# Option 1: CTC Role (Administration Only)



Operation Cost: \$5,972,869 | Administration Cost: \$512,869; Contract Cost: \$5,460,000. Capital Cost: None Current Revenue Available: \$3,036,124 Gap: \$2,936,746

### Pros:

- Tighter contract provisions between the CTC and the providers.
- The coordinated system would be maintained.

- The cost could significantly increase and the CTC is responsible for costs above available revenue.
- Funding partners would have to be identified, because the cost share would be too significant for one agency.
- Additional facility space will be required for administrative staff.



# Option 2: RTS as the CTC and Providing All Trips



Operation Cost: \$6,451,328 Capital Cost: \$6,092,000 Current Revenue Available: \$3,036,124 Gap: \$3,148,205

## Pros:

- RTS would have complete control over quality of service.
- RTS would be able to collect data and provide planning analysis to design routes that tie into the fixed route system.
- The coordinated system would be maintained.

- Significantly higher cost would require additional funding partners.
- The CTC would need to purchase an additional 32 vehicles. RTS will need to find expanded facilities to house administrative and maintenance operations.
- RTS will be providing a service outside of its current service area.



# Option 3: Issue Another RFP for CTC



- Under this option, the MTPO would re-bid the CTC contract with some additional stipulations.
  - CTC would not be the provider of trips.
  - In addition, the CTC would be required to provide contracts similar to the RTS/CTC contract to ensure an adequate level of service is provided and liquidated damages are assessed if contract provisions are not met.
- Extra Funds would need to be identified (\$3,599,587).



# Option 4: RTS as the CTC and Contracting Services



Operation Cost: \$6,635,711 | Administrative Cost: \$1,175.711; Contract Service: \$5,460,000 Capital Cost: \$837,000 Current Revenue Available: \$3,036,124 Gap: \$3,599,587

#### Pros:

- Tighter contract provisions between the CTC and the providers.
- RTS would be able to collect data and provide planning analysis to design routes that tie into the fixed route system.
- The coordinated system would be maintained.

- RTS will be providing a service outside of its current service area.
- The cost could significantly increase and the CTC is responsible for costs above available revenue.
- Additional facility space will be required for administrative staff and operations staff.



Options 5: RTS providing ADA Service at the Current Level of Service



Operation Cost: \$2,255,731 Capital Cost: \$815,000 Current Revenue Available: \$896,328 Gap: \$1,299,403

### Pros:

- RTS would be able to control quality and level of service.
- RTS would be able to collect data and provide planning analysis to design routes that tie into the fixed route system.

- There would no longer be a coordinated system.
- Transition period may be difficult for riders.
- RTS will need to find expanded facilities to house the administrative and maintenance operations.
- Cost will be significantly higher than the approximate \$896,328 for ADA.



# **CTC FUNDING REVENUES**



Funding Source	Contract \$	Comments
ADA	\$ 500,000	
ADA/DS	\$ 53,949	
Developmental Services (DS)	\$ 275,419	
Medicaid	\$ 1,404,720	
TD	\$ 533,682	Required 10% match
5311	\$ 60,000	Required 50% match
Foster Grand Parents (FGP)	\$ 190,000	
Elder Care	\$ 18,353	
Total	\$ 3,036,124	

Potential Funding Source (2007 State Department of Revenue)

1/2 Cent Sales Tax :

\$7,573,000 City of Gainesville

\$21,169,000 Alachua County

