8.2	18.4
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	370,700	205,080	5,398,204	286,236	7,501,416	33,012	1,004,632	2.9%	26.6	X	8.0	18.1
1	309,404	218,140	5,709,320	275,548	7,200,492	8,704	1,004,340	0.8%	26.5	X	7.9	17.8
>1	26,320	20,816	541,388	25,636	664,852	904	90,792	0.9%	26.5	X	7.9	18.0



# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2035 Scenario – North Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>NORTH</b>	458,832	187,512	5,061,012	265,476	7,154,752	24,828	999,796	2.2%	27.4	5.2%	7.4	16.3
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	75,256	25,616	685,776	38,560	1,029,652	5,328	147,548	2.9%	27.0	X	6.7	14.8
\$25,001-\$50,000	87,104	33,572	904,036	49,408	1,325,928	6,088	187,524	2.8%	27.0	X	7.0	15.6
\$50,001-\$75,000	71,168	29,564	800,020	41,712	1,126,544	3,448	158,056	1.9%	27.4	X	7.4	16.2
\$75,001-\$100,000	50,016	21,800	590,332	30,156	815,724	2,008	112,748	1.6%	27.4	X	7.4	16.4
\$100,001 or More	175,288	76,976	2,080,856	105,652	2,856,920	7,956	393,920	1.8%	27.6	X	7.6	16.7
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	77,912	8,724	224,008	27,876	711,444	2,192	106,228	1.2%	25.3	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	50,156	20,484	549,620	29,976	804,216	4,280	118,360	3.0%	26.8	X	7.2	15.9
25 to 34 Years	66,800	34,572	940,980	44,768	1,220,536	4,424	163,000	2.5%	27.6	X	7.5	16.4
35 to 44 Years	59,976	31,564	854,980	41,440	1,125,184	3,704	154,136	2.3%	27.7	X	7.4	16.4
45 to 54 Years	62,116	32,140	867,464	41,772	1,132,636	4,032	152,396	2.5%	27.5	X	7.5	16.5
55 to 64 Years	60,552	30,776	834,788	39,836	1,083,444	3,584	148,936	2.3%	27.6	X	7.3	16.1
65 Years and Over	81,320	29,272	789,196	39,832	1,077,312	2,612	156,740	1.6%	27.6	X	7.3	16.1
Car Ownership												
0	27,612	4,088	110,000	12,164	323,092	9,256	33,452	16.0%	26.7	X	6.9	15.3
1	125,860	52,352	1,403,024	71,408	1,909,520	4,824	272,908	1.5%	27.2	X	7.1	15.8
2	171,024	73,588	1,983,756	101,772	2,740,852	5,588	390,996	1.3%	27.3	X	7.4	16.3
3+	134,336	57,496	1,564,244	80,148	2,181,300	5,160	302,440	1.5%	27.7	X	7.7	16.8
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	253,032	89,832	2,429,752	136,012	3,671,756	20,712	498,492	3.6%	27.4	X	7.5	16.5
1	192,156	90,272	2,431,244	120,128	3,231,128	3,732	465,700	0.7%	27.3	X	7.3	16.1
>1	13,644	7,416	200,020	9,344	251,876	384	35,604	1.0%	27.3	X	7.4	16.4





# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

## 2035 Scenario – Northwest Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>NORTHWEST</b>	505,140	256,996	6,915,528	349,376	9,393,716	17,652	1,335,008	1.2%	27.5	5.0%	7.5	16.4
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	78,868	31,408	833,844	45,060	1,194,584	3,404	177,316	1.7%	26.9	X	6.7	15.2
\$25,001-\$50,000	89,160	41,180	1,102,624	58,748	1,571,520	4,584	228,876	1.8%	27.2	X	6.9	15.4
\$50,001-\$75,000	79,836	41,280	1,107,596	55,704	1,494,072	2,576	215,824	1.1%	27.4	X	7.3	16.2
\$75,001-\$100,000	49,876	27,196	733,068	36,040	970,308	1,480	137,368	1.0%	27.7	X	7.5	16.6
\$100,001 or More	207,400	115,948	3,138,412	153,840	4,163,248	5,608	575,624	0.9%	27.7	X	7.7	16.9
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	79,188	9,728	251,680	29,444	751,628	1,240	122,248	0.6%	25.2	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	51,136	25,176	678,100	35,108	945,564	2,972	141,504	1.9%	27.2	X	7.3	16.2
25 to 34 Years	69,896	46,800	1,258,904	58,540	1,579,768	2,976	215,236	1.3%	27.7	X	7.5	16.5
35 to 44 Years	65,064	44,036	1,187,012	56,636	1,532,252	2,524	210,920	1.1%	27.6	X	7.5	16.6
45 to 54 Years	80,068	53,076	1,431,060	67,016	1,810,448	3,200	249,004	1.2%	27.7	X	7.5	16.4
55 to 64 Years	65,080	41,168	1,112,308	52,092	1,411,364	2,664	195,384	1.3%	27.8	X	7.5	16.5
65 Years and Over	94,708	37,032	996,484	50,564	1,362,712	2,076	200,712	1.0%	27.5	X	7.2	16.1
Car Ownership												
0	31,852	5,768	155,796	15,704	419,732	6,592	49,044	9.2%	27.2	X	7.2	15.8
1	156,100	78,300	2,096,228	102,920	2,752,128	4,268	402,140	1.0%	27.4	X	7.3	16.2
2	185,600	100,396	2,702,896	133,944	3,603,032	3,628	516,708	0.6%	27.6	X	7.5	16.4
3+	131,588	72,540	1,960,624	96,824	2,618,840	3,164	367,116	0.8%	27.7	X	7.6	16.8
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	295,560	134,452	3,624,068	191,376	5,150,440	15,380	723,928	1.9%	27.6	X	7.5	16.5
1	196,292	114,224	3,065,864	147,436	3,957,056	2,128	570,708	0.3%	27.5	X	7.5	16.4
>1	13,288	8,328	225,600	10,572	286,232	144	40,372	0.3%	27.8	X	7.3	16.0





# TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2026-2035 MAJOR UPDATE

### 2035 Scenario – South Planning Area

POPULATION GROUP	POPULATION	VEHICLE HOURS TRAVELED (AUTO)	VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (AUTO)	PERSON HOURS TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON MILES TRAVELED (ALL MODES)	PERSON TRIPS by TRANSIT	PERSON TRIPS by CAR	TRANSIT SHARE	PEAK PERIOD SPEED (MPH) (AM PEAK)	PERCENT LANE MILES WITH V/C > 1.0 (AM PEAK)	WORK TRIP LENGTH (MILES)	COMMUTE TIME (MINUTES)
<b>SOUTH</b>	598,052	392,736	11,662,040	512,756	15,118,312	24,716	1,811,852	1.2%	29.1	6.3%	9.7	19.6
Household Income												
\$25,000 or Less	89,724	39,032	1,164,388	56,436	1,664,528	4,232	219,148	1.7%	28.7	X	8.1	16.5
\$25,001-\$50,000	98,688	54,312	1,627,552	75,204	2,231,476	5,092	282,624	1.6%	28.9	X	9.0	18.2
\$50,001-\$75,000	82,396	53,304	1,585,952	69,656	2,058,692	3,340	251,292	1.2%	29.2	X	9.4	19.0
\$75,001-\$100,000	63,740	46,936	1,403,168	59,048	1,755,016	2,308	203,788	1.0%	29.5	X	10.0	20.0
\$100,001 or More	263,504	199,168	5,880,992	252,428	7,408,616	9,744	855,000	1.1%	29.1	X	10.0	20.4
Age Group												
Under 16 Years	108,908	14,152	388,880	45,344	1,215,840	1,972	174,716	0.7%	25.6	X	NA	NA
16 to 24 Years	60,068	38,192	1,132,064	50,924	1,501,948	4,488	189,736	2.2%	28.7	X	9.4	18.8
25 to 34 Years	85,216	75,552	2,249,540	91,084	2,710,500	4,976	309,664	1.5%	29.2	X	9.6	19.3
35 to 44 Years	76,088	70,212	2,086,904	85,436	2,539,704	3,876	290,140	1.3%	29.3	X	9.6	19.5
45 to 54 Years	88,188	79,912	2,372,684	96,492	2,865,804	3,884	322,040	1.2%	29.3	X	9.9	20.1
55 to 64 Years	77,180	64,348	1,930,672	77,348	2,318,056	3,212	267,580	1.2%	29.5	X	10.0	20.1
65 Years and Over	102,404	50,392	1,501,320	66,152	1,966,488	2,308	257,976	0.9%	29.2	X	9.5	19.2
Car Ownership												
0	25,464	4,884	147,372	13,936	406,572	6,512	41,292	10.6%	29.1	X	9.0	18.2
1	140,116	82,264	2,454,400	106,688	3,155,732	4,648	396,180	1.1%	29.2	X	9.3	18.6
2	263,480	180,404	5,338,104	233,352	6,854,112	7,984	826,948	0.9%	29.1	X	9.7	19.6
3+	168,992	125,192	3,722,176	158,792	4,701,908	5,572	547,432	1.0%	29.2	X	10.1	20.3
Car Availability (Cars/16+ HH Members)												
<1	281,768	165,572	4,963,440	225,832	6,715,176	18,056	784,484	2.1%	29.4	X	9.9	19.9
1	291,048	207,728	6,127,104	262,936	7,701,340	5,992	944,348	0.6%	28.9	X	9.5	19.4
>1	25,236	19,444	571,508	23,996	701,804	668	83,020	0.7%	28.9	X	9.8	20.0